



University of Pennsylvania  
ScholarlyCommons

---

Publicly Accessible Penn Dissertations

---

2017

# Forging Christianity: Jews And Christians In Pseudo-Ignatius

Phillip Joseph Augustine Fackler  
*University of Pennsylvania*, [phackler@gmail.com](mailto:phackler@gmail.com)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://repository.upenn.edu/edissertations>

 Part of the [History of Religion Commons](#), and the [Religion Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Fackler, Phillip Joseph Augustine, "Forging Christianity: Jews And Christians In Pseudo-Ignatius" (2017). *Publicly Accessible Penn Dissertations*. 2273.  
<https://repository.upenn.edu/edissertations/2273>

This paper is posted at ScholarlyCommons. <https://repository.upenn.edu/edissertations/2273>  
For more information, please contact [repository@pobox.upenn.edu](mailto:repository@pobox.upenn.edu).

---

# Forging Christianity: Jews And Christians In Pseudo-Ignatius

**Abstract**

This dissertation explores one of the thorny problems of writing a social history of Early Christianity, the degree to which rhetoric either reflects or evokes worldviews, institutions, and other social formations. Through a focus on the textual traditions associated with Ignatius of Antioch, a second-century martyr and Christian bishop, I explore how language about Jews and Judaism was reproduced and rewritten in later centuries such that it has become evidence for our own histories of Jewish–Christian relations. The textual tradition of Ignatius’s letters includes multiple recensions and was reproduced repeatedly throughout Late Antiquity and into the Middle Ages. By comparing the various recensions, I show how both retention and alteration in the textual tradition can create new rhetorical effects. The different recensions provide evidence for the effects of earlier versions on later readers and how the reading and writing practices of later scribes gave birth to new images of the past and new modes of reading early Christian literature. By engaging recent scholarship on ancient education, scribal practice, and the materiality of texts, I show how careful attention to the effects of texts and textual production helps us better understand the processes and practices that give rhetoric social traction and force.

**Degree Type**

Dissertation

**Degree Name**

Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)

**Graduate Group**

Religious Studies

**First Advisor**

Annette Y. Reed

**Keywords**

ancient education, authorship, Early Christianity, Ignatius of Antioch, Jewish–Christian relations, Late Antiquity

**Subject Categories**

History of Religion | Religion

FORGING CHRISTIANITY:  
JEWS AND CHRISTIANS IN PSEUDO-IGNATIUS

Phillip J. A. Fackler

A DISSERTATION

in

Religious Studies

Presented to the Faculties of the University of Pennsylvania

in

Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the

Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

2017

Supervisor of Dissertation

---

Annette Yoshiko Reed

Associate Professor, Religious Studies

Graduate Group Chairperson

---

Anthea Butler

Associate Professor, Religious Studies

Dissertation Committee

Anthea Butler Associate Professor, Religious Studies, University of Pennsylvania

Bart Ehrman James A. Gray Distinguished Professor, Religious Studies, University of North Carolina Chapel Hill

David Stern Harry Starr Professor of Classical and Modern Jewish and Hebrew Literature, Near Eastern Languages and Civilization, Harvard University

FORGING CHRISTIANITY: JEWS AND CHRISTIANS IN PSEUDO-IGNATIUS

COPYRIGHT

2017

Phillip Joseph Augustine Fackler

*In memory of Joan and James  
For Callie, Elliott, and Linus*

## Acknowledgments

I owe a tremendous debt to Dr. Annette Yoshiko Reed, without whom this project would never have come to fruition. She has contributed deeply to my formation as a scholar through regular conversations (many of them as I stuck my head in her open door to pester her), insightful questions and comments, a generous collegiality, and incisive reading of my research. The depth and breadth of her scholarship has been a continual inspiration to me, and her contributions to this project have consistently pushed me to address questions and concerns that translate beyond my own discipline. Through no fault of hers, errors and infelicities persist, but to the degree this dissertation is successful, it could not have been so without her support, encouragement, and wisdom. For her scholarship and mentorship, I am extremely grateful.

I am also deeply appreciative of my other committee members, Dr. Bart Ehrman and Dr. David Stern. I am grateful to have had someone with Dr. Ehrman's depth of expertise give critical feedback on my project. Dr. Ehrman's numerous works on the Apostolic Fathers, ancient forgery, and New Testament text criticism have been my constant companions since my interest in Early Christian Studies first developed, and he consistently challenged me to sharpen my arguments and distinctions about the relationship between scribal practices and conceptions of forgery and authorship. Dr. Stern has been an unfailingly generous teacher and reader who has sharpened my insights into the materiality of books and deepened my understanding of scribal culture and ancient pedagogy. He has done this while introducing a neophyte to the complexities and subtle beauty of Rabbinic literary culture. This has expanded my scholarly horizons in ways I have yet to fully appreciate. I thank both of them for their time, comments, and the conversations that I have had with each of them during this project.

The Department of Religious Studies at Penn has been a rich and remarkably collegial place to study. I want to thank each of the faculty members there for their insights into teaching, research and professional development and for fostering such a rich environment in which to become a scholar. I am also grateful to my fellow graduate students who have contributed in countless ways to my development as a scholar, through reading groups and colloquium conversations as well as random conversations over lunch. My thanks also go out to Dr. Kim Bowes who supervised one of my exams and whose challenging questions provoked from me a more nuanced engagement with material culture and the complexities of space and place in antiquity. During my time in Raleigh, the Late Antique Studies Reading Group at Duke and the Christianity in Antiquity group at UNC-Chapel Hill both welcomed me. For their friendship and collegiality, I am most grateful.

Lastly, I must also thank my family to whom this dissertation is dedicated. My partner, Callie, put up with a cross-country move, employment uncertainty, and

the countless emotional and practical challenges of sharing life with a budding academic. Our children, Elliott and Linus, have till now, not known a life where I am not a student. Their support has made this entire effort possible, if logistically challenging at times. They are a constant reminder that life is full of joys and surprise if only we are willing to look for them. They deserve and have my deepest thanks and love.

My parents Joan and Jim deserve mention as well. Both of them were avid readers. My mother kept stack of books next to her chair, even after failing eyesight and memory made it impossible for her to read. My father, too, read constantly though with a bit less eclecticism. Between the two of them our bookshelves were cluttered with everything from scholarly tomes to the most vapid of popular fiction. It was they who taught me that the deepest joys of learning lie not in the knowing but in the asking and searching. They both died within a year of each other, as this dissertation rounded to completion, and never saw it in its final form. For their lives and memories, I am daily grateful.

## **ABSTRACT**

### **FORGING CHRISTIANITY: JEWS AND CHRISTIANS IN PSEUDO-IGNATIUS**

Phillip J. A. Fackler

Annette Yoshiko Reed

This dissertation explores one of the thorny problems of writing a social history of Early Christianity, the degree to which rhetoric either reflects or evokes worldviews, institutions, and other social formations. Through a focus on the textual traditions associated with Ignatius of Antioch, a second-century martyr and Christian bishop, I explore how language about Jews and Judaism was reproduced and rewritten in later centuries such that it has become evidence for our own histories of Jewish–Christian relations. The textual tradition of Ignatius’s letters includes multiple recensions and was reproduced repeatedly throughout Late Antiquity and into the Middle Ages. By comparing the various recensions, I show how both retention and alteration in the textual tradition can create new rhetorical effects. The different recensions provide evidence for the effects of earlier versions on later readers and how the reading and writing practices of later scribes gave birth to new images of the past and new modes of reading early Christian literature. By engaging recent scholarship on ancient education, scribal practice, and the materiality of texts, I show how careful attention to the effects of texts and textual production helps us better understand the processes and practices that give rhetoric social traction and force.



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>ACKNOWLEDGMENTS</b> .....	<b>IV</b>
<b>ABSTRACT</b> .....	<b>VI</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION — COMPARISON, AUTHORSHIP, AND THE CASE OF THE IGNATIAN EPISTLES</b> .....	<b>1</b>
Attending to Similarity .....	9
Describing Difference and Assessing Effects without Asserting Intent.....	15
<b>CHAPTER 1—IGNATIUS AS ICON OF CHURCH AND EPISCOPACY: MAGNESIANS BETWEEN THE SECOND AND FOURTH CENTURIES</b> .....	<b>38</b>
Introduction .....	38
Documenting Difference.....	40
Effects of Difference .....	53
Attending to Similarity .....	62
Conclusion.....	80
<b>CHAPTER 2—IMAGINING CHRISTIAN CONTINUITY: THE LONG RECENSION OF <i>PHILADELPHIANS</i></b> .....	<b>82</b>
Introduction .....	82
Documenting Differences .....	83
Effects of Difference .....	110
Documenting Similarity .....	116
Effects of Similarity .....	124
Conclusions .....	143

**CHAPTER 3—READING JUDAISM, TEACHING CHRISTIANITY:  
IGNATIUS AND PSEUDO-IGNATIUS ON JEWS AND CHRISTIANS 147**

Introduction ..... 147

Judaism in Magnesians..... 149

Judaism in *Philadelphians*..... 173

Jews and Judaism Elsewhere in the Long Recension ..... 188

Conclusions ..... 195

**CHAPTER 4—REMEMBERING IGNATIUS, TRANSMITTING  
IGNATIUS: EXEMPLARITY AND THE RECEPTION OF THE  
IGNATIAN CORPUS ..... 203**

Inviting Exemplarity: Ignatius on How to Read His Letters ..... 206

The Ignatian Corpus before Constantine..... 214

Eusebius and the Re-collection of Ignatius..... 230

Imagining Ignatius after Eusebius ..... 241

Conclusion..... 257

**CONCLUSION..... 258**

**BIBLIOGRAPHY ..... 263**

Primary Texts ..... 263

Secondary Texts ..... 264

## INTRODUCTION — COMPARISON, AUTHORSHIP, AND THE CASE OF THE IGNATIAN EPISTLES

“And how am I to apply what the one thing shows me to the case of two things?”<sup>1</sup>

The second-century bishop Ignatius of Antioch has been frequently credited as the first writer to mark Christianity as a global, unified system opposed to an equally monolithic Judaism. Consequently, his letters loom large in scholarly debates about where, when, and how Christians and Jews first came to see themselves as part of mutually exclusive “religions.” More recent studies, however, have been critical of such global models of self-definition, emphasizing the ongoing importance of Judaism and Christianity for each other’s self-definition even after the second century.<sup>2</sup> Scholars have long emphasized the diversity of Second Temple Judaism and earliest Christianity, but only recently have studies drawn our attention to the ways in which such complexity continued throughout Late Antiquity.<sup>3</sup> This newer line of research has highlighted the difficulties in categorizing identity from material remains,<sup>4</sup> the role of rhetoric in

---

<sup>1</sup> Wittgenstein, *Philosophical Investigations* as cited in Smith, *Imagining Religion*, 35. Smith goes on to identify this as a question that “haunts” the modern study of religion. He writes, “It reminds us that comparison is, at base, never identity. Comparison requires the postulation of difference as the grounds of its being interesting (rather than tautological) and a methodical manipulation of difference, a playing across the ‘gap’ in the service of some useful end.”

<sup>2</sup> See especially, Becker and Reed, “Introduction,” in *Ways that Never Parted*; Boyarin, *Border Lines*; Lieu, *Image and Reality*; Schwartz, *Imperialism and Jewish Society*.

<sup>3</sup> E.g. Becker and Reed, “Introduction,” *Ways that Never Parted*, 16–24. “We suggest that Jews and Christians (or at least the elites among them) may have been engaged in the task of “parting” throughout Late Antiquity...*precisely because* the two never really “parted” during that period with the degree of decisiveness or finality needed to render either tradition irrelevant to the self-definition of the other, or even to make participation in both an unattractive or inconceivable option.”

<sup>4</sup> E.g. Rutgers, *Jews in Late Ancient Rome*; Jaś Elsner, “Archaeologies and Agendas,” 114–128; Stern, *Inscribing Devotion and Death*.

marking boundaries and articulating identity,<sup>5</sup> the ways in which our sources simultaneously articulate difference *and* voice shared cultural concerns,<sup>6</sup> and the effects of Roman power on these processes.<sup>7</sup> My dissertation builds on this scholarship by examining the reception of Ignatius's letters in the fourth century. I explore the ways in which a pseudonymous scribe received and re-imagined Ignatius's project by rewriting his letters. By analyzing this almost wholly unstudied reworking of second-century material, I shed light on how certain Christian elites engaged in the "task of parting" through remembering and rewriting the past and the various textual practices and material limitations that made such acts of reproduction and remembering possible.

Past scholarship on the Ignatian corpus exhibits three overlapping tendencies, all of which have had the effect of privileging the second century as the key moment in understanding the letters. Since the foundational work of Joseph Barber Lightfoot in the late nineteenth century, Ignatius's letters have been divided into three recensions, the Short, Middle, and Long Recensions.<sup>8</sup> Lightfoot's text-critical work and its independent corroboration by Theodor Zahn<sup>9</sup> identified the seven letters of the Middle Recension as the authentic work of Ignatius, dating them to the early second century in the reign of Trajan. Their arguments relegated the Short Recension (a Syriac abridgement) and the thirteen letters of the Long Recension to the category of spurious works, at least for the

---

<sup>5</sup> E.g. Lieu, *Image and Reality*; Boyarin, *Border Lines*.

<sup>6</sup> Reed, "Parting Ways' over Blood and Water?", 227–260.

<sup>7</sup> E.g. Schwartz, *Imperialism*; Cameron, *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire*; Jacobs, *Remains of the Jews*.

<sup>8</sup> Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*.

<sup>9</sup> Zahn, *Ignatius von Antiochien*.

reconstruction of “Church” history. This division remains the scholarly consensus, despite several subsequent attempts to decrease the number of authentic epistles<sup>10</sup> or to claim—as did many early modern Protestants—that even the Middle Recension was a mid to late second-century forgery.<sup>11</sup> While these attempts to question the dating or reevaluate the authenticity of the letters have proved unpersuasive to most of the scholarly community, all current arguments of the last forty years, save one<sup>12</sup>, centered on the Middle Recension. Debates raged but have been largely limited to when in the second century the Middle Recension was written and whether or not it was written by Ignatius.<sup>13</sup>

The second trajectory of scholarship on Ignatius arises from use of his letters in research on Jewish–Christian relations. Here again, the focus is on his early second-century context, but often with little concern for textual issues. In the most recent iterations of such scholarship, influential scholars like Judith Lieu have engaged in careful readings of the Ignatian corpus (and other early

---

<sup>10</sup> Joly, *Le dossier*; Rius-Camps, *The Four Authentic Letters of Ignatius*.

<sup>11</sup> Hübner, “Thesen zur Echtheit,” 42-70; Lechner, *Ignatius adversus Valentinianos?* Until very recently, criticism of this consensus has largely been confined to German-language scholarship. Personal correspondence with other young Anglophone scholars suggests a renewed interest among Americans in closely reexamining this consensus and the assumptions that undergird it. See, for example, Thompson, “Rubbish Under the Name of Ignatius.” Here too, the interest remains firmly on what can be treated as authentically second century and whence in the second century it arises. See also n. 13 below.

<sup>12</sup> The only author in recent memory to mount a sustained argument for the priority of the Long Recension is Weijenborg, *Les lettres d’Ignace d’Antioche*. For a witty dismissal of his arguments, see Edwards, “When the dead speak,” 344.

<sup>13</sup> Regardless of their persuasiveness, these disputes point to a larger consensus about the spurious nature of the Long and Short recensions. As Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, already observed over twenty years ago, the battle over authenticity now only plays out on the field of the Middle Recension with most scholars maintaining their authenticity in the face of occasional arguments for some or all of the Middle Recension as forgeries of the late second century (rather than authentic letters of the early second century). Barnes, “Date of Ignatius,” 119–130, has argued that the letters are authentic as most scholars concur but that they should be dated to the reign of Antoninus Pius.

Christian texts), exhibiting admirable caution in their unwillingness to simply equate Ignatius's rhetoric with reality.<sup>14</sup> Other similar (if less rhetorically focused) studies have tended to work on a smaller scale, contextualizing Ignatius either in his native Syria or in the Anatolian locales to which he wrote.<sup>15</sup> Such works construct an Ignatius who does not articulate a majority position but rather speaks and writes as one voice in a rhetorical battle to determine the boundaries of "Christianness" vis-à-vis varieties of Christianity and Judaism. Such studies highlight the ideas and motifs shared by Ignatius and his opponents and emphasize the difficulty in relating rhetoric to reality.<sup>16</sup> Despite this richness, they rarely consider evidence beyond the second century for understanding the effects of such rhetoric.

It is this sometimes myopic focus on the second century as definitive that Lieu and others share with scholars who treat Ignatius as an "inventor" of Christianity—that is, as the first to mark Christianity as a global, unified system opposed to an equally monolithic Judaism. Such scholars rarely attend to the aspirational and evocative role of rhetoric, arguing instead that Ignatius serves as the mouthpiece for a separatist model of Christian self-definition already broadly shared by the "Great Church."<sup>17</sup> It is not difficult to see why scholars might

---

<sup>14</sup> Lieu, *Image and Reality*, 23–56 attempts a clear delineation between the rhetoric and the reality of the Ignatian epistles.

<sup>15</sup> Or both as is the case with Trevett, *Study of Ignatius of Antioch*. Ignatius wrote to Rome as well, but there has yet to be any attempt to situate a specifically Roman context for understanding Ignatius's epistles. Most interpreters take the lack of specifics regarding officers and individuals in *Romans* as a sign that Ignatius knew little about that community.

<sup>16</sup> E.g., Marshall, "The Objects of Ignatius' Wrath," 1–23; Jefford, "Milieu of Matthew," 35–47; Lieu, *Image and Reality*, 23–56; Cohen, "Judaism without Circumcision," 395–415.

<sup>17</sup> E.g. Robinson, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 76–85. Zetterholm makes similar claims but limits the scope of them to Antioch. See, *Formation of Christianity in Antioch*, esp. 203–210. In *Partings of*

support this position. Ignatius is the first writer to use the term “Christianity (χριστιανισμός)” and deploys it as the privileged binary of “Judaism (ιουδαϊσμός, *Magn* 8, 10; *Phild* 6). Thus, he displays self-consciousness about categorization and its terminology that is striking. These terms in turn, because they closely parallel contemporary language, make it easy for scholars to read current ideas about Christianity and Judaism into Ignatius’s rhetoric. Nevertheless, this too privileges the act of inscription over the role of later readers and reading communities in making such rhetoric a reality.

A third trajectory of scholarship ignores the role of Judaism in Ignatius’s thought entirely, focusing on the Roman imperial context as the meaningful background for Ignatius’s ideas and rhetoric. Here too, the second century is privileged as *the* moment that determines the meaning of Ignatius’s epistles. A focus on Roman imperial culture is evident already in the preponderance of references to Greek and Roman philosophers and moralists in William Schoedel’s commentary on the Middle Recension.<sup>18</sup> The trend continues in more recent studies that argue for close connections between Ignatius and the so-called “Second Sophistic.”<sup>19</sup> Much of this scholarship, despite its richness, reproduces

---

*the Ways*, Dunn treats the process of parting as less unified geographically and chronologically, but nevertheless as an inevitable process fueled by doctrinal differences. In the conclusion to *Jews and Christians*, Dunn reasserts this inevitability while conceding that it may not have appeared that way to those involved (367–368). All agree, at least for the areas they discuss, that the process of separation was largely complete by the early second century.

<sup>18</sup> Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*. Schoedel highlights a wide range of parallels, but the likes of Plutarch, Seneca, Epictetus, and Marcus Aurelius all figure prominently in his parsing of Ignatius’s rhetoric. In fact, the inclusion of Greek and Roman rhetorical and philosophical writings helped to pave new ground in the study of Ignatius.

<sup>19</sup> On the Second Sophistic, see Goldhill, “Introduction, Setting an agenda: ‘Everything is Greece to the wise,’” 1–25; Tim Whitmarsh, “Thinking Local,” 1–16; and Greg Woolf, “Becoming Roman,

the “Parting of the Ways” model by implicitly or explicitly treating Jews and their religious and cultural practices as irrelevant or unimportant for understanding Ignatius’s claims. While such studies provide a foundation for examining the discursive world shared by Ignatius and those from whom he seeks to separate himself,<sup>20</sup> they assume that the meaning and importance of the corpus lies in its second century creation, rather than any other moment in its transmission and use.

Such assumptions are not the province of Ignatian scholarship alone. The history of Jewish–Christian relations more generally identifies authors of the second century as decisive for the formation of practices and ideologies that shape all later encounters. Whether by assuming the demise of “Jewish Christianity” sometime in the early second century<sup>21</sup> or by focusing on competition and conflict between well-defined groups,<sup>22</sup> the second century is often implicitly or explicitly treated as the defining period after which there are two separate religions in which later practices and claims are merely responses to

---

staying Greek,” 116–143. On attempts to relate it to Ignatius, see Brent, *Ignatius of Antioch and the Second Sophistic*; Lotz, *Ignatius and Concord*; Maier, “Politics of the Silent Bishop,” 503–519.

<sup>20</sup> Such studies usefully contextualize early Christian writings within various trends and practices (especially rhetorical) of the early Roman Empire, but often ignore the kinds of evidence that might be gained from treating Jewish texts from the early empire as part of the same Roman context. That is, Jews are unconsciously excluded from representing Roman context with much the same effect as earlier scholarship that identified Jewish literature as somehow independent of Hellenistic and Roman literary and political culture. For an analysis of such issues, see Reed and Dohrmann, “Introduction: Rethinking Romanness, Provincializing Christendom,” 1–22. A notable exception to this is Harland, *Associations, Synagogues, Congregations* whose broader category of ancient associations allows Christian, Jewish, and other associations to be considered together.

<sup>21</sup> Typically, this is associated with Bar Kochba revolt and the narration of the end of the Jerusalem church provided by Eusebius.

<sup>22</sup> Such models as this have their roots in Marcel Simon’s groundbreaking *Verus Israel*. While his work provided an important corrective to earlier scholarship that treated “late Judaism” formalistic, legalistic, and lacking in vitality, it tended to support models of differentiation and identity formation that involved a clear, early, and decisive split.



or continuations of those defining moments.<sup>23</sup> To what extent, however, is this true? In what ways are such texts as Ignatius's epistles definitive for any later tradition, trajectory, or expectation? How do we locate the effects of any particular tradition at any given historical moment?

While Ignatian scholarship continues to flourish, one avenue for reevaluating and connecting these various strands of scholarship to other questions being asked in Religious Studies and the Humanities more broadly remains almost unexplored—the reception of Ignatius's epistles, particularly as interpolated and expanded in the Long Recension.<sup>24</sup> Since Lightfoot's work, one can find only seven studies of the Long Recension in English.<sup>25</sup> Most of this work takes the form of articles and deals with either the date<sup>26</sup> or theology of the text.<sup>27</sup> Because of the emphasis on origins and that ever-elusive moment when Judaism

---

<sup>23</sup> There have been challenges to such models as in Boyarin's *Border Lines*, where the moment of rupture is delayed until the fourth century or later. Here, I am not trying to propose a new moment, but rather to explore scholarly practices that recognize that such ruptures as certainly existed were rarely and need never have been decisive. Rather, ongoing textual, educational, liturgical, and other practices operate to perpetuate, revise, challenge, or reinforce particular distinctions, creating many moments of convergence and rupture. See, e.g. Becker and Reed, "Introduction," *Ways that Never Parted*.

<sup>24</sup> Grant, "Apostolic Fathers' First Thousand Years," 421–429 remains a notable exception. He does not, however, consider the Long Recension as an example Ignatius's reception.

<sup>25</sup> The most recent works to deal with the Long Recension are Ehrman, *Forgery and Counterforgery* and Edwards, "When the Dead Speak." The former deals with the Long Recension as part of a study of the varieties of intent or purpose that lie behind ancient Christian forgeries. The latter deals briefly with how the persona of the writer shifts between the Middle and Long Recension.

<sup>26</sup> See Hannah, "Setting of the Long Recension," 221–238; and the response to Hannah by Brown, "Notes on the Language and Style of Pseudo-Ignatius," 146–152. Hannah argues that the interpolated letters stem from the mid to late second century while the wholly new letters stem from the fourth century or later. Brown argues that the interpolations and spurious new letters share elements of style and language that make it unlikely that they were not undertaken by the same redactor. See also, Brown, *Authentic Writings of Ignatius*, whose exploration of the usefulness of linguistic criteria in determining authenticity uses the Long Recension as a well-established forgery for the purposes of comparing the results of other kinds of historiographic research to those derived from more quantitative approaches to linguistic and stylistic criteria.

<sup>27</sup> Smith, "The Ignatian Long Recension." See, also, Cohen, "Dancing, Clapping, Meditating," 29–53.

and Christianity went their separate ways, scholars have paid little attention to the reception of Ignatius's project.

For this project, I turn away from "origins" in order to explore more fully the processes that privilege someone like Ignatius as an "authority" or key figure in Christian historiography. This project overlaps with the text-critical work of previous generations. What I suggest, however, is that we can learn a great deal about the construction of Christian and Jewish identity by using such text-critical work to examine the afterlife of particular Ignatian traditions, especially of those letters (*Magnesians* and *Philadelphians*) in which modern scholars have found evidence for a decisive split between Judaism and Christianity. Instead of seeking to establish an *Ur*-text, I use the multiple recensions and manuscript variants to explore how scribes intervened in textual transmission. Through such interventions, scribal readers shaped our knowledge of and access to Ignatius himself. I utilize this long tradition of text-critical work in order to contribute to our understanding of when and how scribes intervened. I argue that the decision to remember Ignatius was not a neutral act or natural outgrowth of his already established authority. Rather, it was both an effect of earlier reading and memorial practices and a choice of a particular scribe in a particular historical milieu. By focusing on the Long Recension's interventions as effects of the transmission of a textual tradition *and* strategic choices within the constraints of the textual and memorial traditions related to Ignatius, we can use the text-critical insights of previous scholarship to better understand the processes and practices that give rhetoric of Christian/Jewish difference traction and make it an

important mode of social reproduction. This study shows the ways in which absolutist rhetoric required reiteration and amplification in order to produce seemingly stable distinctions between Christians and their various “others” and one vein in which that process of social production proceeded.

### **Attending to Similarity**

As the above paragraphs make clear, comparison and difference play essential roles in this project. To talk of scribal intervention, strategic choices, and the reformulation of martyrial memories is to dwell on the language of difference. What has changed? What did the pseudonymous scribe hope to accomplish by such alterations? These questions and their eventual answers are predicated on the presence and meaningfulness of difference.<sup>28</sup> Were such differences absolute, however, comparison could have little meaning or value as there would be nothing on which to predicate our comparison. Just as absolute identity produces tautology rather than comparison, so too it is similarity that provides a bridge across the gap produced by difference, making the difference historically meaningful. In order to take account of the full breadth of the Ignatius corpus, we must also attend to similarity.

Text criticism, upon which this study depends, is built on the premise that copying (at least in antiquity) produces corruptions or errors in the text being

---

<sup>28</sup> Text criticism is also predicated on access to certain technologies (of travel, printing, communication, etc.) that make such recognition of difference and comparison possible or, at least, substantially easier than it would have been for most people in antiquity. For a recent call to focus on difference without concern for an original or initial text, see Epp, “It’s all about the Variants,” 275–308.

copied.<sup>29</sup> This works well as a foundational premise. It states clearly what is obvious to anyone who has paged through the critical apparatus of any amply attested textual tradition, much less compared ancient manuscripts of the “same” text. Each repetition or manuscript of the tradition is intelligible on its own but rarely identical to the earliest identifiable formulation or any other manuscript, even in its own manuscript family. Differences abound—some major, some minuscule.<sup>30</sup> The warm familiarity of this premise allows it to function as common sense, as something so easily demonstrated it needs no proof.

Through this foundational move, text criticism has (profitably) taught us to attend closely to difference. How do different manuscripts of the “same” text differ? When were those differences introduced? Is the difference the result of unconscious error or deliberate choice? Which variant is earlier or more original than the other? All these questions presume and attend to difference. Similarly, the text critic’s foundational question, “*utrum in alterum abiturum erat?*”, takes difference as its starting point.<sup>31</sup> It is difference that needs to be arbitrated and explained.<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>29</sup> See, for example, McCarter, *Textual Criticism*.

<sup>30</sup> For an argument that text criticism should be directed toward differences and variants rather to other activities such as “restoring” the “original” text, see Epp, “It’s All About the Variants,” 275–308. As I hope will be clear, I agree with Epp that the value of variants is largely determined by the assumed goal of the critic. However, in the intro and throughout the dissertation, I also wish to expand this to a consideration of identity and sameness. The utility and value of sameness is itself determined by the assumptions we make about how and why identity was maintained in a textual tradition.

<sup>31</sup> McCarter argues that all other text critical rules can be subsumed into this one general question. The other rules function as refinements of it for particular textual difficulties. See, McCarter, *Textual Criticism*, 21 and 72.

<sup>32</sup> In arbitrating intentional changes vs. unconscious changes and errors, the text critic participates in a practice of determining another set of differences that make a difference. We attempt to arbitrate which differences are representative of an agency and intention akin to that typically attributed to authors. Despite the fact that such concern for different editorial intentions

However, this assumption encodes another premise, rarely stated and perhaps more dubious. It assumes that in the process of copying, change and difference are the only things in need of explanation, while retention and sameness are the natural outcome.<sup>33</sup> In part, this stems from what we typically mean by copying: the attempt to make something similar or identical to something else. Recent scholarship on scribes, scribalism and ancient education suggests that such a view of scribal activity in textual production and reproduction is, in itself, misleading. Some people certainly had such goals in mind, but—as this research makes clear—the relationship between scribe and text is much more varied.<sup>34</sup> The scribe could be both producer and consumer of a given manuscript, as was particularly common among the sub-elite scribes whose efforts resulted in the survival of a smattering of early Christian literature.<sup>35</sup> In elite circles, highly educated slaves likely performed the bulk of scribal duties, creating a different relationship between scribe and manuscript. The degree of investment on the part of slaves and hired scribes likely varied based on the text

---

have the same effect on most manuscript readers, authorial intention becomes its own category that is charged with meaning for the scholar but may not have been of equal or any importance for the manuscript's readers. On the issue of political and personal investment in identifying differences as meaningful, see Smith, "What a Difference a Difference Makes."

<sup>33</sup> This discussion benefits from similar critiques of form criticism in Biblical Studies (e.g. Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart*, and more recently idem, *Formation of the Hebrew Bible*) and in the study of late antique textual traditions such as the Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies* and *Recognitions* (e.g. Kelley, *Knowledge and Religious Authority*, 1–7). In Form Criticism, the goal has been the recovery of the earliest traditions (the *Grundschrift*) buried or stored in later narratives and compilations. In criticizing this practice, recent scholarship has started to ask questions about what it means to preserve earlier texts within new narrative frames, attending to similarity in order to explain the usefulness of such earlier elements for the themes and arguments of the composite text.

<sup>34</sup> See Haines-Eitzen, *Guardians of Letters*; van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture*; and Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart* for important contributions to this area of study. For the impact of ancient education more specifically, see Criboire, *Gymnastics of the Mind*.

<sup>35</sup> On the scribes and scribal networks that preserved early Christian literature, see Haines-Eitzen, *Guardians*, esp. 77–104.

being copied and the scribe's own interests. In addition, even elite readers produced texts themselves in order to share them with friends or to discuss them as part of convivial gatherings.<sup>36</sup> In each case, the image of a desire for the kind of reproduction we experience in print culture fails to cover the wide range of relationships and motivations that could and did affect scribal activity.

Such a description of scribal activity complicates our persistent inattention to similarity.<sup>37</sup> We can no longer safely assume that a scribe's only meaningful choice is about what to change. Of course, scribes can choose to excise words, correct grammar, or reproduce what the writer really meant to say or should have said in a particular instance. But, they also choose what to keep and what seems to accurately represent the author or textual tradition being copied. These scribal judgments may be frequent or infrequent, fully conscious or unconscious, but the

---

<sup>36</sup> Reading and writing practices varied greatly even among the highest strata of society for whom we have the most evidence. See, especially, Johnson, *Readers and Reading Culture*. The degree to which literate slaves were authorized to correct and alter the text is unclear. Presumably, the collation of manuscripts between scribe and owner would have made this process a collaborative one. Nevertheless, one still had to depend on the version of the text available within one's own social circle (or, on rare occasions, a civic library), corrected by the members of its readership rather than through more modern critical activities of textual comparison. In his discussion of Galen, Johnson notes that Galen depicts textual access as the province of the wealthy and well-connected. Galen, despite his wealth and connections, often found it difficult to access the manuscripts he wanted, even when living in Rome (Johnson, *Readers and Reading Culture*, 93). For scribal readers of less means, as Haines-Eitzen has shown from both literary and early Christian papyri, readers frequently made their own copies of texts or requested them from friends who were themselves both scribes and users of the text. Haines-Eitzen, *Guardians*, 77–104. This suggests that even if greater weight could be placed on accurate reproduction for elite literary production, such was not the case for all scribes and readers, especially those who operated as producer and user simultaneously rather than as producers for a patron reader.

<sup>37</sup> This is not to say, as some text critics have, that the overwhelming degree of similarity indicates a basically trustworthy manuscript tradition (e.g. Porter, *How We Got the New Testament*, esp. 65–71). However, the arguments for similarity and variation in New Testament manuscripts both tend to hang on presentations of statistics without always doing the harder work of examining how and what scribes changed as well as when certain types of changes might be statistically significant as data for the socialization of Christian scribes. At the very least, similarity suggests perceived utility, unquestioned (“doxic”) familiarity, and accuracy on the part of the reproducers who perpetuate those features. It does not make any statements about the probability of this or that version reproducing the “original.”

effects remain the same. Similarity between texts becomes an effect of scribal choice. To whatever degree we can call different manuscripts the “same,” we depend on scribes producing the similarities that lead to such identifications. As a result, we must also make an effort to examine material that persists despite difference. Our attention to difference should not obscure what remains the same.

Because text criticism has taught us to focus on difference in pursuit of the earliest possible version, we rarely examine what persists across versions. The similarities fade into the background, useful only as a tool for identifying the different versions and textual families as part of the same work or textual tradition. However, the decision to preserve and reproduce words as they exist in an exemplar is itself a choice, just as much as any introduction of difference. Deciding what to keep is not a natural consequence of a text or author’s authority or antiquity, but a memorial strategy in which the past is reframed by choosing what to keep and what form to keep it in. It is a decision that serves to establish certain words, images, ideas, and memories as authoritative by virtue of deeming them worthy of preservation for another generation or more. The act of reproduction is not a neutral activity because the very act of reproduction asserts the value or validity of what is reproduced.<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>38</sup> Beard makes a similar comment about the role of the editor in letter collections. “No editor is ideologically neutral; every edition is founded on a series of *choices* (omissions, juxtapositions, emendations, and excerpitions) that combine to offer a loaded *representation* of the letter-writer and the relationships instantiated in the letters.” Beard, “Ciceronian Correspondences,” 120.

Although the bulk of this dissertation deals in difference, the fact of multiple recensions draws our attention equally to similarity.<sup>39</sup> The differences that will be teased apart in subsequent chapters are themselves framed by similarity and continuity in the textual tradition. This frame of similarity deserves attention as well. What are those features that allow us to identify the different parts of the Ignatian corpus as recensions, as something that revises, reviews or revisits an earlier text? What stays the same between recensions? How might such similarities be understood by ancient readers? By approaching these similarities on their own, we can begin to think about the ways in which practices of copying and retention serve to shape communal memory and effect certain changes in the present of their readers. To the degree we can answer such questions, we will better be able to appreciate the differences and how readers might encounter such differences as accurately representative of a particular author or tradition.

---

<sup>39</sup> J. Z. Smith has suggested that both similarity and difference are necessary for scholarship to take place. If difference were absolute, any meaningful comparison would be obviated. Likewise, absolute identity prevents meaningful comparison. It is only the complex interplay of likeness and difference that allows for the creation of knowledge that undergirds all academic pursuits. Smith's early work on this subject was directed toward the tendency in Religious Studies to identify similarities among disparate and often disconnected traditions in order to construct universal conceptions of religion. See Smith, "In Comparison a Magic Dwells," 19–36. A similar history is at play in text criticism given that the identification of difference was a means to establish what was stable (and thus earliest) in a textual tradition. Comparison, even with its attention to difference, was used to identify similarity and stability. Recent trends in text criticism, especially in the work of Bart Ehrman and Eldon Epp, have shifted our attention to variation and difference alongside the kinds of debates and disputes that produced some of those differences. See in particular, Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption of Scripture*; idem, *Forgery and Counterforgery*; and Epp, "It's All about the Variants."



## **Describing Difference and Assessing Effects without Asserting Intent**

The same research on ancient scribalism and education that helps to complicate

our approach to similarity also serves to raise important questions about the

ongoing investment in authors and intent. In scholarship on Early Christianity,

especially that dealing wholly or in part with text criticism, little attention has

been given to the problematics of authorial agency and “lectorial”<sup>40</sup> agency.

Despite decades of research in literary theory, rhetoric, and the sociology and

neuroscience of reading, scholarship that focuses on difference in textual

traditions typically approaches these differences from the vantage point of

intent.<sup>41</sup> The questions that arise are about the *purpose* of such differences. Why

did a scribe or author make this change? What were they intending to

accomplish? Just as approaches to similarity frequently elide the authorizing and

ideological effects of reproduction and the agency of the scribe involved in such

reproduction, scholarship on textual difference overplays scribal agency,

asserting intent as the key index through which to evaluate difference and the

historical role of texts. In this section, I explore some of the effects on scholarship

of a focus on authors and intent and propose a consideration of *effects* as a way of

analyzing textual traditions (and differences within and between them) that

---

<sup>40</sup> This word is my own coinage, but I think the absence of an English adjectival phrase that refers to the reader is itself symptomatic of broader inattention to reading as itself an active, agential process. The relationship between text and reader (or reading communities) in the construction of meaning has been an important avenue of scholarship in the Humanities more generally, especially in fields where literary theory has made an impact. See especially Stanley Fish, *Is there a text in this class?* Bourdieu’s work on cultural production, with its persistent call to locate analysis of writing in the context of the social conditions of its production, circulation, and consumption has been similarly critical though less obviously influential in contemporary discussions.

<sup>41</sup> At least, when typical scribal errors do not persuasively explain the differences.

expands our gaze to include institutional, historical, and other practices that give shape to and make possible the activities of readers *and* writers.<sup>42</sup>

Concern with authorial intent pervades New Testament Studies and Patristics.<sup>43</sup> Whether seeking to establish the correct “historical-critical” reading of a particular passage, the theological program of a particular Church Father, or the motives behind pseudepigraphy, scholars frequently conduct their work at the level of authorial intent. New Testament scholars often construct detailed histories of scholarship that document the ways in which predecessors have misunderstood or failed to appreciate the “real” meaning of the text or texts. Nowhere is the on greater display than in scholarship on Paul.<sup>44</sup> Articles, dissertations, and books on Paul (or a specific passage from a Pauline text) typically start from a problematization of prior readings of the text under discussion in order to develop a newer and truer understanding of the author’s

---

<sup>42</sup> This is in part a response to the kinds of problems and evidence inherent in the Ignatian tradition itself as well as an attempt to take seriously Bourdieu’s call for textual analyses that account for the conditions of cultural production, what he terms the “field.” See, e.g. *Field of Cultural Production*, esp. 29–141. I suspect that an account of the field of early Christian literary production that would satisfy Bourdieu is impossible given the many iterations this field has already gone through in both history generally and the history of scholarship more specifically. Nevertheless, I hope this work will demonstrate the fruitfulness of trying despite its likely floundering on several fronts, including my own tendency to fall into analyses that emphasize individual agency and goals at the expense of the limitations created and sustained by institutionalized and routinized practices.

<sup>43</sup> I focus on these two disciplines because the majority of people who study Ignatius and related materials have been trained in one of them. One of the effects of the traditional distinctions between New Testament and Patristics Studies is that the second century in particular falls between the disciplines. Attempts to define the field differently (e.g. Early Christian Studies, Late Ancient Christianity, Late Antique Christianity, Religions of the Ancient Mediterranean) try to account for this but do not always overcome the weight of historical practices that produced the distinction.

<sup>44</sup> E.g., the ongoing debates about the relationship between Paul and Judaism. See, e.g. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*; Stowers, *A Rereading of Romans*; Gager, *Reinventing Paul*; Westerholm, *Perspectives Old and New on Paul*.

intent.<sup>45</sup> Each option is described and summarily dismissed on the grounds of a particular flaw or failure of the reading in relationship to other aspects of the text or corpus under consideration before the writer provides their own uniquely effective or “correct” reading. The difficulty with such approaches is not that they produce “wrong” readings or misunderstandings of the past. Some are; some are not. The larger issue—especially when a new reading is deemed “probable” or “correct”—is that the practice itself illustrates the degree to which authorial intent could have little effect on how such texts were read and used in practice. If the author’s intent was so subtle that we have no evidence of anyone before now reading a text in the “correct” way, what is gained by the scholarly production of paths never taken?

Traditionally, Patristics scholarship has similarly privileged author and intent.<sup>46</sup> Whether in the classical Patristics practices of collecting patrologies or in the construction of histories of doctrine and dogma, the emphasis has remained on the individuals. Like their literary predecessors,<sup>47</sup> patrologies were frequently constructed as collections of biographical details along with bibliographies of texts written by that individual as an aid to various kinds of

---

<sup>45</sup> E.g. Staples, “What do the Gentiles have to Do with ‘All Israel,’” where a wide array of interpretations of Romans 11:25–27 are rejected summarily in a few paragraphs (372–373) in favor of a reading that was subtle enough to have been missed by everyone, including the earliest readers of Paul (388–390). It is not my purpose to single Staples out. This is a practice widely shared in the study of the New Testament, early Christianity, and beyond. Rather than challenging any particular contribution, we would do better to interrogate the assumptions and institutional expectations that perpetuate such practices to the exclusion of other modes of textual analysis.

<sup>46</sup> This paragraph is indebted to Vessey, “Literature, Patristics, Early Christian Writing,” 42–65, esp. 49–55.

<sup>47</sup> E.g. Jerome, *De viris illustribus* and *De scriptoribus ecclesiasticis*.

study.<sup>48</sup> These practices enshrined named individuals and their biographies as central interpretive tools in studying early Christian literature. Protestant scholars, resistant to the chains of authority constructed by such patrologies, argued for the greater importance of the content and form of early Christian texts.<sup>49</sup> Nevertheless, the focus typically remained on the interplay between tradition and innovation in individual authors, documenting how individual writers made use of established thought or widely used genres. Differences between an author and predecessors or contemporaries were framed as intentional interventions. The church fathers were “authors despite themselves.”<sup>50</sup>

More recent approaches to “patristics”—a term itself often rejected or used primarily to characterize theologically motivated scholarship—have shifted dramatically from their historical moorings in the nineteenth century construction of the discipline. Nevertheless, the focus on individual authors remains influential. In conversation with literary, sociological, and anthropological currents in Humanities more broadly, patristics has moved in the directions of social and literary history.<sup>51</sup> Especially in North America, patristics (or Early Christian History) is represented more as “an aspect of late ancient

---

<sup>48</sup> E.g. William Cave, *Scriptorum ecclesiasticorum historia literaria* (1688)

<sup>49</sup> Vessey identifies the focus on “content” with Friedrich Nitzsch (1865) and the focus on “form” with Franz Overbeck (1882).

<sup>50</sup> Vessey, “Literature, Patristics, Early Christian Writing,” 50, summarizing the arguments of Overbeck.

<sup>51</sup> On the former, see Clark, “From Patristics to Early Christian Studies,” in *Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Studies*; Clark, *History, Theory, Text*, each of which does as much to evoke this trajectory in scholarship as it does to document it.

history and literature”<sup>52</sup>—a kind of area studies approach—than as a sub-discipline of either Theology or “Church History.” Despite the proliferation of approaches to early Christian history that draw on social history, cultural anthropology, gender and sexuality, and materiality (of objects, people, books, etc.), reading practices built on prior assumptions of authorship and intent persist. A brief survey of articles in the *Journal of Early Christian Studies* illustrates the degree to which this is the case. In nearly every issue, one can find an essay or two devoted to what a particular “author” thought about a particular subject or an attempt to correct the scholarly consensus on a particular author. From an article on free will and grace in Clement of Alexandria<sup>53</sup> to considerations of Jerome’s “canonical theory”<sup>54</sup> and Maximus the Confessor on gender,<sup>55</sup> numerous contributions to the field continue to take a named author as the starting point, using their historical context and rhetorical techniques to reconstruct their intent and goals. Scholars document in great detail the “thought” of individual authors, providing historically contextualized portraits of the motivations and intellectual inheritances that generated the authorial act and its meaning for the history of Christianity, Western culture, or the history of ideas.

While often productive of new knowledge, such analytical practices can occlude important aspects of well-attested textual traditions and exclude other textual traditions almost entirely. As Mark Vessey argues, attempts to bring

---

<sup>52</sup> Clark, “From Patristics to Early Christian Studies,” 16.

<sup>53</sup> Havrda, “Grace and Free Will,” 21–48.

<sup>54</sup> Gallagher, “The Old Testament ‘Apocrypha,’” 213–33.

<sup>55</sup> Costache, “Living above Gender,” 261–90.

Patristics into conversation with literary history and the social sciences have brought us once again to the challenge of finding language to speak about “texts/documents that, from the moment of their genesis in Late Antiquity, have also been documents/texts.”<sup>56</sup> That is, though typically treated as documents (e.g. records of language, thought, etc. for a particular place and time),<sup>57</sup> early Christian and late antique literature operate from their inception as texts, material artifacts of an act of writing.<sup>58</sup> The focus on authors and intent obscures the “perceptual limits imposed by a pre-constituted *dossier*” of textual traditions.<sup>59</sup> It renders invisible questions of “what could be *seen*, then and now” and the “kinds of historical seeing that *written* materials, duly transmitted, made possible and impossible.”<sup>60</sup> The focus on authors and their intent unnecessarily narrows our considerations to a single “then” of an initial inscription that may or may not have direct bearing on the transmission and collection on which our historical vision depends. Such practices naturalize writing itself as the primary

---

<sup>56</sup> Vessey, “La patristique,” provides useful examples of this in the work of André Mandouze and Peter Brown. As I understand him, document seems to refer as much to use as to any form or genre of inscription while texts incorporate all (or very nearly all) acts of writing. Texts become documents in their use as evidence of someone or something beyond the text. Nevertheless, not all people engage with or use texts as documents.

<sup>57</sup> Vessey provides an excellent example of this from Mandouze, where Mandouze describes texts as “places” because “the documents used are texts, but what these texts in fact express are *moments* in a person’s developing life and thought.” Vessey, “La Patristique,” 459, quoting Mandouze, *Saint Augustin*, 31.

<sup>58</sup> It is quite possible that I am pushing Vessey’s distinction beyond what he intended. In “La Patristique,” Vessey gives little attention to the material aspects of texts though his language of “*dossier*” and the reference to “written materials” more generally both suggest a material dimension to texts. Elsewhere, Vessey, specifically discusses the current trend in Patristics toward “a sustained focus on the material dimensions of texts and on the physical, technological, and sociological contexts of their realization.” Vessey, “Literature, Patristics, Early Christian Writing,” 57. These include “patterns and regimes of literacy; the forms, techniques, and personnel of book production, distribution, and collection; the functioning of textual, scriptural, or interpretative communities; textuality and intertextuality; modes and methods of reading; constructions of authorship (57).”

<sup>59</sup> Vessey, “La patristique,” 464.

<sup>60</sup> Vessey, “La patristique,” 460 (emphasis in original).

activity in the production, expression, and dissemination of culture and the author as the primary agent in these activities.

The difficulty with analytical practices that locate authors and writing at the center of cultural production (and reproduction) lies not in the analysis itself or even its conclusions but in what kinds of agency and texts are rendered invisible by such practices. Modes of textual analysis that privilege authors and intent, largely ignore the social conditions of production, circulation, and consumption thus rendering invisible the agency of a whole host of actors without whom authors would have no agency at all.<sup>61</sup> In addition, textual practices focused on the individual producer ignore the role of other producers—scribes, publishers, previous scholars, etc.—in developing classifications that determine the data set or *dossier* of textual traditions to be analyzed. Classifications like apostolic fathers, apocrypha, pseudepigrapha, and canon, which are themselves products of social agents other than the social agent responsible for a given text, often affect what kinds of texts are considered relevant for critical analysis. This can obscure who we see as relevant writers and the kinds of literary and other practices deemed legitimate for the writing of history.

We can see the effects of an orientation toward named authors in the marginalization of many anonymous and pseudonymous texts in New Testament

---

<sup>61</sup> Bourdieu consistently criticizes formalist and deconstructionist textual analysis for this very reason, arguing that explanations of text rooted in the individual (e.g. *Field of Cultural Production*, 29, 76–77) or the text itself (e.g. his critiques of Foucault and Russian formalism in *Field of Cultural Production*, 178–80 and of Derrida in *Distinction*, 496–98) ignore the larger sets of objective relationships (the “field” of power, philosophy, art, etc.) in which the texts were produced.

and Patristic studies. For example, Christian apocrypha (e.g. *Acts of Paul and Thecla* or *Acts of Peter*), many of which had long, rich afterlives in communities all over the world, are largely ignored in both New Testament and Patristic studies. In New Testament and Biblical Studies, scholars primarily examine only those anonymous or pseudepigraphical texts that were included in most Protestant and Roman Catholic canonical collections.<sup>62</sup> Vast swaths of literary production that shaped visual culture, piety, “scriptural” interpretation, and practice are deemed irrelevant because they are not part of the “canon,” a category whose very construction depended in part on notions of authorship.<sup>63</sup> To the extent that assumptions about accurate attribution gave shape to contemporary canons, authorship serves to exclude writings that occupied the same historical, geographical and cultural milieu as “scriptural” texts from shaping critical analysis of those texts.

In patristics, anonymous and pseudonymous texts have suffered a similar exclusion. Apocalypses, martyr acts, novels about apostles, and hagiography have all played a marginal role in the study of Christian history.<sup>64</sup> Lacking a clearly

---

<sup>62</sup> Many Orthodox traditions (e.g. Ethiopian) preserve a wider range of textual traditions as part of their canons. See, e.g. McDonald, *Biblical Canon*, 38–69, who recognizes this despite largely ignoring it in favor of a focus on shared notions of canon despite differences in content. Another variation that often goes ignored is that present in some medieval biblical manuscripts in which texts like *Jubilees* might be included immediately following a text like Genesis, with no distinction made between them with regard to status.

<sup>63</sup> On this, see Reed, “Pseudepigraphy, Authorship, and the Reception of ‘the Bible,’” 467–90.

<sup>64</sup> This is not to say they have been entirely absent. See, e.g. Cameron, *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire* and Krueger, *Writing and Holiness*, both of whom make productive use of anonymous and pseudonymous Christian literature. Cameron identifies the effectiveness of Christian discourse with its ability to “create its own intellectual and imaginative universe (6)” which utilized a wide range of literary devices to create this universe and relate it to contemporary circumstances. It would be useful to analyze what kinds of scholarship most frequently incorporate anonymous and pseudonymous works, but my impression is that such works are most frequently considered in scholarship on gender, sexuality, asceticism, and the body. See, e.g.



articulated place and time of composition much less a named author or scribe, these texts make inconvenient documents. They successfully efface their producer (and audiences) in such a way that they do not fit easily into disciplinary assumptions about the role of writers and writing in creating and perpetuating Christian culture.<sup>65</sup>

Texts eventually uncovered as fakes and forgeries suffer a similar fate. Like anonymous texts, these pseudonymous works typically lack the kinds of information that would allow us to locate them precisely in time and space. In addition to this, they have the aura of inauthenticity imputed by their violation of our own (and many ancient writers') sense of literary propriety. As forgeries, they are inherently less trustworthy than their properly authored counterparts.<sup>66</sup> The presumed intent of their actual writers serves to discredit them as historical sources. This is most clearly in evidence in text collections and editions. Herbert Musurillo's widely used collection of martyr acts excludes the martyrdom of

---

Kate Cooper, *Virgin and the Bride*; Perkins, *Suffering Self*; Burrus, *Saving Shame*; Castelli, *Martyrdom and Memory*. At the very least, this tendency in scholarship is supported by Foucauldian discourse analysis and Derridean deconstruction insofar as these analytical practices have made space for neglected texts by highlighting the arbitrariness of many classificatory distinctions that served to exclude them.

<sup>65</sup> For example, despite Cameron's emphasis on the many literary levels on which Christian discourse operated, I can think of no attempt in scholarship to delineate the role of anonymous and pseudonymous literature for processes like in such things as Christianization (aside from vague notions of popular appeal as in MacMullen, *Christianization*). In such studies, named authors predominate. See, e.g. Maxwell, *Christianization and Communication*; and Sandwell, *Religious Identity in Late Antique Antioch*, both of which attend primarily to John Chrysostom's homilies rather than any other type of literary production from Antioch in that period.

<sup>66</sup> This ignores the way in which such compositional activities might actually provide better evidence than orthonymous texts for how a wider array of people thought about a particular aspect of the past insofar as their "deception" depended on meeting their readers' expectations about the past in order to survive at all. By contrast, orthonymous texts could survive because of the associated name even when innovating dramatically. For example, Origen appears in many ways as a highly idiosyncratic Christian scholar and interpreter whose work was of enough importance in certain scholastic circles that it survived his eventual condemnation. Contrast this with the near erasure of so-called Gnostic textual traditions which until the 1940s were only accessible through heresiologists.

Ignatius (and others) on the grounds that, unlike other martyrdom accounts, it lacks historical reliability.<sup>67</sup> Scholarship on these texts has now thoroughly questioned the historical reliability of even these narratives, but the selection of texts given by Musurillo continues to influence what martyr accounts receive scholarly analysis.<sup>68</sup> Editions of the Apostolic Fathers have undergone a similar reduction. Early German editions included both texts deemed authentic and those deemed suspect or inauthentic such as a letter of Clement *On Virginit*y and the Long Recension of the Ignatian epistles.<sup>69</sup> While collected in a separate volume from those deemed more historically reliable, these texts were treated as relevant to the study of the “Apostolic Fathers.” Current editions and translations in German and English include only those texts identified by contemporary scholars as historically reliable.<sup>70</sup> Concerns about authorship and authenticity

---

<sup>67</sup> Musurillo, *Acts of the Christian Martyrs*, describes his selection process as such: “For the present addition, I have chosen twenty-eight of the texts which I consider the most reliable or indeed, in the case of those with fictional elements (like the *Martyrdom of Pionius*, the *Martyrdom of Montanus and Lucius*, and the *Martyrdom of Marian and James*), extremely important and instructive (xii).” As his comments make clear, authenticity was not his only criterion, but he fails to make clear *how* he has decided that some were more “important and instructive” than others.

<sup>68</sup> See, Castelli, *Martyrdom and Memory*; Moss, *The Other Christs* for two scholars who move beyond the limitations imposed by Musurillo in creative and productive ways. Castelli analyzes traditions about and commemorations of Thecla while Moss includes six martyr accounts absent from Musurillo (*Acts of the Abitinian Martyrs*; *Acts of Cassian*; *Martyrdom of Lucian and Marcian*; *Martyrdom of Maxima, Donatilla, and Secunda*; *Martyrdom of Maximus*; *Martyrdom of Philip of Heraclea*).

<sup>69</sup> Diekamp and Funk, *Patres Apostolici*, volume 2, 1–50 and 83–269.

<sup>70</sup> Bihlmeyer, *Die Apostolischen Väter*; Lindemann and Paulsen, *Die Apostolischen Väter*; Ehrman, *Apostolic Fathers*; Holmes, *Apostolic Fathers*. Certainly the reasons for this extend beyond consideration of authorship and authenticity alone. The economics of publishing in particular are significant in this respect. Nevertheless, the point here is that our scholarly gaze operates in a field shaped by such considerations and itself supports those economies. The so-called Apostolic Fathers collection itself assumes the comparability of its texts on the basis of chronological proximity. This is a central aspect of historical analysis and a convenient criterion for delineating the boundaries of the collection. However, we often fail to consider the ways in which such collections limit the kinds of questions we ask or limit the kinds of things we see as comparable.

thus have an effect on scholarly practice and the kinds of knowledge that are most accessible to scholars and students.

In addition to excluding a wide array of Christian inscription practices, these scholarly habits reinforce a perception of identity, or at least strong similarity, between ancient and contemporary notions of authorship. Because we are so accustomed to the idea that people write their own words in their own name and because we, as historians, primarily study texts attributed to a single named figure, it seems obvious to us that both ancient authors and forgers would adopt the same practice, or at least presume that type of writing as normative. Thus, it fails to strike us as strange that some largely unknown (at least to us) scribe in fourth century Antioch would adopt the persona of Ignatius and claim that their own words and ideas ought to be construed as consonant with those of the second century martyr and bishop.

However, this common assumption ignores the plethora of options for composing new texts in antiquity as well as the wide array of stories used to authenticate such compositions. Stories of finding texts under floorboards<sup>71</sup>, recovering them from archives<sup>72</sup>, or discovering a text in temple ruins<sup>73</sup> all illustrate that attribution to a single author was neither an obvious nor necessary

---

<sup>71</sup> E.g. *Apocalypse of Paul* 1–2.

<sup>72</sup> See, e.g. the prologue to the *Gospel of Nicodemus* in Tischendorf, *Evangelia Apocrypha*, 203–204. For more on the ideology of archives that undergirds this, see Fackler, *Adversus Adversus Iudaeos*, 422–23; and Kelly “Going through the archives,” 161–76. For more on this practice in relation to Christianization and the “invention of Christian tradition,” see Dilley, “The Invention of Christian Tradition,” 586–615.

<sup>73</sup> E.g. 2 Kings 22. All of these authorization strategies achieve some sense of verisimilitude for the ancient world. Likewise, thanks to the discovery of ancient manuscripts buried in libraries (e.g. Codex Sinaiticus) and books buried in deserts and caves (e.g. Nag Hammadi, Qumran, and the Oxyrhynchus papyri), contemporary scholars are themselves familiar with the possibility of finding unexpected texts through similar means.

mode of composition. Numerous texts in antiquity circulated without named authors and subsequently were taken up as essential pieces of communal memory.<sup>74</sup> This was often achieved by attributing an otherwise anonymous text to a known individual. However, even these memorial habits highlight the choice involved in asserting an author from the outset. An identifiable author is only necessary or useful for establishing a text's authority at certain historical moments and among readers with similar investment in the authorizing force of a particular individual.<sup>75</sup> At other times, individual readers and reading communities may rely on different criteria for deciding how to utilize a particular text and for determining its value for communal life.

Debates in secondary literature about ancient notions of authorship, literary forgery, and canonicity too often reduce this to an either/or issue. In one vein, scholars highlight the ample evidence for ancient writers fighting and fretting over authorship and accurate attribution.<sup>76</sup> Whether writers play elaborate pranks on one another to demonstrate their literary prowess<sup>77</sup> or provide lists of their own works along with how to identify them (and the proper

---

<sup>74</sup> Mark, Matthew, Luke-Acts, and John provide the most obvious examples with regard to early Christian literature. Hebrews provides a more pertinent example in that it shows that even an epistle need not have authorial authentication to become a foundational component of Christian memory. The eventual attribution to Paul serves to remove this ambiguity for later readers, but that seems to operate more as a *post facto* justification of a widely used (though occasionally disputed) text rather than as a necessary component of its place in Christian memory.

<sup>75</sup> Wyrick, *Ascension of Authorship*, identifies the root of the concern for authorship in Alexandrian Homeric scholarship. Such practices only later influence Jewish and Christian modes of literary production (and collection).

<sup>76</sup> For the strongest arguments along these lines, see Ehrman, *Forgery and Counterforgery*, and Speyer, *Die literarische Fälschung*.

<sup>77</sup> E.g. the story of Heraclides and his former student Dionysius from Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.92–93. See the description and discussion in Ehrman, *Forgery and Counterforgery*, 12–14.

order in which to read them),<sup>78</sup> it is clear that distinguishing authentic from spurious writings and managing one's literary legacy were of fundamental importance to many ancient writers. As Ehrman demonstrates, early Christian and Jewish writers frequently share the concerns of these other Roman writers.<sup>79</sup> On the dissenting side, scholarship on the authorship claims of the Pastoral Epistles and second temple Jewish texts like *Jubilees* suggest that pseudonymity was often used to express a conservative attitude or deference to earlier written and oral traditions.<sup>80</sup> Writers identified with or as a particular teacher in order to portray themselves as bearers of oral teaching traditions and/or as inspired interpreters of the named teacher.<sup>81</sup> Either ancient writers engaged deliberately in literary forgery with an intent to deceive or notions of authorship did not depend on accurate attribution.

How then do we account for the widespread success of literary forgery in a culture seemingly so concerned with accurate attribution? Largely, this question has been answered in terms of ancient inadequacy. Ancient readers lacked our resources for textual research, such as the ability to compare numerous manuscripts, and were generally more trusting of the extant attributions. Yet, we

---

<sup>78</sup> E.g. Galen, *De libris propriis* and *De ordine librorum suorum*. On the latter, see the discussion in Johnson, *Readers and Reading Culture*, 74–97.

<sup>79</sup> Ehrman, *Forgery and Counterforgery*, 70–92.

<sup>80</sup> See Meade, *Pseudonymity and Canon*; Najman, *Seconding Sinai*; Reed, “Pseudepigraphy, Authorship,” 467–90. For a critique of Meade, in particular, see Ehrman, *Forgery and Counterforgery*, 39–42. I agree with Ehrman that Meade, in particular, is engaged primarily in a theological rather than historical argument as the title itself indicates with its focus on pseudonymity and “canon.” Despite the many attempts to historicize and naturalize the canon, the multiplicity of Christian “canons” makes clear that the category itself is largely theological and ideological. This does not however completely address the arguments that these writers (and likely their earliest readers) accepted the claim to Mosaic or Pauline tradition without believing that either of those figures had personally penned the text at hand.

<sup>81</sup> See, Reed, “Pseudepigraphy, Authorship,” 474–480.

have evidence for at least some scholars from antiquity engaging in such comparative practices. Whether it is Homeric scholars sifting versions to identify the real Homer,<sup>82</sup> Galen weeding the Hippocratic corpus, or Origen comparing texts in his *Hexapla*,<sup>83</sup> those with resources and reason to be concerned about accurate attribution and textual stability engaged in practices that would not be wholly out of step with modern historical-critical and text-critical methods.<sup>84</sup> As to ancient readers being more trusting, the ample evidence for concern about forgery and unauthorized versions of texts make this untenable as well. Both readers and writers had access to the same tools for producing and detecting literary forgery, and everyone involved in text production and transmission was aware, to some extent, of the instabilities inherent in the technology, including with regard to attribution.

Given this, it is important to attend not just to what ancient readers would have considered forgery (had they only known). Rather, we must attend carefully to what specific (historical, social, and theological) concerns generated disputes over authorship and attribution. We cannot assume that concern for accurate attribution or a specific notion of authorship was shared by all readers at all times. Rather, readers base their acceptance of texts on factors other than authorship. Readers trust texts because they conform to their expectations (stylistic, historical, and theological) and because they receive them through trusted channels, both personal and institutional.

---

<sup>82</sup> See, Wyrick, *Ascension of Authorship*, 203–80.

<sup>83</sup> See, Williams and Grafton, *Christianity and the Transformation of the Book*, 86–132.

<sup>84</sup> For illustrative cases, see Grafton, *Forgers and Critics*, 69–98. Throughout, Grafton highlights the critical practices shared by forgers and critics alike, into the modern era.

We can see this quite clearly in several cases, two ancient and one modern. In the fourth century, numerous ecclesiastical writers express their opinions about authorship, apocrypha, and the contents of the scriptural canon. Of these, three of the most famous treatments are found in Athanasius, Augustine, and Jerome.<sup>85</sup> Writing in polemical contexts, Athanasius and Augustine draw a clear line between what is authentic to the “catholic” faith and what falls outside its bounds. Authorship figures prominently in the reasons given for trusting certain writings over others. Jerome, however, writing (for once) outside a polemical context, makes the unusual move of asserting Pauline authorship of Hebrews while noting its close correspondence in style and phrasing with 1 Clement.<sup>86</sup> Absent the polemical context, authorship is a consideration but not determinative of the text’s value. Jerome is free to display his literary skill without fear of undermining the value of Hebrews. It was fourth century efforts to solidify what did and did not belong in the teaching and liturgical repertoire of Christian leaders that fostered an atmosphere in which authorial claims were scrutinized, challenged, and presented as decisively important.

Similarly, the concern over forgery we see from Tertullian in the second century demonstrates that concern about authorship often arises only after the reader has already decided that something is amiss. Tertullian illustrates this bifurcation clearly. In one instance, Tertullian presents authorship as of

---

<sup>85</sup> See, e.g. Athanasius, *Ep.* 39; Augustine, *De Doctrina* 2.8 and *De civitate dei* 15.23, 18.38–41; and Jerome, *De viris illustribus* 1.3–5, 9.3, 15.2–3. Another famous treatment is Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* 3.25 where Eusebius puts forward four classifications of Christian literature and some criteria for deciding between them.

<sup>86</sup> *De viris* 15.2–3.

fundamental importance. In excluding the *Acts of Paul and Thecla* from any relationship to normative Christian tradition, Tertullian reports that the presbyter responsible for the text was deposed (*De baptismo* 17).<sup>87</sup> The presbyter's deposition served as proof that the contents lacked antiquity and authority. Elsewhere, however, Tertullian defends Enochic literature which was itself regarded as suspect in antiquity (*De cultu feminarum* 1.3; *De idolatria* 4). He claims that even if such traditions were destroyed by the flood, there is no reason that Noah could not have "renewed" the tradition by the power of the Holy Spirit (*De cultu* 1.3). That is, Tertullian argues that accurate attribution may in fact not depend so much on the scribe who put pen to paper. Rather, anyone sufficiently close to God could have become the vehicle for reauthoring the text. Trust in a divine textual agent makes the name and historical circumstances of the scribe irrelevant to its pedagogical, theological, or historical authority. Enoch conforms to Tertullian's expectations thus the concern about authorship is elaborately dismissed.

Lest we think ourselves immune to such decision-making processes, the production and reception of Ferdinand de Saussure's *Cours de linguistique generale* provides a more modern case. Though written by his students and presented as an accurate collation of his thought derived from his lectures and notes, the work is always catalogued and cited as if it was penned by the hand of Saussure himself. This peculiarity of its publication and cataloguing authorizes a

---

<sup>87</sup> It is interesting here that authorship was deemed relevant and important here even for a text that did not claim to be authored by Paul or anyone of similar stature. Authorship itself serves as a marker of fabrication whereas authoritative traditions about Paul would not be the result of a single authoring individual.



foundational individual for a collective production, which, in its own right, becomes the foundational text for an entire school of linguistics. Scholars are by and large comfortable with this fiction because we see no reason to distrust the channels through which it was transmitted. Such is the success of this inscription practice that many scholars, even those with more than a passing familiarity with structuralism, are not acquainted with the text's mode of production.

It seems that whatever authors might claim or intend, it is always a reader or community of readers who concern themselves with authorship. Typically, they do so when trying to separate the authority they ascribe to a particular author or figure from the content of a disagreeable textual tradition. That is, concern arises in contexts when a reader's memory of and expectations for a named figure conflict with what they read. As long as there is no conflict, the attribution of authorship is unimportant. And even when there is conflict (as in Tertullian), the receptive reader need not agree that authorship is the determinative factor in deciding the text's status.

In the chapters that follow, I explore the utility of an historical analysis of texts that seeks to assess the effects of writing and rhetoric beyond the (possible) intent or goals of the agent who inscribed them. By speaking primarily of effects, I am not trying to suggest that Ignatius or the scribe of the Long Recension had no intentions or that their actions were wholly determined. Rather, I wish to draw attention to the ways in which institutional, pedagogical and other settings in which a text is encountered circumscribe the agency of readers and writers alike. That is, whatever we might think Ignatius meant by the words he wrote

sometime in the second century, his rhetoric can have no effect whatsoever unless there are people to read, copy, circulate, and preserve his writings. So too for the scribe of the Long Recension whose own interventions in the Ignatian textual tradition were limited by the activities of those who transmitted the Middle Recension to him and who gave life to his literary activity after he ceased to put pen to paper.<sup>88</sup>

In such an approach, the Long Recension becomes evidence for different kinds of practice. Because of the nature of its interventions, the Long Recension provides unparalleled evidence for a close, sustained reading of some form of the Middle Recension. As such, we can think about differences between the two recensions as effects of the Middle Recension's language and rhetoric as well as the reading culture in which the scribe of the Long Recension "consecrated" the Ignatian textual tradition as worthy of ongoing attention. The Long Recension's differences from the Middle Recension are not just the product of a will to change the inherited text but also evidence for how a reader with his own assumptions, training, and institutional affiliations understood the intent and import of the Middle Recension.

---

<sup>88</sup> Or, as was sometimes the case, ceased to dictate to another scribe. A visual I find helpful here is that constructed by Latour for his analysis of Pasteur's agency in bringing about the "Pasteurization" of France. See Latour, *Pasteurization*, esp. 267 for the image and 69–70 for the analysis of the various realms in which Pasteur operated. According to Latour, Pasteur exercises agency through a series of transpositions and/or translations in which he linked together laboratory practices and disciplines that were in many ways irrelevant to one another. First by bringing the microbes into his lab then by bringing his lab and the results of laboratory work into venues that took advantage of institutional vectors of force already present (data collected by those documenting outbreaks of illness and the conditions of outbreaks, military efforts to maintain colonial footholds, etc.). The overall agency and force of any of Pasteur's actions and linkages is relatively small compared to the institutional forces which amplify his work.

In a different but related vein, an analysis of effects pushes us to explore how consumers and (re)producers of the Middle and Long Recension might have remembered Ignatius and the history of Christianity differently depending on which version they encountered and when they encountered it. As Jorge Luis Borges cleverly reminded readers with his “Pierre Menard, author of the Quixote,” identical inscriptions can mean very different things depending on the historical moment or context in which they are written (and implicitly, read). Comparing identical sections of text, Borges praises Menard’s *Quixote* as “infinitely richer” than that of Cervantes for all the ways in which it violates the stylistic and theoretical expectations of the moment in which it was authored.<sup>89</sup> The combination of recensional evidence and attention to effects allows us to situate the Ignatian inscriptions in different historical contexts, using evidence available from each period to imaginatively reconstruct the effects of the Middle and Long Recension for readers encountering the letters within different institutional, philosophical/theological, and educational contexts. The recensions allow us to examine how differences and similarities between the Middle and Long Recensions might have contributed to different ways of remembering the past and imagining what it means to be Christian at different moments in history.

---

<sup>89</sup> Borges, “Pierre Menard.” The same words that Borges calls “mere praise of history” in relation to Cervantes, he characterizes in this way when attributed to Menard: “History, the *mother* of truth: the idea is astounding. Menard, a contemporary of William James, does not define history as an inquiry into reality, but as its origin. Historical truth, for him, is not what has happened but what we judge to have happened. The final phrases—*exemplar and adviser to the present, and the future’s counsellor*—are brazenly pragmatic (53).” Borges’ “literary analysis” of Menard imaginatively explores the potential for historical distance to alter the meaning, interest, and import of identical inscriptions, and simultaneously highlights the role analysts and analysis have in giving any inscription meaning, even when that meaning is attributed by the analyst to the author and/or the inscription itself.

We need not think of any act of reading or copying as acceptance or rejection of Ignatius's authorial intent. Instead, each historical context provides an opportunity for the reader or hearer to be moved by the words inscribed and to make sense of them in terms of their own conditions and expectations, some of which were in continuity with those that shaped Ignatius and others which were different, sometimes radically so.

By situating our study in terms of effects, we are better able to attend to the ways in which Ignatius's (and other writers') acts of inscription may have been only tangentially related to the ways in which readers appropriated Ignatian language and imagery. It also focuses our gaze on the reasons later scribal readers give for revisiting or transmitting particular textual traditions.

This approach leads to a different set of questions than those typically discussed in studies of Jewish-Christian relations. How did the ideas of a separatist like Ignatius gain traction? How were such ideas transmitted and received in different times and places? Why do later scribes and readers revisit and transmit such texts? As I endeavor to show throughout this dissertation, the Ignatian textual tradition provides a productive place to begin answering such questions.

Chapters One and Two begin from a close comparison of the Middle and Long Recensions. Each chapter takes a single letter that includes references to Jewish-Christian difference and describes the kinds of changes and similarities we see between the Middle and Long Recensions. After describing these scribal habits, I explore the potential effects of both the changes (additions,

emendations, etc.) and similarities. In Chapter One, I argue that the differences and similarities between the Middle and Long Recensions of *Magnesians* both effect a memory of Ignatius as an ideal bishop and an image of the ideal church. Changes make Ignatius intelligible in terms of certain fourth-century expectations of bishops while similarities create an impression of continuity in the institutional church between the second and fourth centuries. Chapter Two demonstrates similar tendencies and practices at work in *Philadelphians*. This chapter expands to include the ways in which epistolary features and biographical episodes helped to establish Ignatius's character in ways that could be used to interpret other traditions by and about him, in particular emphasizing his role as a teacher and heresiologist who helped to restore inter- and intra-ecclesiastical harmony.

Chapter Three focuses more narrowly on the ways in which the Long Recension reimagines those portions of the Middle Recension that explicitly inscribed "Judaism" and "Christianity." Here, the focus shifts to the role the Long Recension's pedagogical orientation to the Middle Recension plays in giving arguments for Jewish-Christian difference traction, especially as a tool for teaching correct Christology. As potentially anti-Jewish texts are read and deployed pedagogically, Jewish-Christian difference is amplified in order to reinforce correctly Christian attitudes and to make abstract theological distinctions more knowable and memorable.

After three chapters of detailed textual analysis, Chapter Four outlines a broader narrative of Ignatian memories and uses, analyzing the conditions of

production that made the Long Recension possible and, ultimately, successful. By examining the reception of Ignatius between the second and fifth centuries, we can tease out the ways in which Ignatius was remembered, ignored, and forgotten in successive generations, often with little interest in or regard for the texts he supposedly produced. I suggest that both the Middle and Long Recension benefitted from a memorial culture in which texts often functioned as monuments to someone or something rather than as vehicles of correct belief, teaching, or action. That is materiality mattered more than content.

Focusing on Ignatius's reception allows me to fill a lacuna in academic research while offering a lens through which to approach a host of broader issues. This study provides an opportunity to explore how the "parting" of Christian and Jewish identities was an ongoing process in Late Antiquity even within a textual tradition that is highlighted as evidence for an early, decisive split. Further, this study may contribute to a better understanding of the role of pseudepigraphy in shaping Christianity and in legitimating various people, places, and practices as authoritative. It provides an exploration of ways to include all too often excluded textual practices into our understanding of Christian cultural production in Late Antiquity and beyond. The focus on the transmission and reception of the Ignatian corpus also helps to expand our understanding of the ways in which the material limitations of textuality (e.g. storage, copying, transmission, etc.) can become productive loci for the construction of Christian memory, affording a degree of malleability and flexibility that allows antiquarians, scholars, and cultural elites to deploy texts and traditions within the frame of new collections

and new memories. As a result, it contributes, not just to scholarship on early and late antique Christianity, but also to the study of the history of Jewish-Christian relations, broader discussions in the discipline of Religious Studies about the nature of identity and tradition, and recent concerns throughout the Humanities for exploring the dynamics of cultural memory.

## **CHAPTER 1—IGNATIUS AS ICON OF CHURCH AND EPISCOPACY: MAGNESIANS BETWEEN THE SECOND AND FOURTH CENTURIES**

### **Introduction**

What are the effects of rhetoric? How can we study them? These two seemingly simple questions animate the analysis and arguments that follow in this and subsequent chapters. Such questions are rarely asked of early Christian literature as much of our attention is turned toward intention. What ideas were our writers trying to convey? Is their language descriptive or aspirational? To what degree does rhetoric conform to reality? Scholarship on the relationship between rhetoric and reality in ancient writings, however, too often ignores the role of readers and hearers in this process. Often the difference between explanatory and justificatory rhetoric<sup>90</sup> relies not (only) on the intentions of the author but on the disposition of the audience. Thus, when arguing about rhetoric versus reality in an ancient text, we are really arguing about readers. Did readers and transmitters of early Christian writings share the worldview of the texts they transmitted? Did they share all aspects of it? One goal of this and the subsequent chapter is to model an approach to ancient textual traditions that makes the interplay between

---

<sup>90</sup> I use these designations drawn from the disciplines of rhetoric and writing education to cover very broad generalizations about writing. The designation “explanatory rhetoric” describes those acts of writing (and speaking) in which the writer and reader share a variety of assumptions about the contents of the writing. It typically lacks explicit normative claims. “Justificatory rhetoric” refers to all those instances of writing (and speaking) in which normative claims are made. The writer must present arguments and evidence in such a way that whatever assumptions are shared might lead the reader to accept the writer’s proposition(s). There is no assumption on the part of writer or reader that the two parties agree. Of course, this distinction is not static. By questioning a fact or connection between facts, the reader of explanatory rhetoric refuses the consensus that undergirds it. So too, a person can direct normative, justificatory rhetoric at an audience that already agrees, using it to explain and strengthen existing ideologies and practices. Hence the apt phrase “preaching to the choir.” The difficulty is that we cannot fully determine what an act of writing meant for an ancient reader by attending only to the writer and writing. We must imagine the reader as well through whatever data we have at our disposal.



writer and reader, between rhetor and audience, explicit in the analysis of early Christian textual traditions.

To such an end, this chapter, along with the next, tries to map the larger epistolary differences and continuities between the Middle and Long Recensions of *Magnesians* and (in the next chapter) *Philadelphians*.<sup>91</sup> While these letters were selected primarily for the role they have played in accounts of “the Parting of the Ways,” they also serve to highlight trends common in the interplay between similarity and difference between the Middle and Long Recensions. By first exploring the effects of difference and similarity before revisiting questions of Jewish–Christian relations, I attempt to provide a snapshot of the how Ignatius and the subapostolic past are imagined between the second and fourth centuries. Because the Long Recension directly builds off the Middle Recension, it gives us access to the ways in which at least one ancient, sub-elite reader engaged with the rhetoric of the Middle Recension. In this way, the Long Recension provides evidence for the effects of early Christian rhetoric that go unconsidered in most scholarship on first- and second-century (retrospectively) Christian writings.<sup>92</sup> Where previous scholarship has focused only on the differences between the recensions in order to determine chronological priority and authenticity, part of my goal in this chapter is to articulate the ways in which the act of rewriting the same words in a new time and place can signify something new.<sup>93</sup> I argue that in *Magnesians*, both the differences and similarities between the Middle and Long Recensions effect a memory of Ignatius as an icon of inter- and intra-ecclesial unity and ideal episcopal governance.

---

<sup>91</sup> These letters were selected because they both contain inscriptions that invoke “Judaism” and “Christianism.” Part of the genesis for this project was to examine the afterlife of such inscriptions. Were other theological, social, or ideological concerns involved in the genesis of this project; other Ignatian epistles would have served equally well.

<sup>92</sup> In Chapter Three, I focus on how such ways of reading and (re)writing the past reframe our understanding of the Ignatian epistles for writing the history of Jewish–Christian relations.

<sup>93</sup> For a delightful literary example of this, see Borges, “Pierre Menard author of *Don Quixote*.”

## Documenting Difference

In the history of scholarship on the Middle and Long Recensions, the differences between the two have garnered the bulk of the attention. Whether arguing for the priority of the Long or the Middle Recension, scholars repeatedly look to difference to justify their claims. This is not surprising given the extent of the differences between the recensions. A simple comparison of length exemplifies the degree of difference between the two recensions. In the Funk and Diekamp edition of *Patres Apostolici* (the last critical edition to include the Long Recension), the letter runs to 202 lines. The Middle Recension occupies only 120 lines in the same edition. The additional materials that comprise those 82 lines of text are scattered throughout the letter.<sup>94</sup> Such additions constitute the bulk (but not the entirety) of the differences between the recensions. These additional materials take three primary forms: the citation of authorizing texts, lists of exempla, and theological (typically Christological) expansion.

The Long Recension of *Magnesians* 3 provides an example of expansions that include both text citation and exemplary discourse. In sharp contrast to the Middle Recension, the Long Recension defends a young bishop's authority by citing scripture, a portion of Job 32:8–10.<sup>95</sup>

...just as I also know that even the holy presbyters have not looked upon apparent youth, but to prudence (φρόνησιν) in God since “those of many years are not wise (σοφοί), and the elders do not understand, but it is the spirit in mortals.” (3.1 LR)

---

<sup>94</sup> Diekamp and Funk, *Patres Apostolici*, 1:230–42; 2:112–33.

<sup>95</sup> The contrast arises from the rarity with which the Middle Recension explicitly cites much less utilizes or alludes to texts that have been received as part of scripture. For a brief discussion of this difference between the recensions, see Edwards, “When the Dead Speak.”

While not explicitly citing these few lines from Job as scripture,<sup>96</sup> the Long Recension incorporates the sayings of the fourth, youthful friend in Job as a bit of gnomic wisdom in support of a youth speaking with the voice and authority of God. For those possessing a certain intimacy with Greek versions of Job, the quotation cleverly introduces authoritative words from the mouth of a youth. For those less familiar with Job, the statement still has authoritative resonance through its relationship to genres of wisdom literature in which such aphoristic assumptions were frequently encoded in the ancient world.<sup>97</sup> The statement does not depend on its status as “scripture” for its authorizing force.

---

<sup>96</sup> On issues of marked vs. unmarked citations in the Long Recension, see Albrechts, “Markierte Intertextualität,” who extensively documents the terms used to introduce writings that came to be part of the Old and New Testaments. He identifies 87% of all Old Testament Citations in *Magnesiensians* as marked while only 32% of New Testament citations are marked. Most citations are marked with the article γάρ. The introductory phrase ἐπειπερ does introduce the subsequent sentence as causal and thus as an authoritative statement that demonstrates the truth of the letter’s claims. However, it nowhere indicates why this particular phrase is authoritative or ascribes it to a particular authoritative voice or text. Elsewhere, the Long Recension employs phrases such as φησὶν to indicate scriptural citation (e.g. *Magnesiensians* 3.8 and 7.1). In most instances, scriptural citations are attributed to individual voices (prophets, God, Christ, Paul, etc.) rather than to a body of writings. For example, the Middle Recension rarely uses any explicit citation formula, but when it does present support as a quotation, the term γέγραπται is used (*Ephesians* 5.3 and *Magnesiensians* 12). The Long Recension, despite regularly citing texts that came to be part of Christian canons, likewise avoids the verb γράφω in introducing authoritative words. Both words were widely used in the fourth century to introduce authoritative texts, but φησὶν was far more common. Almost the reverse seems to have been true in the first two centuries of Christian writings. The literature collected in the New Testament and under the heading Apostolic Fathers exhibits a marked preference for γέγραπται in introducing quotations. Some authors use both terms (e.g. Clement of Rome), but the only author who utilizes φησὶν with more frequency than γέγραπται in the first two centuries of the Common Era is Irenaeus. However, many of the instances introduce the words of “heretics.” Among Jewish writers, Philo shows a marked preference for φησὶν to introduce quotations. It seems worth considering to what extent there is an investment in presenting scripture as authoritative speech rather than writing at the same time that ecclesiastical leaders are trying to make definitive statements on the authority of a specific list of texts. Nevertheless, all these instances point to a sense of textual authorities as individual voices rather than authoritative collections. It is the citation practices themselves that create the sense of harmony between authoritative or inspired voices.

<sup>97</sup> The clearest example of this is the place of such aphoristic (and frequently moralistic) phrases in Hellenistic and Roman educational practices, especially at the primary levels. See, Cribiore, *Gymnastics*, 178-180. Maxims and sayings both reflected “popular” wisdom and could be deployed as symbols of a person’s command of cultural knowledge.

Other scriptural citations pepper this section of the letter. The writer cites God as the voice who speaks to Jeremiah, urging him not to use his youth as an excuse for avoiding the command to prophesy.<sup>98</sup> 1 Timothy provides evidence of Timothy's youthful authority.<sup>99</sup> Portions of 1 Samuel 8:7 and Exodus 16:8 also fit into the conversation as evidence for the transitive implications of speaking against leaders. To speak against the divinely appointed leader is to speak against God.<sup>100</sup>

In addition to scriptural citations not found in the Middle Recension, the Long Recension also contains a laundry list of positive and negative exempla. In *Magnesians* 3.2–6, the Long Recension includes the biblical prophets Daniel, Samuel, and Jeremiah, the Judahite kings Solomon and Josiah, and the apostle Paul's associate, Timothy, as worthy exempla of pious youths. Daniel, following a Greek version's expansions narrating his role in the rescue of Susanna, is described as "wise at the age of twelve, having been possessed by a divine spirit (3.2, cf. *Susanna* 44–46)."<sup>101</sup> Samuel is described as a "tiny little boy (παιδάριον ὦν μικρόν; 3.3, cf. 1 Sam 3)" in contrast with the "90-year-old Eli" whom he was asked to reprove. In similar fashion, the writer praises the others, noting that Solomon was only twelve when he passed judgment on the two women arguing over a baby (3.4, cf. 1 Kgs 3) and Josiah was only eight when he "threw down the altars...and burned the sacred groves (3.4, cf. 2 Kgs 22)." The list concludes with Paul's companion Timothy, citing Paul to support Timothy's youthful authority: "The Christ-bearer Timothy was a youth, but listen to what the teacher wrote to him, 'Let no one despise your youth, but be an example (τύπος) of faith in speech, in way of life (3.6, cf. 1 Tim 4:12).'"

---

<sup>98</sup> *Magnesians* 3.3; cf. Jeremiah 1:7.

<sup>99</sup> *Magnesians* 3.6; cf. 1 Tim 4:12.

<sup>100</sup> *Magnesians* 3.8.

<sup>101</sup> The details of this story seem to follow the Theodotion text rather than the extant Old Greek version where the reference is to a "spirit of understanding" rather than a "divine spirit." See Ziegler and Munnich, *Susanna, Daniel, Bel et Draco*.

In *Magnesiensians* 3.7–10, the positive exempla give way to negative ones. While the former proved the possibility of youthful piety, the latter exempla threaten the reader with the dangers of disobeying the bishop and speaking out against him, whatever his age. The Long Recension reminds its readers that “no one remained unpunished (ἀτιμώρητος) who rose up against [his] betters (κατὰ τῶν κρείττωνων, 3.9).” Then, the letter lists and glosses the deeds of biblical characters who spoke or rose up against their leaders: Dathan and Abiram against Moses (cf. Numbers 16; Deut 11:6; Ps 106:17),<sup>102</sup> Kore against Aaron (cf. Numbers 26:9-10), Absalom and Abedaddan<sup>103</sup> against David (cf. 2 Sam 13-19), Uzziah against the priests of the temple (cf. 2 Chronicles 26:16-22), and Saul against Samuel (cf. 1 Sam 13).

The Long Recension of *Magnesiensians* 12 incorporates a similar intermingling of exempla and textual citation. The Middle and Long Recension of this chapter are identical up to and including a citation of Proverbs:

And what’s more, whenever I praise you, I know that you feel ashamed, as it is written, “The righteous man is his own accuser (cf. Prov 18:17 LXX).”

The Long Recension incorporates additional material at this point, providing additional quotations and several exempla.

---

<sup>102</sup> This episode between Moses, Dathan, and Abiram takes a different turn in 4 Maccabees where Moses’ refusal to act against Dathan and Abiram is framed as an ideal of temperance inasmuch as Moses uses reason to temper his anger (2.17).

<sup>103</sup> Lightfoot suggests that this represents a conflation of the name Obed-Edom with the biblical story of Sheba. Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2.1.263–64. The name Abedaddan only appears in two texts, once in the Long Recension of *Magnesiensians* and twice in *Apostolic Constitutions* 6.2. While this coincidence between the two texts has helped establish a relationship of shared authorship between the Long Recension and the *Apostolic Constitutions*, it has not been considered as an aspect of the reception of both texts. The Long Recension is well attested in both Greek and Latin, yet the reference to Abedaddan is rarely altered in any extant manuscripts. A single Greek manuscript changes the name to Abner who also fits the bill of someone who died after opposing David (cf. 2 Samuel 3). Several Latin codices split Abedaddan into Achab (or the variants Aab and Ahab) and Dathan (or Dadan). See Diekamp and Funk, *Patres Apostolici*, vol. 2, 118–19. Correction of this text was a rarity suggesting that scribes saw nothing problematic with the name or that there was little interest in such textual details. None of the variants fit the details of Abedaddan’s description exactly, but they do substitute names that fit the general pattern of recompense for harming or resisting one’s superiors.

...and, “First, speak your sins in order that you may be made righteous (Is 43:26 LXX),” and, “Whenever you do everything appointed for you, say, ‘We are useless slaves (Luke 17:10),’” because “what is prized among people is an abomination to God (Luke 16:15).” For it/he says, “God, be merciful to me a sinner (18:13).” Therefore, those great ones Abraham and Job called themselves “dust and ashes (Genesis 18:27)” before God. So too, David, “Who am I before you, O Lord, that you glorified me this far (cf. 2 Sam 7:18)?” Even Moses, the gentlest of all people (cf. Numbers 12:3), said to God, “I am weak-voiced and slow of tongue (Exodus 4:10).” Therefore, be humble-minded like them in order that you might be exalted. For “the one who humbles himself will be exalted and the one who exalts himself will be humbled (Luke 14:11, 18:14).”<sup>104</sup>

The verse from Proverbs found in both recensions provides a springboard to other texts viewed as of equal authority. The clauses are all connected by καί, creating a unified series introduced by the verb γέγραπται. Just as with the pious youths of *Magnesians* 3, the text describes biblical heroes as living out this series of injunctions to self-abasement. Patriarch, prophet, and king are all united in their humility.

Other of the Long Recension’s additional materials take on a more explicitly theological character. Three sections in the Long Recension include Christological statements not found in the Middle Recension. In *Magnesians* 1, both recensions include the words “I pray that in the [assemblies] there may be a union of flesh and spirit of Jesus Christ (1.2).” The Middle Recension adds other pairs that exhibit the same unity: “faith and love” and “Jesus and the Father.” The Long Recension, however, includes material that all relates back to Jesus Christ.

I pray that in [assemblies] there may be a union of the flesh and spirit of Jesus Christ, “who is the savior of all people, especially of those who believe (cf. 1 Tim 4:10),”<sup>105</sup> by whose “blood you are redeemed (cf. 1 Peter 1:18), through whom “you have known God and, what’s more, are known by him (Galatians 4:9),” in whom those who endure all the abuse of this age will survive. For, “For faithful is the one who does not allow you to be tested beyond your ability (1 Corinthians 10:13).”

---

<sup>104</sup> The ordering of the clauses is transposed from its ordering in Luke, perhaps to emphasize the benefits of humility over the threat of self-aggrandizement.

<sup>105</sup> The antecedent of the same phrase in 1 Timothy is God rather than Jesus Christ. Aside from the final citation of 1 Corinthians, these quotations lack any citation formulae. The phrases depend on audience familiarity for their rhetorical force.

Every clause in the passage begins with a relative pronoun that points back to the antecedent, Jesus Christ. Rather than incorporating a series of images for Christian unity, the Long Recension specifies Jesus' role in salvation history and human cognition of the divine.

The Long Recension of *Magnesians* 11 also incorporates material that makes specific claims about the person, nature, and role of Jesus Christ. As in *Magnesians* 1, the differences between recensions are framed by shared introductory material. Both recensions characterize the preceding portion of the letter as precautionary rather than necessary. They read, "These things, my beloved ones, (I say) not knowing anyone from you who is like this. But as one less than you, I want you to be on your guard (11.1)." The recensions diverge after an expression of a wish that the readers "be fully assured (πεπληροφορησαι)." The Middle Recension encourages the reader to be assured "in the birth, passion, and resurrection that happened in the time of the governorship of Pontius Pilate (and) that were truly and certainly done by Jesus Christ, our hope, from which may you never be turned aside (11.1)." The Long Recension identifies Christ himself, rather than his activities, as that in which the reader should be assured.

...but that you might be assured in Christ who was begotten of the Father before the ages and was born from the Virgin Mary without intercourse with a man, and who lived piously as a citizen (πολιτευσαμένω), treated every disease and sickness<sup>106</sup> in the people, and did signs and wonders for the service (εὐεργεσιᾶ) of people, and who announced to those run aground in polytheism the one and only true God, his Father, and who submitted to suffering and to the Christ-killing Jews under the governorship of Pontius Pilate and the kingship of Herod, and who patiently endured the cross and died, rose, and ascended to the heavens to the one who sent him, and who "sits at his right hand" (cf. Mk 16:19)<sup>107</sup> and is

---

<sup>106</sup> This echoes a phrase repeated multiple times in the Gospel of Matthew's account of Jesus' ministry. Cf. Mt 4:23, 9:35, and 10:1.

<sup>107</sup> This section contains several phrases identified by Funk and Diekamp as citations of the New Testament. As is often the case, these instances of similar or identical language to New Testament texts go unmarked. In this case, the language seems drawn from attempts to formulate creedal language in the wake of the Council of Nicaea. The language would likely have the reciprocal effects of rendering Ignatius's statements familiar to a fourth century audience while granting specific ways of thinking about Jesus greater antiquity.

coming at the end of the ages with paternal glory (cf. Mt 16:27) “to judge the living and the dead (1 Peter 4:5)” and “to repay each according to his deeds (Romans 2:6, cf. Mt 16:27).” The one who knows these things in certainty (πληροφορία)<sup>108</sup> and has believed is blessed. Therefore, even as you are God-lovers and Christ-lovers in the certainty (πληροφορία) of our hope, let us never be turned aside from it.

Christ serves as the antecedent for every phrase. Where the Long Recension of *Magnesians* 1 employed a list of relative pronouns, this section uses a list of participles that all identify a different activity specifying the past, present, and future significance of Christ. The concluding lines are very similar to those found in the Middle Recension. The Middle Recension concludes with a claim that the passion and resurrection have been “accomplished truly and certainly (βεβαίως) by Jesus Christ, our hope, from which may you never be turned aside.” The Long Recension, by contrast, does not identify the hope directly with Christ. Rather, it connects the “certainty of our hope” to the audience’s status as God-lovers and Christ-lovers. The Long Recension frames the potential to turn away as the possibility of losing confidence or certainty.

We find another difference in Christological material in *Magnesians* 6. Here the differences are less extensive than in *Magnesians* 1 and 11. Both recensions begin by referring back to the various leaders of the Magnesian assembly identified in *Magnesians* 2. “Therefore, since I beheld the entire assembly (πλήθος) by faith and love in the persons mentioned already, I urge you...” Both recensions go on to assert the proper organization and harmonious functioning of the community, with bishops presiding in the place of God, presbyters standing in for the apostles, and deacons as living reminders of the ministry (διακονία) of Christ. The Middle and Long Recensions, however, provide different characterizations of Jesus Christ at this point. The Middle

---

<sup>108</sup> Both as a verb and a noun, this word is relatively rare in Greek literature until the first century. A TLG search lists various texts collected into the New Testament as the first instances of a variety of verbal forms and the nominal form.



Recension refers to Christ as the one “who was with the Father before the ages and was revealed at the end (6.1).” The Long Recension describes Jesus Christ as the one “who, having been begotten by the Father, was the Word God, the only begotten Son, and this same one (ὁ αὐτός) endures beyond the end of the ages.” The Long Recension then provides explicit support for this notion “for ‘His kingdom will not end,’ says the prophet Daniel.”<sup>109</sup> While both versions deal in some way with notions of Christ’s pre-existence and place at the end,<sup>110</sup> the Long Recension cuts off options left available by the Middle Recension. Where the Middle Recension leaves space for various modes of relationship between Father and Christ, the Long Recension specifies a parental, generative relationship between Father and Son, insisting that this particular relationship precedes the moment when Logos and Christ are united in Jesus and remains in place into eternity.

While the theological differences between the Middle and Long Recensions typically involve descriptions of the role or nature of Christ, they can also take an anthropological turn. In *Magnesians* 5, both recensions utilize the shared conception that deeds (πράγματα) result in binary outcomes, life or death (5.1). The Long Recension differs here in specifying what kinds of activities lead to life and death and in adding explicit language of choice. Obedience or the safeguarding of tradition (φυλακῆς) brings life, and disobedience (παρακοῆς) brings death (5.1). In the Middle Recension, the

---

<sup>109</sup> The wording most closely follows Luke 1:33 rather than any specific version of the text of Daniel. Similar ideas of a never-ending kingdom are found in Daniel 2:44 and 7:14, 27. This passage is cited by Eusebius in *Contra Marcellum* 2.1, and both Lightfoot and Zahn identified the thrust of this passage as countering Marcellus’s claim that the Logos/Christ (along with the Holy Spirit) will return to a single *hypostasis* at the end of all things. See Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2.3.169–70, n. 35. More recently, see Joseph Lienhard “Two Friends of Athanasius,” 56–66; Lienhard, *Contra Marcellum*; and the discussion of the Long Recension’s theological affirmations in Ehrman, *Forgery and Counterforgery*, 466–80.

<sup>110</sup> The Middle Recension focuses on Christ appearing or being revealed at the end of the age, a notion which two hundred years on likely seemed less tenable. Thus, the Long Recension emphasizes Christ’s continuation beyond the “end of the ages.”

outcome is characterized as inevitable: “...each will surely go to his own place (5.1).” The Long Recension differs in including the adjectival participle “chosen” (τοῦ αἰρεθέντος) to modify “place” and includes an explicit exhortation to “flee death and choose life (5.1 LR).”<sup>111</sup> These differences are further illustrated in the divergent ways both recensions incorporate metaphors of coinage (νομίσματα).

#### Middle Recension

For just as there are two coinages (νομίσματα), the one of God and the other of the world, so also each of them has its own stamp (χαρακτῆρα) set upon it – the unfaithful that of this world, the faithful in love the stamp of God the Father through Jesus Christ, through whom if we have not voluntarily (αὐθαιρέτως) died into his suffering, his life is not in us.

#### Long Recension

For I say there are two stamps (χαρακτῆρας) found in people, one of legal coin (νομίσματος) and the other of counterfeit coin (παραχαράγματος). The pious person is legal coin, having been stamped by God. The impious, falsely-named legal coin, is base (κίβδηλον), bastardized (νόθον), counterfeit coin (παραχαράγμα) not made by God but the Devil.

I do not mean there are two natures of people, but one person who at one time is of God and another of the Devil. If someone is pious, he is a man of God; if someone is impious, he is a man of the Devil, not by nature but by his own will (ἑαυτοῦ γνώμης). The faithless have the image of the ruler of wickedness; the faithful have the image of the ruler, God the Father, and Jesus Christ, through whom if we have not voluntarily died for the sake of truth into his suffering, then his life is not in us.

As this side-by-side comparison makes clear, the Long Recension employs the coinage metaphor in ways not found in the Middle Recension. The Middle Recension establishes two coinages that are each stamped by different dies, that of God and that of the cosmos.

---

<sup>111</sup> The differences here suggest that the scribe of the Long Recension possesses a more direct familiarity with deuteronomistic scriptural traditions than the scribe of the Middle Recension.

Those stamped by God are characterized as “faithful in love” and the divine impress is linked to being in some way shaped by Christ’s suffering. The Long Recension makes the impress or stamp the basis of its comparison. Instead of starting with two distinct but valid coinages (νομίσματα), the Long Recension identifies two different stamps, one leading to legal coin and the other to counterfeit.<sup>112</sup> The Long Recension specifically rejects the implication that both types should be considered legal tender, characterizing only one as νόμισμα and the other as ψευδώνυμον νόμισμα. The metaphor is used to convey a distinction between the real and the counterfeit rather than to establish the better of two alternatives. The text of the Long Recension also establishes interpretive constraints for the coinage metaphor. The Long Recension’s additional material urges the reader not to take the metaphor too literally, specifying that there are not two natures (φύσεις) but a single human person who can take on the mark of the Devil by incorrectly using his own will (γνώμη). Personal choice determines whether an individual will bear the image (εικόνα) of “the ruler of wickedness” or the image of “God the Father and Jesus Christ.” The use of “image” in the Long Recension, rather than “character” or “stamp” which we find in the Middle Recension, layers another metaphor onto that of coinage. The language of image loses the connotations of something externally imposed and focuses more on bearing the likeness and even the reality of

---

<sup>112</sup> The differences in the metaphors are highly suggestive with regard to changing minting practices. In the second century, certain communities still had the ability to mint local coins. This was true at Antioch from Hellenistic times, with drastic reorganizations during the Tetrarchy and again during the reign of Anastasius. For an overview, see Metcalf, “Mint of Antioch,” 105–11 and the bibliography cited there. Following the fiscal reforms under Diocletian, however, the possibility of local, legal coin was greatly reduced, most likely limited only to base coins rather than those minted from precious metals. In expanding and centralizing its bureaucratic reach, the Roman Empire successfully implemented greater control of the production of money, reducing the likelihood that readers would have encountered a multiplicity of legal coinages in their daily transactions. In such an environment, most readers would have been familiar with attempts to pass off base metals as legal coins.

someone else.<sup>113</sup> Through these different word choices and the explanatory material, the Long Recension develops the coinage metaphor as an opportunity to reflect on individual choices and the outcomes that stem from them while articulating a specific anthropology of human error.

Subtle differences also emerge in the characterization of clerical offices. The first such instance involves the difference of a single word. In the Middle Recension, Ignatius refers to the deacon Zotion as his “fellow-slave (συνδούλου).” In the Long Recension, the term we find is “companion (συμβιωτοῦ).” While the former suggests an identification of shared ministry between Ignatius and Zotion, the latter suggests a person with whom one lives or shares a journey. Such a difference does not alter the portrayal of clerical offices but could serve to clarify Ignatius’s office as something other than deacon, avoiding the confusion that might arise from Ignatius’s self-identification with the deacon. The difference in characterization of offices comes in the way the two recensions deploy similar language to describe Zotion’s relationship to the other office holders. In the Middle Recension, Zotion is characterized as “subject to the bishop as to the grace of God and the presbytery as the law of Jesus Christ (2.1).” The Long Recension subtly alters this to characterize Zotion as “subject to the bishop and presbyters by the grace of God in the law of Jesus Christ (2.1).” This alternative presents the deacon as responsible to a bishop and individual presbyters, rather than the whole presbytery. In contrast to the Middle Recension where bishop and presbytery are associated with God and Jesus Christ through similes, the Long Recension establishes the “grace of God” as the means

---

<sup>113</sup> Liddell, Scott, Jones suggests that *χαρακτήρ* refers primarily to marks by which a person is known to belong to a larger class or group. It can, of course, stand in for the reality of someone as it does in the imperial seal. The language of *εἰκῶν* with its connotations of statuary that lined civic *fora* draws more explicitly on discourses of exemplarity in which public statuary was used to memorialize heroes and benefactors and encourage their emulation.

by which Zotion is able to follow the law of Christ. It is the “grace of God” that establishes subjection to bishop and presbyters alike in “the law of Jesus Christ.”

Similarly, in *Magnesians* 3, the characterizations of the bishop differ slightly. The Middle Recension refers to God the Father as “the bishop of all (3.1),” contending that any hypocrisy or false deference to the “visible bishop” only defrauds “the invisible one (3.2).” These references to God as bishop are absent from the Long Recension. Like the Middle Recension, the Long Recension urges the reader to obey the bishop (3.2 MR, 3.7 LR), specifically exhorting the reader not to “speak against” or “contradict” (ἀντιλέγειν) the bishop.”<sup>114</sup> They differ, however, in characterizing God with the language of episcopacy. The Middle Recension makes a neat parallel between God, the invisible bishop, and visible bishops. The Long Recension makes a different parallel, comparing the earthly bishop to other divine intermediaries like Moses and Samuel. Both recensions may demand obedience to the bishop from their readers, but only the Middle Recension uses the earthly office to imagine God’s role and activity in the world.<sup>115</sup>

The Long Recension of *Magnesians* 4, instead, associates episcopal status with Jesus Christ. As part of a comparison between the reality of being a Christian and merely being called one, the Middle Recension calls to mind people who “invoke the bishop but

---

<sup>114</sup> This statement goes beyond the exhortation of the Middle Recension which, while advocating subjection to the bishop, specifically urges the reader to “maintain all respect” for the bishop despite his youth and to “obey without hypocrisy.” The Middle Recension seems more concerned with false appearances of obedience than with an open attempt to speak against the bishop or disagree.

<sup>115</sup> This is a distinction noted by Brent, “Enigma,” 434–437 and elaborated more fully in idem, *Ignatius and the Second Sophistic*, 41–120. where he argues that Ignatius’s vision of monarchical episcopacy is dependent on civic and imperial cults in which the one who presided over a procession or other ritual carried the image of the god, and thus embodied the divine for that particular ritual act. This is in distinction from later views of episcopacy that depend on succession and the like for determining monarchical rule. The Long Recension here introduces a sense of bishop as divinely appointed mediator – still the visible representative of God, but not in an iconic sense, rather in the sense of speaking the word of God to the people because of his privileged access to the divine. Thus, disobedience is akin to disobeying God because it is only through the bishop that God speaks.

do everything apart from him.” The author states, “Such people, not having a good conscience, appear to me to not meet validly (βεβαίως) in accord with the commandment.” The Middle Recension uses the danger of false appearances to paint meetings apart from the bishop as insecure, lacking necessary divine mandate. The Long Recension portrays people who “call someone bishop but do everything apart from him” in the role of the crowd in the gospel of Luke when Jesus says, “Why do you call me ‘Lord, Lord,’ and do not do what I say (Lk 6:46).” Rather than merely naming the speaker as Jesus, however, the Long Recension introduces this verse by saying, “He who is the true and first bishop and only high priest by nature says to such ones...” The Long Recension makes Christ, rather than God, the archetype of the episcopal office. This emphasizes the role of Christ as intermediary between God and people, just as the bishop acts as a divine intermediary.<sup>116</sup> By such a locution, the Long Recension positions Jesus as the “true” and “first” intermediary, whether that intermediary is envisioned as priest or bishop.<sup>117</sup> Where the Middle Recension tends to associate bishops with God the Father, the Long Recension makes bishops the living mouthpiece of Jesus’s teachings and divinely appointed mediators.

While this description does not enumerate every difference between the two recensions, I have tried to describe and classify the differences that give the Long Recension a distinct voice. Differences occur at both the micro and macro levels of composition, from word, tense and mood changes to some of the expansions documented here. In the next section, I will identify some possible effects of the

---

<sup>116</sup> This also makes the Christology of the Long Recension analogous to those of the likes of Theophilus of Antioch and the Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies* where Christ is portrayed as the last in the line of “True Prophets” (*Hom.* 1.19; 2.5–6, 12; 3.11) who were sent to lead people back to observance of the commandments (*Hom.* 78; 11.23 and *Ad Auto.* 3.11).

<sup>117</sup> Interestingly, this characterization of Christ as bishop and priest creates an image of the church as a new temple rather than a new Israel. It also serves to distinguish possession of an office “by nature” from other modes of holding office.

differences between the recensions with an emphasis on the shifting imperial and ecclesial contexts of the second and fourth centuries.

## Effects of Difference

The textual differences identified in the previous section have a myriad of potential effects. Of course, such effects ultimately depend just as much on the knowledge and disposition of readers as on the intent and activity of authors and redactors. By comparing the two recensions and the syntactical and grammatical constraints they introduce, we can gain a sense of how some readers might have encountered Ignatius differently by virtue of which recension they had access to and when they lived. Also, by focusing on effects rather than an authorial intent behind the differences, we can map of the kinds of discourses in which the Long Recension participated.<sup>118</sup> The effects of difference were multiple, creating a new way of portraying and remembering Ignatius.

Above all, the differences between the recensions result in a substantive change in what constitutes the central theme of the letter. The theme that drives the rhetoric of the Middle Recension is this exhortation to union (ἔνωσις) and concord (ὁμόνοια). This theme is common throughout the Ignatian epistles, but receives special emphasis in *Magnesians*, giving shape to every subsection. Sections 1 and 2 of the epistle praise the audience and their representatives for the “great orderliness (πολυεὐτακτον)” of their love, encouraging a unity among the audience akin to the relationship between Jesus’

---

<sup>118</sup> As Ehrman notes in *Forgery and Counterforgery*, the redaction of the Long Recension (and other spurious texts) does not stem from a single goal or intent but frequently engages in disputes happening on multiple fronts (e.g., 5; 460–79). By eschewing the language of intent, I am trying to move away from concerns about authorial motivations toward the scholar imaginatively inhabiting the mind of the reader. How is the reader’s subjectivity formed by the act of reading? How might textual differences produce different effects, regardless of whether the scribe produced them with explicit or tacit awareness?

“flesh and spirit,” between “faith and love,” and exemplified by the “union (ἔνωσις)” of “Jesus and the Father (1.1–2).” On the heels of this praise and parenthesis, the Middle Recension presents Damas, Bassos, Apollonios, and Zotion as representatives who allow the writer to see the Magnesians community. The named members of the community, through their representation as bishop, presbyters, and deacon, give the first hints of the kind of orderliness the Middle Recension articulates.

The Middle Recension’s praise of the Magnesians’ “orderliness” and “unity” is tempered by caution. The text raises the specter of hypocrisy (3.2), indicating that any deceptive behavior toward the bishop defrauds (παρολογίζεται) God the Father who is “the bishop of all.” Any attempt to maintain appearances, whether through “being called Christians” or “calling someone bishop” (4.1) and acting apart from him, has to be supported by an underlying reality. Using specific terms (e.g. bishop) apart from appropriate action (e.g. obedience) nullifies their significance. This warning about the danger of seeming and appearing instead of being something segues into a fundamental choice between life and death (5.1).<sup>119</sup> The Middle Recension portrays a reality in which there are only two choices, each of which inevitably leads “to its own place” (5.1). As we saw in our description of differences, the Middle Recension utilizes a metaphor of coinage (5.2). Only two coinages exist, the faithless bearing the imprint of the world and those “faithful in love” the imprint of God the father. Faithfulness in love hearkens back to the orderliness in love that began the encomium of the Magnesians (1.1). This suggests that faithfulness and orderliness are intimately intertwined with a particular structure of

---

<sup>119</sup> This motif of binary choice certainly owes something to the “two ways” outlined in Deuteronomy (e.g. 11:26, 30:14) and later recapitulated with varying emphases in texts like the *Didache* 1.1. However, we cannot point to a source, but rather to rhetorical practices that simultaneously limited the possible range of choices and indicated the preferential course by portraying the choice as between a universally recognized ill (e.g. death) and a universal value (e.g. life). I do not see a genealogy of connection back to deuteronomistic discourse, especially since the selected metaphor depends far more on *paideia*-based educational training than on any predecessors within Jewish and Christian traditions.



communal life that must govern more than appearances and names. Unity in and by means of this organizational structure is itself part of the impress or stamp of the divine character.

After this rhetorical detour to praise the Magnesian embassy and to warn against false appearances, the line of argument returns to the dominant theme. The author exhorts the audience to do everything in the “harmony of God (ὁμόνοια θεοῦ).” This godly harmony is linked by participial phrases to the leadership structure of the community where the bishop stands in as a proxy for God the Father, the presbytery is linked to the “council of apostles,” and the deacons to “the ministry of Jesus Christ (6.1).” The community is urged to remain united to the bishop and those “presiding in the image (τύπον) and teaching of immortality (6.2)” and to eradicate anything which might lead to separation or division. Jesus’ unity with the Father exemplifies the unity the community should seek. Just as Jesus did nothing without God the Father, so too the audience should not act apart from the bishop and presbyters (7.1).

The Middle Recension builds on this exhortation to unity with indications of potential threats to that unity. Starting from general warnings to “let nothing be in you that is able to divide you” (6.2) and exhortations to “gather together as in one temple of God” (7.2), the Middle Recension then transitions into examples of different things that might lead to division (8.1). The audience is warned against “differing opinions (ἑτεροδοξίας)” and “old stories (μυθεύμασιν τοῖς παλαιοῖς, 8.1),” “Sabbatizing (9.1),” and “Judaizing (10.3).” Such activities raise the possibility not only of creating communal division but also separating the audience from Jesus Christ.

After raising such specters of division, the Middle Recension assures the audience that the rhetoric is merely prophylactic; the author doesn’t know anyone among them

who Judaizes in such a fashion.<sup>120</sup> He only desires that they will be “fully assured in the birth, suffering, and resurrection” of Jesus Christ (11.1), presumably without reference to anything else. He extends his praise of them (12.1) before adding a final exhortation to submit to the bishop (13.2) to preserve both “fleshly and spiritual” unity, keeping the focus on unity with office holders from the beginning of the letter almost to its final farewell.

Although the Long Recension shares some of the material devoted to communal unity, the additional material repeatedly breaks up the singular focus evident in the logical and rhetorical structure of the Middle Recension. The Long Recension’s additions frequently blunt the force of the larger argument, drawing emphasis away from the communal *ὁμόνοια* that governs the Middle Recension. For example, where the Middle Recension offers an abundance of images for unity (union of flesh and spirit of Jesus Christ, faith and love, Jesus and the Father; 1.2), the redactor includes only a single image (union of flesh and spirit). Instead, the Long Recension gives greater attention to a series of theological statements about Jesus. Through a pastiche of scriptural allusions, the Long Recension identifies Jesus as savior, redeemer, and the means by which God is made known (LR 1.3). Concern for theological precision takes precedence over concerns about communal unity. Shared cognition supersedes peaceful assembly.

The expansive list of exemplary figures found in the Long Recension of *Magnesians* 3.1–10 likewise draws the reader’s attention away from the issue of communal unity. The exemplary figures all serve as evidence either for the idea that age and piety are independent categories or the notion that speaking against leaders, whatever their age, constitutes speech against God. In the Middle Recension, the aside

---

<sup>120</sup> The passages dealing with Judaizing will be treated in more detail in Chapter 3.

on the youthfulness of the bishop served as an encomium to the wisdom of the Magnesians who were able to see beyond physical appearances and age, a fact they exhibited through their unity with and deference to the bishop. In the Long Recension, this section becomes a pedagogical or homiletical exercise focused on cultivating an individual rather than communal ethos. Israelite prophets and kings (Daniel, Samuel, Jeremiah, Solomon and Josiah) stand alongside Paul's companion Timothy as examples of youthful devotion and divinely ordained authority (3.1–7). Alongside the example of these devoted youths, the Long Recension sets the negative examples of individuals who criticized their leadership, reminding the audience of the dangers that ensued when various individuals spoke out against Samuel, Moses, and Aaron (3.8–10). The exempla do not make a case for communal unity; they speak only to individual behavior. The individual stays on God's good side by recognizing the authority of the bishop and not speaking critically against him. The effect is to establish individual character and will at the center of proper piety and devotion. Conflict with leadership affects the instigator not the whole community.

Other additional material found in the Long Recension has a similar effect. We can see this again in the Long Recension's expansion of the coinage metaphor (5.2 MR, 5.3-4 LR). In the Middle Recension, the metaphor refers to two different coinages present in the world, setting one group who is "faithful in love" over against a worldly coinage. The emphasis is on a collective as embodying and bearing the impress or character of God the Father (5.2). The Long Recension uses the coinage metaphor to discuss individuals, drawing the distinction between the pious person who is legal tender and the impious person who is counterfeit coin (5.3–4). The redactor goes on to specify that this is not a statement about two different kinds or natures of people but about a single person "who at one time is of God and at another is of the Devil (5.4)." Where in

the Middle Recension the concern was for those who were in and of the community against those of the world, the Long Recension shows much greater concern for the development of personal piety and the negotiation of evil influences on the individual. There is greater interest in inculcating personal practice than in evoking the ideal community.

The additional materials that focus on Christological or quasi-creedal statements add further support to this shift to the individual. Like the exempla found in *Magnesians* 3, these theological materials play a pedagogical role, shaping the individual reader's awareness of what is necessary information in order to be counted among the pious readers. The Christological and creedal assertions that pepper the additional materials of the Long Recension (e.g. 1.2-3, 6.1, 11.1-4) have the effect of emphasizing correct knowledge as of equal or greater importance than communal practice and unity. The additional material in *Magnesians* 11.1-4 gives explicit voice to the concern for correct knowledge. This section concludes with the statement that "the one who knows these things with complete confidence and believes is blessed (11.4)." This makes clear the importance of correct cognition for the redactor, associating individual knowledge and belief with access to a happy or blessed (μακάριος) life. The Christological materials found elsewhere in the Long Recension are less explicit on this point, but their inclusion is consistent with such pedagogical aims.

The repeated pedagogical and homiletical interludes give the Long Recension a substantially different rhetorical effect, shifting communal unity under episcopal authority to a secondary issue. The cultivation of individual piety and correct belief take center stage. The episcopal persona of the author shines forth as a teacher and cultivator of proper Christian belief and praxis rather than a curator of Christian community.

Along similar lines, the inclusion of numerous scriptural citations and allusions helps bolster the perception of Ignatius, and bishops generally, as teachers and skilled rhetors whose own speech imitates that of biblical prophets and the apostles.<sup>121</sup> As we saw in the description of differences between the Middle and Long Recensions, the Long Recension frequently bolsters its claims through the addition of scriptural citations. In some instances, these citations go unmarked as citations. They thus serve as marks of (Christian) education and cultivation when encountered by the astute reader who can identify the allusion.<sup>122</sup> For those unable to instantly recognize the citations, they function more as familiar modes of speaking that reinforce other aspects of Christian life, whether by evoking liturgical reading of scripture or similar moments in the preaching of contemporary bishops and presbyters. We see one example of this in *Magnesians 1*. When specifying roles in salvation history for Jesus, the Long Recension strings citations one after another. The text quotes 1 Timothy 4:10 to identify Jesus as savior, Galatians 4:9 to establish him as the means by which God is known, and 1 Corinthians 10:13 to comfort the reader after referring to the persecution that followers of Jesus will face (*Magn 1.3*). The Long Recension also contains an echo of 1 Peter 1:18–19 in its assertion that Christ’s blood is the means of redemption (τῷ αἵματι ἐλυτρώθητε, *Magn 1.3*).<sup>123</sup>

---

<sup>121</sup> This conforms closely to the model of bishop as intermediary between God and community discussed above, where the bishop was equated with Moses and Samuel.

<sup>122</sup> Studies of Hellenistic and Roman education all highlight the role of the repetition and imitation of culturally important writers in the construction of one’s own literary voice. Rhetoricians like Libanius and Symmachus pepper their personal correspondence with classical allusions and learned to imitate the vocabulary, style, and syntax of such diverse models as Homer, Cicero, Demosthenes, and Herodotus. A similar approach to scriptural knowledge is visible in the Christian scholars and rhetors of the third and fourth century: Origen, Gregory of Nyssa, Basil of Caesarea, John Chrysostom, and their contemporaries. See Criboire, *Gymnastics*, 160–244. For a greater focus on the peculiarities of the fourth century see, Criboire, *School of Libanius*.

<sup>123</sup> The echo comes in both idea and word choice. 1 Peter claims Christ’s blood, rather than any monetary means, as the mode of redemption. In echoing this, the Long Recension does not quote word for word, but uses the same verb form as 1 Peter, ἐλυτρώθητε, to articulate Christ’s

Such citations cut in two directions. Extant homilies and texts from theological disputes present scriptural citation as a kind of elite Christian *koine* in which the depth, breadth, and cleverness of one's interpretive activity helped to establish ecclesial authority.<sup>124</sup> In such an environment, the added citations found in the Long Recension serve to make Ignatius's voice a familiar, episcopal one.<sup>125</sup> No longer is Ignatius someone who avoids or is incapable of weaving together scriptural citations as he appears in the Middle Recension. Instead, the Ignatius of the Long Recension writes as someone well versed in scripture, prepared to offer an allusion or citation to bolster his teaching.

These citations have another effect as well—to make Ignatius sound like the apostle Paul. Unmarked citations present Ignatius as a person who describes the nature of Christ in a Pauline register. The bulk of unmarked citations are drawn from Pauline texts. He speaks Pauline phrases as his own, creating an implicit chain of authority from Paul to himself.<sup>126</sup> By the addition of such citations, the Long Recension makes Ignatius sound like a typical fourth century bishop and a transmitter of an apostle's words.<sup>127</sup>

Such chains of citation, whether marked or unmarked as scriptural, also serve to construct a singular voice for scripture itself. As we saw in *Magnesians* 12, the Long Recension provides a set of exhortations to humility all explicitly framed as authoritative

---

redemptive activity. This particular form of *λυτρόω* is exceedingly rare in Greek, appearing almost exclusively in direct quotations of 1 Peter.

<sup>124</sup> While not all extant materials from the fourth century enshrine scripture in this way (e.g. hagiographies which emphasize individual power over illness and demons more than interpretive prowess), the bulk of homilies and episcopal letters utilize scripture to weave their social, political, and ecclesial ideologies. Such prolific writers as John Chrysostom and Augustine provide only the most obvious examples.

<sup>125</sup> Mark Edwards makes a similar argument with regard to the voice of the Long Recension writing, "To be a teacher of the people in the fourth century was to have a scripture at hand for all occasions." Edwards, "When the Dead Speak," 350.

<sup>126</sup> This also allows the Long Recension to present particular interpretations of apostolic voices as dating almost to the beginnings of Christian communities. We will see a specific example of this in the comparison and analysis of *Magnesians* 8–10 in Chapter 4.

<sup>127</sup> The hints of non-Pauline apostolic voices such as the references to 1 Peter suggest the beginnings of a more comprehensive and unified sense of the "apostolic" as distinct from what follows.

writings (γέγραπται), connected by a repetition of καί. The Long Recension weaves together a gnomic saying from Proverbs with sentences drawn from the Gospel of Luke, Isaiah, Genesis, 2 Samuel, and Exodus. Though the names of the source texts are not recorded, the Long Recension refers to each of them as written records of the speech of such exempla as Abraham, Job, David, and Moses. When these voices are combined with Luke, the disparate scriptural texts encountered by Late Antique readers become a single harmonious voice.<sup>128</sup> Whether the citation refers to Jesus' speech in one of the eventually canonical gospels or to the voice of Moses, they all speak with one accord, agreeing that rigorous self-accusation and self-examination are part of the path to piety and righteousness. The Long Recension of *Magnesians* 3 provides a similar case in its defense of a young bishop's authority. The text includes Paul's words to Timothy and the divine voice that speaks to Jeremiah, among others, in order to demonstrate the possibility of divine wisdom despite apparent youth. Once again, widely variant exempla speak with a single voice.

The combination of differences and similarities found in the Long Recension ultimately has the effect of retrojecting fourth century ideals, ideas, and practices into the second century. By placing scriptural citation, pedagogical and homiletical asides, and more precise theological statements into the mouth of a second century martyr and bishop, the Long Recension encourages an image of ecclesial continuity stretching back

---

<sup>128</sup> Such rhetorical moves seem particularly important in fostering a widespread agreement concerning canonicity, especially as such texts circulated relatively independently of one another and in conjunction with texts not necessarily authorized by such ecclesial authorities as Nicene or even homoian bishops. While such monumental works as Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus in conjunction with Eusebius' reference to Constantine's gift of fifty complete bibles suggest the possibility of people encountering the Old and New Testaments as single material object, the papyrological and manuscript evidence points to the greater likelihood that readers and liturgical participants encountered such texts in more fragmentary ways. A bishop or prominent presbyter and teacher might have access to a well-sourced library or patron, as did Origen, however such extensive collections were rare. The typical literate Christian was more likely to encounter only a small portion of the texts that came to be canonical. For provocative reflections on these issues, see Kraft, "The Codex and Canon Consciousness."

to the early second century. The way the church looks and should look today is just as it looked in the days of Ignatius, when he learned at the feet of John and corresponded with Polycarp on his way to a glorious martyrdom.

## **Attending to Similarity**

While the first section of this chapter addressed difference, we turn to similarities in this section. These similarities will help to provide a frame for considering more closely the effects of difference. As we will see, the similarities fall into three general categories: authorial claims, epistolary form, and concern for proper communal order including pre-eminence of the bishop. Just as with the differences, the similarities contribute to an image of Ignatius as an ideal bishop and icon of communal harmony who would hardly be out of place in the fourth century.

The first category of similarity, identity of authorship, may seem too obvious to even mention. Any reader who bothered to look at extant manuscripts and editions even casually would immediately encounter the Middle and Long Recensions' shared authorial claims. Both recensions begin with the identical phrase, "Ignatius, also called God-bearer."<sup>129</sup> Aside from a letter to Ignatius from an otherwise unknown Mary that is included in most manuscript traditions of the Long Recension, this brief introductory phrase begins every letter.<sup>130</sup> Throughout both recensions, the assumed subject of every

---

<sup>129</sup> *Magnesians* p.1

<sup>130</sup> Even in this letter, Ignatius's name appears very close to the beginning of the letter. The address includes Ignatius's name (Ἰγνατίῳ Θεοφόρῳ) as the fifth and sixth words in the letter. This contrasts with the address formulae used in all the other letters of the Middle and Long Recensions, where the name of the addressee comes several lines into the letter, typically following a string of adjectives and adjectival phrases characterizing the recipient. The letter to Polycarp (in both recensions) provides the only exception this pattern. There the address to Polycarp (Πολυκάρπῳ ἐπισκόπῳ) comes immediately following Ignatius's statement of his own name. *Polycarp* is often an exception to patterns we find in the Ignatian corpus with the typical



first person singular verb is Ignatius. By means of this simple phrase, the force behind every imperative and cohortative is identified with Ignatius. When the textual tradition indicates meetings and greetings passed along, Ignatius is the assumed node in the network.<sup>131</sup> The effect of this is obvious. Whichever recension the reader encounters, he or she will engage the text as the product of a single author, a single person who can be located in time and space. The text can then be connected to other traditions and knowledge of this individual to generate a horizon of expectations for what may or may not be legitimately considered Ignatian.<sup>132</sup> The shared attribution to “Ignatius God-bearer” asserts the importance of the one doing the writing for the evaluation of the letter’s contents.

As discussed in the introduction, we should be wary of assuming this decision was a natural or obvious one. Rather, the decision to foreground a named author in both recensions highlights a shared concern for a singular person behind the text, a concern not shared by all writers or readers in antiquity.<sup>133</sup> While the reasons for adopting the

---

explanation that this letter was written quickly and under extreme duress as the explanation for its stylistic differences. See, e.g. M. Brown, *The Authentic Writings of Ignatius*, 5.

<sup>131</sup> E.g. *Magnesians* 2 and 15.

<sup>132</sup> Cf. Foucault, “What is an author, 210. There Foucault argues that the “author’s name is not simply an element in a discourse” but serves as something that has a “classificatory function.” It serves to establish a network of intelligibility by which one can establish similarities, genealogies of tradition, explain other texts, or authenticate a particular idea or text (211). Other aspects of the text’s construction and transmission serve to bolster this. As Beard notes with the extant collections of Cicero’s correspondence, the activity of collection creates its own narrative or life of the author which similarly participates in a larger network of intelligibility. See, Beard, “Ciceronian Correspondence,” 103–144. This deserves further exploration in the development of the Long Recension. What kind of narrative emerges from the details of the two recensions and the order in which they were collected? How do these narratives create similar, yet distinct memories of Ignatius?

<sup>133</sup> If Dieter Hagedorn is correct in his argument that the redactor of both the *Apostolic Constitutions* and the Long Recension of Ignatius’s letters are indeed the same person, a certain Julian “the Arian”, then we see a similar concern across his productions. Notions of singular authorship govern both the production of the Long Recension and the *Apostolic Constitutions* as well as forming the first part of his commentary on Job, which deals with attributing a particular persona to Job himself. For Hagedorn’s detailed argument for shared authorship, see Hagedorn, *Der Hiobkommentar*, XLI–LVII. This may, itself, be an effect of this scribe’s social position and education.

first person may not be the same in both cases (e.g. epistolary genre conventions in the Middle Recension vs. successful deception in the Long Recension), the effect is to elevate the import of the individual in the creation of the text. This is in sharp contrast to other modes of achieving textual credibility. As discussed in the introduction, many composition strategies do not rely on the author for their plausibility. Instead, they rely on the possibility of finding older materials hidden away in archives and buildings or on receiving theophanies and angelophanies that directly transmit heavenly knowledge. These compositional strategies depend on the probability of finding lost objects or receiving visions rather than the strength of identification with a single, well-known person.<sup>134</sup>

The focus on a named individual in both recensions also leads to a consensus that Ignatius is worth remembering. However, they do not share in the same discourses of exemplarity or imitation. While someone may be remembered along with a call to imitation, merely keeping alive the name or actions of a particular figure may serve memorial purposes.<sup>135</sup> In this regard, the Middle Recension encourages the readers to memorialize their encounters with Ignatius by demonstrating unity through a visible system of leadership and by deepening inter-ecclesial connections through the exchange of ambassadors.<sup>136</sup> The Long Recension, on the other hand, deemphasizes the Middle Recension's ideals of ecclesiastical leadership and focuses more on cultivating a correct memory of Ignatius. While the recensions may not always agree on how best to

---

<sup>134</sup> It may be beneficial to ask what was shared by those writers who make authorial attribution central to their composition, especially in the case of materials now recognized as "forgeries." My suspicion is that such practices are primarily fostered by educational practices that privilege the literary authority of the texts used in teaching reading, writing, and rhetoric.

<sup>135</sup> For example, early readers of Ignatius like Polycarp (*Philippians* 9, 13) explicitly urge their audiences to imitate him while later memorials to Ignatius, such as John Chrysostom's homily on Ignatius (*In sanctem Ignatium martyrem*) invite the audience to approach Ignatius's memory and remains in order to receive ethical and material blessings (5).

<sup>136</sup> On the former, see *Trallians* 3.1, 12.2; *Philadelphians* 4.1; *Magnesians* 6.1 and many others. For the latter, see especially, *Philadelphians* 10; *Polycarp* 7; and *Smyrnaeans* 11.

remember or honor the memory of Ignatius, both recensions point to him as a singular figure, worthy of repeating in ink, ritual, and stone.<sup>137</sup> The repetition has the effect of asserting Ignatius's importance, remembering him as a letter writer, teacher, and exemplary model of Christian piety.

The identification of a single author behind the text forms an integral part of a broader similarity between the two recensions—the maintenance of the epistolary form. Both recensions share a set of epistolary conventions, from standard forms of greetings and references to points of connection between author and audience and standard farewell formulae that request a specific action or pass along greetings from travel companions.<sup>138</sup>

The portions of *Magnesians* that fulfill generic epistolary expectations are one of the areas where we see extensive similarities between the Middle and Long Recensions. The inscription of the letter is almost identical in both recensions.

Ignatius, also called god-bearer, to her who has been blessed through the grace of God the Father in Christ Jesus [our]<sup>139</sup> savior, in whom I greet the church that is

---

<sup>137</sup> Later preachers and writers would take up this task. Eusebius provides the first extensive treatment of Ignatius in *Historia ecclesiastica* 3.22, 36. John Chrysostom is the earliest witness to a liturgical celebration of Ignatius which seems to indicate a martyr shrine in the cemetery outside the Daphne gate. See, *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem*, PG 50: 587-596. It is only with the conversion of the Tychaeum at Antioch into a church dedicated to Ignatius under Theodosius II that we have witness to a public monument dedicated to the early martyr. The tradition is recorded in Evagrius, *Historia ecclesiastica* 1.16. For a brief overview, see Mayer and Allen, *Churches of Syrian Antioch*, 81–82. The church of Ignatius also appears in several homilies by Severus of Antioch (*Hom.* 9, 37, 65, and 84). For more on the reception of Ignatius in antiquity, see chapter 4.

<sup>138</sup> Epistolary handbooks, such as that attributed to Demetrius of Phaleron (Pseudo-Demetrius, *On Style*), appear to have been utilized as an important part of literate education in the Hellenistic and Roman world. The relevant portions have been compiled and translated in Malherbe, *Ancient Epistolary Theorists*. Cribiore's examination of papyri suggests that writers did indeed follow the conventions established in such manuals. Cribiore, *Gymnastics*, 216–17. Even fictional letters, both those found in literary works and those created as school exercises, mirror these conventions. See Rosenmeyer, *Ancient Epistolary Fictions*. A helpful summary of the extant epistolary typologies can be found in Poster, "A Conversation Halved," 21–51.

<sup>139</sup> This word only appears in the Middle Recension.

in Magnesia on the Maeander, and I wish in God the Father and Jesus Christ<sup>140</sup>  
[our Lord, let there be to you]<sup>141</sup> abundant greetings.<sup>142</sup>

This eclectic text of both recensions illustrates the extent of the similarity. The changes shown in brackets are minimal and, at least in the case of the additional ἡμῶν, are of the sort that may have arisen at almost any point in the transmission process through scribes conforming a well-known phrase to contemporary liturgical or other usage. The farewell section of the letter exhibits similar conformity between the two recensions.

The Ephesians at Smyrna greet you (from where I also write to you). Being near to the glory of God just as you also are, they have refreshed<sup>143</sup> me in everything, together with Polycarp the bishop of the Smyrnaeans. The rest of the assemblies greet you in honor of Jesus Christ. Be well in concord...<sup>144</sup>

In both the inscription and farewell portions we see the maintenance of generic letter features. Both recensions utilize standard terminology to express their greetings and farewell (e.g. χαίρειν, ἀσπάζονται, ἔρρωσθε). As is often the case in letters, the inscription focuses on the relationship between writer and recipient without engaging the subject matter or reason for the letter. So too, the conclusion expands the relationships indicated by the letter to pass along greetings from parties assumed to be known by both the writer and the recipient(s).

We also see a high degree of conformity between the two epistles in sections that follow other epistolary conventions. While lacking the characteristic vocabulary of

---

<sup>140</sup> The Long Recension more commonly reads “Christ Jesus.”

<sup>141</sup> This portion is in the Long Recension only. Such changes as this are part of a pattern of changes that have the effect of making Ignatius appear more conversant with post-Nicene theological language and norms.

<sup>142</sup> *Magnesians* p.1.

<sup>143</sup> ἀνέπαισαν in MR and ἀνεπαύσατε in LR.

<sup>144</sup> *Magnesians* 15.1. The final lines of the letter differ between the two recensions. The Middle Recension concludes with “in the concord of God having acquired the indissoluble spirit that is Jesus Christ.” The Long Recension reads, “having acquired the indissoluble Spirit in Christ Jesus through the will of God.” As we have seen, these differences are part of a consistent pattern of altering Christological and other theological language to conform to post-Nicene expectations of exactitude.

greetings and farewells, certain topics tend toward the beginnings and ends of letters.<sup>145</sup>

The two most pertinent to this particular letter are the attention to the process of correspondence found near the beginning of many letters, and commentary on the length of what has been written along with requests commonly found near the close of the letter. *Magnesians* 1–2 illustrates the former, detailing how Ignatius came to write this particular letter and how he received what information he has about the recipients.

(1) Having come to know of your most orderly and godly love, I rejoiced and decided to speak to you in the faith of Jesus Christ. For deemed worthy of a [most-godly]<sup>146</sup> name in the bonds I carry about, I sing the assemblies in which I pray for a union of the flesh and spirit of Jesus Christ...<sup>147</sup> (2) Therefore, since I was deemed worthy to see you through Damas, your most worthy bishop, and the [God]<sup>148</sup>-worthy presbyters, Bassus and Apollonios, and my [fellow slave (MR)/companion (LR)], the deacon Zotion, from whom may I benefit because he is subject to the bishop...and to the presbytery...<sup>149</sup>

*Magnesians* 1 withholds the specifics of how Ignatius received his information by using the aorist participle to indicate knowledge of the audience without yet specifying how that knowledge was obtained. This section portrays the letter as part of a larger project associated with Ignatius's bondage in which he "sings the assemblies." Whatever resonances this unusual turn of phrase had for the letter's audience(s)<sup>150</sup>, it

---

<sup>145</sup> For a convenient overview of the typical placement of topics within letters, see Trapp, *Greek and Latin Letters*, 36.

<sup>146</sup> The reading in brackets is from the Middle Recension. The Long Recension reads "divine and desirable" before "name."

<sup>147</sup> At this point, the two recensions diverge in their delineation of the various relationships between the Spirit, the Father, and Christ. See discussion above.

<sup>148</sup> Found only in the Long Recension.

<sup>149</sup> *Magnesians* 1.1–2 and 2.1. The ellipses in 2.1 indicate a divergence between the Middle and Long Recension in how to characterize Zotion's obedience to bishop and presbytery. The Middle Recension styles subjection to the bishop as to "the grace of God" and to the presbytery as "to the law of Jesus Christ." The Long Recension establishes both relationships as "by the grace of God in the law of Jesus Christ."

<sup>150</sup> As William Schoedel notes, the most obvious referent is to large cultural practices of choral singing, especially in the theater. More specifically, he locates this verb with the imagined role of poets and sophists who used their art to praise "places, persons, and gods." Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 104. Allen Brent argues for a more specific context, situating Ignatius's rhetoric as a transformation of language typically used to describe civic and other cultic festal processions. See, Brent, *Ignatius of Antioch*. Both agree that the rhetors of the "Second Sophistic" like Aelius Aristides and Dio Chrysostom provide important parallels to Ignatius's rhetoric. Ignatius uses his

contextualizes the letter as part of Ignatius's activity on behalf of multiple assemblies while he carries his chains from Syria to his death in Rome. This letter connects the Magnesians to other assemblies already chained into the procession by Ignatius. Only in *Magnesians 2* do we get the details of how this relationship came to pass through the visit of Magnesian ambassadors whom Ignatius names as assembly office holders.<sup>151</sup>

*Magnesians 14* provides an example of the common practice of commenting on the length of the letter alongside a list of requests.

Knowing that you [are full of God (MR)/have been filled with every good (LR)], I exhorted you briefly...<sup>152</sup> Remember me in your prayers in order that I might attain to God and the assembly in Syria [from where (MR)/of which (LR)] I am not worthy to be called [bishop]<sup>153</sup>. I am in need of your united prayer to God and love in order that the assembly in Syria be deemed worthy to be [refreshed by your assembly (MR)/guided by your good order in Christ (LR)].

Despite slight variations between the recensions, the bulk of this section remains identical. This portion of the letter follows epistolary convention by commenting on the brevity of the letter that has preceded it and issuing specific requests. Ignatius requests prayers for himself in his efforts and for the assembly in Syria that he left behind. While the specifics of this request do not remain the same and the Middle Recension lacks any reference to Ignatius's status as bishop, the adherence to genre conventions further cements epistolary form as one of the overarching categories of similarity between the

---

bondage to praise the assemblies of those devoted to Jesus just as the rhetor at a festival, competition, or on an imperial embassy would speak in praise of the city or of Rome more generally.

<sup>151</sup> I imagine very different readings of this between the second and fourth centuries. In the former, the connection between assemblies was something under construction and often in flux. In particular, Ignatius's focus on office holders as essential to its reality appears to be innovative rather than a reflection of widespread practice. In the fourth century, these become a new narrative of the Christian past. Ignatius presents himself as merely participating in what already is rather than creating something new (which might be suggested by the choice of the verb "to sing").

<sup>152</sup> Here the Long Recension adds "in the love of Christ."

<sup>153</sup> The change in preposition and the inclusion of "bishop" in the Long Recension shift the focus from being worthy of the place in the Middle Recension to being worthy of a particular office in that place in the Long Recension. This difference fits into a larger pattern of emphasizing Ignatius's episcopal status in the Long Recension.

Middle and Long Recension. These requests also indicate similar notions of and expectations for prayer as a technique affected by and capable of effecting unity. Furthermore, the inclusion of prayer as an appropriate response to Ignatius's exhortation enshrines prayer as part of the ongoing reciprocal exchanges between Ignatius and the Magnesians. Their ambassadors visited with him (2.1), he writes a letter, and they continue the exchange by praying for him and for those gathering in like fashion in Syria (14.1).

The adherence to epistolary form between the two recensions seems, at first glance, like an obvious truism. If one recension is the prototype for the other (as most scholars agree), isn't the maintenance of such genre markers a necessary tool of the later redactor's artifice? On one level, the answer is certainly yes. In order to present a redacted version of a letter as a more accurate or correct version of an earlier letter, the redactor would need to maintain those elements that most readily characterize the genre. In another sense, the answer is no. Scribes of antiquity possessed a multiplicity of ways in which they could reuse material from earlier traditions. As the transmission of the Middle Recension of Ignatius's letter to the Romans shows, scribes could opt to create a new generic superstructure in which to embed the epistle. The "Antiochene" narrative of Ignatius's martyrdom exemplifies precisely this rhetorical strategy. It incorporates a version of *Romans* as a narrative set piece in a distinct literary genre. In addition, ancient scribes might efface the original genre of a text entirely by incorporating it in an anthology, stringing together choice "flowers" into a wholly different form.<sup>154</sup> The Syriac

---

<sup>154</sup> The anthology was a common genre from antiquity through the Middle Ages. For an overview of the anthology in Jewish tradition, see Stern, "The Anthology in Jewish Literature, 3-11. As Stern notes, a definitive theorization of anthology has yet to be published. However, some initial explorations exist, at least for specific time periods. See Ferry, *Tradition and the Individual Poem*; Nichols and Wenzel, eds., *The Whole Book*. While I know of no studies of anthology in the Roman world more generally, the practices of creating quote books and other writing aids were an important part of educational curricula. At all levels of education, the student created collections

Short Recension of Ignatius's *Polycarp*, *Ephesians*, and *Romans* highlights yet another way in which a scribe might tackle the redaction of earlier texts. There, the scribal notes continue to refer to the texts as letters and maintain the inscription in some form, but rarely incorporate any other common characteristics of letters, in some cases dropping the farewell entirely.<sup>155</sup> Such cases should caution us against dismissing formal similarities as somehow natural or necessary.

Even were we to accept these similarities as components of an attempt to deceive readers in an effort to replace a prior version of the text, the similarities would still necessitate scrutiny. Whatever the intent of the scribes involved in producing the Middle and Long Recensions, the effects of preserving certain formal characteristics extend beyond the intentions of the scribe. The repetition of these formal elements with identical words serves to articulate a particular set of relationships as typical in the Christian past and present. As the voluminous correspondence of Cicero, Pliny, Augustine, Libanius, Symmachus, and Basil attests, letters were an important means of establishing and maintaining relationships (not to mention reputations), situating their authors at (and as) essential nodes in imperial networks. So too, the repetition of characteristic epistolary forms naturalizes a particular set of relationships as typical.<sup>156</sup>

---

of maxims and choice phrases that they would then revisit for a variety of tasks. See, Cribiore, *Gymnastics*, esp. 178–80 and the essays in Morlet, *Lire en extraits*. In the Ignatian tradition, we see this practice of extracting choice quotes most clearly in Theodoret's *Eranistes* and Timothy Aelurus's *Testimonia Patrum*. For more on these, see Chapter 4.

<sup>155</sup> See for example the Short Recension of *Polycarp* and *Ephesians*. *Romans* retains the farewell, perhaps because it falls last in the collection, standing in for the characteristic farewell. Other generic features such as the reason for writing, specific requests for assistance, and the extension of greetings from mutual acquaintances are all absent in the Short Recension. There, the redactor preserved elements focused on ethical and theological exhortation rather than maintaining all aspects of the letter form. For a brief discussion, see Chapter 4.

<sup>156</sup> The subsequent arguments owe an important debt to DeVore, "Character and Convention," 223–252. There DeVore argues that Eusebius' decision to write his history with a strong emphasis on selective citation of early Christian epistles was a deliberate strategy rooted in cultural attitudes toward letters as closely connected to personal character. Eusebius uses these letters to establish the ideal character for the Church as a whole.



The first is the relationship between Ignatius and the assemblies to which he writes. Both recensions portray Ignatius as someone authorized and accustomed to addressing such assemblies. The formulaic language serves to persuade the reader that this relationship is utterly conventional and unexceptional. Ignatius provides no explanation as to whom or what gives him the right to address a community rather than an individual.<sup>157</sup> The letters suggest there is nothing unusual about an individual from Syria addressing people in a far away city whom he has not previously met.<sup>158</sup> Despite emphasizing offices such as bishop and presbyter for his interlocutors, Ignatius identifies his “bonds” (1.1)—rather than his office—as that which has given him a “name” or reputation as someone worth listening to. By incorporating this statement of his authority in a formal feature of the letter, Ignatius does not need to justify his epistolary rights. Instead, the letter declares Ignatius’s relationship to the Magnesians as if it is beyond contestation, at least in such circumstances.

Similarly, these generic letter features effect an image of Christian congregations as identifiable entities with close relational ties to one another. *Ad hoc* assemblies related to devotion to particular deities, neighborhood and work associations, and other shared concerns appear throughout the epigraphic record of the early Roman Empire.<sup>159</sup>

References to such associations enjoy less prominence in the epigraphic record and

---

<sup>157</sup> Despite all the resonances with Pauline epistolary conventions and the efforts made in both recensions to characterize Ignatius as an accurate imitator of Paul, this aspect diverges from Paul’s model of expending great rhetorical effort in justifying his rights as an apostle. Cf. Galatians 1; 1 Corinthians 1:1, 9:1-5; Romans 1:1, 5. Ignatius apparently felt no similar compulsion to justify his authority, perhaps because those who carried his correspondence sought him out, thus investing him with a modicum of authority.

<sup>158</sup> Doering, *Ancient Jewish Letters*, 399–403; 507–511 argues that the practice of addressing corporate rather than individual bodies is something Christian writers inherited and adapted from Jewish epistolary practice. Again, however, the comparison with Paul suggests Ignatius is doing something different here. Paul typically presented himself as the primary author along with other co-authors, as does Ignatius’s contemporary Polycarp (*Philippians* 1). That is, the authorial activity of the primary writer is affirmed by the collective attribution. Ignatius never identifies any co-authors.

<sup>159</sup> For a broad survey with an eye to what dedication inscriptions from various associations can tell us about early Christians, see Harland, *Associations*.

literary sources of the later Roman world (and in secondary literature), but there is no reason to assume that the practice of creating loosely formalized associations disappeared along with the decline in the epigraphic habit.<sup>160</sup> The increasing monumentalization of churches and synagogues starting in the early fourth century suggests a renewed importance for such associations, though perhaps a different impetus for its importance.<sup>161</sup> In both recensions, the *ekklēsia* or assembly is the locus of address, characterized primarily by its association with a particular *polis* (p.1). Ignatius's reference to his own congregation is geographically broader. He refers not to an *ekklēsia* at Antioch but to the *ekklēsia* in Syria (14.1 in MR; 14.2 in LR). Whether referring to a *polis* or a province, the letters portray the *ekklēsian* as an identifiable unit that needs no explanation or identifying specifics beside geography. Either the audience is already

---

<sup>160</sup> For literature on the epigraphic habit, see MacMullen, "The Epigraphic Habit," 233–46; Meyer, "Explaining the Epigraphic Habit, 74–96; Woolf, "Monumental Writing," 22–39. It is possible that such associations did in fact decline along with the broad incorporation of former non-citizens into citizenship, particularly if their primary function was to foster a sense of place or belonging in the Roman World, as Harland suggests. Nevertheless, this is a case where absence of evidence does not prove the absence of such associations. At the very least, the development of circus factions and the ongoing importance of churches and synagogues in Late Antiquity suggest the continuation, albeit in different forms, of a similar impulse to associate on the basis of certain shared ideals or practices.

<sup>161</sup> The earliest monumental Christian structures develop at Rome and elsewhere in the empire due to imperial patronage. Some of these foundations may have developed out of earlier structures set aside exclusively for Christian communal gatherings. Such is the position of Richard Krautheimer with regard to the early monumental basilicas at Rome and Michael White with regard to both church and synagogue structures more generally. See, e.g. Krautheimer, *Rome*; White, *Social Origins*. However, the evidence for such transitions between earlier and later structures is only clear from a few cases (e.g. the Dura-Europos synagogue in which two phases of synagogue life are archaeologically visible). While some synagogal structures do exist prior to the late 3<sup>rd</sup> century, the majority of monumental, basilical synagogues date to after this period. The monumentalization of the synagogue appears to coincide with the development of monumental church structures. Seth Schwartz has suggested that such increasingly visible synagogue architecture in Palestine is part of a revitalization in Judaism stemming from ongoing efforts to Christianize the Roman Empire. See Schwartz, *Imperialism*, esp. 215–239. As to the issue of why such associations become important, scholarship is more concerned with the Hellenistic and Early Roman periods in which associations, congregations, and the like are identified as an important mechanism for carving out a place in *polis* life. The focus is thus on the association as means of belonging. See Harland, *Associations*, 55–112. The *ekklēsia* figures prominently in the fourth century as well, but it is more frequently imagined as something universal, stretching beyond the bounds of any *polis* to encompass the Roman Empire and more. The focus on monumental buildings hints at individual *ekklēsias* functioning more as nodes in a tightly woven network than as independent entities created to fulfill local needs.

assumed to know the people and places involved in these congregations or the letter carriers are expected to make the necessary identifications on the letter writer's behalf. However we reconstruct this aspect of Ignatius's rhetoric, the letters assume the *ekklesian* as a fundamental unit of organization for followers of Jesus. Both recensions characterize Ignatius's activity as that of "sing(ing)" the *ekklesias* (1.2). In carrying about his chains, he has the opportunity to make visible and praise the assembly which he calls home, but even more importantly the assemblies he has identified along the way. By incorporating references to the *ekklesia* in the formulaic portions of the letter, both recensions portray the assembly as itself conventional. There is no need to determine who or what constitutes a true *ekklesian* as it will be obvious to author and reader alike. Likewise, the requests for prayer for the Syrian *ekklesia* (14.1–2) function to present inter-ecclesial activity as something expected and beneficial to all.

Such an approach is rhetorically useful whether we situate the rhetoric in second or fourth century contexts. In the former, it allows the author to present aspects of the assembly such as the bishop, presbytery and deacons as conventional despite the lack of consensus on what such titles mean and what authority those designated by such titles possess.<sup>162</sup> When *Magnesians* suggests that the whole *ekklesia* is made visible through the visitation of a bishop, presbyters, and a deacon (2.1), these office holders are rendered a microcosm of the whole, somehow capturing and sharing the larger association's essence. The idea of having a messenger or ambassador stand in for the presence of another person or group is not novel in the second century. In imperial correspondence, office holders frequently represented the emperor's wishes to local

---

<sup>162</sup> Maier, *Social Setting of the Ministry*. Allen Brent attributes the tepid reception of Ignatius's writings to his innovative and radical reformulation of ecclesial offices. See Brent, "The Enigma of Ignatius," 429–456. Writers before Ignatius made use of terms like "bishop" and "elder" but the efforts of the Pastoral Epistles to delineate behaviors to go with the titles along with the concern about "bishops" and "prophets" in texts like the *Didache* all point to disagreement about what the titles indicate and what should be expected of the office holder.

communities and adjudicated disputes on his behalf. The Ignatian correspondence adds a slight twist to this convention of intermediaries representing the will and even the person of an absent person or group (e.g. the senate). By naming the ambassadors from Magnesia as bishops, presbyters, and deacons, the letter subtly establishes ill-defined and contested titles as full and authentic representations of an absent community. Whether the readers were already familiar with such titles or not, the decision to describe the visitors with these titles presents this constellation of office holders as sufficient for identifying and knowing a Christian congregation. *Magnesians* presents the bishop, presbytery, and deacon as normal and sufficient elements of the Christian *ekklesian* simply by incorporating these titles into a formulaic description of the correspondence.

The references to a single *ekklesia* in a single *polis* also serve to normalize the office holders as presiding over all followers of Jesus in a particular locale. Despite frequent references to disagreements and factions among Jesus-followers in second century texts, the letter asserts the validity of a single assembly and its leaders when there may have been a multiplicity of households and a multiplicity of assemblies within the same *polis*.<sup>163</sup> In an atmosphere where intercommunal networks are beginning to take shape, this form of address encourages the recipients to see themselves as part of a

---

<sup>163</sup> The classic study is Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy*. While Bauer's study is not without problems, particularly in its reification of the categories of orthodoxy and heresy, it helpfully directed the attention of scholars to the constant refrain of disagreement and contestation present in many early Christian writings. Letters in the Ignatian corpus exhibit just such features, suggesting that Ignatius did not meet with approval from everyone he encountered on his journey to Rome (e.g. *Philadelphians* 8). With regard to the number of households or assemblies that identified as followers of Jesus, I do not mean to suggest that Christian demographics necessitated such multiplicity. All estimates of the number of Christians in the second century suggest that Christians were few in number. However, to assume that a movement with no senatorial elites and few, if any, provincial or civic elites had access to a single gathering space large enough for all the Christians in even a small *polis* like Magnesia to meet, pushes the bounds of credulity. A loose network of households seems more plausible even for a small number of Christians.

broader network brokered by Ignatius, perhaps to the denigration of other Jesus-followers who did not share in the embassy to Ignatius.

In the fourth century however, the effect is different. The conventional portions of the epistle blur the distinction between Christian past and present. Fourth century readers, who may or may not agree as to who the real bishop was,<sup>164</sup> nearly all agreed that the administrative and teaching authority of the church centered on the bishop.<sup>165</sup> Bishops were a necessary part of any authentic geographical unit of “the Church.” Thus, mentioning bishops and other office holders as full representations of their local congregations would hardly seem novel. The bishop was the one who represented the local assembly to the emperor and imperial officials, as well as to other Christian communities throughout the Roman world.<sup>166</sup> In such an environment, the rhetoric shared by both recensions effects a continuity between past Christian practice and present modes of ecclesiastical organization. *Magnesians*, in both recensions, affords the status quo a semblance of antiquity. The effect is to further bolster the episcopal mode of organization and to imply the translatability of early Christian concerns to contemporary challenges.

The shared rhetoric of both recensions of *Magnesians* also characterizes “the Church” as constituted by reciprocal, peaceful relationships between local Christian assemblies. While the individual assembly may at times be fractious, the whole is characterized by congregations that send assistance to those in need (1.1, 2.1), offer counsel (6.1), and engage in prayer and thanksgiving for one another (1.2, 14.1).

---

<sup>164</sup> In the late fourth century, Antioch alone had as many as three bishops, representing competing factions in the Christological and Trinitarian debates. For a recent, succinct survey with relevant citations, see Shepardson, *Controlling Contested Places*, 11–19.

<sup>165</sup> This is not to say that all people devoted to Jesus in the fourth century had bishops or found them necessary, but it seems clear that those churches recognized and, to an extent, patronized by various emperors all espoused an episcopal structure of some sort.

<sup>166</sup> The most obvious example of this is Constantine’s efforts to gather Christian bishops at Nicaea in an “ecumenical” council.

*Magnesians* thus provides an image of the Christian *ekklesia* as always united by reciprocal relationships between individual congregations. Such an image of the past serves in the fourth century to critique contemporary fractiousness deriving from theological controversy.<sup>167</sup> The harmonious reciprocity of early congregations articulated in the epistles establishes the fundamentally unified character of “the Church.”

Epistolary conventions do not provide the only occasions of similarity between the Middle and Long Recensions. Both recensions preserve references to Ignatius’s imprisonment and impending martyrdom. We already saw an element of this in *Magnesians* 1.2 where Ignatius connects his sense of his worthiness of an honored name to the “bonds” he carries about. This element of bondage is again shared between the recensions in 12.1. There, Ignatius hedges the hortatory nature of his rhetoric by diminishing the import of his bondage in favor of praising his audience. Both recensions read:

May I benefit from you in everything if I am worthy. For even if I am bound, I am nothing compared to one of you who is free. I know that you are not puffed up for I know that you have Christ in yourselves. And what’s more, whenever I praise you, I know you feel ashamed. As it is written, “The righteous man is his own accuser.”

This appeal to humility and the superiority of the audience is a common rhetorical method for making epideictic, corrective rhetoric more palatable by encasing it in praise. While it subtly contradicts the pride of name asserted on the basis of bondage earlier in the epistle, it nevertheless reiterates the importance of Ignatius’s status as prisoner within the epistolary exchange.

In the second century, this rhetoric of bondage serves to remind the recipients why they sought him out in the first place. It was his bonds that generated interest from

---

<sup>167</sup> Were non-Christian readers to encounter this text, it may also have the effect of asserting the fundamentally peaceful and unified character of Christianity over and against contemporary critics who might suggest it threatens the strength, peace, and cohesiveness of the Roman Empire.

Jesus-followers in Asia Minor. It is the reputation forged by imprisonment that authorizes him to exhort the Magnesians. However, as Ignatius nears the close of the letter, he deploys that same rhetoric to invite support of his corrective rhetoric. His praise of the Magnesians righteousness subtly reflects back on himself because he does not let himself get “puffed up” about his imprisonment and impending martyrdom. He performs his praise of the Magnesians by interrogating and minimizing the very thing that authorizes him to speak. Ignatius seems to recognize that the effectiveness of his bonds depends on reminding his audience that it is they who recognize and value his chains rather than him.

The interplay between pride and humility in bondage would find a different audience in the fourth century. Third century attempts to assert “traditional” Roman religious practices under Decian and later Diocletian gave rise to a renewed importance for martyrdom within the history of the church. Christians disputed what kinds of action were permissible in relation to violence directed at Christian assemblies.<sup>168</sup> Later, Eusebius’ various historical works participated in creating a memory of Christianity as a religion characterized by perseverance in persecution.<sup>169</sup> Similarly, advocates of asceticism and monasticism applied rhetoric of spiritual martyrdom to their activities. They utilized the memory of martyrs in order to develop more rigorous forms of piety in a world in which imperial patronage provided new opportunities for accommodating Christian devotion and civic participation.<sup>170</sup> In such a milieu, Ignatius emerges as a

---

<sup>168</sup> E.g. disputes over place of *traditores* in ecclesial hierarchy as exemplified by the Donatist controversy; acceptability of flight/exile instead of submitting to torture and possible death as seen in the Novatianist controversy.

<sup>169</sup> The *Ecclesiastical History*, *Martyrs of Palestine*, and even the *Onomasticon*, emphasize (and occasionally exaggerate) the importance of martyrs in making “orthodox” Christianity. See Grant, *Eusebius as Church Historian*, 114–125.

<sup>170</sup> On the role of memory of martyrs in the making of ascetic practice, see Castelli, *Martyrdom and Memory*, 134–171. On asceticism and renunciation in relation to shifting social expectations, the classic study remains Peter Brown, *Body and Society*. Brown also helpfully illuminates how

moderating voice, valuing both the valor of martyrdom while authorizing other forms of devotion as equivalent, if not superior, to his own suffering. We find clearer support for such a fourth century reading in a passage found only in the Long Recension. In *Philadelphians* 4, Ignatius steps into debates about asceticism, valuing the former but urging no denigration to the latter.<sup>171</sup> While claiming to have been assailed by beasts from Syria to Rome, the Long Recension nevertheless tempers this expansion with exhortations that promote pieties steeped in spiritual martyrdom rather than imitation of physical martyrdom.<sup>172</sup>

Even in cases where the Middle and Long Recensions lack textual similarity, a thematic similarity emerges. Sections such as *Magnesians* 3, in which the recensions differ dramatically,<sup>173</sup> still contain a shared theme. Both recensions deal with the perceived youthfulness of the bishop. The Long Recension defends this on the basis of scriptural *exempla* who performed pious deeds despite their youth. The Middle Recension focuses instead on the parallel position between God, the heavenly bishop, and the earthly bishop. If a person deceives or mistreats the latter because of his youth, that person also attempts to cheat God who is never deceived (3.2 MR).

The effects of such thematic similarities are more difficult to assess because most readers would not have had access to both versions. Were someone to have access to both versions, thematic similarities would likely have provided indications of

---

ascetic and monastic practices were viewed differently in different parts of the empire. See, e.g., Brown, *Rise of Western Christendom*, 82–84.

<sup>171</sup> *Philadelphians* 4.4–5.

<sup>172</sup> Direct exhortations tend to encourage submission to household and ecclesiastical authorities (*Philadelphians* 4, e.g.) as well as ascetic practices that are properly directed toward “meditating on the law” (*Philadelphians* 4). Neither recension contains a direct exhortation to imitate Ignatius’s chains or his eventual martyrdom. Rather, Ignatius’s own sufferings serve as a gift analogous to the sufferings of Christ. They provide benefit for the community without demanding replication of those sufferings.

<sup>173</sup> *Magnesians* 3 occupies 10 lines in the Middle Recension (Diekamp and Funk, *Patres Apostolici*, 1:232) and 39 lines in the Long Recension (Diekamp and Funk, *Patres Apostolici*, 2:114–18).



verisimilitude or falsehood, depending on the reader's reaction to the contents. On the one hand, the reader who was familiar with ancient practices of paraphrase and abridgement could see in the shared themes proof of such a relationship between the recensions.<sup>174</sup> On the other, a reader who viewed either text prejudicially could point to these similarities as part of an effort to deceive.<sup>175</sup> At the very least though, the preservation of thematic similarities reinscribes the importance of certain topics regardless of historical milieu. The focus on obedience to the bishop, whether or not he is young, readily finds a place in Christian discourse of the second and fourth centuries. In the former, it has the effect of establishing qualifications for a disputed office. The lists of qualifications for bishops found in 1 Timothy 3:1, Titus 1:7, and the *Didache* 15 suggest that different communities were seeking to establish norms and expectations for an office of overseer. Sometimes this relationship was imagined as complementary to that of the prophet or charismatic teacher,<sup>176</sup> and other times it was imagined as an attempt to counter charismatic authority that occasionally created communal dissent.<sup>177</sup> By the fourth century, the office itself was no longer at stake in most Christian discourse.

---

<sup>174</sup> Interestingly, William Whiston proposed just such a relationship between the Long Recension and the Middle Recension in *An Essay Upon the Epistles of Ignatius*. Whiston argued that the Middle Recension was forged by Athanasius in order to defend his anti-Arian views. More recently Reinoud Weijenborg has proposed the same directionality between the Long and Middle Recensions, arguing that both are forgeries with the Long Recension providing the basis for the Middle Recension. Weijenborg, *Les lettres*. Like his forerunner Whiston, he has failed to alter the scholarly consensus. However, the repetition of such a viewpoint raises the possibility that readers disposed to the value of the Long Recension might very well imagine abridgment as the best explanation for the differences.

<sup>175</sup> This was the case even before the discovery of the Middle Recension in the middle of the seventeenth century. Early protestant readers following in the footsteps of John Calvin decried the letters as a Roman Catholic forgery that did not conform to what we know of early Christianity from texts included in the New Testament or to citations of Ignatius's letters in Eusebius and Theodoret. Prior to the Protestant reformations, differences in citation of Ignatius's letters and in manuscripts went unnoticed or, at the very least, unremarked.

<sup>176</sup> E.g. *Didache* 15 where the bishops and deacons can act as prophets and teachers for the assembly.

<sup>177</sup> Ignatius has served as one of the primary sources for reconstructing this aspect episcopal authority. See in particular, Trevett, *Study of Ignatius*. For a treatment of charisma and church order more generally, see Maier, *Social Setting of the Ministry*.

Nevertheless, the contours, privileges, and powers of the office were still under dispute. Thus, fourth-century church orders and conciliar acts all played a role in articulating the necessary conditions for different clerical offices.<sup>178</sup> Numerous attempts were made to identify “objective” criteria for clerical office: age, marital status, physical ability, legal status, and wealth.<sup>179</sup> In a world in which cities could have multiple bishops all advocating different theological positions and in which there was little agreement on what made someone a bishop, the Long Recension’s invocation of age as irrelevant to episcopal authority contributes directly to contemporary discourse about episcopacy while simultaneously suggesting that those who question episcopal successions and elections are courting disaster. Such assertions imagine a historical ideal as both template for and critique of contemporary episcopacy.

## **Conclusion**

Whether we attend to difference or similarity, the Long Recension creates continuity between the past and present. In the hands of the redactor, Ignatius begins to speak in fourth century idioms. He speaks with greater Christological precision, clearly and consistently portraying Jesus as the only-begotten Son of the unbegotten Father. He also speaks in the idiom of scripture and scriptural citation, marking authoritative knowledge through the compilation of biblical prooftexts and exempla. In particular, he speaks as a bishop should in the fourth century, inculcating piety in his audience and having a “scripture to hand for every occasion.”<sup>180</sup> He becomes an ideal bishop, brokering peace,

---

<sup>178</sup> See, Sessa, “Cleric,” 218–233.

<sup>179</sup> Sessa, “Cleric,” 222–227.

<sup>180</sup> Edwards, “When the dead speak,” 350.

encouraging ethical behavior, and interacting with other bishops and clergy. The second century martyr's words now bridge the divide between past and present.

He also becomes an icon of the ideal church, preserving a sense of inter-ecclesial networks overseen by bishops as fundamental part of Christian life in all times and places. By speaking the present as from the past, the Long Recension effects continuities that naturalize the present order while critiquing its more egregious attributes. Bishops are in charge and easily recognizable. Churches have always had them, along with other clerical offices. Bishops have always acted as ambassadors for the community. In these ways, Ignatius becomes intelligible and useful to a new world.

## CHAPTER 2—IMAGINING CHRISTIAN CONTINUITY: THE LONG RECENSION OF *PHILADELPHIANS*

### Introduction

The comparison between the Middle and Long Recensions of *Magnesians* in the preceding chapter highlighted the ways in which the Long Recension facilitated a continuity of memory between the second and fourth centuries. Patterns of similarity and difference served to arbitrate Ignatius's memory in support of increasing episcopal authority and an irenic image of church life. Through the efforts of a fourth-century scribe, Ignatius emerges as a model bishop who provides timely exhortation, exposition of scripture, and exempla worthy of imitation.

In taking the same comparative approach to *Philadelphians*, these effects do not disappear. The redactor likely saw the Ignatian epistles as a coherent corpus rather than an *ad hoc* collection, thus engaging in similar writing practices across the interpolated and wholly invented letters.<sup>181</sup> The Long Recension of *Philadelphians* does provide distinctive elements which are rooted in a close reading of the second-century recension. Ignatius again shines forth as a model teacher for all times, this time as an expert in the many gradations of incorrectly "Christian" beliefs and practices. *Philadelphians* 6, in particular, provides a terse heresiological handbook, delineating correct Christian practice from a variety of dangerous deviations. This addition is closely coupled with changes that emphasize the biography of Ignatius, using the letter to provide a window onto his personality.

---

<sup>181</sup> This issue deserves more careful consideration than can be given to it here. Letters like Pseudo-Ignatius, *Philippians*, function more as literary set pieces than as a replication of the epistolary structure and contents of the already extant materials. This letter may be an outlier, however, as many of the other letters recycle phrases and collections of biblical exempla.

This chapter follows a similar structure to the previous one. We will start by describing and analyzing difference and then treat similarity. How does the Long Recension incorporate material also found in the Middle Recension? What are the effects of retention and emendation? Overall, difference and similarity both serve to construct continuity between the Ignatian past and the fourth-century world of the Long Recension. Continuities in biography and formulaic letter features as well as the addition of pedagogical lists of heresies and exempla provide fourth-century readers with intelligible elements that connect the memory of Ignatius to their own experiences.

## **Documenting Differences**

The differences between the Middle and Long Recensions of *Philadelphians* are abundantly clear from a comparison of length. In the Funk-Diekamp edition, the Long Recension of *Philadelphians* occupies 236 lines while the Middle Recension spans only 117. The Long Recension is almost double the length of the Middle Recension version. What the following catalogue of differences makes clear is that the additional materials and alterations found in the Long Recension do not have a clear, singular purpose. Some alterations and additions seem to clarify in ways that largely agree with the Middle Recension while other differences radically alter the textual tradition. While there are tendencies that unite these differences, especially the tendency to expand the pedagogical aspects of the epistle,<sup>182</sup> even these do not make clear a coherent intent on the part of the scribe redacting the letter collection because they address divergent themes.<sup>183</sup> Rather, the scribe of the Long Recension allowed the text of the Middle

---

<sup>182</sup> This was evident in the Long Recension of *Magnesians* as well. See, Chapter 1.

<sup>183</sup> Cf., e.g., *Philadelphians* 4, which briefly addresses marriage and asceticism, and *Philadelphians* 9, which uses imagery of temple priesthood to articulate the divine hierarchy.

Recension to govern many aspects of his own writing, adding and clarifying the epistles in ways that brought them into greater conformity with his and his audience's expectations for Ignatius and bishops more generally.<sup>184</sup>

As with *Magnesians*, the bulk of the differences between the Middle and Long Recensions of *Philadelphians* stem from pedagogical and clarifying statements found only in the Long Recension. Pedagogical materials are found in several places in the Long Recension of *Philadelphians* and often share thematic connections to the Middle Recension even while providing more extensive instruction to the reader. As in *Magnesians*, the pedagogical sections often include lists of exempla that demonstrate a familiarity with biblical characters and provide scriptural warrants for specific behaviors.

The first of the extended teaching sections in this letter appears in *Philadelphians* 3.2. The Middle Recension includes a brief set of two conditionals that outline the basis for belonging to God. A second set of two conditionals reinforces the idea that separation from the community in action or will takes a person out of conformity with Christ.

“For whoever is of God and Jesus Christ, they are with the bishop, and whoever, having repented, comes to the unity of the assembly, these also will be of God because they are living according to Jesus Christ. Do not be deceived, my brothers! If someone follows a separatist (σχιζοντι), he does not inherit the kingdom of God. If someone goes about with a different purpose (ἀλλοτριὰ γνώμη), he is not conformed to the passion (3.2–3).”

Like the Middle Recension, the additional material in the Long Recension is structured around issues of inclusion in and return to the Christian assembly. Unity with the bishop is identified as the key instantiation of the individual's relationship to Christ. The Long Recension, however, goes on to make explicit that those who “turn away” from the

---

<sup>184</sup> The topics addressed in the interpolated letters largely determine those addressed in the new compositions. The only letter to depart drastically from the style and concerns of the Middle Recension is *Philippians* which adopts a very different formal structure. A large portion of the letter is written as direct address to Satan (5–11) and a brief reply from Christ (12).

bishop and keep company with “those calling down curses” are cut off, presumably from human and divine community.

Whoever turns away from him<sup>185</sup> and welcomes fellowship with those calling down curses, these are cut off with them. For they are not a crop of Christ, but a sowing of the enemy, from whom may you always be delivered by the prayers of the shepherd<sup>186</sup> who presides over you most faithfully and gently.

The hypothetical outsiders are made completely antithetical to the Christian community. They are a “sowing” or “offspring” of the enemy. This association with “the enemy” and subsequent exhortations to “hate those who hate God and you” and “regard them as enemies” invite the reader to see any activity that separates someone from the bishop as equivalent to active dissent or opposition to God. Failure to sufficiently “keep away from the lying messenger” or a “different purpose” from the rest of the community is a sure path toward destruction, no matter the reader’s relationship to such a person.

Brothers, do not be deceived. If someone does not keep away from the lying messenger, he will be condemned to Gehenna. For it is necessary neither to separate from the pious nor to lie together with the impious. If someone goes about with a different purpose (ἀλλοτρίᾳ γνώμῃ), he is not of Christ nor of the fellowship of his suffering. Rather, he is a fox,<sup>187</sup> a corrupter of Christ’s vineyard. Do not get mixed up with such a one so that you may not be destroyed together with him, whether a father or a son or a brother or a member of your household.<sup>188</sup>

While encouraging similar attitudes of unity with the bishop and possibility for return to the community through repentance, the Long Recension offers a stark division between insider and outsider and a more detailed image of just how fine the line is between salvation and destruction. The Middle Recension primarily warns against communal

---

<sup>185</sup> The pronoun here has an ambivalent antecedent. The pronoun could refer either to Christ or the bishop. The play on this ambivalence continues and implicitly supports the notion that separation from the bishop and separation from Christ are one and the same thing.

<sup>186</sup> Here again, the Long Recension plays on the ambivalence between Christ as shepherd and bishop as Shepherd.

<sup>187</sup> Cf. *Apostolic Constitutions* 5.13

<sup>188</sup> The list of individuals here mirrors that found in Deut 13:6. The subsequent citation of Deut 13:8 suggests that the author had this section of Deuteronomy in mind when articulating how to engage with difference and faction.

fracture while the Long Recension portrays a fractured world in which a person can only associate with God or “the enemy.”

In both recensions, the exhortation to join with the bishop and avoid separation is followed by an appeal to unity. The Middle Recension exhorts the reader,

Be eager, then to have one eucharist for there is one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ and one cup of his blood for union, one altar as there is one bishop together with the presbytery and deacons, my fellow-slaves in order that whatever you might do, you do in a godly way (*Philadelphians 4*).

Where the Middle Recension focuses exclusively on ritual action and office holders as the activities and people that safeguard unity, the Long Recension lays out a more extensive set of singularities that encourage unity among Christians. The Long Recension exhorts the reader

to have one faith and one proclamation and one eucharist. For there is one flesh of the Lord Jesus and one is his blood that poured forth over us (for one bread was broken by all and one cup was distributed to the whole), there is one altar in every assembly and one bishop together with the presbytery and the deacons, my fellow-slaves. And since there is one unbegotten God and Father, and one only-begotten Son, Logos-God and human, and one paraclete, the spirit of truth, and also one proclamation and one faith and one baptism and one church which the holy apostles founded as households from one end to the other in the blood of Christ by sweat and toil (*Philadelphians 4.1–2, LR*).

The alteration of the list in the Long Recension gives more prominence to the singularity of “faith” and “proclamation.” The ritual and ecclesial symbols of this unity serve to assert a single faith and a single proclamation. The subsequent assertions of the oneness of the unbegotten God, the only-begotten Son, and the paraclete underscore these theological assertions as the fundamental guarantors of unity. Where eucharist proclaims faith in Christ’s one body and one blood, baptism and the ongoing presence of the church proclaim the singularity of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. The doubling of reference to “faith” and “proclamation” suggests that ritual unity is an expression of a more fundamental unity of belief and speech.



The Long Recension adds further pedagogical material here, extending the discussion of ecclesiastical unity to proper household relationships.

Therefore it is necessary that you complete everything as a ‘peculiar people and holy nation (cf. Tit 2:14, 1 Pet 2:9)’ in the concord of Christ. ‘Women obey your husbands in fear of God (cf. Eph 5:22).’ Virgins dedicated to Christ in incorruption, do not loathe marriage but desire what is better, not by slandering marriage, but for the sake of practicing/learning the laws. Children, obey your parents and love them as fellow-workers with God for your birth. ‘Slaves, obey your masters (cf. Eph 6:5, Col 3:22, Tit 2:9)’ in God, in order that you may become ‘freedmen of Christ (cf. 1 Cor 7:22).’ ‘Husbands, love your wives (cf. Eph 5:25, 28)’ as fellow-slaves to God, as the body of the household, as companions in life and fellow-workers in child-bearing (*Philadelphians* 4.3, LR).

Through a pastiche of citations and allusions to (mostly) Pauline texts, the additional materials articulate proper interpersonal relationships, especially those of the home, as the parallel to properly unified ecclesiastical life. Harmony in the church must be extended to harmony in the home by a similar strategy of obedience toward those in positions of power over you.

The Long Recension then addresses “virgins” again, imagining their life blessing the putative author in the same way as the memories of scriptural exempla.

May I be blessed by your holiness as that of Elijah, as of Joshua son of Nun, as of Melchizedek, as of Elisha, as of Jeremiah, as of John the Baptist, as of the beloved disciple, as of Timothy, as of Titus, as of Euodius, as of Clement, the ones who departed life in chastity (*Philadelphians* 4.4, LR).

Other exempla are brought forward to assure the reader that the married faithful are no more of a blessing than the chaste.

It is not to blame the rest of the blessed ones because they clung to their wives that I now remember these (For I pray that being found worthy of God, I will be found at their feet in the kingdom just as Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, as Joseph and Isaiah and the other prophets, as Peter and Paul and the other apostles who clung to their wives) but I brought them up out of desire that (the virgins) intend the same deed (*Philadelphians* 4.4–5, LR).<sup>189</sup>

---

<sup>189</sup> This last phrase is corrupt in the manuscript tradition as the Latin version offers a different reading “who not by reason of desire but for the sake of producing offspring did they keep their wives.” I follow the reading of Funk and Diekamp in connecting this phrase back to the phrase “it is not to blame the rest of the blessed ones...”. The adversative ἀλλ’ makes most sense when connected back to the οὐ ψέγον. In the emendations proposed by Zahn as well as in the Latin

The excursus on virginity provides lists of exempla for every reader's state, providing scriptural exempla for the life of virgins and married people alike.<sup>190</sup> These lists demonstrate an expected familiarity with early Christian traditions about the marital state of various figures, from Peter and Paul to Melchizedek and Joshua.<sup>191</sup>

The Long Recension continues with additional exhortations for fathers, masters, government and military officials, church officials, and widows. Fathers are to keep their children from leisure and educate them in "holy writings (4.6)." Masters are to care for the whole household because "in Christ, there is neither slave nor free (4.6)." All officials are urged to participate in a chain of obedience and submission that ultimately traces back to God.

Let the officials be subject to Caesar, the soldiers to the officials; the deacons to the presbyters as to priests, the presbyters and deacons and the rest of the clergy together with all the people and the soldiers and the officials and Caesar to the bishop, the bishop to Christ as Christ to the Father. In this manner unity is preserved by everyone...I do not command like an apostle (for who am I and what is my father's house that I should call myself the equal in honor to these?) but as your fellow-soldier, I respond to this ordinance (*Philadelphians* 4.7–8).<sup>192</sup>

---

versions, the "but rather" part of the parallel construction is lost. My translation attempts to indicate what I think is the more plausible sense of the passage despite its lack of literal correspondence to the extant textual variants.

<sup>190</sup> Interestingly, the focus in this text is on *παρθένοι*, a classification specific to women, while the exempla presented are all men. Female exempla are presented later in the section, but only as a model for widows. Cf. *Philadelphians* 4.8 (LR).

<sup>191</sup> For many of these characters best known from biblical stories, the identifications of them as married or unmarried stem from passing references. For Melchizedek, the designation stems from Hebrews 7:3 where he is described as *ἀγενεαλόγητος*. Jerome interprets the designation this way in *Adversus Jovinianum* 1.23. Melchizedek was the subject of speculation at least as early the first century of the common era as witnessed by Hebrews, fragmentary remains from Qumran (11Q), and 2 *Enoch*. The celibacy of Joshua finds its basis in scriptural silence about a wife. The genealogy of Ephraim in 1 Chronicles 7.22-27 ends with Joshua, implying to some readers that he was the last of that line of descent. The married state of Paul was taken for granted in certain Christian circles on the basis of Phil 4:3 in which Paul addresses his *σύζυγε*. For Peter, the reference to his mother-in-law in Mark 1:29–31/Matt 8:14–15/Luke 4:38–39 led to widespread consensus that he was married. On the marital status of Peter and Paul in patristic exegesis, see David L. Eastman, "Marital Status of Peter and Paul," 499–516.

<sup>192</sup> The final line situates the author on the side of the audience, merely a fellow-soldier reminding the reader of the proper battle plan or arrangement, rather than occupying the place of the commander.

With the incorporation of instructions to these diverse groups of people, the Long Recension has eclectically included household, ecclesiastical, civic, and military roles in a pedagogical section that ostensibly started from unity of belief and ritual among and within Christian communities. Instead of merely outlining Christian unity, the Long Recension articulates a vision of ecclesiastical officials as guarantors of civic and imperial unity. With all people subject to Caesar and Caesar subject to the bishop, “unity is preserved by everyone (4.7).” Christian unity leads to a public role for all who participate in the “concord of Christ (4.3)” and all strata of society are given a role in perpetuating Christian unity.

The next section of both recensions develops the place of prophets among those devoted to Christ. The Middle Recension urges the reader,

Let us love the prophets because they announced the gospel<sup>193</sup> and hoped in him (Christ) and awaited him, in whom by faith we are also saved. They are, in the

---

<sup>193</sup> There is a long scholarly history of dispute over whether or not Ignatius refers to written texts (and which ones) when writing about τὸ εὐαγγέλιον. While Massaux’s extensive study of the early Christian reception of Matthew identifies seven instances of “certain” literary contact, Koester, Sibinga, and Schoedel have argued that these similarities derive not (primarily) from literary dependence but Ignatius’s adaptation of a more fluid collection of gospel traditions that included Matthew and Matthew-like traditions not included in the synoptic gospel. Massaux, *Influence of the Gospel of Saint Matthew*, 91–94; Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, 7–8; *ibid.*, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 24–60; Sibinga, “Ignatius and Matthew,” 263–283; Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 201, 234. Recently Brown has eschewed questions of textual or oral indebtedness in favor of exploring the ways in which Ignatius contextualizes and uses the term τὸ εὐαγγέλιον in the letters. See, Brown, *Gospel and Ignatius*. Like these scholars, I find at least some of Massaux’s “certain” literary contacts persuasive insofar as Ignatius seems to have known traditions that we now know from the Gospel of Matthew. The debates in scholarship over literary dependence versus “free” and oral gospel traditions tend to miss the extent to which Ignatius’s lack of direct citation is ideological rather than a product of his literary environment. The instances of contact with Matthew strongly suggest that Ignatius wrote in an environment where he had access to inscribed gospel traditions, whether or not they were identical in whole to Matthew. However, the free adaptation of these materials and the lack of citation formulae indicate that Ignatius refuses to grant any particular inscription of these traditions equal authority to those traditions presented with the tongue or pen of ecclesial office holders. Living instantiations of the gospel are to be preferred to more static, inscribed ones. Similar concerns with textuality and orality were emerging around this time in Rabbinic culture with its emphasis on “oral matters” as distinct from “written matters.” Both Ignatius and the rabbis authorize themselves (and other teachers) as vectors of correct knowledge by implicitly and explicitly denigrating authority derived from inscribed texts. Some of the rabbinic concern for potential improper use and understanding of inscribed texts is on display in m. *Sanhedrin* 10.1 where most of ways in which Israelites will be excluded from the world to come revolve around proper and improper use and understanding of

unity of Jesus Christ, holy ones worthy of love and admiration, having been witnessed to by Jesus Christ and counted together in the gospel of common hope (5, MR).

The Middle Recension presents a kind of feedback loop between prophet and Jesus Christ. The prophets are praised for their role in announcing the gospel and their devotion to Christ. Their status as saints or holy ones is cemented by Jesus' testimony to them and their presence in the gospel.<sup>194</sup> The Long Recension outlines this relationship in a different manner, framing it as a first-person testimony rather than exhortation.

I love the prophets as ones who announced Christ, as partakers of his spirit (which the apostles also did). For just as the false-prophets and the false-apostles drew to themselves one and the same evil, deceitful and misleading spirit, so too the prophets and apostles received one and the same good, authoritative, true, teacherly Holy Spirit by God through Jesus Christ, the righteous spirit. For the God of the old and new covenant is one. The mediator between God and humans is one, who made thoughts and perceptible things and possessed foreknowledge of what is fitting and appropriate. And, one is the paraclete who was active in Moses and prophets and apostles. Therefore all the holy ones have been saved in Christ having hoped in him and awaited him and through him they attained salvation (5.2–4, LR).

Where the Middle Recension's use of the cohortative (i.e. "Let us love...") assumed, at the least, insufficient commitment to the value of prophets for devotion to Christ, the Long Recension removes any hint of justificatory rhetoric. Instead the Long Recension opts for a confessional voice, asserting that the "prophets and apostles" and the "old and new covenant" derive their unity from their connection to "one and the same...Holy Spirit." One God and one mediator give rise to the one Holy Spirit and paraclete who "was active in Moses and prophets and apostles."

---

inscribed texts. While doing little to delineate Christians from Jews as many of the attitudes to Torah expressed therein would have been shared by Christians, this passage helpfully illustrates a wider cultural conversation about the relationship between texts and authority. On the ideological aspects of rabbinic claims to orality, see Fishman, *Becoming the People of the Talmud*, esp. 20–90.

<sup>194</sup> The passive participles here do not make clear who is doing the "counting together in the gospel."

Both the Middle and Long Recensions establish the fundamental unity of “the prophets” for those devoted to Christ. They each characterize the prophets as “hoping” and “awaiting” Christ and finding salvation in him. However, this relationship between prophets and Christ plays a more central role in the Middle Recension where the prophets’ status as holy ones depends on them being “in the unity of Jesus Christ” and having been recommended by Christ. By contrast, the Long Recension establishes their authority based on a perceived consonance between prophetic and apostolic witness. It is not the witness of Christ that guarantees a place for the prophets but the assertion of a singular Holy Spirit in opposition to the “evil, deceitful, and misleading spirit.” The Long Recension’s cosmological and theological statements provide anti-Marcionite and anti-Gnostic arguments while the Middle Recension’s Christocentrism lacks an obvious opponent.<sup>195</sup> Instead of expressing why the reader should pay attention to the prophets, the Long Recension asserts prophetic and apostolic unity rooted in access to the same divine spirit.

---

<sup>195</sup> Not that readers of the letter have been unwilling to posit one or more opponents. The list of opponents has ranged from gnostics and other docetists to Jewish-Christians and “Judaizers.” Schoedel’s suggestion that these statements set the stage for Ignatius’s argument in *Philadelphians* 8 concerning the relationship between “the archives” and “the gospel” seems the most persuasive. Schoedel, “Ignatius and the Archives.” The tendency in the interpretation of early Christian writings to assign a theological movement (e.g. docetism, Gnosticism, Jewish Christianity, etc.) to every instance of theological argumentation is misplaced. As John Marshall notes, there is a tendency to treat opponents (and Ignatius) as purveyors of “full-blown theological systems.” See Marshall, “Objects of Ignatius’ Wrath,” 5. However, despite his caution about turning every rhetorical opponent into a theological system, Marshall argues that we should identify a single opponent in all the letters. This too creates an unnecessarily cohesive social and theological project for the letter collection. All these attempts to identify an opponent or multiple opponents are, I suggest, effects of the epistles collection into a corpus rather than any kind of theological consistency on the part of Ignatius or his opponents. Rather, the act of collection—whether by Polycarp or other scribes—invites the perception of systematicity and unity of purpose. It unnecessarily and unhelpfully assumes a fundamental cohesiveness in both retrospectively orthodox and retrospectively heretical beliefs that is at odds with the extant evidence for early devotion to Jesus. Ignatius himself appears equally capable of “gnostic” formulations (e.g. *Ephesians* 7.2; *Magnesians* 8.2; cf. Hübner, “Thesen zur Echtheit,” 51–59 and the responses by Edwards, “Ignatius and the Second Century,” 214–226) and “Jewish” apocalyptic visions (*Ephesians* 13, *Trallians* 4–5; cf. Marshall, “Objects of Ignatius’ Wrath,” 19) that he is supposedly organizing against.

The different approaches to the place of prophets in the Middle and Long Recensions give way to starkly different pedagogical emphases in the subsequent section. The Middle Recension builds on the discussion of prophets by raising the specter of Judaizing.

If anyone expounds (ἐρμηνεύη)<sup>196</sup> Judaizing to you, do not listen to him. For it is better to hear Christianizing from a circumcised man than Judaizing from a foreskinned one. If both do not speak about Jesus Christ, they are to me steles and graves of the dead upon which are written only the names of men (6.1, MR).

This brief imperative to avoid Judaizing becomes a much more extensive pedagogical exercise in the Long Recension. Following up on the assertions of the previous section concerning the singularity of God, the mediator, and the paraclete, the Long Recension sets forth a string of conditionals that exclude certain theological positions from normative teaching and praxis.

If someone preaches that the God of the law and prophets is one, but denies that Christ is the Son of God, he is a liar as his father is the devil (cf. John 8:44). Such a one is of the lower circumcision, a pseudo-Jew. If someone confesses Christ Jesus as Lord, but denies the God of the law and prophets saying that the father of Christ is not the one who made heaven and earth, such a one does not stand in the truth and his father is the devil (cf. John 8:44). Simon Magus is such a one, but not a disciple of the Holy Spirit. If someone says that God is one and confesses Christ Jesus, but thinks that the Lord is a mere human, not the only-begotten God and the wisdom and word of God but thinks that he is from soul and body, such a one is a serpent, preaching fraud and deceit for the destruction of people. Such a person is a poor man with respect to understanding even as he is named an Ebionite. If someone confesses these things and calls lawful marriage and childbirth destruction and defilement or some foods abominable, such a one has the apostate dragon (cf. Job 26:13 LXX) dwelling within him. If someone confesses the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit and praises creation but calls the incarnation an appearance and is ashamed of the passion,

---

<sup>196</sup> Marshall has argued against the more common translation of this term as “interpret” in that it seems to strongly connote textual interpretation when, in his argument, more than texts are under consideration (e.g. Sabbath observance). Marshall, “Objects of Ignatius’ Wrath,” 8. Schoedel argues that textual interpretation is exactly what is in view here as *Philadelphians* 8 deals directly with how to interpret “the archives.” Schoedel, “Ignatius and the Archives,” 99–101. I agree with Marshall that the term indicates more than explanation of texts but find the connection to other aspects of the letter (e.g. the Hellenistic and early Roman connotations of archives as public, *written* records) more persuasive than connections to Sabbath observance and the like that are based on reading the letter collection as a whole rather than each letter as an occasional epistle.

such a one denies the faith no less than the Christ-murdering Jews. If someone confesses these things and that God the Word dwelled in a human body, the Word being in him as a soul in a body, on account of God being the inhabitant, but not a human soul,<sup>197</sup> and says that unlawful unions are good and sets the goal of happiness as pleasure, such a one is a the falsely-called Nicolaitan, and this one is able to be neither a friend of God nor a friend of Christ, but is a corrupter of the household of flesh and, because of this, is void of the Holy Spirit and a stranger to Christ. All such persons are steles and graves of the dead, upon which are written only the names of dead people (6.1–7, LR).<sup>198</sup>

Through these conditionals, the Long Recension maps the boundaries of correct belief.

Unlike the Middle Recension, no element of this is labeled specifically as Judaizing.

Certain aspects, such as denial of the divinity of Christ and a docetic Christology, are directly linked to Jews (or pseudo-Jews), but none are said to be Judaizing. Despite employing similar language about “steles and graves” in the concluding sentence, the Long Recension is much more specific about what beliefs or actions entail this kind of living death. For the Middle Recension, “those who do not speak about Jesus Christ” are grave markers and containers of death. For the Long Recension, one must speak about Christ in the correct ways.

The Long Recension cements the importance of this specificity of belief with a phrase not paralleled in the Middle Recension. Both recensions present unity as the antidote to living death and theological error saying, “But all of you, come together with an undivided heart (6.2, MR; 6.8, LR).” The Long Recension, however, expands this phrase adding,

and willing soul, being at unity and of one mind (cf. Phil 2:2), always believing the same about the same things, in both ease and danger, in grief and joy (6.8, LR).

---

<sup>197</sup> The redactor of the Long Recension offers here a Christology in which the Logos replaced the human soul of Jesus, thus making him divine and human. Many Greek manuscripts are amended at this point to allow for Christologies in which Jesus possessed a human soul and a divine soul, while Armenian versions omitted the discussion entirely. See Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2.3, 212 n. 10.

<sup>198</sup> A similar list of heresies can be found in *Apostolic Constitutions* 6.26.

Here, as in *Philadelphians* 3–4, unity specifically means unity of belief. Coming together in the same place, it seems, is not enough. One must think and believe the same things, regardless of circumstance. While the Middle Recension certainly seeks a degree of homogeneity in belief (e.g. in acceptance of the reality of Christ’s suffering and death), it generally lacks specifics as to the contents of belief. Instead, the exhortations there rely primarily on gathering in a community that will police such things at a local level. The Long Recension, however, utilizes these extended pedagogical sections to elevate the importance of more specific beliefs.

Despite the appearance of greater specificity, the Long Recension is less explicit in delineating the issues that were of primary concern in the Christological controversies of the fourth century. The various beliefs proscribed by the series of conditionals examined above all tie back to disputes from earlier centuries. Few people in imperially supported churches in the fourth century would have publically denied that Jesus was the Son of God, argued that the God of creation was different than the Father of Christ, or asserted the “mere” humanity of Jesus. Such accusations against other followers of Jesus were much more common in second-century writings,<sup>199</sup> whether it is the Middle Recension of the Ignatian corpus inveighing against docetic understandings of Jesus,<sup>200</sup> Tertullian railing against the radical dualism of Marcion,<sup>201</sup> Justin and the *Didache* warning about the dangers of false-prophets,<sup>202</sup> or Irenaeus accusing the Gnostics of a

---

<sup>199</sup> On the early history of the idea of heresy, the standard work remains Le Boulluec, *La notion*. He locates the beginnings of the idea of heresy with Justin who identified common traits between philosophical schools and the demonic origins of dissensions. However, followers of Jesus could themselves be identified as a Jewish *haireisis* by Justin (*Dialogue with Trypho* 62.3).

<sup>200</sup> Such references are numerous in the Middle Recension. See especially *Trallians* 10.1, *Smyrnaeans* 2, *Ephesians* 7.2, and *Polycarp* 3.2.

<sup>201</sup> Tertullian, *Against Marcion*.

<sup>202</sup> E.g. *Didache* 11.1–6 and Justin, *Dialogue with Trypho* 82.1. Draper has argued that the references to prophets here and elsewhere in the *Didache* are part of the latest redactional layer of the text and were originally concerned primarily with apostles. See, Draper, “Torah and Troublesome Apostles,” 347–372. Le Boulluec has suggested that Justin’s false-prophets



plethora of theological and moral errors.<sup>203</sup> The additional materials in the pedagogical sections do contain material that has more affinity with the “Eusebian” position in the Arian controversies. The Long Recension articulates the singularity of each hypostasis (e.g. one God and Father, one only-begotten Son, one Paraclete) rather than emphasizing the unity of being possessed by all three. Nevertheless, the pedagogical sections of the Long Recension do not mark these as distinctions that cut a person off from Christian community or tie a person to arch-heretics like Simon Magus and the “Christ-murdering Jews.” Only those theological disputes largely deemed settled by the fourth century come in for direct censure.<sup>204</sup>

I do not mean to suggest that fourth-century writers ignored such second and third century “heresies” in their theological pedagogies. In fact, fourth century and later Byzantine writers frequently recycled categories from earlier theological disputes as part of their efforts to catalog error, creating encyclopedias of error and correct Christian doctrine.<sup>205</sup> They happily labeled their theological opponents with names drawn from second and third century disputes. Athanasius of Alexandria called his “Arian” opponents “Jews” for their supposed denial of the Son’s divinity.<sup>206</sup> Eusebius of Caesarea protested against Marcellus of Ancyra and homoousians more generally for their

---

heresiology may have earlier Jewish precedents; *La notion*, 65. Biblical notions of true and false prophecy remained consistently important for a variety of ritual movements from Montanists to Manichaeans and eventually the followers of Muhammad but are identified most clearly in the extant literature of the second century. As with many things, this too may be a product of textual preservation more than fundamental shifts in ideas. For example, the Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies* and *Recognitions* show that concerns about prophecy and *paideia* continued into the fourth century as sections of the *Grundschrift* dealing with prophecy were reproduced and redacted in both versions of the text. See, e.g. Nicole Kelley, “Problems of Knowledge,” 315–348.

<sup>203</sup> Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*.

<sup>204</sup> On the Long Recension as a theological *eirenikon* (building on the insights of both Lightfoot and Zahn), see Smith, “Ignatian Long Recension,” 94–129

<sup>205</sup> See, Cameron, “How to read Heresiology,” 471–484.

<sup>206</sup> E.g. Athanasius, *Discourse against the Arians* 1.8 and elsewhere.

tendency toward “Sabellianism.”<sup>207</sup> Additionally, heresiologies like Epiphanius’ *Panarion* provided a detailed compendium of titillating misdeeds for a variety of heretical positions, many of which were treated as present realities.<sup>208</sup> Such literary practices flourished alongside dualist traditions, such as Manichaeism, which persisted into the fourth century and beyond, as most clearly displayed by the broad geographic dissemination of Manichaeism in Late Antiquity.<sup>209</sup> There difference here is that the Long Recension has the effect of writing this scribal practice into the very beginnings of Christianity.

A final section of pedagogical material found only in the Long Recension frames its teaching as praise. Following the assertion in both recensions that “the archives are Jesus Christ” and the “inviolable archives are his cross and death and his resurrection (8.2),” the Middle Recension uses language drawn from Judahite priesthood to demonstrate the supreme importance of Christ.

The priests are good but better is the high priest who has been entrusted with the Holy of Holies, who alone is entrusted with the hidden things of God. He is the door of the Father through whom Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and the prophets and the apostles and the *ekklesia* entered – all these into the union/unity of God (9.1, MR).

---

<sup>207</sup> E.g. Eusebius, *Adversus Marcellum* and *De ecclesiastica theologia*. The individual instances are too numerous to list. Though Athanasius agreed to the condemnation of Marcellus’ teachings and Marcellus eventually recanted the positions espoused in the *Contra Asterius*, Eusebius appeared to see little difference between the two. Though the *De ecclesiastica theologia* was directed in name at Marcellus, its title’s claim to wider ecclesiastical relevance suggests a more broadly homoousian thrust, especially as he had already written another work against Marcellus. For more on the connection between Athanasius and Marcellus, see Lienhard, “Two Friends of Athanasius,” 58–61.

<sup>208</sup> See, e.g., *Panarion* 26.17.4–9 which constructs his knowledge of Phibionites as an autobiographical episode. The whole of *Panarion* 26 mixes historical episodes with information gleaned from texts and other sources that is represented as part of Epiphanius’s and his reader’s present experience. Scholars continue to mine Epiphanius for the existence or non-existence of particular kinds of excluded Christian beliefs and practices. More recent treatments of Epiphanius have tried to move the discussion into an appreciation for the work as a whole and for its place in the larger stream of Christian culture-making. See, e.g., Schott, “Heresiology as Universal History”; Cameron, “How to Read Heresiology,” 2-10; Cameron, “Jews and Heretics,” 345–360; Jacobs, “Epiphanius of Salamis,” 437-464; and Kim, *Epiphanius of Cyprus* for some important contributions.

<sup>209</sup> See, e.g., Lieu, *Manichaeism in Central Asia* and idem, *Manichaeism in Mesopotamia*.

Employing metaphors better known from Hebrews, the Middle Recension connects Christ's role as mediator to the special role entrusted to high priest in the Jerusalem Temple at Yom Kippur. Anyone who achieves union with God, whether pre-Christian patriarchs and prophets or participants in the "Christian" assembly, does so through Christ the high priest.<sup>210</sup>

The Long Recension comes to a similar conclusion, but takes a different path getting there. The Long Recension uses the metaphor of priesthood to map a heavenly hierarchy that parallels the earthly one.

The priests and servants (διάκονοι) of the *logos* are good,<sup>211</sup> but better is the high priest entrusted with the Holy of Holies, who alone was entrusted with the secret things of God. Good are the ministering powers of God. Good is the Holy Spirit who is the holiest above the holy things and the servant (διάκονος) of the Word. Over all the holy ones, the holiest is the high priest, the one who is messenger (ἄγγελος)<sup>212</sup> and servant (διάκονος) of the Father and the ruler of the legions of heaven's soldiers, through whom the Father made all things and foreknew everything. This one is the way that leads to the Father, the rock, the fence, the key, the shepherd, the sacrificial victim, the door of knowledge, through whom entered Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, Moses and the whole chorus of prophets, and the pillars of the world, the apostles, and the bride of Christ, over whom he poured out his own blood as a marriage contract. All these into the unity/union of the one and only true God (9.1–2).<sup>213</sup>

---

<sup>210</sup> Marshall suggests that Ignatius's references to a single temple and "good" priests (*Ephesians* 9.1; *Magnesians* 7.2; *Philadelphians* 9.1) position him closer to the matrix of those he characterizes as "Judaizers" and to "Jewish-Christianity" than his rhetoric against Judaizing would indicate. "Objects of Ignatius' Wrath," 20. Nevertheless, the tendency to only refer positively to Jewish institutions that are no longer extant seems more akin to later Christians who relegate Jews to historicized and textualized relics rather than real presences. See, e.g., Jacobs, *Remains of the Jews*, 103–138. Positive references to the Temple and priesthood stand in striking opposition to Ignatius's rejection of Sabbath observance (*Magn* 9.1) and his concern about excessive exegetical attention to Jewish scripture (*Philadelphians* 8), both of which are present realities rather than historical and textual "Jewish" relics.

<sup>211</sup> This and all other instances of the word "good" in this passage are translations of some form of καλός. The Greek word has connotations of both moral and physical goodness as well as beauty.

<sup>212</sup> This language of Logos as ἄγγελος of the Father is reminiscent of strands of angelomorphic Christology found in early Christian texts such as Revelation and closely related to the angelology of several Second Temple Jewish texts. See, especially, Stuckenbruck, *Angel Veneration and Christology*. Another broad survey largely directed at challenging the notion in New Testament scholarship that angeology had no role in early Christological developments is also available. Cf. Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology*.

<sup>213</sup> This section is absent from the Greek manuscripts of the Long Recension but is strongly witnessed in the Latin versions. Funk and Diekamp restore this section on the basis that it was

By incorporating “servants” or “deacons of the *logos*” into a comparison that is otherwise identical with the Middle Recension, the Long Recension suggests that the priests and high priest under discussion are not the officers of the Jerusalem Temple but metaphors for the ecclesiastical hierarchy of presbyters, deacons, and the bishop. This mixing of priestly imagery drawn from the Torah and Christian appropriations of temple symbolism subtly sets up an earthly hierarchy that is mirrored in a heavenly one. Both the Jerusalem Temple and ecclesiastical offices are blended to make Christian and cosmological realities conform. The Holy Spirit is over all holy things but functions as a servant or deacon to the Logos. In this structure, the “ministering powers of God” are akin to the deacons of the church, guided and ruled by those over them in the hierarchy. The Holy Spirit is over these “holy things” and acts as servant or deacon to Christ much as the presbyters to the bishop. Christ, the Logos, is then above all as high priest, the servant of the Father but of greater importance to the people because of the Logos’s role as “way that leads to the Father” and “door of knowledge.”<sup>214</sup>

As noted above, such extensive additions are not the only differences found between the Middle and Long Recension. Many of the differences occur at the micro-level of words and phrases. Frequently, these function to clarify or specify statements that are common to both recensions. In some cases, small-scale alterations resonate with the types of additions we see in the longer pedagogical sections. For example, the Middle

---

more likely expunged from later Greek versions than to an addition in the Latin transmission of the text. See, Funk and Diekamp, 2, 186–187 n. 2. The excision of this section from the Greek manuscript tradition likely stems from the assertion of a hierarchy of holiness, with the Holy Spirit occupying a status above all the “holy things” but subordinate to the position of the Logos as its servant. This inequality of persons offended the “Nicene” party of Athanasius insofar as it undermined the fundamental unity of God.

<sup>214</sup> The specification of Christ as the “door of knowledge” in the Long Recension is consonant with the greater emphasis given to belief, will, and cognition found throughout the Long Recension. Even when faith and belief are not explicitly mentioned, the presence of extended pedagogical sections serves to implicitly elevate the importance of correct knowledge received from the proper sources.

Recension exhorts the reader to a particular form of mimesis. Besides keeping close to the bishop, loving union, and fleeing divisions (7.2 MR), the readers are urged to “become imitators of Jesus Christ as he too was of the Father (7.2 MR).” For the Long Recension, the pattern of imitation is somewhat different. There the readers are encouraged to “become imitators of Paul and the other apostles, as even they were of Christ (7.2 LR).” This small difference between the recensions follows the Long Recension’s pattern of introducing scriptural, frequently apostolic, exempla in its pedagogical sections.<sup>215</sup> Rather than imitating Christ directly, the reader should imitate those who followed and observed Christ. This difference also seems to clear up what may be a problematic theological statement for the redactor of the Long Recension. The idea of Christ imitating the Father runs the risk of being construed by some readers as depicting an incorrect relationship between the only-begotten Son and the Father by suggesting that the relationship is mimetic rather than one of shared being.

Such attempts at greater theological specificity appear more clearly elsewhere in the epistle. The opening of *Philadelphians* provides one such clarification that follows the pattern of theological specificity we saw in examining *Magnesians*. The Middle Recension of *Philadelphians* concludes the opening salutation by asserting the divine origins of the assembly’s leadership.

Especially if they are at one with the bishop and the presbyters and the deacons with him, who have been appointed in the will (γνώμη) of Jesus Christ, whom he established in security by his holy spirit (p.2, MR).

The Long Recension shares the conditional aspect of the greeting, also asserting the fundamental importance of unity with the ecclesiastical officers. However, the Long Recension characterizes the divine will differently.

---

<sup>215</sup> Cf. *Magnesians* 3 (LR) as well as *Philadelphians* 4.4–5 (LR) discussed above.

...who have been appointed in the will (γνώμη) of God the Father through the Lord Jesus Christ, who through his own will (βούλημα) securely established the assembly upon a rock...(p.2, LR)

The opening salutation then concludes with a prayer for the ongoing security of the church. As we saw in *Magnesians*,<sup>216</sup> the Long Recension occasionally includes more precise formulations of the roles of Father and Son in the divine hierarchy. The Father is presented as the origin point of divine activity with the will of Christ operating in conformity with the will of Father, never as the generator of the intention.

Elsewhere, the clarifications and specifications found only in the Long Recension involve the addition of only a few words. Where the Middle Recension refers to the reader by the title “children of the light of truth (2)”, the Long Recension adds the particle ὡς, suggesting the title is conditional and adopted rather than essential. In the same section, the Long Recension clarifies the exhortation further. The Middle Recension urges the reader to “flee division and evil teachings (2, MR).” The Long Recension exhorts the reader to flee “division of unity and evil teachings of heretics from whom defilement came out into all the earth (2, LR).” The addition of “of unity” adds little to the sense of the text since unity, especially unity with the bishop, has already been a focus of the epistle. The latter addition of “heretics,” however, creates an image of evil teaching as always stemming from sectarians who keep themselves separate from the assembly.

The Long Recension provides other expansions and clarifications that also create an image of stark duality between those who are correctly Christian and everyone else.

The Middle Recension includes the exhortation

Keep away from evil plants which Jesus Christ does not cultivate because they are not a planting of the Father (2, MR).

---

<sup>216</sup> E.g. *Magnesians* 6 (LR).

The Long Recension includes a designation for the one who does cultivate such evil plants, calling this cultivator of evil plants “the man-murdering monster, because of whom they are not a planting of the Father but a seed of evil (2, LR).” In this same section of the epistle, the Middle Recension goes on to remind readers that someone who “follows a separatist (σχιζοντι; 2, MR)” loses out on the kingdom of God. The Long Recension clarifies this statement as one “who follows someone separating (σχιζοντι) from the truth (2, LR).” These clarifications invite the reader to identify themselves with truth and God. Just as with the reference to heretics discussed above, those who differ from the reading community are breaking from the truth and uniting with a murderous and evil force. Through such differences, the Long Recension articulates a more explicitly dualistic view of the relationship between church and world.

Such clarifying additions are not always directed at making implicit worldviews explicit. The additional materials of the Long Recension can also serve to alter the theological or pedagogical focus of shared materials. For example, the Middle Recension reminds the reader that “where there is division (μερισμός) and wrath, God does not dwell (8.1, MR).” The Long Recension modifies this, suggesting that “where there is disagreement of opinion (διάστασις γνώμης) and wrath and hatred, there God does not dwell (8.1, LR).” The Long Recension suggests that danger stems not from personal separation between those devoted to Jesus, but from division in the community members’ dispositions and thoughts. The ideal unity seems to be cognitive and inward rather than manifest only in the exterior.

Occasionally, the differences offer more direct or familiar-sounding language. In the Middle Recension, the bishop of Philadelphia is described as “attuned (συνευρύθμισται) to the commandments as a *kithara* to its strings (1.2, MR).” The Long Recension describes him as “united (συνήερμισται) to the commandments and decrees

of the Lord like strings to a *kithara*, and he is blameless no less than Zechariah the priest (1.2, LR).” The Long Recension uses a different verb with connotations of physical linkage, rather than musical, and specifies the commandments as those of the Lord. It also reverses the order between strings and instrument. Where the parallelism of the Middle Recension identified the commandments with the strings, the Long Recension identifies the dominical commands and decrees with the *kithara*. This seems less like an attempt to alter the meaning of the metaphor and more an attempt to conform the direction of the comparison to a familiar pattern.

Another metaphor receives similar treatment. In the Middle Recension, the reader is warned that “many plausible (ἀξιόπιστοι)<sup>217</sup> wolves take the God-runners prisoner by wicked pleasure (2, MR).” The Long Recension shares the Middle Recension’s conclusion that “wicked pleasure” is a danger to those who would run the divinely appointed race. However, the Long Recension identifies the danger as stemming from “wolves in sheep’s clothing (2, LR).”<sup>218</sup> Most modern commentators see the Middle Recension’s version as a close parallel to or dependent on Jesus’s statement to “beware the false prophets who come to you in sheep’s clothing but inwardly are ravenous wolves (Mt 7:15).”<sup>219</sup> However, the Middle Recension’s formulation lacks the emphasis on deceit present in the Matthean and Long Recension version. The wolf in this metaphor never pretends to be a sheep, but merely pretends to be a “trustworthy” wolf.<sup>220</sup> Whatever the

---

<sup>217</sup> The term can be used in a positive sense to indicate someone as trustworthy and in a negative sense to suggest that the object of the adjective merely seems trustworthy.

<sup>218</sup> This conforms closely to the portrayal of false-prophets in Matthew 7:15 which itself became an important part of heresiological polemics beginning as early as Justin, *Dialogue with Trypho* 35.3.

<sup>219</sup> Koester identifies this and other Matthean-like passages in Ignatius as part of oral tradition that preceded and continued beyond its incorporation into a written gospel. Koester, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 34.

<sup>220</sup> Two of Aesop’s fables included in Perry’s index to the Loeb edition of Babrius and Phaedrus (234 and 267) both tell stories of wolves who did not pretend to be sheep but seemed trustworthy for a time. Fable 234 involves a wolf cub raised with herd dogs who eventually reverts to its



origins of Ignatius’s unusual formulation of the wolf, the redactor of the Long Recension found the passage in need of clarification—apparently recognizing an ambivalence in terminology that has not been felt by modern readers. By shifting to the trope of a wolf dressed as a sheep, the Long Recension makes clear that the wolf’s intent is to deceive rather than an accident of its nature.<sup>221</sup> Here and elsewhere, the Long Recension adds to or clarifies material from the Middle Recension in ways that emphasize the role of will and intent in any impiety.<sup>222</sup>

The inclusion of extended pedagogical sections and clarifying statements in the Long Recension closely parallels the differences we observed between the Middle and Long Recensions of *Magnesians*. Despite hewing closely to the theme or topics found in the Middle Recension, the Long Recension frequently expands on these similarities in ways that more directly address the reader and inculcate specific behaviors. So too the clarifications help make a specific interpretation of the Middle Recension more explicit, inviting the reader to share the worldview of the redactor and his reading community.

In addition to these differences that closely parallel those between the Middle and Long Recensions of *Magnesians*, we find differences in the autobiographical

---

nature, consuming sheep and persuading the herd dogs to join in. This latter version seems more closely related to Ignatius’s unusual formulation than the “wolf in sheep’s clothing” but as with most Aesopica, the exact forms of the core stories identified by Parry and others varied widely making it difficult to map when and where such gnomic stories would have been known and whether they exerted any influence on the formulation devised here.

<sup>221</sup> As we saw in the changes in the coinage metaphor in *Magnesians* 5, the Long Recension develops a binary worldview that is rooted in individual will and choice, rather than in nature.

<sup>222</sup> E.g. *Magnesians* 5 (LR) where the redactor emends the coinage metaphor with, among other things, the assertion that no one is part of the base, counterfeit coinage by nature. The Middle Recension does not shy away from constructing a strong binary itself, that between *ekklesia* and “the world.” See, e.g., the heuristically useful map and discussion in Malina, “Social World Implied,” 71–119, which itself is rooted in the ideas and arguments of Douglas, *Purity and Danger*. Despite this binary, there is not the same degree of emphasis on individual will as in the Long Recension. This could be due merely to the constraints of hurried, occasional epistles that lack the systematicity sought by scholars when identifying the “theology” or “intent” of the author. The consistency of the Long Recension in emphasizing volition signals a shift in the reader and/or reading community in which such emphases are deemed necessary or in which they have become so familiar as to be incorporated through force of habit.

material of *Philadelphians* that lack an obvious parallel in *Magnesians*. For example, in the Middle Recension, the account of Ignatius's knowledge of the bishop is tied directly to the salutation by a relative pronoun.

Which bishop, I know that he acquired (κεκτηῖσθαι) the ministry for the common good neither through himself nor through people nor according to vanity but in the love of God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ (1.1, MR).

Here, the relative pronoun directs the reader back to the greeting in which the Philadelphians were greeted “in the blood of Jesus Christ, which is eternal and constant joy, especially if at one with the bishop... (p.1–2, MR).” The Long Recension eschews that connection, presenting Ignatius as an eyewitness to the bishop.

Having beheld your bishop, I know that he was deemed worthy (ἡξιώθη) to be entrusted with (ἐγχειρισθῆναι) the ministry for the common good neither through himself nor through people nor according to vanity but in the love of Jesus Christ and God the Father, who raised him from the dead (1.1, LR).

The indication of seeing the bishop uses language identical to *Magnesians*, where both recensions identify Ignatius as seeing the whole community through the person of the bishop (*Magn* 1.1). In this instance, the Long Recension establishes direct contact between Ignatius and the bishop akin to patterns found elsewhere in the Ignatian corpus. The Middle Recension, however, mentions the bishop without giving any indication that Ignatius had met him even though both recensions document an encounter between Ignatius and the Philadelphian assembly.

This account of meeting the bishop also contains a change in verb with regard to how the bishop obtained his office. In using the verb κτάομαι, the Middle Recension connotes an active role for the bishop in obtaining the office. Despite the insistence that divine love was the driving force, the bishop is characterized as “seeking” the office. The Long Recension makes doubly certain that this process is a passive one. Both verbs utilize the passive voice, making clear that the bishop himself is not the agent by which

his office was procured. Others, most likely the assembly, found him worthy and entrusted the office to him.

The two recensions differ further in their characterization of the Philadelphian bishop. The Middle Recension describes him as one “who keeping silent (σιγῶν) is capable of more than those who speak idle things (μάταια, 1.1, MR).” The Long Recension expresses a similar idea but alters the comparative slightly. There the bishop, when keeping silent, “is capable of more than those speaking much (πλέον, 1.1 LR).” Both recensions depend on ancient discourses about the ideal rhetor for whom knowledge of when to keep silent was deemed as important as knowledge of when to speak.<sup>223</sup> However, the Long Recension improves on the portrayal of the bishop in the Middle Recension, portraying him as a master of the art of getting maximal force out of minimal speech. By contrast, the Middle Recension’s assertion that the bishop’s silence is better than idle chatter reads as damning with faint praise. His silence is not necessarily more eloquent than the speech of others, but at least he is not speaking idly. The Long Recension allows no such ambiguity, driving home the point that silence is connected to piety by providing an exemplum. The text refers to the bishop as “blameless no less than Zechariah the priest (cf. Luke 1:5–24).”<sup>224</sup> As such, the Long Recension

---

<sup>223</sup> For a treatment of this in the Middle Recension, see Maier, “Politics,” 503-519. I agree with Maier that the Middle Recension draws from such approaches to rhetoric and oratory. However, the comparison with the Long Recension suggests that there was a real possibility that ancient readers would in fact read this defense of silence in ways that Maier attempts to refute in his historical reconstruction. Maier does not consider audience reception of such tropes and thus overlooks that such rhetoric of silence as better than idle chatter could serve as a sufficient or insufficient defense of the speaker depending on the receptivity and expectations of the audience. The fact that Ignatius appeals to such an ideal in defense of this bishop suggests that he does not imagine everyone in his audience interpreting the bishop’s silence as due to his rhetorical prowess. Much like modern political rhetoric, Ignatius was portraying a communal experience in a way that he hoped would be construed positively by his audience.

<sup>224</sup> Zechariah’s silence garners little attention in early Christian or Patristic exegesis aside from that of Clement of Alexandria. He reads Zechariah’s silence as the silence of the enigmatic prophetic utterances which would be broken by the coming of the Logos Christ. See, *Protrepticus* 1.10.

makes explicit that this silence is not merely tolerable but an effect of connection to God.<sup>225</sup>

Other subtle differences in the way readers are addressed and the way Ignatius's encounter with the Philadelphians is described minimize the appearance of dissent and disagreement. In the Middle Recension, the exhortation to "keep away from evil plants (3.1)" is interrupted by an aside. The letter reads, "Not that I found division with you, but a filtering (ἀποδιύλισμόν)." Already in the Middle Recension, there is an attempt to portray the situation at Philadelphia, though less than ideal, as manageable. The unusual term ἀποδιύλισμόν derives from language for straining or filtering, especially wine.<sup>226</sup> These connotations suggest that whatever disputes and factions may be at play in Philadelphia, they are merely the byproduct of the process of making the assembly, rather than division or faction within the assembly. The Long Recension phrases this aside somewhat differently.

Not because I found division with you do I write these things, but I am securing you beforehand (προασφαλιζομαι) as children of God (*Philadelphians* 3.1, LR).

In place of a euphemism for communal tension, the Long Recension asserts the absence of any division among its readers. The reader is invited to receive the exhortations as prophylactic measures rather than challenges to what they believe or do.

A similar formulation is present elsewhere in the Ignatian corpus in both the Middle and Long Recension. In several instances, we find the writer characterizing certain exhortations as attempts to keep the reader on their guard (προφυλάσσω)<sup>227</sup> rather than viewing them as accusations. While only the Long Recension uses the verb

---

<sup>225</sup> Zechariah makes an unusual example here given that his silence seems to stem from his lack of trust in the angel's message about his wife becoming pregnant (Luke 1:20).

<sup>226</sup> *LSJ* s.v. διύλισμα and διύλις.

<sup>227</sup> *Magnesians* 11.1; *Smyrnaeans* 4.1; *Trallians* 7.1 (LR), 8.1; *Antiochenes* 6.1; *Philadelphians* 5.1.

προασφαλιζομαι,<sup>228</sup> both recensions use the rhetorical technique of excluding their audience from those under censure. Such rhetorical techniques frequently frustrate our attempts to reconstruct the social life of these early assemblies as they can be used whether real conflict is present or not. By writing in this way, scribes assert ideals that may or may not reflect actual viewpoints espoused by members of the assembly. In *Philadelphians*, the differences between the Middle and Long Recensions suggest that the redactor understood such assertions as reflections of reality, excising the appearance of conflict suggested by the unusual ἀποδιῦλισμόν.

Such a position is borne out by the next section of the epistle in the Long Recension. After the pedagogical material in 3.2–6 regarding how to engage with those separating themselves from the community in thought and action, the Long Recension again excludes the reader from those who have gone or are in danger of going astray.

I rely on you in the Lord that none of you thinks differently. Therefore, I write confident in your God-worthy love...(4.1, LR).

Without repeating the sense of putting the reader on guard or securing them, the Long Recension portrays Ignatius as confident that there is no disagreement with the audience. There is no sense that they might reject his teaching authority or read the epistle with skepticism.

---

<sup>228</sup> *Trallians* 8.1 (LR); *Antiochenes* 6.1; *Philadelphians* 3.1 (LR). Both verbs have connotations of security in face of a potential or impending threat. προφυλάσσω has roots in keeping a person or household on guard while προασφαλιζομαι typically relates to fortifying or securing a place. While it is speculative to read too much into such a fine distinction, the differences in word choice may reflect a subtle difference in the conception of assemblies between the second and fourth century. In using προφυλάσσω, the *ekklesia* addressed is thought of as people rather than a place. For the Long Recension, both verb forms are possible but the one which treats the *ekklesia* as place to be secured is the one used when departing from the earlier recension. The use in both instances is metaphorical, but the choice of metaphors with slightly different valences may reflect differing conceptions of *ekklesiai*. This distinction is complicated further by the presence of ἀσφαλιζομαι in both recensions (*Philadelphians* 5.1), though it too is used in one instance in the Long Recension where the Middle Recension uses a form of φυλάσσω (*Trallians* 7.1).

This minimization of dissent continues in other portions of the letter that directly address Ignatius's experiences at Philadelphia and his knowledge of the community. In the Middle Recension, the text indicates that some did not receive Ignatius's preaching of obedience to the bishop and other ecclesiastical officers warmly. It characterizes their response this way:

There were those who suspected that I said these things as one who foreknew the division of some (7.1, MR).

The Middle Recension carefully avoids directly suggesting that any of the readers were such people without denying that such people may be reading the letter as well. The Long Recension, however, turns this from a statement of reality into a conditional.

If you suspect that I said these things as one learning beforehand the division of some...(7.2, LR).

Both recensions then defend Ignatius's ignorance of local ecclesial politics on the grounds that his bondage demonstrates his lack of knowledge deriving from human informants. Nevertheless, the conditional aspect of the Long Recension makes all such disagreement hypothetical while the Middle Recension indirectly acknowledges the reality of dissent.

Elsewhere, the Long Recension goes much further in eliminating any hints of intra-ecclesial dispute. In the Middle Recension, *Philadelphians* 8 gives a brief account of a conversation Ignatius had while at Philadelphia.

Since (ἐπεὶ) I heard some saying, "If I do not find it in the archives, I do not believe it in the gospel." And when I said to them, "It is written." They answered me, "It lies before (πρόκειται)." For me the archives are Jesus Christ. The inviolable archives are his cross and death, and his resurrection and the faith through him in which I desire to be justified by your prayer (8.2, MR).

The Long Recension removes any sense of a dialogue or exchange between factions.

For (γάρ) I heard some saying, "If I do not find it in the archives of the gospel, I do not believe it." To such ones I say, "For me, the archives are Jesus the Christ, whom to disobey is clear ruin. For me, the inviolable archive is his cross and

death and his resurrection and faith concerning these things, in which I desire to be justified by your prayers.” The one who distrusts the gospel, distrusts everything along with it. For the archives of the Spirit do not lie before (πρόκειται). To kick against the goad is hard (cf. Acts 26:14); to distrust Christ is hard; to reject the preaching of the apostles is hard (8.2–3, LR).

Unlike in the Middle Recension, Ignatius’s opposition has no voice in the Long Recension. Instead, the Long Recension uses the verb *πρόκειται* which was spoken by the opposition in the Middle Recension to assert the impossibility of arguing about the “archives of the gospel.” The opponents portrayed in the Middle Recension argued that whether or not “it was written” was exactly what was being debated. The Long Recension erases any semblance of debate. Ignatius’s response is not part of a conversation, but something he would say to anyone who said such a thing. His response asserts that anyone who would question or attempt to debate such archives engages in a dangerous activity, running the risk of distrusting the Spirit, Christ, and the preaching of the apostles. The Long Recension relegates dissent to the hypothetical.

While the differences examined above do not provide us with a clear sense of authorial intent, they do suggest numerous ways in which the scribe of the Long Recension imagined Ignatius and his world. The sheer variety in the additional material highlights the inaccessibility of authorial intent when approaching such literature. In allowing epistolary context to determine the theme of additional pedagogical materials, the redactor gave significant agency to the earlier inscription of Ignatius, expanding it in ways that resonated with the source material. Such close connection between reading and reinscribing Ignatius blunts and muddies whatever intentions motivated the project. Nevertheless, such attention on the part of the reader to his source material provides an avenue for gauging the effects of this new inscription, exploring the ways in which the Long Recension brings the Middle Recension into conformity with horizon of expectations of the scribe and other readers. In approaching difference through the lens

of effects rather than intention, we catch a glimpse of the ways in which wider social discourses produced important aspects of the Long Recension's pseudonymous scribal activity.

### **Effects of Difference**

The effects of the differences between the Middle and Long Recensions of *Philadelphians* are, in many ways, like what we observed in our analysis of *Magnesians*. The additional materials of the Long Recension, especially the pedagogical additions, alter the rhetorical landscape of the letter. Where the Middle Recension reads as an attempt to head off division *within* the Philadelphian assembly (e.g. 2.1), the Long Recension subtly turns the reader's attention to external forces (p.2, LR). Rather than walking the Middle Recension's fine line between praising and censuring its readers, the Long Recension adopts the habits of heresiology, helping readers to understand the vast variety of dangers that threaten those striving for salvation in Christian terms. In so doing, Ignatius becomes a prototype of the bishop-heresiologist.<sup>229</sup>

This larger shift is effected in several ways by the differences introduced in the Long Recension. First, the differences between the Middle and Long Recensions serve to minimize the reality of division and dispute within the Philadelphian congregation. We saw this most clearly in portions of the letter that recounted Ignatius's time among the Philadelphians. Selective additions and deletions of material found in the Middle Recension allow the Long Recension to create an irenic image of the Philadelphian congregation and a relatively peaceful visit from Ignatius. Gone are the Middle

---

<sup>229</sup> This closely conforms to the description of Ignatius in Eusebius (3.36.4) where he is characterized as exhorting readers to guard against heresies that "were beginning to prevail" in his day.



Recension's references to a "filtering (3.1)" and responses from Ignatius's opponents (8.2). In their place, the Long Recension assures the audience that they are not under censure, but merely protected (3.1) from whatever dangers lurk in the wings. The Long Recension assures the reader of the writer's confidence in them that "none of them thinks differently (4.1 LR)." Where the Middle Recension portrayed dialogue and dispute between Ignatius and some Philadelphians, the Long Recension constructs an Ignatian response to anyone who might insist that the totality of gospel resides in its written formulations and sources. By removing the dialogical aspect of Middle Recension, the Long Recension makes the dispute hypothetical, erasing the impression of lively, ongoing conflict.

This image of irenic interchange between Ignatius and his readers manages the memory of Ignatius as well. The realities of interpersonal conflict between Ignatius and some Philadelphians suggested by the Middle Recension effect a very different portrait of Ignatius than that of the Long Recension. The references to the existence of "some who suspected" that Ignatius spoke as a partisan in ongoing disputes at Philadelphia (7.1), the "dishonoring" of Ignatius's companions Philo and Rheus Agathopus by "some" Philadelphians (10.1) and some folks challenging Ignatius's teaching effect an image of Ignatius as a cause of conflict and dissent. The community he left in Syria was only recently recovered from turmoil (10.1) and his presence exacerbated tensions at Philadelphia. The Long Recension, in minimizing communal dissent, portrays Ignatius as authoritative for even his earliest readers. Some people may have held "heretical" positions or taught things that differed from Ignatius, but no member of the Christian congregation challenges his authority or status. The reader is left with an impression of Ignatius as someone who was welcomed and supported by many churches, maintaining friendly ties and encouraging wider networks of relationship through his letters.

This minimization of dispute bolsters the irenic image of inter- and intra-ecclesial relationships already intimated by the epistolary form. Where the genre itself suggests peaceful and highly-networked relationships between geographically dispersed congregations, Ignatius's interactions with Philadelphians in the Long Recension embody those relationships. He was welcomed into their community and preached among them (7.2) and now encourages their further participation through an embassy to Syria (10.1). The image of inter-ecclesial harmony offered by other epistles is confirmed.

This irenic image of inter-ecclesial relationships and Ignatius's role in supporting them implicitly affirms fourth-century (and earlier) accounts of the origins of heresy and difference. In most heresiological schema, heresy is treated as innovation.<sup>230</sup> Drawing on a shared repertoire of anti-*paideia* arguments,<sup>231</sup> Christian anti-heretical writings created histories of heresy in which a pristine, virginal core was corrupted by theological innovations. Epiphanius's account went even further than most, writing the history of heresy as part of the fabric of primeval, universal history from the entry of sin into the world through Adam and his descendants.<sup>232</sup> By writing of early Christian communities as engaged in bonds of friendship and collegiality, the Long Recension affirms the view that division and exclusion were later products, derived not from early Christian

---

<sup>230</sup> E.g., Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem* 1.1.6; Hegesippus apud Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, 4.22.4; Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* 1.1.1.

<sup>231</sup> E.g., Josephus, *Contra Apionem*, 1.15–27; Tatian, *Ad Graecos*, 3.3. Eusebius builds on such critiques of agonistic displays of *paideia* in his characterization of heretics as driven by their constant desire to innovate (νεωτεροποιίας), *Historia ecclesiastica* 1.1.1. These characterizations also drew on prior strands of philosophical thought in which philosophers sought to distinguish themselves from sophists, accusing the sophists of being concerned only with fame, reputation, and luxury, rather than with the pursuit of “Truth.” E.g., Plato, *Gorgias* and Isocrates, *Against the Sophists*. Despite disagreements between them, both contributed to a discourse about rhetoric in which competition for fame and wealth drove the majority of practitioners, rather than the pursuit and inculcation of truth. Such critiques became part of Christian and Jewish responses to the totalizing claims of Hellenistic literary culture and Roman imperial ideology.

<sup>232</sup> For a discussion of this aspect of the *Panarion* which has vexed many an interpreter (e.g. Young, “Did Epiphanius Know?”, 199–205), see Jeremy Schott, “Heresiology as Universal History,” 546–563. For the historical imaginations of Epiphanius more generally and their place in the late fourth century cultural discourses, see Kim, *Epiphanius of Cyprus*.

congregations but from those outside the fold or those who had left the fold chasing pleasure and other impieties.

Many of the Long Recension's additions that clarify text shared by both recensions further emphasize danger, division, and deviance as external to the Christian congregation. As noted in the above description of differences, the Long Recension paints a more explicitly dualistic portrait of the world. In the Long Recension of *Philadelphians*, "evil teachings" are the provenance "of heretics from whom defilement came out into all the earth (2.1, cf. Jer 23:15)." "Evil plants" are cultivars of a "murdering monster (3.1)." The divine spirit that spoke in prophets and apostles is opposed by a singular lying spirit that inspired false prophets and false apostles (5.2). Such people are those who "separate from the truth (3.3)." In these comments not paralleled in the Middle Recension, the early Christian community is remembered as pristine. Evil and danger exist, but they are rooted in people who separate themselves from truth, which the assembly possesses, and draw to themselves the deceitful spirit. The effects of "heresy" bring pollution (μολυσμὸς) to the whole earth. Even the allusion to Jeremiah in which the Jerusalem prophets are accused of failing to speak the word of the Lord affirms the conception of "heresy" as a corruption of the truth. By such means, heresy is associated with historical change while truth and true Christian community is made to seem unaffected by historical processes.<sup>233</sup> The Long Recension simultaneously supports this view and memorializes it as a component of early Christian community and teaching.

The pedagogical material in the Long Recension of *Philadelphians* 6 demonstrates Ignatius's own mastery of the many varieties of deviance from the truth.

---

<sup>233</sup> A similar process is at play in Epiphanius's *Pananrion*. See, Schott, "Heresiology as Universal History."

Breaking each heretical trajectory down into a small number of beliefs, the letter provides an easy handbook for identifying error. In this way, Ignatius is authorized for a new era by remembering his skill as a heresiologist. Simultaneously, the practice of heresiology itself is normalized as an essential facet of early Christian culture making. The additional materials in *Philadelphians* 6 have the effect of naturalizing the list-based heresiological pedagogy that became more prominent in fourth-century ecclesiastical circles<sup>234</sup> and give the imprimatur for such practices to a martyr.

The effects of the materials found only in the Long Recension are not limited to the heresiological. As in the Long Recension of *Magnesians*, the frequent pedagogical interventions effect a shift in focus from the community to the individual. This is most clearly visible in the additional materials in *Philadelphians* 4. Both recensions agree on the centrality of ritual symbols of unity—the community gathered around one altar, hearing one proclamation and professing one faith (4.1). The Long Recension adds other corporate markers of unity such as a single baptism and the notion of single church “founded as households from one end (of the world) to the other (4.2 LR).” Yet such corporate activities occupy only a fraction of the Long Recension’s pedagogy on oneness and unity. These corporate symbols depend on perfect individual behavior that identifies Christians as “a peculiar people and holy nation (4.3 LR).” The bulk of this section builds on the calls to submission and obedience found in the household codes of 1 Peter and passages from Ephesians 5 and Colossians 3. Proper patterns of submission within the household—between men and women, dedicated virgins and married Christians, master and slaves, parents and children—establish the basis for civic and ecclesiastical patterns

---

<sup>234</sup> As Cameron, “How to Read Heresiology” notes, heresiology played an important role for late antique and medieval writers. The habits of rewriting similar lists and expanding them with the rise of new threats (e.g. Islam) all suggest an important pedagogical role for such texts through much of Christian history. However, the degree to which such listing practices intersect with other areas of culture formation have only begun to be mapped.

of proper behavior (4.7). Commanders obey Caesar; soldiers obey commanders. Deacons subject themselves to presbyters while the entirety of the ecclesiastical and civic hierarchies, including the emperor, should submit themselves to the bishop. While hopes of ecclesiastical dominance over political structures never quite resulted in the desired outcome, the entirety of the program for living as a holy people revolves around individual patterns of submission to superiors in social hierarchies. Participation in the ritual symbols of Christian unity is not enough. The effect is to memorialize ideal Christian practice as stemming primarily from individual rather than corporate behaviors.

In the fourth century, such assertions did not produce the kind of focus on the individual that emerges in European Protestant discourses.<sup>235</sup> Nevertheless, they suggest an increasing concern with how to inculcate correctly Christian ideas and habits at the level of the individual. As Christian communities gained imperial support and increased in social and political prominence throughout the Roman Empire, participation widened, especially in those places where imperial patronage was most visible and the benefits to participation seemed most tangible. As a result, congregations lost the ability to police personal thought and praxis. Communal participation no longer guaranteed correctly Christian belief or behavior.<sup>236</sup> In such an environment, education of the individual takes

---

<sup>235</sup> That is, though individual in focus and concerned with the possibility of human will and choice, the pedagogical interventions in the Long Recension focused on external activities effecting new interiorities. The major Protestant discourses that helped produce contemporary notions of the individual and the self focused on an altered interiority that creates the possibility of external change. Both are concerned with interiority but there is little agreement about the ability of embodied action to positively influence the immaterial (at least in Protestant discourse) aspects of the human person.

<sup>236</sup> While most recent literature on Christianization of the Roman Empire suggests a more gradual and tenuous process than that imagined in earlier scholarship, an influx of insufficiently catechized participants in Christian communities remains a central causal factor in numerous reconstructions of fourth and fifth century Christian history. Most recently (though by no means the first to suggest it), Boin has argued that such insufficiently rigorous Christians are the driving force in many anti-pagan writings. Boin, "Hellenistic 'Judaism'" 167–196.

on increasing importance as the community and its ritual interactions can no longer be counted on to effectively produce the attitudes and behaviors endorsed by Christian elites. The pedagogical interludes of the Long Recension, thus, emerge as effects of wider social discourses on individual behavior and belonging, while themselves providing a historical memory and a martyr-exemplum that implicitly justify ecclesiastical attempts to homogenize belief and practice.

### **Documenting Similarity**

Just as in *Magnesians*, the similarities between the Middle and Long Recensions play an important role in structuring textual differences. As in *Magnesians*, most of the similarities could be subsumed under authorial claims, epistolary form, and support for a tripartite clerical hierarchy. These categories of similarity are present in *Philadelphians* as well, though the focus on communal hierarchy figures less prominently in *Philadelphians* than elsewhere in the Ignatian corpus. The Long Recension of *Philadelphians*, like that of *Magnesians*, maintains similarity in the sections devoted to fulfilling epistolary conventions and solidifying authorial identifications. Beyond these commonalities, both recensions of *Philadelphians* provide more biographical material than *Magnesians* and exhibit high degrees of similarity in those sections as well.

The Middle and Long Recensions use a nearly identical greeting. It reads:

Ignatius the God-bearer, to the assembly of God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ which is in Philadelphia [of Asia]<sup>237</sup>, which has been shown mercy and established in the harmony of God and rejoices without distinction in the suffering of our Lord [Jesus]<sup>238</sup> and in his resurrection, having been fulfilled in all mercy, I greet in the blood of Jesus Christ which is eternal and constant joy,

---

<sup>237</sup> The designation “of Asia” is only present in the Middle Recension.

<sup>238</sup> The name “Jesus” is only found in the Long Recension.

especially if [they are]<sup>239</sup> at one with the bishop and those appointed presbyters and deacons [with him].<sup>240</sup>

Both recensions identify Ignatius as the only author of a letter addressing a gathering of people which he identifies as an assembly devoted to God and Christ. In addition to the common Ignatian reference to addressees as recipients of mercy (ἡλεημένη),<sup>241</sup> the Philadelphians are further characterized as “rejoicing” in Jesus’ suffering and resurrection. As such, these brief theological notes serve to articulate a baseline of agreement between the writer and reader which will serve as a foundation for discussing points of difference between Ignatius and the Philadelphians.<sup>242</sup> The reality of Jesus’ suffering and resurrection become an important litmus test of correct teaching (*Philadelphians* 8).

Both recensions preserve a hint of disagreement between author and imagined audience. The conditional “especially if” (μάλιστα ἐάν), which most likely modifies the greeting itself, suggests that any agreement between Ignatius and the Philadelphians is contingent on unity between congregation and clergy. Though addressed to the whole assembly at Philadelphia, the letter suggests that at least some are better disposed to listen to Ignatius than others.

---

<sup>239</sup> The verb of being is explicit only in the Long Recension.

<sup>240</sup> This final prepositional phrase only appears in the Middle Recension.

<sup>241</sup> *Romans* p.1; *Philadelphians* p.1; *Smyrnaeans* p.1; *Philippians* p.1; *Ad Mariam Cassobolitam* p.1; *Antiochenes* p.1. The form of the participle found in the Middle Recension (except *Smyrnaeans*, ἐλεημένη) is far less commonly used than the form typically found in the Long Recension (ἡλεημένη). Both forms are in parallel with other perfect participles, suggesting that the scribes transmitting the Long Recension produced a more familiar form that did not alter the meaning of the term.

<sup>242</sup> For an interpretation and discussion of the dispute between Ignatius and the Philadelphians, see Schoedel, “Ignatius and the Archives,” 97–106; and Sumney, “Those Who ‘Ignorantly Deny Him,’” 354–359. Schoedel understands Ignatius’s account of his disagreement with some of the Philadelphians in *Philadelphians* 7–8 as rooted in different practices and understandings of scriptural interpretation. Sumney largely agrees with this and uses the differences between *Philadelphians* and other Ignatian epistles to argue that Ignatius’s letters each address a specific occasion rather than a problem or set of problems common to the corpus.

In similar fashion the request and farewell portions of the letter also exhibit a high degree of agreement between the two recensions. *Philadelphians* 10 identifies the request that motivates the correspondence.

Since according to your prayer and the affection you have in Christ Jesus, it was announced to me that the assembly in Antioch of Syria is at peace, it is fitting for you as an assembly of God to appoint a [deacon (MR)/bishop (LR)] as an ambassador of God to undertake an embassy there in order to rejoice<sup>243</sup> with them when they assemble and to glorify the name [of God].<sup>244</sup> Blessed in Jesus Christ is the one who has been deemed worthy of such a ministry...For you who desire to do this, it is not [at all]<sup>245</sup> impossible because of the name of God, as even the nearest churches have sent bishops along with presbyters and deacons.

The request is framed as a continuation of actions the Philadelphians' have already undertaken on Ignatius's behalf. Although the passive voice suggests that the Philadelphians were not actually the agent by which Ignatius heard this news, he credits their prayer and affection toward him as a factor in the peace at Antioch. Unlike in the requests for prayers found at the conclusion of many letters in the Ignatian corpus, the request does not come as an imperative.<sup>246</sup> Instead, the request is framed as a suitable, even ideal, course of action.<sup>247</sup> It is the logical outcome of what the Philadelphians have already done and mirrors what others are already doing.

The final farewell includes details of mutual acquaintances, greetings from the assembly in Troas, and introduces the messenger who carried the letter. While there

---

<sup>243</sup> The two recensions use different verb forms here. As there is no change in meaning, it is unclear when this difference emerged in the manuscript tradition.

<sup>244</sup> The phrase "of God" is found only in the Long Recension. In the Middle Recension, "the name," a likely shorthand for "the name of the Lord," may refer either to God or to Christ. The latter is the more common referent in the Middle Recension. See Marshall, "Objects of Ignatius' Wrath," 20 and the citations there for the place of this terminology in traditions often labeled "Jewish-Christian."

<sup>245</sup> This phrase is only found in the Long Recension.

<sup>246</sup> E.g. *Ephesians* 21; *Magnesians* 14; *Trallians* 12; *Romans* 9.

<sup>247</sup> *Polycarp* 7 and *Smyrnaeans* 11 contain similar locutions, presenting the course of action as "fitting" or "suitable" to whom the addressee is or what they have already done. This consistency in formulation suggests a connection with wider rhetorical conventions for the request of ambassadors. Unlike these letters though, only *Philadelphians* supports this course of action by reference to what others have already done. This presentation of supporting reasons fits well with the other aspects of the letter that suggest conflict between Ignatius and the intended audience.



appears to be a corruption of one of the names in the Long Recension, the two recensions preserve a standard epistolary form, sending greetings from mutual acquaintances and introducing an unfamiliar letter carrier.

Concerning Philo the deacon, a man from Cilicia approved by testimony<sup>248</sup>, who even now ministers to me in word<sup>249</sup> together with Rheus Agathopus,<sup>250</sup> an elect man who followed me from Syria having renounced life, these also testify to you. And I too give thanks concerning you because having welcomed them, the Lord also (welcomes)<sup>251</sup> you. And may those who dishonored them be redeemed in the grace of Jesus Christ...<sup>252</sup> The love of the brothers in Troas greets you, from where I also write to you through Burrus who was sent together [with me]<sup>253</sup> by the Ephesians and Smyrnaeans as an expression of honor. The Lord Jesus Christ in whom they hope with flesh, soul, spirit, faith, love, (and) concord will [repay/honor]<sup>254</sup> them. Farewell in Jesus Christ our common hope [and in the Holy Spirit.]<sup>255</sup>

As in the other portions of Philadelphians that fulfill generic epistolary functions, we see here indications of a history of dispute and disagreement between writer and readers.

Both recensions portray Ignatius as suggesting that despite the communal welcome of his companions, there were some who mistreated them. Additionally, Philo, Rheus, and Burrus are put forward not only as mutually known parties but as witnesses to Ignatius's own status in that they have joined themselves to him and testify to the truth of Ignatius's claims. The conclusion not only incorporates the expected farewell and greetings from mutual acquaintances but reiterates many concerns of the letter as a

---

<sup>248</sup> This appositional phrase follows a slightly different word order between the two recensions. In the Middle Recension, "from Cilicia" precedes the description of Philo as someone vouched for by trusted persons. The Long Recension wording sandwiches the prepositional phrase "from Cilicia" between the noun and participle in apposition to "Philo the deacon." The phrasing of the latter is more elegant while the former relies heavily on parataxis. It is plausible, though far from certain, that the prominence given Philo's origin in the Middle Recension betrays a concern to distinguish between Philos or an attempt to emphasize a wide geographical range of support at the expense of a more literarily elegant formulation.

<sup>249</sup> The Long Recension adds "of God" here.

<sup>250</sup> The Long Recension divides this into two names in most manuscript traditions: Gaius and Agathopus.

<sup>251</sup> The verb is explicit in the Long Recension but implicit in the Middle Recension.

<sup>252</sup> The Long Recension justifies this hope in reconciliation with an allusion to Ezekiel 33:11 that is absent from the Middle Recension.

<sup>253</sup> This phrase is found only in the Long Recension.

<sup>254</sup> The Middle Recension reads "honor" while the Long Recension reads "repay."

<sup>255</sup> This last phrase is found only in the Long Recension.

whole, especially for communal concord and the incorporation of the Philadelphians into the network of associates and assemblies who honor Ignatius. The witnesses likely served to certify the author's claims while inviting the Philadelphians to increased levels of care for Ignatius's companions and his home assembly.

The Middle and Long Recensions have other similarities interspersed throughout the letter. While similarities in formulaic letter features suggest a sense of continuity in letter-writing culture on the part of fourth-century readers, other similarities in the two recensions of *Philadelphians* participate in the construction of a consistent Ignatian biography.

Here, as in *Magnesians*, the letter is directly associated with "Ignatius the God-bearer." Whichever recension a reader encounters, the contents are associated with and to be interpreted in light of that particular author function.<sup>256</sup> Unlike other letters in the Ignatian corpus, *Philadelphians* narrates part of the encounter between Ignatius and the Philadelphians during his journey through Asia Minor. Three sections include material that describes an encounter and conflict between Ignatius and his audience. The conclusion of *Philadelphians* 6 introduces the disagreement.

I give thanks to [my]<sup>257</sup> God [through Jesus Christ]<sup>258</sup> that I am of a clear conscience concerning you and that no one can boast either secretly or publicly that I burdened anyone in anything small or great. And, I pray for all among whom I spoke that they may not have it for a witness (against them; 6.3, MR; 6.9, LR).

Despite including more theologically nuanced prayer language (e.g. "through Jesus Christ"), the Long Recension repeats the Middle Recension exactly. Both incorporate sentences which establish Ignatius's independence from the Philadelphians and head off any possible accusations that his presence in Philadelphia unduly burdened or disrupted

---

<sup>256</sup> In my use of the term "author function" I follow Foucault, "What is an author?" 205–222. For more on this, see Chapter 1.

<sup>257</sup> The possessive pronoun is found only in the Middle Recension.

<sup>258</sup> This phrase only appears in the Long Recension.

the community. Ignatius's prayer simultaneously exhibits benevolent concern and censure of the readers, suggesting that his spoken words (and perhaps his person) stand as witness (μαρτύριον) to truth.<sup>259</sup>

The next section of the letter narrates what Ignatius had to say when he visited the Philadelphians. Here too, the two recensions are largely the same.

For if some wanted to deceive me according to the flesh, yet [the spirit from God/my spirit]<sup>260</sup> was not deceived...<sup>261</sup> For he knows from where he comes and where he goes and exposes hidden things. While among you, I cried out; I spoke with a great voice [the voice of God/not my word, but God's].<sup>262</sup> "Give heed to the bishop and the presbytery and the deacons. [Some suspected/If you suspect] that I said these things as one who [foreknew/learned ahead of time] the division of some. He for whom I am in chains is my witness that I did not know from human [flesh/mouth]. The Spirit proclaimed<sup>263</sup> through me saying, "Apart from the bishop, do nothing. Guard your flesh as a temple of God. Love union. Flee division. Become imitators of [Jesus Christ as he also is of the Father/Paul and the other apostles as also they are of Christ, (7)].<sup>264</sup>

Although the recensions are not identical, the portions that remain the same all deal with the narration of events: the possibility that some people were trying to deceive Ignatius, the failure of their efforts, suspicion that Ignatius already knew about communal

---

<sup>259</sup> In *Trallians* 12, both recensions exhibit a similar concern with Ignatius's action counting as testimony against the recipients. There, however, the reference is to the letter itself serving as a witness. *Philadelphians* raises this possibility for Ignatius's speech.

<sup>260</sup> The Middle Recension articulates a different agent at work in detecting the deception. For the Middle Recension, the same spirit of God that speaks in Ignatius also detects the fraud. This creates an image of inspiration in which the divine voice is separate from the person speaking. The Long Recension makes the agent of detection Ignatius's own *pneuma*, rather than God's. The Long Recension does include God as an agent with the phrase "for by God I detected it," but here too the emphasis is first and foremost on the "I" doing the action rather than utilizing a model of revelation or inspiration in which the individual *pneuma* is displaced by the divine one.

<sup>261</sup> The Long Recension adds "for by God I detected it."

<sup>262</sup> The Middle Recension once again defines the voice as belonging to a separate agent while the Long Recension understands this as a human agent speaking things belonging to God.

<sup>263</sup> Both recensions use the same verbal root but the Middle Recension has the verb in the imperfect while the Long Recension uses the aorist.

<sup>264</sup> The two recensions here opt for different characterizations of the proper hierarchy of imitation. The Middle Recension characterizes Christ's relationship to the Father as an imitative one. As we saw with *Magnesians*, such language choices became more problematic in the theological controversies of the fourth century. Imitation, however, remains important in the ethical imagination of the fourth century. Thus the Long Recension interposes apostolic intermediaries into the hierarchy of imitation and removes any sense that Christ imitates the Father rather than somehow sharing the Father's being in some way.

fractures, the consistent message of unity with the bishop, and the need to do everything possible to avoid division. The “biographical” details are preserved by both recensions.

The next section of *Philadelphians* contains more such biographical detail.

Therefore I did what was proper to me as a person preparing for union (ἔνωσιν).<sup>265</sup> Where there is [division/divided opinion]<sup>266</sup> and wrath [and hatred, there]<sup>267</sup> God does not dwell. Therefore, [the Lord/God] forgives all those who repent, if they [return to/run together in] the unity of [God/Christ] and the meeting<sup>268</sup> of the Bishop. I trust the grace of Jesus Christ that he will remove every bond [of wickedness]<sup>269</sup> from [you/us].<sup>270</sup> [Therefore]<sup>271</sup>, I exhort you: do nothing according to selfish ambition but according to the teaching of Christ. For I heard some saying, “If I do not find it in the archives [of the gospel]<sup>272</sup>, I do not believe it [in the gospel]<sup>273</sup> ...<sup>274</sup> For me the archives are Jesus Christ [whom to

---

<sup>265</sup> There seems to be a play on the two senses of “union” most common in the Ignatian corpus. The term appears in the corpus in two primary contexts: to discuss the union of flesh and spirit that imitates God (*Trallians* 11.2; *Philadelphians* 7.2; *Magnesians* 13.2) and to encourage interpersonal or interecclesial unity (*Magnesians* 1.2; *Philadelphians* 4.1; *Polycarp* 5.2 [of marriage]). Ignatius makes his journey to martyrdom a preparation for both kinds of union. His preparation for divine union is an opportunity to prepare communities for interpersonal and interecclesial union.

<sup>266</sup> The Middle Recension uses a word here found frequently in both the Middle and Long Recension of the Ignatian corpus, μερισμός. The Long Recension characterizes this slightly differently. There is a διάστασις γνώμης, a disagreement of opinion. The former seems to capture a broader range of differences and disagreements while the latter focuses more specifically on disagreement in the realm of beliefs and ideas given the etymological connection with knowledge and the mental faculty.

<sup>267</sup> The Long Recension includes an additional term for animosity (μῖσος) in the list of things that proscribe the divine presence. The Long Recension also makes “there” explicit while it is implied in the Middle Recension.

<sup>268</sup> The Middle and Long Recensions use slightly different terms here for the meeting or gathering of the bishop. The Middle Recension uses συνέδριον which has connotations of any official assembly or gathering, probably familiar to early Christian readers both as the label for the gathering of Jerusalem elders in some gospel traditions and as reference to imperial and local councils. The Long Recension uses the term συνεδρεία which likewise covers a range of meetings from the gathering of a circle of friends to a sitting of the Roman Senate (LSJ s.v. συνεδρεία) but lacks any connotation of Jewish gatherings. By the fourth century, συνέδριον would have been more familiar as a term for Jewish councils, eventually being inscribed into the Theodosian Code (16.9.29 = Justinian Code 1.9.17) in the fifth century (ca. 426) as a term for the leadership groups of local synagogues throughout Palestine.

<sup>269</sup> This additional gloss on “bond” appears only in the Long Recension.

<sup>270</sup> The Middle Recension includes only the reader in its address while the Long Recension incorporates writer and reader as recipients of such freedom from bondage.

<sup>271</sup> This transition is found only in the Long Recension.

<sup>272</sup> This characterization of the archives appears only in the Long Recension. It will be discussed in a subsequent section.

<sup>273</sup> The Middle Recension treats the gospel as distinct from the archives while the Long Recension treats the archives as the gospel.

<sup>274</sup> The Middle Recension includes a dialogue between Ignatius and some members of the Philadelphian community that is absent from the Long Recension.

disobey is clear ruin]<sup>275</sup>. [For me]<sup>276</sup> the inviolable archives<sup>277</sup> are his cross and death and his resurrection and the faith [through him/concerning these things] in which I want to be justified by your prayer (8).

Couched in shared exhortation to unity, both recensions assert Ignatius as someone “preparing for union” who behaved as such a person should when confronted with disagreement. Both recensions preserve memories of Ignatius as encountering people who challenged certain beliefs on the basis of written documents.<sup>278</sup> In both versions, Ignatius is presented as turning the challenge into a teaching moment, asserting Jesus Christ as the essential source of authority. Despite differences in the portrayal of the dispute and the correct teaching that resolves it, both recensions share a sense that textuality has an ambiguous relationship to assertions of correct belief.

Other less extensive similarities pepper the Middle and Long Recensions of *Philadelphians*. Many of these deal in some way with praise of the bishop and in asserting the value of unity for authentically Christian life. Both recensions characterize the bishop’s role as a benevolent one rooted in the divine will. The bishop obtained his office “for the common good, neither through himself nor through people, nor from vanity, but in the love of [God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ].”<sup>279</sup> The bishop is praised for his “equity” (ἐπιεικεία) as well as his “steadfastness and freedom from anger (1.1, 2).” The bishop’s equity and gentleness is presented as a product of life lived in God’s own ἐπιεικεία (1.2).

---

<sup>275</sup> Found only in the Long Recension.

<sup>276</sup> This is present only in the Long Recension

<sup>277</sup> Archive is singular in the Long Recension.

<sup>278</sup> Archives could and did take a variety of shapes in the ancient world, but they all had in common the preservation of information through inscription on a variety of writing surfaces. As we see here, the recensions portray the disagreement in slightly different terms, nevertheless they agree in the conclusion that the material testament to Christian truth is housed not in a particular set of texts but the untouched “inscription” or “archives” of Christ’s cross, death, and resurrection. These are central because they were not authored or inscribed by human hands. They were thus inviolable (ἄθικτον), that is literally untouched.

<sup>279</sup> *Philadelphians* 1.1. The words in brackets follow the Middle Recension. The Long Recension alters the order and removes the designation “Lord” (“love of Jesus Christ and God the Father...”).

In similar fashion, both recensions encourage unity, urging readers to “flee division and evil teachings (2.1)” and to “keep away from evil plants which Jesus Christ does not cultivate (3.1).” Anyone following “those separating” is excluded from inheriting “the kingdom of God (3.3).” Those on the right side of matters are easily identifiable because “such ones are with the bishop (3.2).” And to avoid “the evil arts and treacheries...of this age,” the readers must “come together with undivided hearts (6.8 LR, 6.2).” While the two recensions often expand on these exhortations in divergent ways, they both reinforce unity with the bishop as an antidote to whatever dangers may arise.

### **Effects of Similarity**

Much like in *Magnesians*, the similarities present an overarching set of implicit continuities that help to structure the differences between the two recensions. They serve to reinforce shared points of concern between the second and fourth centuries as well as continuities with broader cultural discourses about the value of unity and clear lines of authority. The similarities structure the letter’s contents in ways that invite the perception of continuity between the ecclesiastical structures and leadership of the second- and fourth-century churches. In addition to this, the similarities establish more fully the biography of Ignatius, providing details that can be utilized to interpret his writings and memory.

From the outset, *Philadelphians* continues the Ignatian textual tradition’s emphasis on the importance of the individual author.<sup>280</sup> By maintaining the reference to

---

<sup>280</sup> This mode of composition is the primary mode for the Ignatian corpus. Only the Roman version of the martyrdom narrative sets this voice aside entirely, preferring a novelistic approach in which Ignatius’s speech and actions are reported by an omniscient narrator. The Antiochene Martyrdom narrative largely embodies this same approach but maintains the focus on Ignatius as

Ignatius as the author in the letter's opening lines, both recensions authorize Ignatius. The preservation of this corpus into the fourth century bolsters this implicit assertion, suggesting that Ignatius, the author, remains someone whom generations of Christians have found worth remembering.<sup>281</sup> Both recensions thus claim to be authentic witnesses to the thought of the same individual. Scribal interventions to preserve, copy, and redact become testaments to the authority behind these letters insofar as previous generations have authorized these texts by the attention given them in the act of copying.

The authorial identifiers encourage readers to see a single personality and biography at work across the entire textual tradition. While modern critical readers have long separated the recensions and martyrdom narratives into different categories, there is little evidence that ancient readers attempted any such differentiation with regard to this textual tradition.<sup>282</sup> In fact, many ancient readers who cite Ignatius include little or no identifying material, suggesting that despite the importance of Ignatius's name and

---

an author by embedding *Romans* within the narrative much like historians or novelists would embed "source" documents in their narratives of battles, embassies, and important personages.

<sup>281</sup> This is the assumption that underlies much of Eusebius's presentation of Ignatius. For more on this, see Chapter 4.

<sup>282</sup> Lightfoot has suggested that the roughly two centuries between the composition of the Long Recension and the first certain Greek citations of it—in the work of Anastasius of Antioch and Stephanus Gobarus apud Photius' *Bibliotheca*—suggest a degree of circumspection on the part of ancient readers and a relatively slow diffusion of the Long Recension. Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 1.2.257–260. While Lightfoot's work helpfully maps the ways in which texts could be transmitted in part or whole between only a few locations (e.g. his observation that the Latin manuscripts are nearly all of Burgundian origin suggesting local production and possibly more localized distribution), he does not apply the same rigorous skepticism to the transmission of the Middle Recension. The Middle Recension finds few voices of confirmation and support between the second and fourth centuries before exploding to prominence in the historical work of Eusebius, the scribal work of the Long Recension's redactor, and in the narrative vision of the composers of the various acts of martyrdom. It appears from patterns of citation both recensions followed more localized and haphazard patterns of transmission rather than being widely diffused by some vaguely osmotic process. See, Chapter Four for a detailed discussion of this. Whatever the modes of transmission, the frequent incorporation of letters from both the Middle and Long Recensions in translations and the common presence of the Acts of Martyrdom in many Greek and Latin letter collections indicates that all of these pieces of the Ignatian textual tradition were frequently viewed as part of a single Ignatian tradition.

person within the textual tradition as a whole, readers could happily pluck choice phrases without participating in the identifications promoted by the corpus of epistles.<sup>283</sup>

Much as in *Magnesians*, the generic similarities between the Middle and Long Recensions of *Philadelphians* play an important role in the epistle's intelligibility in both the second and fourth centuries. For second and fourth century readers, the letter form itself frequently carried generic expectations. The conventions of letter writing often gave the reader clues for interpreting its contents. Various treatises from antiquity serve as guides for how to use the epistolary form as well as hints of the ideologies that underlie letter writing. In Demetrius' *On Style*, the epistolary project itself is stylistically linked to dialogues and thus to lived conversations.<sup>284</sup> The letter's close connection to speech was part of an insistence among epistolary theorists that epistles should show forth the character of the writer, revealing the reality of the author plainly and directly.<sup>285</sup> Other Greek rhetorical handbooks, in their focus on friendly and paraenetic letters, indicate

---

<sup>283</sup> E.g. Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses*, v.28.4; Origen, *De oratione* 20; *In canticum canticorum*, Prologue III; *Homilia in Lucam* 6.3. The passage from Irenaeus attributes the citation of *Romans* 4 to "someone from us (*quidam de nostris*)," and Origen provides no name with a citation of *Romans* 3 in *De oratione* while the Latin translation of *In canticum canticorum* has a turn of phrase in which the citation is introduced as from "someone of the saints said, named Ignatius, concerning Christ... (*aliquem sanctorum dixisse Ignatium nomine de Christo*)." Because of the unusual syntax of the latter, the name seems likely a later addition. The citation from Origen's homilies on Luke is likewise extant only in a Latin extract from Jerome. Here too, the phrase that introduces the quotation is separated from the quote by additional details that name Ignatius and identify him as the bishop of Antioch after Peter ("in one of the letters of a certain martyr it is written, I am speaking of Ignatius the second bishop of Antioch after blessed Peter, who under persecution fought with the beasts in Rome: 'The virginity of Mary was hidden from the ruler of this age [*Ephesians* 19.1].'") Even if the inclusion of the names is original, which seems unlikely, both these citations deemphasize the importance of the name for the reader, highlighting instead the timelessness of the words. We see something similar in Syriac manuscript traditions where the name of Ignatius is used but the ideas expressed thereby are characterized as "sayings" with the force of "ecclesiastical canons." See, Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 1.2.91–94. The name is part of the authorization but the act of collecting the sayings with a variety of other fragments from other authors grants them authority and a timeless force by their conformity to other voices. For more detailed treatment of the reception of Ignatius's epistles, see Chapter 4.

<sup>284</sup> *On Style*, 223–225. For description and analysis, see Poster, "Conversation Halved," 23.

<sup>285</sup> *On Style*, 227. See Poster, "Conversation Halved, 23–24 on this ideal. See, Devore, "Character and Convention," 223–252, for a creative use of this theorization of letters in the composition of Eusebius's *Ecclesiastical History*.



that a sense of exchange between equals rooted in shared *paideia* grounded epistolary theorization.<sup>286</sup> A shared educational culture allowed writers and readers to see themselves as relatively equal, despite other differences in status. While letters could be supplicatory and emphasize the subordination of writer to intended reader, most of the epistolary types identified in the manuals assume a degree of parity between writer and reader, even when one party is offering advice or placing blame for a particular action.<sup>287</sup>

For the identified audience of this letter, such assumptions would support the letter writer's rhetorical strategies of identifying himself as on par with his readers despite his bondage and his unstated status as an ecclesiastical officer. The letter's urgings and exhortations are portrayed as friendly rather than imperatives from an agreed upon authority to his inferiors. This allows the readers to encounter even Ignatius's accounts of intra-communal disagreement as the advice of a fellow-initiate seeking to keep them on the right path.

For later second-century readers, these epistolary ideologies encourage them to approach the text as revelatory of Ignatius's actual character. We catch a glimpse of this in Polycarp's letter to the Philippians. The penultimate section of that letter indicates that the Ignatian epistles known to Polycarp have been subjoined to his own epistle as exemplary of "faith and patience (13)." Polycarp's brief introduction to the epistles highlights their exemplary character and suggests that these make them useful for building up the community "in the Lord (13)." Polycarp identifies access to Ignatius's

---

<sup>286</sup> Ps.-Demetrius, *Typoi Epistolikoi* and Ps.-Libanius/Ps.-Proclus, *Epistolimaioi Kharacteres*. See Poster, "Conversation Halved," 24–32.

<sup>287</sup> Latin letter writing seems to place more emphasis on hierarchy and status, see Poster's discussion of Julius Victor's *Ars Rhetorica* in Poster, "Conversation Halved," 34–36. For an analysis of the correspondence between Jerome and Augustine that builds the importance of such hierarchies in letter writing, see Ebbeler, "Mixed Messages," 301–324. There Ebbeler compares the "successful" correspondence between the Ausonius and Paulinus to the failed exchanges between Augustine and Jerome, suggesting that Augustine's refusal to play the part of novice and lower status writer to Jerome's elder teacher created the antipathy that characterized their epistolary interactions.

character as the primary reason for reading the letters, rather than anything they might have to say more specifically about communal leadership, Christology, or any other dogmatic content.<sup>288</sup>

Continuity in epistolary theory between the second and fourth century makes the revelation of Ignatius's character an important aspect for fourth-century readers as well. As in the second century, the epistolary form invites fourth-century readers to perceive the Ignatian letters as direct access to the character and holiness of the martyred Ignatius. Unlike hagiographical texts which employ third-person narration and stories of heroic deeds, the epistle provides the reader with a sense of unmediated connection to the putative author. The writer's true character emerges in a way impossible in other genres. For readers more familiar with the homiletical and liturgical celebration of Ignatius's heroism, the letters show how his holiness and teaching authority manifested themselves in quotidian interactions as opposed to conversations with emperors or the embrace of death in the arena.<sup>289</sup> The epistolary genre invited fourth century readers to view themselves as friends of the martyr-bishop and sufficiently like the assemblies of earlier centuries to see themselves as part of the intended audience. The letter form allowed them to hear his words to the Philadelphians and other early Christians as for them as well.<sup>290</sup> John Chrysostom's homily on Ignatius demonstrates just such an

---

<sup>288</sup> For a more detailed treatment of this text and the reception of the Ignatian corpus more generally, see Chapter 4.

<sup>289</sup> E.g. *Martyrdom of Ignatius* (Roman) where the bulk of the narration is an account of various dialogues between Trajan and Ignatius.

<sup>290</sup> Can we generalize this idea – that the friendship/parity aspect of letters makes them ideally suited for specific kinds of copying and reading that other genres don't invite in the same way. E.g. reader of letter can either read as someone overhearing other people's conversation or by identifying with the named reader(s). The former mode of reading does not lead to a strong sense of text as authoritative unless it is viewed as providing a memory or history for contemporary claims to a particular status (e.g. as the Torah, prophets and historical books seem to for Josephus in *Contra Apionem* – there such texts are scripture because they provide an authentic history not rooted in a competitive literary culture). The latter mode in which the reader identifies with the named reader offers a clearer sense of how such texts might be scripturalized as speaking an

approach to traditions by and about Ignatius. With only a single citation from any of the letters,<sup>291</sup> Chrysostom weaves an encomium on Ignatius rooted in his character rather than his words or teaching.<sup>292</sup> Much as Ignatius praises the bishop of Philadelphia for his God-like equity or reasonableness (*Phil* 1.2; cf. *Eph* 10.3), Chrysostom applies Pauline qualifications for bishops to Ignatius, lauding him as self-controlled, temperate, sensible, and respectable.<sup>293</sup> The homily goes on to portray both continuity and difference between Ignatius's day and that of the audience. In praising Ignatius for managing the affairs of so great a city as Antioch, Chrysostom memorializes Ignatius's episcopal activity as continuous with the civically-minded episcopal ideology of his own day.<sup>294</sup> Such notions of continuity in the role of bishops from Paul onwards stand alongside the discontinuity of living in an age when "there is no danger for bishops, but deep peace on all sides," a world in which Chrysostom imagines that "the Word of piety has been extended to the ends of the world, and our rulers preserve the faith with strictness."<sup>295</sup> These continuities and discontinuities all highlight the strength of Ignatius's character, inviting the audience to emulate it in their own circumstances.

In addition to the ideological aspects of letters, the formulaic components of letters themselves have important effects. For all ancient readers, the greeting of *Philadelphians* follows well-known conventions. This introductory material found in

---

authoritative word despite the otherwise different claims of the named author. The first step in this direction seems to be the process of collection itself in which letters to disparate audiences are stitched together, creating a kind of coherence in the image of author as well as the sense of the letters' importance for readers outside the named audience.

<sup>291</sup> Chrysostom cites *Romans* 5.2 where Ignatius writes "may I have the pleasure of the wild beasts." *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem* 5.

<sup>292</sup> See esp. John Chrysostom, *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem*, 2. When compared with Chrysostom's homily on Babylas, the praise of Ignatius is strikingly general, spending as much time pondering how to praise Ignatius and in what order (*In sanctum Ignatium martyrem* 1) as on anything Ignatius is remembered to have said or done.

<sup>293</sup> Chrysostom, *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem* 2 (PG 50: 589); cf. Titus 1:7–9; 1 Tim 3:2–7.

<sup>294</sup> Chrysostom, *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem* 4.

<sup>295</sup> Chrysostom, *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem* 3 (PG 50: 589).

both recensions establishes the recipients as participants in a single assembly of which they are a local instantiation, calling them “the assembly of God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ that is in Philadelphia (p.1).” In addition, the reference to the Philadelphians “rejoicing without distinction in the suffering of our Lord and in his resurrection (p.1)” establishes Christ’s passion and resurrection as shared premises from which to build the exhortations that form the body of the letter.

For second-century readers, these statements served to establish (or reestablish) the link between writer and reader. The rhetorical effectiveness of these greetings depends on the degree to which individual readers and hearers saw themselves in the address. The shared materials of the greeting only give the barest hint that not all readers were well-disposed to Ignatius. The greeting includes a statement that “Christ’s blood is eternal and constant joy, *especially if*” there is union with “the bishop and those appointed presbyters and deacons (p.1).” Even this conditional, however, keeps the focus on what is shared in that implicitly allows even those at odds with the bishop to share a similar ideology with respect to Jesus’ blood. The greeting merely asserts that the value of Christ’s blood is more certain and durable for those united with the ecclesial officers.

The greeting also encourages second century readers to see themselves as an instantiation of a larger network of assemblies devoted to “God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ (p.1).” Given the location of this idea in the greeting of all the Ignatian epistles, it is likely that Ignatius expected his audience to share the idea that the local communities were in some way interconnected. With several of his correspondents traveling to nearby cities to meet Ignatius, his assumptions appear warranted. However, the repeated emphasis in this and other epistles on manifesting visible signs of this interconnection through communal leadership, mutual support, and the exchange of

ambassadors all suggest that such aspects of Christian life operated as much at the level of ideology and theology as of practice.<sup>296</sup>

For fourth-century readers who no longer share a living memory of Ignatius or the stories of his journey among the churches, this greeting (along with other generic features) plays a substantially different role. Foremost among these, the presence of generic letter features invites a perception of continuity across centuries. Because genre constraints of letters changed little between the second and fourth centuries, the formal components of letters suggest shared vocabulary and culture across great chronological distance. By utilizing a standard form of address and including theological statements that were still common in the fourth century, the letter appears intelligible despite the temporal distance separating reader and putative writer. In such a situation, the maintenance of epistolary form and a familiar theological vocabulary allows readers to see the text as engaged with contemporary ideas and concerns rather than a distant historical occasion. Such similarities invite a flattening or collapsing of time in which Ignatius can be viewed as speaking about and to the reader and his or her own sense of church.

In similar fashion, the identification of the assembly as part of an established network of devotion would read in the fourth century like an ideological and practical assertion. Making use of imperial networks and patronage, local congregations had

---

<sup>296</sup> We see a similar sense of the struggle to build practices of interconnection in Paul's letters, particularly the pieces of letters collected in 2 Corinthians. Similarly, even the largely interconnected vision of Acts and the Pastoral Epistles rely on Paul (or Peter) and their associates to enact the network, rather than the communities. The *Didache's* discussions of how to address traveling prophets and teachers does not treat them as representatives of other congregations but itinerant devotees of Christ (11–13). Adherence to correct teaching identifies traveling teachers, prophets, and apostles as part of the same network as well as their willingness to move along in a timely manner (11). 1 Clement indicates some knowledge of conflict in relatively distant locale but gives no indication of how this information was known or that the writer knew any of those in the Corinthian assembly by name given that only the messengers from Rome sent with the letter are named. In all these instances, we get a glimpse of various practices of interconnection, but each case presents them as sporadic or incomplete.

increased opportunity for practical interconnections, whether as the result of relatively rare ecumenical councils or through slightly more frequent regional gatherings of ecclesiastical officers.<sup>297</sup> So too the designation of churches in Asia Minor at the level of the *polis* and the churches of major cities like Antioch as churches of the province<sup>298</sup> all suggest continuity with a church that now organizes itself primarily along the lines of imperial networks. Such similarities (whether real or perceived) invite readers to see church structures of past and present organized along familiar lines.

Our own familiarity with devotional readers of ancient texts should not lead us to think such an imagination of continuity was a natural or necessary outcome. While it is common practice for many readers of New Testament translations to read such texts as divine or divinely inspired speech directed to all times and places, such assumptions of transparency were not the only mode of approaching authoritative textual traditions. Many readers throughout history have treated such writings as distinctly discontinuous with contemporary modes of thought and speech, especially insofar as they refer to heavenly realities that are at best only dimly mirrored in human experience. Instead, they could be considered oracular forms of speech in need of careful consideration and interpretation that is possible only for a select few who have been trained in the philological and hermeneutical arts.<sup>299</sup> Many scriptural writings were the purview of

---

<sup>297</sup> Patterns of trade and travel were already at play prior to imperial patronage of certain Christian assemblies, but such activities were likely sporadic, providing limited and largely unstructured kinds of contact and interconnection. Eusebius provides some evidence for earlier “synods” such as the account of Origen and some regional bishops who gathered to confront Beryllus, bishop of Bostra, about his heretical doctrines (*HE* 6.33.2).

<sup>298</sup> The Middle Recension typically refers to the “Church in Syria.” Only in the Long Recension do we find the occasional specification of this to the Church in Syria at Antioch.

<sup>299</sup> Such is the view typically attributed to Origen and often on display in the exegetical works of later “Origenists.” In his commentary on Song of Songs, Origen suggests that such scriptural writings demand preparation before reading them as the untrained reader might draw base conclusions.

For an overview of the problem of language and reference in relation to patristic biblical exegesis, see Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, esp. 119–212. In highlighting the significant degree of

scholars who alone were capable of navigating the dangerous waters of interpretation that lead to the distant shores of “truth.”<sup>300</sup> In the Ignatian corpus, however, the similarities between the recensions assert the intelligibility of the shared elements for readers in widely different contexts. Nothing in either recension invites approaching the letters as a source for hidden or secret knowledge. Both form and content present the material as accessible and useful to the reader despite the passing of time.

The similarities in form between the recensions and the maintenance of inoffensive theological statements also serve to support another form of coherence. The bulk of the similarities between the Middle and Long Recensions of *Philadelphians* help to establish a consistent biography for Ignatius. In *Magnesians*, we saw brief points of similarity between the two recensions in the presentation of Ignatius’s impending martyrdom and his imprisonment. Such aspects are present in *Philadelphians* as well. Both recensions portray Ignatius as “bound” for the sake of Christ but needing the prayers of the Philadelphians in order to be perfected (5.1). As in other parts of the

---

overlap in genres and reading strategies between “Antiochene” and “Alexandrian” exegetes, Young identifies the primary difference as to whether the readers saw the text as symbolic or iconic. Seeing the text as symbolic suggested that the relationship between symbol and what was symbolized was less clear, capable of obscuring as much as it revealed. For readers with assumptions about the iconicity of texts, the text is presumed to more directly mirror what it represents. Symbolic modes of exegesis assume a degree of discontinuity—which can be quite extreme or minimal depending on the reader—between inscription and meaning. The iconic position asserts a high degree of continuity between inscription and meaning. Of course, both methods of reading can and do persist within the same reader. A question that remains unexplored and which this argument raises is: to what extent does the maintenance of genre markers across long chronological spans encourage readers to identify certain texts or genres as continuous with the present rather than discontinuous? That is, does the reader’s cultural affinity for a particular genre and its conventions encourage particular modes of reading? An exploration of what reading strategies are most common for what genres of texts would helpfully illuminate this issue.

<sup>300</sup> Such a view is common in patristic writings about what texts are appropriate for Christian use. See Reed, “Pseudepigraphy, Authorship,” esp. 467–474. As Reed argues, such views continue to shape to many of the taxonomies of historical-critical scholarship, thus deeply influencing our scholarly reconstructions of the past and determining what texts we privilege for the history writing. Cyril of Jerusalem encourages a strict line on access to texts, telling catechumens “what is not read in church should not be read privately.” *Catecheses* 4.36. Even texts read in Church could be dangerous if the reader remained untrained, as the concerns expressed in the prologue to Augustine’s *De Doctrina* imply.

Ignatian corpus, the authorial voice asserts the Christological significance of his own bondage and impending suffering while simultaneously insisting that these actions are humbling rather than empowering (e.g. *Eph* 11.2; *Tral* 12.2; *Smyr* 10.2; *Poly* 2.3). Thus, both recensions of *Philadelphians* maintain a memory of Ignatius as acting with humility despite his willingness to suffer for Christ.

While most of the corpus maintains this memory of Ignatius as humble and willing martyr, *Philadelphians* provides additional detail of Ignatius's journey, in particular his time in Philadelphia as he traveled under guard through Asia Minor. Many of the passages that are identical (or nearly so) between the Middle and Long Recensions narrate Ignatius's actions while receiving hospitality from the Philadelphians. As we saw above, *Philadelphians* 6–8 introduces and narrates Ignatius's preaching while in Philadelphia along with disagreements that arose because his presence there. In both recensions, Ignatius preaches unity with the bishop only to discover that some people suspect him of taking sides in an ongoing disagreement at Philadelphia. While the two recensions characterize the dispute and dissension at Philadelphia in different terms, both present Ignatius as preaching unity with the bishop only to be challenged on matters of exegesis and authority.

This biographical material has the effect of giving a martyr's voice to issues that have affected Christian communities throughout Christian history. Whether in the second or the fourth century, readers would encounter Ignatius as a voice for maintaining communal cohesion and unity, particularly through the maintenance of a clear ecclesiastical hierarchy.

Such issues would, however, have been approached and understood differently at different historical moments. In the second century, readers would likely have encountered this epistle with an awareness of multiple models of communal leadership



or at the least an awareness that other assemblies in the same city or region organized themselves in different ways. Materials that survive from the first two centuries of Christian life, while consistently presenting some sort of episcopal and presbyteral structure,<sup>301</sup> frequently disagree over the role of these offices or suggest the presence of disagreement about the qualifications for and responsibilities of such office holders.<sup>302</sup>

Due to increased imperial patronage in the fourth century, ecclesiastical structures were expanding and becoming more prominent civic institutions. Among other powers, Constantine and later emperors granted many bishops the power to resolve ecclesiastical *and* secular disputes.<sup>303</sup> *Philadelphians* presents bishops as speaking with authority even outside their own ecclesiastical jurisdictions.<sup>304</sup> As long as

---

<sup>301</sup> This consistency in presenting episcopal leadership in surviving texts is itself, at least in part, a product of selectivity. Materials that survive from Christ-following groups which did not pass through retrospectively “orthodox” histories of copying and transmission do not necessarily share the emphasis on such leadership as indicative of or important to Christian community. For example, so-called gnostics seem to have organized themselves as study groups with varying levels of involvement and participation in other groups devoted to Jesus. See, e.g., the survey discussion in Brakke, *The Gnostics*, 112–140. Leadership in such study circles was rooted primarily in achievement of specialized knowledge rather than in election or ordination to particular offices, though members were known to do both.

<sup>302</sup> As discussed in the previous chapter, we see evidence for such concern with leadership especially in the Pastoral Epistles and the *Didache*. There has also been discussion about the imprecise usage of such terms in 1 Clement and *Shepherd of Hermas*. For more on the issue of Christian ministry in the early second century, see Maier, *Social Setting of the Ministry*.

<sup>303</sup> The increase in the civic prominence of the episcopacy is most readily visible in the imperial legislation regarding the the ability of episcopal courts to hear and decide legal matters. *CTh* 1.27.1. For a helpful overview of attitudes toward and the practices of such courts, see Lamoreaux, “Episcopal Courts.” For a more nuanced approach to the legal sources, see Harries, *Law and Empire*, esp. 191–211. However, we should not imagine that the power of bishops was thoroughly institutionalized at this time. Both Sotinel and Brown caution us against such a view. Sotinel’s study of the economic resources of bishops makes clear that powerful bishops wielded their authority through personal wealth and patronage networks rather than through institutionalized resources and responsibilities. Sotinel, “Le personnel Episcopal.” Brown directs scholarly attention to the middling status of many bishops, drawn from the upper ranks of artisans or the outer fringes of town councils, who wielded few personal resources and thus little in the way of power and authority that could shape ecclesiastical (much less imperial) policy. See the summary treatment in Brown, *Poverty and Leadership*, 45–73; as well as the more detailed treatments in Brown, *Through the Eye of a Needle*, esp. 31–52.

<sup>304</sup> Bishops regularly traveled outside their own dioceses in Late Antiquity such that even Ammianus Marcellinus made cutting reference to the “throng of bishops” whose travel clogged up public travel networks (*Rerum Gestarum* 21.16.18). The question of episcopal authority outside diocesan bounds, however, was particularly problematic. Bishops from large metropolitan

the bishop is preaching unity and correct doctrine, his teaching authority extends beyond the local diocese into every community of the Christian world.

Furthermore, the episcopacy is presented as an office concerned at all times and places with maintaining unity and establishing correct doctrine. Fourth century readers were unlikely to read this material as part of a larger dispute over whether bishops were even a necessary part of Christian communities. Instead, both recensions present fourth century readers with the impression that emerging models of imperially supported episcopacy are in direct continuity with the apostolic and sub-apostolic church. Episcopal authority is not something new or novel but a foundational part of Christian life from its earliest moments.<sup>305</sup> An episcopal structure is such an important part of Christian memory that both recensions present Ignatius's primary message as one of unity with the bishop. He preaches it everywhere whether there is dissension or not.

The additional biographical material, however, does more than reinforce ideas about episcopacy. It also helps establish a biography for Ignatius that can in turn be used to interpret his writings. Different aspects of his biography, however, are emphasized by different letter collections and by different readers.

---

centers (especially Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, and, eventually, Constantinople) regularly sought to exercise authority over the churches in their region, but the decisions of one such metropolitan were not always honored by others, as the contradictory opinions with regard to Pelagius between eastern and western bishops illustrate clearly. Despite geographical limitations in authority, bishops could and did insert themselves into affairs outside their local church through embassies to other cities and personal travel or as the result of exile.

<sup>305</sup> Rapp argues that we should see the strong emergence of episcopacy in the fourth and later centuries as part of a gradual process of associating new duties and responsibilities with an extant title and office. Rapp, *Holy Bishops*, 3–22. While I agree with Rapp that there is little evidence for a radical break between pre- and post-Constantinian theorizations of episcopacy, I caution against equally overplaying the impression of continuity because the transmission and preservation of sources plays an important role in our own impressions of continuity and stability. I would argue that continuity and gradual change were in play for some congregations but that there were likely other models that existed alongside and failed to gain the imperial support and sanction that bolstered episcopally governed Christian assemblies.

The earliest order of the letter collection, so far as it can be reconstructed from the extant evidence,<sup>306</sup> does not follow an order based on the internal chronological hints of the letters themselves. The letter collection begins with *Smyrnaeans* and *Polycarp*, letters whose farewell sections indicate they were sent from Troas, before jumping back chronologically to include *Ephesians* and *Magnesians* which were sent from Smyrna. *Philadelphians* and *Trallians* follow these with *Romans* concluding the collection.<sup>307</sup> Lightfoot notes that this construction appears to conform to the arrangement suggested by Polycarp's collection of the Ignatian epistles.<sup>308</sup> While this helpfully explains the incorporation of the correspondence sent to Smyrna as the opening letters, it does not provide much in the way of explanation for the subsequent ordering or its potential effects. Aside from concluding with *Romans*, the letter collection after *Polycarp* follows an order of descending length.<sup>309</sup> Such an ordering gives pride of place to two aspects of Ignatius's biography that remain important in traditions about Ignatius, his connection to the equally famous martyr Polycarp and his own meditations on impending martyrdom. This organization of the collection emphasizes Ignatius's martyrdom over his teaching, providing Polycarp as an external witness to his equanimity in the face of death and *Romans* as evidence of his determination to do nothing to escape his fate.<sup>310</sup>

---

<sup>306</sup> See Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2.2, p. 2–3.

<sup>307</sup> *Philadelphians*, like *Polycarp* and *Smyrnaeans*, was sent from Troas while *Trallians* and *Romans* were both sent from Smyrna. The Armenian version, which Lightfoot identifies as providing an early witness to the order of the texts in the collection, transposes *Trallians* and *Philadelphians*.

<sup>308</sup> Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2.2.3. Polycarp, *Philippians* 13. "The epistles of Ignatius which were sent to us by him, and others, as many as we had with us, we send to you just as you requested. They are attached to this letter."

<sup>309</sup> The difference in length between *Philadelphians* and *Trallians* is slight, only five lines in Lightfoot's edition. The number of lines in Lightfoot's edition are as follows: *Ephesians* 248 lines; *Magnesians* 141 lines; *Philadelphians* 132 lines; *Trallians* 127 lines. If the Armenian version preserves an earlier or more common ordering, the letters between *Polycarp* and *Romans* are arranged in chronological order. Clearly from the beginning and concluding letters, chronology was not the guiding principle of organization.

<sup>310</sup> In the reception of the letters, citations of *Romans* far outstrip those from other letters. See Chapter 4 for more detail.

Like the Middle Recension, the Greek manuscripts of the Long Recension do not follow a clear chronological order.<sup>311</sup> The conclusion of the collection once again emphasizes Ignatius's martyrdom with *Romans*. However, the beginning of the letter collection makes different biographical connections, presenting an already arrested Ignatius as in correspondence with a certain Mary who was an associate of Anenecletus, the person often remembered as bishop of Rome after Peter and Linus.<sup>312</sup> These letters provide an introduction to the letter collection that begins shortly after Ignatius's arrest at Antioch, show the character of Ignatius as a bishop who does not neglect his episcopal responsibilities even when under duress, and emphasizes the importance of Antioch.<sup>313</sup> It is Ignatius's character as bishop of Antioch rather than his connection to Polycarp that now stands as a witness to the authority of the collection's contents.

The fourth century also saw the biographical aspects of the Ignatian corpus take on importance in other ways. Eusebius is the first to provide a list of the epistles based on the chronological clues of the letters.<sup>314</sup> Like the collections of the Middle Recension, Eusebius focuses on his connection to Polycarp and his martyrdom, quoting only from *Romans*, *Smyrnaeans*, and the notice in Polycarp's letter to Philippi concerning Ignatius's letters.<sup>315</sup> The fourth century also saw the emergence of martyrdom narratives that became a vehicle for the transmission of *Romans* and gave their own distinctive

---

<sup>311</sup> The order in most Greek manuscripts is: *Mary to Ignatius*, *Ignatius to Mary*, *Trallians*, *Magnesians*, *Tarsians*, *Philippians*, *Philadelphians*, *Smyrnaeans*, *Polycarp*, *Antiochenes*, *Hero*, *Ephesians*, and *Romans*. Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2.3.127.

<sup>312</sup> *Ignatius to Mary* 4. Lightfoot agrees with earlier interpreters that the Mary intended by the letters is the same Mary greeted by Paul in *Romans* 16:6. If early readers did indeed understand the text this way, the beginning of the letter collection adds another layer of Pauline imitation to the Ignatian corpus.

<sup>313</sup> This last because of the association of both letters with Antioch and the fact that Mary reaches out to Ignatius for help rather than to Rome where Ignatius indicates she had been well-established.

<sup>314</sup> Eusebius, *Church History* 3.36.4, 6, 10.

<sup>315</sup> Eusebius, *Church History* 3.36.1, 5, 10–11, 13–14.

emphases to the biography of Ignatius, extending even to the biography of his remains.<sup>316</sup> Focused as they are on Ignatius's martyrdom, even the characterization and depiction of Ignatius as a letter writer is built upon and demonstrated by *Romans*. They display a biographical interest not so much in Ignatius's character as in details that will facilitate devotion to the martyr. Thus the spectacle of his trial(s) and execution and the places of his death, burial, and relics become central biographical details.

The shared material in *Philadelphians* gives an unparalleled degree of (auto)biographical detail.<sup>317</sup> Rather than glimpsing Ignatius only through his epideictic rhetoric and modes of fulfilling epistolary convention, *Philadelphians* provides an episode from the martyr's daily life that is sorely lacking in other sources.<sup>318</sup> As such, it presents his character in a fashion only hinted at by the other letters. When read as part of the corpus rather than an occasional letter to a specific community, this individual episode confirms the picture of Ignatius as skillful curator of Christian community that emerges in the other letters. Ignatius's interaction with the Philadelphians is a microcosm of his entire epistolary project, illustrating how his character and daily life conformed to his exhortation to live in unity with bishop and the whole assembly. His preaching at Philadelphia mirrors the things he says in other instances, and the dispute

---

<sup>316</sup> One of the main differences between the Roman and Antiochian versions of the *Martyrdom of Ignatius* is the final resting place of his relics. The Roman version has them remain at Rome while the Antiochian version has them translated back to the cemetery outside of Antioch. The latter version was clearly dominant at Antioch as Chrysostom's homily on Ignatius presumes the presence of his remains in the cemetery there. Later versions of the *Martyrdom of Ignatius* manage this difference by having Ignatius remain at Rome only for a short time or by having part of Ignatius remain while the rest is translated to Antioch. See Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2.2.368–370.

<sup>317</sup> Only *Romans*, especially when embedded in the *Martyrdom of Ignatius*, provides more autobiographical detail about the internal, personal concerns and ideals of the putative author. That, however, is expressive of character without providing narration of actual life events. It only provides Ignatius's expectation of events in the arena and his concern that they might not come to pass at all. *Philadelphians*, by contrast, offers an important first-hand account of Ignatius's activities while in custody that is largely absent from or merely hinted at in the other epistles.

<sup>318</sup> Later traditions about Ignatius provide more quotidian details, whether in his travels to martyrdom in the *Martyrdom of Ignatius* narratives or in the correspondence between Ignatius and Mary that opens the Greek manuscripts of the Long Recension.

over the “archives” reiterates his message of the centrality of Christ’s passion and resurrection for all aspects of Christian life, whether hermeneutical or practical. Through dispute and disagreement, Ignatius is portrayed as the picture of self-control, not a person who loves argument for its own sake, but someone who engages it for the sake of finding truth. For readers of the letter collections, *Philadelphians* confirms that Ignatius’s actions conform to his hortatory, oratorically inflected claims. That is, the “real” man and the rhetorical one align.

For its putative audience, *Philadelphians* 7–8 functions to absolve Ignatius of any part in creating and expanding communal dissension. It presents his activities there as part and parcel of what he said and did everywhere he went. He merely did what “was appropriate to [himself] as a person preparing for union (8.1).” The letter, as a kind of rear-guard action, reasserts the proper hierarchy between himself and the Philadelphians which was left in some doubt both by his rocky reception there and the indications near the letter’s close that his companions were also “dishonored” (11.1) by some.

When circulated more broadly (and as part of a letter collection), such specific, occasional issues likely took a back seat to the presentation of Ignatius’s character and the content of the disputes. Letters provided later readers the impression of overhearing unmediated, open speech from the writer.<sup>319</sup> In Ignatius’s account of the dispute, he emerges as both an inspired speaker (7.1) and someone who does not seek disagreement or shy from it when it becomes necessary (8.2). He is a model of inspiration and self-

---

<sup>319</sup> See discussion of this aspect of letter-writing above. This ideology of ancient epistles is well-established in the literature on the subject. See, e.g. Morello and Morrison, “Editor’s Preface,” vi–vii. The lack of response included in the corpus also allows the reader to fill in the subsequent gaps in the narrative and imagine the resolution that best conforms with their own ideologies and predispositions. See Owen Hodkinson, “Better than Speech,” 283–300, esp. 296. There Hodkinson argues that the inclusion of a response can be part of the literary activity inviting speculation about resolution before providing a confirmation or refutation of the anticipated outcome in the subsequent epistle.

control. Even the words he preaches with “the voice of God” match the kinds of things he writes to other communities. His character as inspired speaker conforms to his character as it is on display in his other epistles. In this way, the details of the collected epistles reinforce the impression of epistles as windows onto the writer’s true character.

In the fourth century, the biographical details are an important part of the appeal and preservation of the epistles. Whether in Eusebius’s construction of Christian history or in the expanding hagiographical traditions, Ignatius’s story becomes an important piece in the construction of the direct link between Christian past and present. His memory offers the possibility of linking the age of the apostles to the contemporary church, whether as a model of the ongoing importance of martyrdom or a witness to the centrality of the episcopal model of leadership. As such, Ignatius offers fourth-century readers a model for how bishops might wield their authority when in another community, providing exhortation to unity in the face of dissension and acting as a teacher of scriptures.<sup>320</sup>

In addition to this, Ignatius’s story bolsters the importance of Syria, and Antioch in particular, in Christian memory. In *Philadelphians* (as well as the rest of the Ignatian corpus), Ignatius is presented as strengthening and preserving Christian communities throughout the Roman Empire. Such benefit flows from Antioch outward, even to Rome. Ignatius can be added to the stories of Paul and Peter as important martyrs who began from Antioch in their efforts to strengthen (and establish)<sup>321</sup> Christian assemblies. While Rome and Antioch might dispute ownership over Peter and Paul, Ignatius offered

---

<sup>320</sup> Notably, the Long Recension presents Ignatius as a much more effective and knowledgeable interpreter of scripture. See discussion of *Magnesians* in the previous chapter for more detail on this.

<sup>321</sup> *Martyr to Ignatius* 1 suggests that Ignatius was called upon to send leaders to help establish churches, thus linking him more directly to this aspect of apostolic activity. This portion of the Long Recension also provides an example of Ignatius having authority not only over presbyters and deacons within his own church, but over bishops of other cities as well.

another reminder that the story of Christianity was one that flowed from east to west, rather than the other way round.<sup>322</sup>

The concluding farewells have similar differences in effect between the second and fourth centuries. In the second century, the references to companions and the support of particular communities play an important role in Ignatius's self-presentation to those he is trying to persuade. They are tangible symbols that others trust Ignatius enough to financially support those who act as his messengers and companions. Such an entourage requires an investment of resources that Ignatius advertises to encourage additional support both for himself and for the assembly he left behind in Antioch. The closing sections of the letter make these rhetorical purposes clear. Ignatius claims that the Philadelphians have the ability to send an ambassador because of the power of God's name and because "even the nearest churches" have sent multiple ambassadors (10.2). So too, the additional companions mentioned in the farewell "bear witness" to Ignatius's character and worth (11.1). For second-century readers, such indications of support would have served to authorize Ignatius as an authority worthy of attention and invited them to see themselves as part of a network that extended beyond the local or regional assemblies with which they were most familiar.<sup>323</sup> As such, Ignatius would have served

---

<sup>322</sup> One can see a similar notion at play in the narratives of the contemporary Antiochian Orthodox Church which point to their connection with Antioch and its multiplicity of apostolic and New Testament figures in their construction of their own history and importance in the Christian world.

<sup>323</sup> Certainly, early Christian texts portray a high degree of mobility within the early Christian movement. Nevertheless, we should be cautious about assuming a high degree of interconnection between assemblies from the earliest period. First, even Paul's letter make clear that it took a great deal of effort on his part to persuade certain assemblies that they were responsible for and should financially support other assemblies, especially that at Jerusalem (e.g. 2 Corinthians). Additionally, relevant comparanda suggest limited translocal interconnectivity. As Philip Harland's research indicates, the focus of assemblies and congregations (at least in Asia Minor) was civic belonging. Occasionally, there are indications of connections to other assemblies, but the bulk of the connections are between the assembly and the *polis*. Even Jewish congregations, some of whom sent financial contributions to the Jerusalem Temple, were networked through a single center rather than connected to one another more directly.



them as a model for building and strengthening such networks, especially through more clearly defined roles for communal leaders and office holders.

For the fourth century reader, ecumenical councils and imperial patronage had naturalized such highly networked ecclesiastical structures. Rather than fostering such translocal networks, the indications of translocal support found in both recensions provide an image of the past as continuous with the present. These allusions to networks that make real the idea of a translocal, even universal, church create an image of Christian community as always characterized by such extensive networks.

The Medieval West saw the incorporation of new details to the biography of Ignatius. Additional correspondence between Ignatius, John the beloved disciple, and Mary, the mother of Jesus, added new layers to the biographical focus of the Ignatian corpus. These new letters memorialized a direct connection between two of the most important apostolic-era figures in the Medieval western imagination, highlighting Ignatius's access to apostolic tradition and the intercessory power of Mary. They also tangentially supported extant traditions of Ignatius as the child picked up by Jesus.<sup>324</sup> Thus, in nearly all aspects of the manuscript tradition, Ignatius's biography as martyr, bishop, and, eventually, disciple of the apostles play an organizing role.

## **Conclusions**

In an era when emperors actively intervened in ecclesial affairs and bishops sought political support for their "religious" activities,<sup>325</sup> such memories of the past are not

---

<sup>324</sup> Cf. Mark 9:36.

<sup>325</sup> The ecumenical councils are only the most visible and well-known of such activities. Bishops regularly appealed to imperial officials and even the emperor to arbitrate their disputes. Augustine's pleas for and defense of imperial coercion in the Donatist controversies provide one of the more famous examples. The classic treatment of the issue remains Brown, "St. Augustine's

politically or ideologically neutral. The battles over the memory of holy sites in and around Jerusalem are the strongest indications that forms of Jesus-devotion rooted in local contexts persisted well into the fourth century.<sup>326</sup> Texts such as the Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies*, the *Book of the Rooster*, and the *Didascalia Apostolorum* suggest disputes over the importance of local traditions and expressions of Jesus-devotion persisted in the increasingly homogenized, centralized practices of the fourth and later centuries.<sup>327</sup> In such a milieu, the consistency with which the Ignatian epistles portray the highly networked character of churches serves to assert the naturalness of imperial efforts to establish greater homogeneity in doctrine and practice.<sup>328</sup> Assemblies at odds with emerging orthodoxies found their appeals to antiquity of practice undermined by the fact that their practices were not shared more universally and lacked the support of witnesses like Ignatius. Local expressions of devotion and ritual or pedagogical practice are thus written out of Christian memory, except when preserved as models of heretical deviation. Memories of a highly networked, translocal Christian body implicitly deny a place in Christian memory for those who find themselves at odds with imperially supported Christian institutions. Such constructions of the past legitimate the teaching and practices of those who promote them.

---

Attitude to Religious Coercion.” Reliance on imperial intervention was a commonplace of most major theological controversies

<sup>326</sup> Antioch likely dealt with similar issues regarding access to and control of sacred space, though not with quite the same empire-wide investment as the conflicts at Jerusalem. See, e.g., Shepardson, *Controlling Contested Places*, 31–57.

<sup>327</sup> See, e.g. Reed, “‘Jewish-Christianity’ as Counter-history?” on Eusebius and the Ps-Clementines; Pierluigi Piovanelli, “The Book of the Cock,” on the *Book of the Rooster* and Palestinian Christian traditions; and Charlotte Fonrobert, “Didascalia Apostolorum,” on ties between the Mishnah and the Syriac version of the *Didascalia Apostolorum*.

<sup>328</sup> Here again, I draw on the creative work of Devore in which he articulated a strong case for viewing Eusebius’s use of letters in the *Ecclesiastical History* as part of an effort to portray the church as having an irenic character (Devore, “Character and Convention”). I am trying to push this even further, suggesting that such an act was not only an attempt to demonstrate the peaceful, benevolent character of the church to outsiders (Devore, 247–249) but also something that served to marginalize other expressions of Christian practice. That is, anything that did not conform to this irenic and interconnected memory of the Christian past should be jettisoned as outside the true church and unrepresentative of the “real” Christian ethos.

The similarities between the Middle and Long Recensions of *Philadelphians* invite readers to see their own realities as continuous with those of earlier centuries. Shared epistolary features present the documents from the past as intelligible to the contemporary reader, embodying the same generic expectations. Images of the church as highly networked give a degree of inevitability to emerging imperial institutions and networks. While the role of the emperor in ecclesiastical affairs was novel and in need of support,<sup>329</sup> the images of bishops as in regular contact and community leaders as frequent ambassadors to locales across the empire served to reduce the novelty of church structures increasingly modeled on imperial governance and increasingly entwined with civic affairs.<sup>330</sup> Alongside these features, the coherence between the recensions in biographical material served to create a stable picture of Ignatius's character that could be used to interpret traditions by and about him and provide justification for why later readers should attend to what he said and how he lived.

The differences in the epistles address related concerns, particularly the pedagogical additions. They create a perception of continuity between ecclesiastical past and present while simultaneously providing tools for inculcating correctly Christian thought and praxis in a world where participation in the church widened substantially. The pedagogical interludes of the Long Recension emerge as effects of wider social discourses on individual behavior and belonging and in turn affect historical memory,

---

<sup>329</sup> E.g. Eusebius, *Vita Constantini*.

<sup>330</sup> While such modeling of church leadership on imperial modes of organization was under way well before Constantine and his successors became patrons of churches and ecclesiastical institutions, there is little evidence that such models were any more prevalent than models based more directly on familial and domestic models. On continuities in episcopal organization, see Rapp, *Holy Bishops*, 3–152. On the persistence of “domestic” or “private” models of organization even in imperial centers, see Bowes, *Private Worship, Public Values*, esp. 61–123. This is not to say that domestic structures of governance were entirely divorced from imperial ideologies of rule. Rather, these models were based in fundamentally different economies of scale. What seems clear from material culture is that the institutional realities of Christian ideologies of universality only emerged with imperial patronage.

making the martyr-bishop Ignatius an implicit justification for ecclesiastical attempts to homogenize belief and practice.

## CHAPTER 3—READING JUDAISM, TEACHING CHRISTIANITY: IGNATIUS AND PSEUDO-IGNATIUS ON JEWS AND CHRISTIANS

### Introduction

ὁ γὰρ χριστιανισμὸς οὐκ εἰς τὸν ἰουδαϊσμὸν ἐπίστευσεν, ἀλλ' ὁ ἰουδαϊσμὸς εἰς τὸν χριστιανισμὸν ... (*Magnesians* 10.3, MR; 10.4, LR)<sup>331</sup>

Ἐὰν δέ τις Ἰουδαϊσμὸν ἐρμηνεύη ὑμῖν, μὴ ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ. Ἄμεινον γάρ ἐστιν παρὰ ἀνδρὸς περιτομῆν ἔχοντος Χριστιανισμὸν ἀκούειν, ἢ παρὰ ἀκροβύστου Ἰουδαϊσμὸν (*Philadelphians* 6.1, MR)<sup>332</sup>

With brief statements such as these, *Magnesians* and *Philadelphians* have contributed both to the construction of Jewish–Christian difference and the historiography of that difference. In support of the former, these letters provided the witness of a martyr who spoke in terms redolent of something uniquely Christian, coining terms such as *Christianism* in apparent opposition to Judaism and referring to a conception of the *ekklesia* as catholic or universal.<sup>333</sup> These same terms have given rise to competing claims in contemporary scholarship. Do these designations in fact mark a “Parting of the Ways” between Judaism and Christianity around the time of Ignatius? Does Ignatius’s rhetoric mark an extant reality, a widely-shared sense of Christianity as something separate from Judaism,<sup>334</sup> or is it an act of world-creation, an attempt to trim the messy

---

<sup>331</sup> “For Christianizing did not trust in Judaizing, but Judaizing in Christianizing.” This and all subsequent translations are my own unless otherwise noted. For the text of the Long Recension, I rely on Diekamp and Funk, *Patres Apostolici*, 83–269. For the Middle Recension, I follow the edition of Camelot, *Ignace d’Antioche*, 56–154.

<sup>332</sup> “If someone expounds Judaizing to you, do not listen to him. For it is better to hear Christianizing from a man having circumcision than Judaizing from a foreskinned one.”

<sup>333</sup> *Magnesians* 10; *Philadelphians* 6; *Smyrnaeans* 8 (MR only). As Judith Lieu notes, even the term “Christianism” seems to derive from “Judaism,” taking Maccabean literature with its emphasis on renewing Jewishness by zealousness for a set of ancestral customs. See Lieu, *Image and Reality*, 30.

<sup>334</sup> Such is the position of Robinson, *Ignatius and the Parting of the Ways*. It is worth noting that the latter idea of separation from Jews/Jewishness/Judaism is not dependent on a strong sense

hedges of Jesus-based Jewish messianism into a separate plant that no longer depends for its nourishment on Jewish roots?<sup>335</sup>

In the first two chapters, we focused our attention on the effects of similarity and difference between the Middle and Long Recensions of *Magnesians* and *Philadelphians*. In so doing, we observed the ways in which the rewriting of the Ignatian epistles is, at least partially, an effect of extant reading and writing practices that, in turn, produce new effects when read in a new historical milieu. The present is retrojected into the past; the past becomes intelligible in relation to present concerns and expectations.

In this chapter, I build on the literary contexts explored in the previous two chapters. I examine the ways in which those comparisons between the Middle and Long Recensions might take seemingly intractable debates about the so-called “Parting of the Ways” and late antique Jewish–Christian relations more generally in new directions. Rather than seeking solely to determine how reflective of reality Middle Recension’s rhetoric was, this chapter attempts to explore the effects of that rhetoric, asking how the scribe who produced the Long Recension read and reinterpreted Ignatius’s rhetoric. My hope is that in so doing we will be better positioned to identify the practices that construct Jewish–Christian difference as something central to being Christian. I argue that the Long Recension’s expanded interest in Jewishness (as compared to the Middle Recension) is itself an effect of increasing concern with correct cognition as essential to “religious” adherence. Though the ostensible goal of such a project is to better distinguish Jews from Christians, the effect is to further entangle already intertwined identities.

---

of the former – one need not be a Christian to see themselves as different from those who identify as Jews.

<sup>335</sup> This latter is roughly the position of Judith Lieu who decides that Ignatius’s words are more rhetoric than reality, an attempt to draw lines that were only beginning to be imagined. See Lieu, *Image and Reality*, 23–56.

## Judaism in Magnesians

In Chapter 1, we explored the ways in which the Long Recension altered and reiterated various aspects of the Middle Recension, effecting an image of Ignatius as an ideal bishop and a memory of an irenic church. By focusing on a smaller selection of *Magnesians*, we can see the ways in which such larger effects structure the Long Recension's rewriting of "Judaism." As comparison will show, the Long Recension makes Jewishness more explicit in *Magnesians* 8–10 than it had been in the Middle Recension. Such changes are suggestive of the ways in which readers' assumptions have changed between the second and fourth century, creating new ways of appropriating parts of the Christian and Jewish past. In the Long Recension of *Magnesians*, we see intra-Christian polemics merging with pedagogical rhetoric, making anti-Judaism an important tool for forming Christian subjects. Implicit anti-Judaism becomes explicit.

From the first lines of *Magnesians* 8, a concern with explicitly "Jewish" things is apparent. While the Middle Recension makes no explicit mention of Jews, Judaizing, or Judaism until *Magnesians* 10.3, the Long Recension introduces Jewishness into the conversation from the outset of *Magnesians* 8. The Middle Recension's discussions of "living according to law" (8.1), prophets (8.2, 9.2), and "sabbatizing" (9.1), can easily be read as critiques of Jewish ideas and practices, but the Middle Recension does not foreground or make explicit the association with Jews. By contrast, the Long Recension signals a concern with categorizing certain activities and ideas as Jewish. Not only does the Long Recension contain an additional warning against holding fast to "Jewish delusions (8.1)," it also identifies other unmarked features in the Middle Recension as Jewish. Where the Middle Recension states that "if we live now according to law (νόμον),

we admit (ὁμολογοῦμεν) that we have not received grace (8.1 MR),” the Long Recension reads, “For if we live now according to Jewish law (νόμον ιουδαϊκόν) and circumcision of the flesh, we renounce (ἀρνούμεθα) the grace we received (8.1 LR).” The additions of Jewish law and Pauline language about circumcision make delineating Jewish–Christian difference more central to the rhetoric of the Long Recension.

Attributing “law” and other “delusions” directly to Jews replicates the kinds of differences already discussed in Chapters 1 and 2. Just as many additions provided theological precision or expansive lists of exempla, the marking of certain things as “Jewish” provides precision in many places where the Middle Recension allowed for greater ambiguity. It marks a particular reading of these terms as normative.

Other differences between the Middle and the Long Recension here effect greater precision as well. For example, The Middle Recension identifies two kinds of potentially deceptive things stating, “Do not be misled (πλανᾶσθε) by different opinions (ἑτεροδοξίας) or by stories that are uselessly old (μυθεύμασιν τοῖς παλαιοῖς ἀνωφελέσιν, 8.1).” This creates two potential categories of error. The first deals with the plurality of opinions that arise from disputational methods of securing knowledge, and the latter, with its emphasis on stories, hints at the dangers associated with knowledge constructed from (seemingly?) ancient texts.<sup>336</sup> Both terms are governed by a single verb, πλανᾶσθε.

---

<sup>336</sup> Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, argues that ἑτεροδοξία and its companion verb ἑτεροδιδασκαλέω “are evidently all but technical terms for heresy (118).” While he is correct that Ignatius always gives these terms negative connotations (*Smyr* 6.2, *Magn* 8.1, *Poly* 3.1) and that Platonists like Philo treated it similarly, this does not prove that the term must be synonymous with “doctrinal error”—as Schoedel seems to mean by heresy—in order to have such a negative valuation. Each time the Middle Recension uses these terms, the authorial voice warns against people who are in some sense devoted to Christ but teach something different from what is taught by Ignatius. These seemingly devoted followers of Christ proliferate opinions about Jesus. The negative valuation is framed both in terms of personal disagreement (i.e. they do not teach what Ignatius teaches) and such proliferation’s potential for communal dissension, the main target of the Middle Recension. Schoedel’s treatment of ἑτεροδοξία as a technical term is overdetermined by later Christian use. This is amply clear from the different ways in which the Long Recension



In the Long Recension, this verb only has a single object, ἑτεροδοξίας. Other kinds of error are introduced by a different verb, ἐνέχετε<sup>337</sup> (hold or keep fast to): “Do not be misled by different opinions or ‘hold fast to<sup>338</sup> stories (μύθοις) and unending genealogies (1 Tim 1:4)’ and Jewish delusions (8.1 LR).” The action associated with each term takes on a new importance. *Heterodoxies* mislead, but other kinds of knowledge or tradition become problematic only when over-emphasized or, perhaps, over-interpreted. Where the Middle Recension suggested different approaches to knowledge that might mislead the reader, the Long Recension places one category outside Christian knowledge, marking it as misleading or deceptive, while the other is firmly inside Christian knowledge but in danger of being misappropriated. Where the Middle Recension highlighted the potential ambivalence of different modes of knowledge production, the Long Recension gives greater attention to the entanglement of “stories and genealogies” within Christian tradition, treating the undue attention given to such things as peculiarly Jewish.

Such a trend of specifying the problematic aspects of “stories and genealogies” as peculiarly Jewish is visible in the reception of 1 Tim 1:4, which the Long Recension includes at this point in *Magnesians*.<sup>339</sup> Our earliest evidence for the reception of this

---

treats this terminology. In *Magnesians*, ἑτεροδοξίας are distinguished from other errors by treating such different opinions as the only category that is in essence deceptive. In *Smyrnaeans*, the Long Recension adds a list of deceptive teachings to emphasize the doctrinal character of such “different opinions.” The Long Recension portrays such different opinions as a collection of easily identifiable theological errors where the Middle Recension provides no such specificity.

<sup>337</sup> Many manuscripts read ἀνέχετε (lift up, exalt; uphold, maintain) instead of ἐνέχετε. Both are viable readings of the passage with each suggesting slightly different connotations for the scribes and readers. For my purposes, the consistent addition of a second verb here is more important than the nuances of verbs found in the textual tradition.

<sup>338</sup> Manuscripts of 1 Tim 1:4 use the verb προσέχειν while the manuscripts of the Long Recension use ἀνέχετε or ἐνέχετε.

<sup>339</sup> The purpose here is not to completely divorce the Middle Recension from the history of the reception of 1 Timothy as its language of “heterodoxies” and “stories” seems to allude to this aspect of Pauline tradition. However, in its overall tendency to perform Paul rather than cite him, the Middle Recension embodies a very different relationship to Paul than that of the Long

passage comes from Tertullian, writing at least several decades after the composition and, perhaps, collection of the Middle Recension. Tertullian appeals to this passage on four different occasions, three times in heresiological contexts and once in what we might term a philosophical context.<sup>340</sup> In no case is the text interpreted in relation to specifically “Jewish” forms of knowledge production. Rather, Tertullian alludes to “Paul’s” words to critique Christian heretics and separate Christian notions of the soul from those produced in “philosophy.” Tertullian’s critiques mirror the Middle Recension’s ambivalence toward the dominant practices of ancient knowledge production.<sup>341</sup> Later reception of 1 Tim 1:4, especially in the fourth century, does not dismiss the more general concern with dominant modes of knowledge production. Nevertheless, the likes of Athanasius and John Chrysostom identify “stories and endless genealogies” almost exclusively with Jewish practices. Athanasius separates Pauline critique of “Greeks” from that of Jews. “Greeks,” he writes, “as the apostle has said, make their attacks with prolixity (ὑπεροχῆ), persuasive speech, and plausible arguments, but the Jews, neglecting (ἀφέντες) the divine scriptures, now (as the apostle again has said) contend about ‘fables and endless genealogies.’”<sup>342</sup> He goes on to include the “Manichees and Valentianians with them” but the error remains, in essence, a Jewish one which others expand upon. Chrysostom gives some attention to the place of stories and genealogies in “Greek” traditions, mentioning in one brief sentence that Greeks, too, paid

---

Recension where both performance of Pauline texts and citation of them exist intermingled in the letter collection.

<sup>340</sup> Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.* 1.9.7; *Adv. Valen.* 3.4; *Against All Heresies* 33.8; *De anima* 2.7.

<sup>341</sup> Critiques of the practices of *paideia* are frequent in second-century and third-century literature. See, e.g. Tatian, *Against the Greeks*; Bardaisan, *Book of the Laws of Countries*; and Porphyry, *De philosophia*. Often, the writers employ their knowledge of educational and scholarly practice to assert the preference of another set of practices for arriving at “truth.” That is, despite their critique of Greek *paideia*, they depend on many of the same practices and ideologies in their disparagement of “Greek” practices of knowledge production. Usually, “barbarian” wisdom is put forth as a corrective to the problems inherent in greek *paideia*.

<sup>342</sup> Athanasius, *Historia Arianorum* 66.

excessive attention to frivolous stories.<sup>343</sup> Nevertheless, Jews are more closely associated with these terms. “The Jews” collected “stories and genealogies” to give themselves a “reputation for deep research (ἐμπειρίας πολλῆς) and historical inquiry (ιστορίας).”<sup>344</sup> The problem, as Chrysostom frames it, is that such questioning is the very opposite of faith—“inquiry (ζήτησις) is destructive of faith.”<sup>345</sup> The Long Recension draws out the specifically anti-Jewish implications of Ignatius’s words in ways that are consistent with reading practices shaped by fourth-century heresiology and homiletics.

The Long Recension refracts the Middle Recension through stereotypical Pauline text and imagery. Not only does the Long Recension incorporate 1 Timothy but it inserts 2 Corinthians 5:17 into the mix as well. Sandwiched between statements about Jewish delusions and living according to Jewish law (8.1 LR), we find the statement: “The old things have passed away; see everything has become new (2 Cor 5:17, 8.1 LR).” Here, as with the citation of 1 Timothy, Paul’s words remain unmarked as that of an authoritative person or text. Instead, Ignatius is again portrayed as writing Paul rather than quoting him.<sup>346</sup> This refraction is striking insofar as the Middle Recension already embraces a Pauline vocabulary and persona.<sup>347</sup> The Pauline-sounding language already present in the Middle Recension’s formulation “different opinions and stories” becomes more

---

<sup>343</sup> John Chrysostom, *Homilies in First Timothy* 1.2 (PG 62: 507, lines 4–6). “He seems also to hint at the Greeks here, when he says ‘myths and genealogies, since they catalog (καταλεγόντων) their gods.’”

<sup>344</sup> John Chrysostom, *Homilies in First Timothy* 1.2 (PG 62: 506, lines 21–24). One wonders if he has something like Josephus in mind here, especially since many Christian apologists appealed to non-Christian witnesses like Josephus in order to demonstrate the antiquity and reliability of Christian scriptural traditions. “The Jew” functions as proof that Christians haven’t merely interpolated ancient texts but also cannot be granted true historical knowledge for fear that they will be viewed as authentic bearers and interpreters of ancient traditions.

<sup>345</sup> *Homilies in First Timothy* 1.2 (PG 62: 506, lines 31–32).

<sup>346</sup> Much like Pierre Menard in Jorge Luis Borges’ “Pierre Menard, Author of the Quixote,” Ignatius is made to seem as if he was writing the same words as Paul out of his own life experiences. He does not merely copy, but in some sense reauthors Paul, marking Paul’s words as new and relevant for a different age. See Borges, “Pierre Menard,” 45–55.

<sup>347</sup> See especially, Reis, “Following in Paul’s Footsteps,” 287–305; and Maier, “Politics and Rhetoric,” 307–324.

explicit. Paul is used to imagine a historical context for Ignatius's words—the danger of living according to “Jewish law and circumcision of the flesh (8.1 LR).” Both the specification of law as Jewish and the inclusion of circumcision remove the ambiguities present in the Middle Recension. Whatever law second century readers might have had in mind,<sup>348</sup> the Long Recension identifies it with “Jewish” law. Likewise, Paul's concern with Gentile circumcision is directly referenced despite the fact that the Middle Recension mentions circumcision only once in the context of a hypothetical comparison in which it is “better to hear Christianizing from someone circumcised than from a foreskinned Judaizer (*Phild* 6.1, MR).”<sup>349</sup>

Ignatius also becomes a vehicle for interpreting Paul by recontextualizing 2 Corinthians 5:17 as a distinction between Jewish things and Christian things. In the Long Recension, Paul's sweeping rhetoric about the remaking of the whole human person is reduced to a distinction between Jewish things and appropriately Christ-centered behavior.<sup>350</sup> The shift from old to new is identified primarily with a shift from Jewish to Christian.

---

<sup>348</sup> Some recent scholarship seeks to correct the exclusive focus on the Jewishness of law in Paul and rabbinic literature as well. Jacob Taubes argues that Paul's discussion of “law” in Romans is directed at the hypostatization of law, whether Roman, Jewish, or more broadly Hellenistic. Taubes, *Political Theology of Paul*, 23. Such an understanding of Paul would work well for Ignatius since the rhetorical force of “living according to law” does not depend on its formulation as Jewish, though the subsequent discussion of Sabbath observance shifts in this direction. In an analogous vein, Nathalie Dohrmann makes the argument that even Jewish focus on legal traditions before and after the destruction of Jerusalem owes some of its impetus to the effects of Romanization. Rome, with its extensive legal framework, reinforced law as a central category for all participants in the empire. Dohrmann, “Law and Imperial Idioms,” 63–78. Elizabeth Meyer's work on Roman *tabulae* offers a potent example of the extreme reverence for “law” in the Roman Empire generally as demonstrated by attitudes to the legal texts recorded on such *tabulae*. Meyer, *Legitimacy and Law*.

<sup>349</sup> See section two of this chapter for more on this passage.

<sup>350</sup> Patristic readers often identified a cosmological thrust in Paul's language about a “new creation” and the remaking of all things. The likes of John Chrysostom, Athanasius, and Theodoret maintained a broad conception of the “old things” as a reference to the whole of creation since the fall. This could incorporate elements that focused on the distinctions between the new Christian order and Jewish tradition as in Chrysostom's comment that the new involves “new promises and covenant” (John Chrysostom, *Commentary on the Second Epistle to the*

The Long Recension's greater explicitness gives it a sharper polemical edge than the Middle Recension. The Middle Recension characterized "living according to law (8.1)" as admitting or confessing (ὁμολογοῦμεν) that such a person has not received grace. By contrast, the Long Recension characterizes "living according to Jewish law and circumcision of the flesh (8.1)" as an active denial or refusal (ἀρνοῦμεθα) of received grace. Adherence to "Jewish law" is thus equated with active antipathy toward the Christian dispensation rather than a sign that a person has been insufficiently or incompletely formed. In both cases, grace is presented as superior to law, but the Long Recension's use of a more active verb characterizes all engagement with Jewish law as willful. Like characterizations of Jews in *Adversus Iudaeos* literature, the Long Recension employs a term that resonates with wider literary practices of imagining contemporary Jews through the lenses of prophetic critiques of Israelite behavior and gospel stories in which Jews are simultaneously stubborn and blind in their unwillingness to see Jesus as Messiah.<sup>351</sup>

As I showed in Chapters 1 and 2, this tendency toward greater explicitness stems in part from pedagogical reading assumptions. Texts and people are cast in primarily pedagogical roles, treating justificatory rhetoric as if it were explanatory and supplementing it when it fails to be sufficiently explanatory. We can see this move toward pedagogical precision in the variant characterizations of prophets between the Middle and Long Recensions. Both agree that the prophets were people who "lived according to Christ" as demonstrated by their persecution (8.2). However, for much of its argument, the Middle Recension remains imprecise about the temporal location of

---

*Corinthians*, PG 61: 475). However, even such pointed references to promises and covenant are couched in a more widespread transformation of everything from body and soul to modes of dress.

<sup>351</sup> For an excellent overview of *adversus iudaeos* traditions, see Limor and Stroumsa, *Contra Iudaeos*, especially Stroumsa, "From Anti-Judaism to Antisemitism," 1–26.

such prophets (as well as the source of knowledge about them). It does not specify whether these prophets were those who lived in ancient times or more recent leaders and spokespeople for early Jesus-believing communities.<sup>352</sup> The ambivalence continues into the subsequent section of the letter in which the prophets are characterized as those who “had conducted themselves (ἀναστραφέντες) in ancient practices (παλαιοῖς πράγμασιν)”<sup>353</sup> and “came into a newness of hope, no longer keeping Sabbath but living according to the Lord’s day (κατὰ κυριακὴν ζῶντες, 9.1, MR).”<sup>354</sup> Only the conclusion of the conditional seems to resolve this ambivalence. The conditional that began by assuming a change on the part of prophets (“if those who had conducted themselves in ancient practices...”) concludes with a rhetorical question: “How are we able to live apart from him whom even the prophets, being disciples in the spirit, were expecting (προσεδόκων) as teacher? (MR 9.2).” The sense of expectation indicated here most properly belongs to figures from the past awaiting a particular future possibility. The use of the imperfect for the act of expectation coupled with a reference in the imperfect to Jesus as “the one who was rightly awaited (ἀνέμενον, 9.2)” is the closest *Magnesians*

---

<sup>352</sup> That both are possible is clear from other early, retrospectively Christian, works. The canonical gospels typically refer to either biblical prophets or contemporary prophetic figures who are portrayed as in competition with Jesus or his followers (e.g. Mt 2:23; 24:24). Acts and various epistles use the term to talk about both biblical prophets and contemporary prophets (e.g. Acts 3:24; 11:27; 13:1, 6; 15:32; 21:10; Romans 1:2; 1 Corinthians 11-14; Ephesians 2:20; 3:5; 4:11). Similar ambivalence is found among other early “Christian” writings. *Barnabas* (5) and *1 Clement* (17; 43) use the term to refer to biblical prophets, either as prooftexts for Christological statements or as exempla of devoted living in their own right. The *Didache* (11; 13), however, presents guidelines for welcoming or rejecting prophets that assume them to be contemporary (and frequently itinerant) participants in communal life.

<sup>353</sup> Given that the letter connects this idea to an eventual cessation of Sabbath observance, πράγμα seems to function here as a synonym for πράξις. See LSJ s.v. πράγμα II.3 for a few examples of this usage.

<sup>354</sup> As Lieu notes, the latter half of this phrase could be interpreted to mean either “according to the Lord’s life” or “day” as the object of the possessive adjective is not specified. Either reading works for the purposes of my analysis and I suspect this ambivalence was intentional given Ignatius’s concern with “living according to Jesus Christ” and the identification of prophets as “persecuted” which signified their conformity to Christ’s life. However, I follow the translation of “Lord’s day” because of the clear binary it draws between Sabbath and Sunday. See Lieu, *Christian Identity*, 135.

comes to establishing prophets as only figures from antiquity. The ambivalence is rhetorically useful as it begins with a statement likely to garner broad assent (some prophetic figures as opting out of practices such as Sabbath observance) before turning that notion into the potentially more controversial memory of ancient prophets as people who rejected Sabbath observance.

The Long Recension does not depend upon or utilize any such ambivalence about the prophets. Instead, it immediately places the prophets in the past and textualizes them. Prophets are characterized as “dwelling (ἀναστραφέντες) in ancient letters (παλαιοῖς γράμμασιν)” and “waiting for (ἐκδεχόμενοι) Christ (9.1, LR).” In case the reader still entertained any doubts about the temporal priority of prophets to Christ, the Long Recension directs the reader to Jesus’ own teaching. “As the Lord teaches saying, ‘If you trust Moses, then you would trust me, for that one wrote about me (John 5:46, 9.1 LR).” The Long Recension splices this together with two other passages (John 8:56, 58) to drive the point home that ancient Jewish texts are prophetic and direct the reader to Jesus as Christ. Every characterization of prophets in this section depends on the temporal subordination of prophets to Christ. They are characterized as Christ’s “slaves” who “were looking forward to him in the spirit, awaiting him as teacher, and expecting him as Lord and savior (9.2 LR).” Where the Middle Recension allows for an audience that might have somewhat divergent understandings of prophets and their temporal location, the Long Recension assumes its readers see prophets only as scriptural figures who lived in expectation of Christ. Because of these additions, the Long Recension provides a much clearer statement of who the prophets are in relation to the reader and how they are to be incorporated into a correctly Christian worldview. This reading of the

Middle Recension is itself an effect of scriptural reading and interpretive practices that engage Jewish scriptures Christologically.<sup>355</sup>

Surprisingly, the Long Recension's relegation of prophets to the pre-Christian past gives way to a much greater emphasis on Sabbath observance. The Middle Recension mentions "keeping sabbath (σαββατιζοντες)" only once as part of its contrast with "living according to the Lord's day (9.1)." Nowhere in *Magnesians* does the Middle Recension directly exhort the reader to shun the Sabbath. Instead, its argument assumes that the audience already shares the conviction that such practices were irrelevant even for the prophets. By contrast, the Long Recension mentions "keeping Sabbath" three times while largely ignoring the Middle Recension's concern with the connection between the Lord's day and resurrection (9.2). Rather than directing the reader away from Sabbath observance, as the Middle Recension assumes, the Long Recension exhorts the reader to keep Sabbath correctly.

Therefore, let us no longer keep sabbath Jewishly (τουδαιικῶς), rejoicing in leisure. "For the one who does not labor does not eat (cf. 2 Thess 3:10)," and again, "for by the sweat of your brow, you will eat your bread (Gen 3:19)," say the oracles. Instead, let each of you keep Sabbath spiritually (πνευματικῶς), rejoicing in study of laws (μελέτη νόμων), not relaxation of the body; marveling at the craftsmanship of God, not eating day old food and drinking lukewarm drinks and walking with counted steps and rejoicing in senseless dancing and clapping. After keeping Sabbath, let everyone devoted to Christ celebrate the Lord's day, the day of resurrection, the queen, the best of all days, about which the expectant prophet used to say, "To completion, on the eighth (Ps 6:1),"<sup>356</sup> on which our life was made to rise and there was victory in Christ over death...(9.3–5 LR)

---

<sup>355</sup> This, of course, was not the only way to approach the entangled textual heritage of Jews and Christians. As we have seen elsewhere in the Long Recension, scripture could also be read as providing exempla for contemporary ethical activity and subject formation. Christian and Jewish interpreters also engaged this textual heritage cosmologically, seeing in biblical texts evidence for the structure of earth and heavens.

<sup>356</sup> This directional heading to Psalm 6 had a long afterlife in Christian tradition as a reference to Sunday as the day of resurrection. E.g. Eusebius, *Commentaria in Psalmos* PG 23:120. Similar commentary can be found in Gregory of Nazianzus, Basil of Caesarea, John Chrysostom, and Theodoret.



Unlike the Middle Recension, Long Recension does not draw a distinction between Sabbath observance and devotion to Jesus. Instead, the additional material distinguishes between different modes of observing Sabbath—one deemed spiritual and implicitly Christian, the other explicitly Jewish and implicitly carnal. The Middle Recension’s assumption that prophets stopped keeping Sabbath implicitly proscribed any place for Sabbath observance in “Christian” praxis. Here, however, proper observance of the Sabbath is characterized as an important component of Christian praxis. One should observe Sabbath spiritually rather than focusing on certain physical, ritual observances. Emphasis on leisure, leftovers, and rules for walking should be replaced by “study” or “practice of laws (μελέτη νόμων).” The term μελέτη has a variety of connotations but all of them revolve around disciplined study, practice, and habituation, whether of military matters, philosophical care for the soul, medical treatments or oratory.<sup>357</sup> The reader is no longer to eschew Sabbath as a potential source of division but to observe it rightly, seemingly as a day for serious, laborious study rather than with the frivolity of “dancing and clapping” or the misplaced emphasis on managing the physical body. In the transition to the importance of the “Lord’s day,” we see the barest hint that such Sabbath observance need not be exclusively Christian. By concluding this expansion on the Sabbath by writing “let everyone devoted to Christ celebrate the Lord’s day,” the Long Recension leaves open the possibility that those keeping Sabbath properly may not all be “devoted to Christ.” As the discussion of Sunday implies, they should be but lack of

---

<sup>357</sup> The term μελέτη is quite common in philosophical and medical discourse in antiquity, indicating the kind of special attention and repeated engagement that develops correct habits. While the term is also common in fourth century Christian writings, it is more frequently associated with the study of scripture rather than “laws.” The only text with a consistent association of μελέτη and “law” is Psalm 118 [119 in the Masoretic text] or commentary on Psalm 118. Certainly, “laws” could function here as a reference to biblical texts or divine writings more generally, but given the specifically anti-Jewish context of the reference, the word choice is unusual. Cohen, “Dancing, Clapping, Meditating,” argues, based on comparison with the *Apostolic Constitutions*, that the focus is on attending to God’s activity in the natural world, as indicated by the phrase “marveling at the craftsmanship of God.”

devotion to Christ need not prevent them from observing Sabbath properly. Ultimately, it is the connection between Sabbath and Sunday that distinguishes those devoted to Christ. Thus the Long Recension upholds the centrality of the “Lord’s day” and its connection to resurrection but maintains an important place for Sabbath in Christian life. One, in fact, *should* observe the Sabbath but better not do so “Jewishly.”

The Long Recension continues its pedagogical expansions by constructing a pastiche of textual citations that hint at the varieties of people who deny Christ through excessively carnal actions. The Long Recension warns against “children of destruction (cf. Is 57:4)” who deny Christ, “enemies of the cross whose god is the bowels (cf. Phil 3:18–19),” “those comprehending earthly things,” those “fond of pleasure,” and “those selling the word (cf. 2 Tim 3:4, 5; *Magn* 9.5 LR).” Where the Middle Recension evinced concern with the danger presented by differing understandings of Jesus’ death (9.1 MR), the Long Recension articulates the danger of being too devoted to worldly things, whether to the belly, hedonistic pleasures, or wealth. Following immediately after the discussion of “keeping Sabbath Jewishly” as a distinctly embodied affair, such unmarked references to materiality work implicitly to further the association between Jewishness and a lack of spiritual insight.<sup>358</sup> By connecting materiality, denial of Christ, and the possibility of using a Christian identity for material gain, the Long Recension dissociates its potentially Jewish-identified Sabbath practices from the “Jewish” way of doing things and deploys an all too Jewish carnality as a critique of intra-Christian abuses. The warnings against grasping pseudo-Christians offer a critique of those who might attempt to curry favor in an era when churches were recipients of imperial euergetism and

---

<sup>358</sup> The inability to understand scripture and history in an appropriately spiritual way was an accusation leveled against Jews, Marcionites, and “Gnostics” alike. For a synthesis of scholarship on this issue, see Stroumsa, “Anti-Judaism to Antisemitism.”

bishops had become civic patrons,<sup>359</sup> but are vague enough to function as a critique of almost any opponent.

At almost every turn, the Long Recension's greater explicitness moves Jewishness to center stage. Whether by specifying "Jewish delusions" as a threat equivalent to heterodoxy, turning the discussion of prophets into a claim about texts and interpretation, or urging the reader to observe Sabbath less "Jewishly," the Long Recension consistently turns the reader's attention to the dangers of thinking or acting too Jewishly. Through such interventions, the Long Recension makes Jews and Jewishness of greater concern than did the Middle Recension. The Middle Recension proscribed Sabbath observance but did so because it distracted from the centrality of Christ's death and resurrection. Even though the Middle Recension highlighted a practice frequently framed as Jewish, that practice is not criticized for being Jewish. Whether or not Ignatius was taking aim at Judaizing Jesus-devotees or not, the focus is

---

<sup>359</sup> The *Apostolic Constitutions* address this issue directly, asserting that bishops who have obtained office for the perks and privileges associated with it should be deposed and their congregations censured alongside them, 8.37. All the opponents articulated in the Long Recension of *Magnesians* 9.5 are joined by critique of excessive interest in materiality: food, pleasure, the appearance of piety, sex, and money. Though not necessarily only directed against things and people deemed too Jewish, such critiques of Jews (and Judaizers) as gluttonous and animalistic found an important place in *Adversus Iudaeos* discourse. See, e.g., John Chrysostom *Adversus Iudaeos* I.2.6. Concern about materiality and religious identity were certainly alive and well in the fourth century when we see the early beginnings of widespread ascetic practices, the expansion of imperial patronage to the church, and the rise of bishops as the most prominent civic patrons in certain locales. In such an environment, this mixture of support for specific kinds of Sabbath observance coupled with critiques of using one's identification as Christian for personal gain serves to carve out a distinctive Christian practice. Through retrojecting a particular memory of the past, the redactor creates space for Sabbath observance while subtly critiquing the kind of convenient Christian identification that arises with imperial support. Recent research on the *Book of the Rooster* and the Ps.-Clementine *Homilies* suggests the importance of local Palestinian and other Syrian forms of Jesus-devotion. See Piovanelli, "The *Book of the Cock*," 308-322; Reed, "'Jewish Christianity' as Counter-history," 173-216; and Côté, "Le problème de l'identité," 339-70. In such an environment, the insistence on correct Sabbath observance plausibly upholds local practice against imperial and pilgrimage-based efforts to homogenize Christian practice. Unlike the *Book of the Rooster* and the *Homilies*, the Long Recension embraces Paul as a central voice in the construction of correct Christian devotion. However, it does share with those texts a sense that certain "Jewish" practices should be retained as proper to Jesus-devotion.

on the maintenance of *homonoia* through shared celebration of and opinions about Christ's death and resurrection. The Long Recension's additional materials do not imagine such unity of practice as sufficient for forming Christians. In its efforts to inculcate correct Christian observance, the Long Recension focuses on inculcating the correct cognition of and disposition to things typically deemed Jewish.

It is important to keep these differences in mind as we turn to *Magnesians* 10, especially 10.3, which has functioned as a parade-passage in contemporary scholarship on the early history of Jewish-Christian relations.<sup>360</sup> This section of the Middle Recension famously includes the earliest extant inscription of the term *χριστιανισμός* ("Christianity," "Christianism") and sets it in opposition to *ιουδαϊσμός* ("Judaism"). In most translations, these terms are treated as abstract nouns designating religions imagined as distinct by definition and in essence from one another.<sup>361</sup> Debates about

---

<sup>360</sup> See, e.g., Robinson, *Ignatius and the Parting of the Ways*, 203–241; Zetterholm, *Formation of Christianity*, 203–216; Lieu, *Image and Reality*, 23–56; Dunn, *Partings of the Ways*, 344–45.

<sup>361</sup> Most major English translations render these as Christianity and Judaism, words which, for most readers, connote a stable essence and sense of group cohesion. On similar language in *Philadelphians* 6, Shaye Cohen argues that there is no reference to Jews at all, but rather to Christian insiders. Cohen, "Judaism without Circumcision," 395–415. This distinction was popularized in the history of Christianity by Robert Wilken's study of Chrysostom's *Adversus Iudaeos* homilies. Wilken noted correctly that the homilies were directed against Christians who participated in Jewish rituals rather than directly against Jews. However, as noted by Stroumsa in his analysis of trends in the study of Jewish-Christian relations, this sociological approach rooted in analysis of social context fails to account for the effects (political, legal, etc.) such rhetoric quickly had on those who identified (and were identified by others) as Jews. That is, the political and social situation in which the rhetoric arose fails to adequately deal with the ways in which such internally directed discourse came to shape laws, attitudes, and physical violence directed at contemporary Jews. See, Stroumsa, "Anti-Judaism to Antisemitism," 16–26. The focus on the internal direction of rhetoric was utilized recently by Douglas Boin as part of an argument for seeing language targeting "pagans" as similarly directed against Christians who made too many accommodations to traditional Roman practices. See Boin, "Hellenistic 'Judaism,'" 167–196. Recently, Megan Williams' synthesis of several works dealing with the problem of categorization has noted the difficulties in using any kind of abstract category whose essence is essentially unspeakable. While a person may identify or be identified by someone else as a Jew or Christian, Christianity and Judaism fail to convey any specific or stable content. Williams, "No More Clever Titles," 41–42. Todd Berzon's Marginalia review of Aaron Johnson's *Religion and Identity in Porphyry of Tyre* helpfully points out the limitations of any discussion of identity, arguing that the continued emphasis on the malleability of identity serves to make the term almost useless for analysis of the ancient world. Berzon, "The problem with Identity." Rather than disputing rhetoric

such terminology are frequently mired in disputes over the degree of reality implied by such rhetoric. Judith Lieu highlights just such an issue in discussing this material, preferring the transliteration “Christianism” in order to destabilize any easy equivalence between contemporary connotations of Christianity and the concerns of Ignatius in the early second century.<sup>362</sup> Steve Mason has argued that the tendency to see terms like *χριστιανισμός* and *ιουδαϊσμός* as abstract nouns for religions stems from a misunderstanding of the *-ισμός* ending. In Greek, this nominal form derives from verbs with *-ιζω* endings, indicating a causative sense that suggests movement between alternatives, not an abstract category.<sup>363</sup> When we treat such Greek terms as the equivalents of modern English *-ism* endings with their denotation of an abstract category, we often miss points of difference or aspects of their content that do not translate simply or easily into the modern categories.<sup>364</sup> This is especially true when such

---

versus reality or attempting to parse out the specific or consensus content of such terms, it seems important to start looking at how rhetoric becomes reality. How does rhetoric participate in larger networks of signification and practice in order to construct realities that conform more fully to aspirational rhetoric? Attention to textual reception and the construction of memory seems to me a useful avenue for pursuing answers to such questions.

<sup>362</sup> Lieu, *Image and Reality*, 23–56. Notably, no attempt is made to do the same for “Judaism” even though she recognizes the role of Maccabean literature and its use of the term *ιουδαϊσμός* in the creation of Ignatius’s parallel term (2 Macc 14:38; 4 Macc 4:26).

<sup>363</sup> Mason, “Jews, Judaeans, Judaizing,” 457–512. The literature on the problem of “Judaism” as a category is vast. For some recent contributions to the debate, see Mason; Boyarin, *Border Lines*; Schwartz, “How Many Judaisms,” 208–38. The concern for categorization extends into the realm of material culture as well. See Elsner, “Archaeologies and Agendas,” 114–28; Rutgers, *Jews in Late Ancient Rome*, 50–99; Stern, *Inscribing Devotion and Death*, 51–98. For an overview of some of the ramifications and suggestions for moving beyond them, see Reed, “Parting Ways over Blood and Water?” 227–60; Carleton Paget, *Jews, Christians, and Jewish Christians*, 1–36. For a broad overview of the numerous interlocking issues addressed in this debate, see the Marginalia Review of Books Forum, “Jew and Judean: A Forum on Politics and Historiography in the Translation of Ancient Texts,” <http://marginalia.lareviewofbooks.org/jew-judean-forum/>, especially the essays by Reinhartz, Mason, Reed, and Sheridan.

<sup>364</sup> Mason proposes a primarily ethnic and geographic sense for *ioudaios* and *ioudaismos*, treating the category religion as anachronistic. However, as Reed notes in the MRB forum (see above) such a distinction often fails for the Medieval and modern worlds in which many Jews have resisted being categorized along the lines of particularly Christian notions of what constitutes religion. See also Williams, “No More Clever Titles,” 42 who helpfully reminds us that such

terms are approached through questions of *when* terms from the ancient world came to resemble our own conceptualizations and categories. The tendency to see *χριστιανισμός* and *ιουδαϊσμός* as third order categories<sup>365</sup> makes it all too easy to ignore *how* the boundaries of such terms are constructed within a given rhetorical context as well as the effects of such formulations for audiences who make be geographically and chronologically distant.

Both the Middle and Long Recensions of *Magnesians* explicitly use language of “Judaizing (*ιουδαΐζειν, ιουδαϊσμός*)” and “Christianizing (*χριστιανισμός*)” but incorporate them very differently in their arguments, despite the linguistic overlap. For the Middle Recension, Mason’s emphasis on the directionality of *-ισμός* terms is helpful. The Middle Recension always frames these terms as an action, a movement in a particular direction. The Middle Recension reads,

Therefore, let us not be unaware of (Christ’s) great kindness. For if he were to imitate us according to what we do, we will no longer exist. Therefore, having become his disciples, let us learn to live according to Christianizing (*κατὰ χριστιανισμόν*). For whoever is called by another name in addition to (*πλέον*) this one, he is not of God. Therefore pass over the evil leaven, which has grown old and turned sour, and be changed into a new leaven, who is Jesus Christ. Be salted in him in order that no one among you spoils. For by odor, you will be examined. It is absurd to utter Jesus Christ and to Judaize (*ιουδαΐζειν*). For those Christianizing (*χριστιανισμός*) did not trust in Judaizing (*ιουδαϊσμόν*), but those Judaizing (*ιουδαϊσμός*) in Christianizing (*χριστιανισμόν*), into which every tongue that trusted was gathered to God (10.1–3 MR).

What is at stake here is not an opposition between Christianity and Judaism, but the centrality of Jesus as Christ. Even the phrase “to live according to *χριστιανισμόν*” has its

---

abstract categories are not things actors call themselves but generalizations whose essence is, by definition, unspeakable.

<sup>365</sup> By this, I mean a set or category of intangible entities. As opposed to say the second order category “Christians” which is more easily defined as the set that includes all those who call themselves Christian. As a set of intangibles, third order categories are much less easily defined and constantly contested. This of course, does not preclude them from having power and recognizable reality in the world. Rather, such categories, at least as categories of social cohesion, operate apart from explicit definition.

closest parallel earlier in the letter where Ignatius states that “the most godly prophets lived according to Jesus Christ (MR 8.2).”<sup>366</sup> One should live aligning oneself with Jesus Christ, not with Jewish ancestral customs. The purpose, according to Ignatius, of Judaizing was to be “gathered to God.” Once that is accomplished by aligning with Christ, Judaizing ceases to have any value as it is no longer directed toward alignment with the messiah but a source of division and distraction from harmonious living centered on Christ.

The idea that Judaizing trusted in Christianizing works in two ways. First it makes a messianic claim. Those Judaizing expected and believed in a Messiah, thus in some sense they were already “Christianizing” insofar as they aligned themselves with a messianic hope.<sup>367</sup> Secondly, this sense that Judaizing trusts in Christianizing depends on the image of Judaizing constructed in Maccabean literature. As Judith Lieu and Steve Mason have both suggested, the Judaizing referred to in 2 Maccabees (2:21, 8:1, 14:38), 4 Maccabees (4:26), and even Galatians (1:13–14) is closely connected to zeal for certain customs, in particular a willingness to endure and inflict violence in order to promote practices deemed essential for being a Jew.<sup>368</sup> Most important for the Middle Recension’s construction of Christianizing are the ways in which 4 Maccabees refracts this sense of Judaizing through the lens of philosophy and exemplary discourse. 4

---

<sup>366</sup> This would help make sense of the awkward (at least to us) connection between *christianismos* and “the name.” Thanks to a long history of Christian discourse on “the name” we are used to thinking of it as “Christian”—particularly because martyrdom narratives encourage us to do so through the repetition of “Christianus sum” and its Greek equivalents. However, it seems that for Ignatius “the name” more properly refers to “Jesus Christ” rather than to any designation for his followers.

<sup>367</sup> On the

<sup>368</sup> Lieu, *Image and Reality*, 30; Mason, “Jews, Judaeans, Judaizing,” 465–70. Although Mason primarily envisions this as an attempt to prevent movement or mixing between different ethnic affiliations, he does note that this is often internally directed. That is, Jews are the ones who need to Judaize. It seems that this concern with Jews being the only ones to Judaize motivates much of Paul’s rhetoric, especially in Galatians. The connections between Ignatius and 4 Maccabees were first articulated by Perler, “Das vierte Makabaerbuch,” 47–72.

Maccabees frames the suffering and death of Eleazar, the seven brothers, and their mother in terms of “virtue (1:8),” “nobility of character (1:10),” and “endurance (1:11).” While concerns about purity and adherence to ancestral law, especially in terms of food consumption, are the primary examples (5), 4 Maccabees consistently directs the reader’s attention to the act of suffering, both for its demonstration of the control of reason over the passions and for its success in persuading even one’s tormenters (e.g. 17:17). In the Middle Recension, the directionality of this Judaizing activity is turned toward Christ and Christianizing. By equating Judaizing with endurance and suffering and eliding the specifics of what Eleazar and his successors died for, the Middle Recension portrays Judaizing as a kind of Christ-like suffering. The prophets (*Magn* 8.2), like the Maccabean Judaizers, suffered because they were conforming their life to Christ’s.

Such an interpretation of the passage (and of Maccabean literature as well) has been criticized on the basis that Christianizing implies a thing, Christianity, to move towards, just as Judaizing implies moving towards Judaism.<sup>369</sup> That is, by changing our approach to -ισμός terms, we still have a category, Judaism (Judeans in Mason’s translation) or Christianity, toward which people are moving. However, one need not conjure abstract religions or entities. We can think of this language in terms of shifting identifications, not with an abstract tradition, religion, or even ethnicity, but with particular people and practices. Judaizing and Christianizing do not automatically imply “a system, principle or ideological movement”<sup>370</sup> but an audience who identifies certain people or activities with a specific term. As Mason notes, there is no culture or system

---

<sup>369</sup> Seth Schwartz, “How Many Judaisms?”

<sup>370</sup> Mason, “Jews, Judaeans, Judaizing,” 461. This is part of a list of different kinds of -ism terms that are common in modern European languages. For Mason, there is an abstract category implied by such terms, but he argues that for the ancient world, it is not “religion” but “ethnicity.”



implied by terms like “Medism” or “barbarism.”<sup>371</sup> Rather, these terms are deployed against others who identify themselves with similar terms but behave inappropriately in some way. “Medizers” were usually those Greeks who sought peace with the Persians who invaded their cities; “Judaizers” were those who refused practices they identified as Greek, whether participation in the gymnasium (2 Macc 4:9–12), turning temple wealth over to the Seleucid rulers (4:7–8), or eating impure meat (4 Macc 5:8, 14). The problem was a perception of insufficient commonality between those who identified themselves by the same name. All seem to think of themselves as Jews, but those championing Judaizing perceive a lack of commonality that calls the reality of such identifications into question.<sup>372</sup> The practices of inscribing such terms are directed toward mobilization, toward summoning certain actions from the audience.<sup>373</sup>

The Middle Recension’s invocation of “Christianizing” is just that, a call to actions that create greater conformity between people who identify with Jesus Christ. It is highly probable, given the variety of rhetorical appeals in the Middle Recension, that Ignatius encountered pluriformity in Jesus devotion on his way to Rome. While the different forms of practice and belief he might have encountered remain unclear, the call to action is manifest in numerous instances—regular communal gatherings with clearly identified ecclesiastical officers. Such practices will create a visible framework for mitigating the

---

<sup>371</sup> Mason, “Jews, Judaeans, Judaizing,” 463.

<sup>372</sup> We see similar tropes in nationalistic discourse in the United States. Even though most US citizens identify themselves as “American” (to the chagrin of people in other parts of the Americas), there is little commonality in what constitutes such an identification. As clashes between Republican and Democratic partisans illustrate, people can hold very different notions about the appropriate ways for citizens to dissent from government policies and practices. For some, criticism of military intervention is tantamount to denial of “Americanness” while for another such criticism is itself an essential component of “Americanness.” For helpful vocabulary for discussing aspects of identity often effaced in scholarship on identity (religious or otherwise), see Brubaker and Cooper, “Beyond ‘Identity,’” 28–63, esp. 41–48. For an intervention in this direction in scholarship on Roman and Christian antiquity, see Berzon, “The Problem with Identity.”

<sup>373</sup> See Rogers Brubaker, *Ethnicity without Groups*, 10. “By *invoking* groups, they seek to *evoke* them, summon them, call them into being. Their categories are *for doing*—designed to stir, summon, justify, mobilize, kindle, and energize.”

kinds of pluriformity that seemed distressing or dangerous to Ignatius and his companions. Judaizing, to the degree that it has any specific content, is portrayed as a kind of looking backward to times and things before Christ.<sup>374</sup> In a milieu in which works like 4 Maccabees were popular among people who identified as Jews or Christians, this sense of looking backward is hardly novel. People from the past provided exempla whose imitation could lead to virtue.<sup>375</sup> Ignatius's radical Christocentrism identifies only imitation of Christ (*Eph* 10.3; *Phild* 7.2) and life according to Christ (*Magn* 8.2) as sufficient to achieving this. Everything else, whether encapsulated by "different teachings" or "stories," by "prophets" and "keeping Sabbath," leads away from Christ and away from participation in the resurrection, the very thing on which the value of Ignatius's impending martyrdom depends.

The use of χριστιανισμός in the Middle Recension of *Romans* helps clarify this point. *Romans* makes no reference to Jews or ιουδαϊσμός. At stake is Ignatius's own quest for martyrdom and the truth of his devotion to Christ-like living that will be made manifest in its completion. Ignatius seems to suggest that he will only truly be a Christian when he is no longer visible (3.2). After an extended plea to the church at Rome to put up no barriers to his martyrdom, Ignatius writes, "Not an act of persuasion (πεισμονῆς τὸ ἔργον) but of power is Christianizing (ὁ χριστιανισμός), when it is hated by the world (3.3)." Here again the translation is somewhat awkward, but only made more so by inserting "Christianity." By translating as Christianity in English we lose the sense of action found in its characterization as an "ἔργον" of power rather than persuasion. Again, the Middle Recension inscribes a call to action. Here it is not directed

---

<sup>374</sup> *Philadelphians* 6 (MR) provides a more explicit case of this in that the "past" creating the danger of Judaizing is "archives."

<sup>375</sup> Ignatius himself imitates Paul in numerous ways, but he never explicitly makes Paul the *exemplar*, rather the audience is to imitate *Christ*, as did Paul and the apostles.

at mitigating pluriformity but at preserving the power on display when a person “Christianizes” in the face of worldly pressures and, especially, violence. Christianizing finds its truest and most powerful expression when it does more than preach in the face of hostility. It is most powerful when it involves activity that fully identifies the participant with the suffering and death of the Christ. Fundamentally, *χριστιανισμός* is an action that conforms the actor to Christ not an abstract religion or thing to which one adheres.

By contrast, a comparison with the Long Recension illustrates a different understanding of the term *χριστιανισμός* and highlights the reading practices that help to reify both *χριστιανισμός* and *ιουδαϊσμός*. Pedagogical clarifications like those we have seen elsewhere in the Long Recension encourage readers to treat “Christianity” and “Judaism” as categories rather than activities. The Long Recension version reads:

Therefore, let us not be unaware of (Christ’s) great kindness. If he were to imitate us according to what we do, we would no longer exist. For “if you took note of lawlessness, O Lord, Lord who would remain (cf. Ps 130:3)?” Therefore, let us become worthy of the name which we have received. For whoever is called by another name more (*πλεῖον*) than this, he is not of God. He has not received the prophecy concerning us, saying “he shall be called by a new name that the Lord will give him (cf. Is 52:2, 12).” Wherefore, it was fulfilled first in Syria. For “in Antioch the disciples were called Christians (cf. Acts 11:26),” when Peter and Paul were laying the foundations of the church. Therefore, pass over the old, evil leaven and be changed into a new leaven of grace. Dwell in Christ in order that another may not rule over you. It is absurd to speak Jesus Christ with the tongue and to hold fast with the mind to a *ιουδαϊσμόν* that has ceased (*παυσθέντα*). For where there is *χριστιανισμός*, there is no *ιουδαϊσμός*. For one is the Christ in whom every nation that believed and “every tongue that confessed was gathered” to God (cf. Mt 3:9/Lk 3:8).” Those who were stony-hearted became children of Abraham, the friend of God, and in his seed, all those appointed will be blessed into eternal life in Christ (*Magn* 10.1–4, LR).<sup>376</sup>

As is clear from the parenthetical notes, this section is peppered with scriptural references. These quotations serve to reformulate the portions of the epistle that remain

---

<sup>376</sup>The last line alludes to Genesis 22:18 and shares the terminology of appointment or ordination with Acts 13:48, using the verb *τάσσω* in a similar sense.

identical between recensions. For example, both recensions imagine Christ imitating a rather undefined “us (10.1).” In the Middle Recension, the reader is left to imagine exactly what kinds of behaviors Christ might imitate and how that would effect non-existence of the ascribed audience. By incorporating the reference to Psalm 130 immediately following this statement, the Long Recension provides a characterization that undercuts the strangeness of the Middle Recension’s formulation, moving it from speculative possibility to a rather banal pronouncement of the expectation that God punishes human sin.

Other scriptural references serve to translate the Middle Recension into more familiar formulations. The Long Recension eliminates any reference to “Christianizing” in this instance, focusing instead on the subsequent discussion of “the name (10.2 LR).” The Long Recension moves directly from remembering divine forbearance into exhortation, “Let us become worthy of the name which we have received (10.2 LR).” Rather than encouraging the reader to “learn to live according to Christianizing (10.1 MR), the Long Recension invites ethical advancement, urging all to “become worthy” of the kindness they have been shown.

This change creates a shift in the names under consideration. Although both recensions identify those “called by another name more than this” as not belonging to God (10.1 MR, 10.2 LR), they point to different names. The Middle Recension maintains a focus on the name Jesus Christ throughout. Christianizing is imagined as imitation of and conformity to Jesus Christ and the reader is even urged to “be changed into the new leaven, who is Jesus Christ (10.2 MR).” For the Long Recension, the name at stake here is that of “Christian.” This name is itself portrayed as foretold by prophets and fulfilled for the first time in Antioch, when “Peter and Paul were laying the foundations of the church (10.2 LR).” The reader is not imagined as capable of being changed into another

Christ. Instead, the reader is to “be changed into a new leaven of grace” and to “dwell in Christ so that another does not rule over you (10.3 LR).” The reader fully participates in this name by participating in the Church, which was the first embodiment of this “new name.”

When the Long Recension introduces the term *χριστιανισμός* in 10.4, the connection to a sense of action or directionality is absent. The Long Recension provides no explicit connection to any verbal form such as *ιουδαΐζειν*. The choice imagined is not one of directionality or emphasis, but a choice between a living Christianity and a Judaism that is portrayed as a relic of the imagination. “Judaism” becomes a kind of inappropriate mental exercise, an act of intellectual (*ἐπι διανοίας*, 10.4 LR) engagement with a dead artifact. A person can speak and live as a Christian or hold onto a Judaism that has ceased (*παυσθέντα*, 10.4 LR). There is no direction that a person could move. Once there is Christianity, there is no longer a Judaism. To be sure, there still seem to be Jews, but they are not part of any larger religious tradition. They too, apparently, cling to an idea that has long since ceased to have any reality. The Long Recension does not entertain any sense in which “Judaizing trusted in Christianizing.” Rather, Judaism is akin to every ethnicity since “every nation that trusted and every tongue that confessed was gathered (10.4, LR)” to God in Christ. Speaking Christ and the presence of *χριστιανισμός* should subsume every other ethnic affiliation, rendering them irrelevant, even non-existent. In the Long Recension, a person is either inside *χριστιανισμός* and the church or ruled by another. There is no longer any mixing or movement between but an absolute delineation of difference. “Judaism” is merely an instance of faulty cognition.

When set within the larger rhetorical context of the letter, this increased emphasis on Jewishness as the antithesis of proper Christian praxis takes on a new tone. What is often perceived as derogatory or anti-Jewish in the Middle Recension becomes

full-blown anti-Jewish polemic. “Jewish” becomes an appropriate modifier for delusions or vanities. Judaism is said to be something that no longer even exists. Jews themselves are identified as “Christ-killing” (11.3 LR). The Middle Recension certainly identified Judaizing as a distraction or disruption of the ideal orientation toward the Messiah, but never resorted to the kinds of polemics we see in the Long Recension.

Such anti-Jewish ideas are also given a substantively different rhetorical purpose. The additional materials in the Long Recension, with their emphasis on correct Christological assertions, lists of exempla, scriptural citations, and proper praxis for Sabbath, give such anti-Jewish polemics a flavor of the school room. All these interventions effect a greater explicitness that betrays a concern for the reader to interpret and understand Ignatius correctly. No longer is the focus solely on the occasional, hortatory aspect of the letter. Instead, such pedagogical and homiletical elements structure anti-Jewish rhetoric as part and parcel of the basic elements of how to properly bear the name Christian. The Middle Recension developed its implicit anti-Judaism around an effort to instill proper communal organization and communal unity. It provided organizational solutions to the problems of pluriformity. In the Long Recension, these elements of ecclesial hierarchy and unity remain but are subsumed into a pedagogical mode of reading Ignatius. In such rhetoric, anti-Judaism takes its place alongside submission to the bishop, youthful wisdom, and generic creedal formulations as a necessary component of Christian ideology and practice. Anti-Judaism becomes one way in which to form people as Christians.

When coupled with other fourth-century images of Ignatius as martyr, ideal bishop, and source of blessing,<sup>377</sup> the assertions of the Long Recension begin to form part of the historical memory of Christianity. While the absolute distinctions drawn between

---

<sup>377</sup> For more on these, see Chapter 4.

a real, vibrant Christianity and an ephemeral, noetic Judaism may seem new or innovative to contemporaries, especially those who find participation in Jewish festivals an important part of their orientation toward Christ, the Long Recension utilizes a partially realized distinction from the Middle Recension to craft a long history of Jewish–Christian difference. The past is remembered in ways that speak directly to contemporary anxieties and arguments. Innovations in theology and practice are articulated through a second-century voice as what the church has always taught.

### **Judaism in *Philadelphians***

In the Long Recension of *Philadelphians*, we once again see pedagogically inflected reading habits giving new shape to expressions found in the Middle Recension. In particular, the strikingly different materials included in the Long Recension highlight the effects of wider discursive practices which framed Jewish–Christian difference as a matter of cognition. Where the Middle Recension (once again) relativizes terms like *χριστιανισμός* and *ιουδαϊσμός* in favor of practices that conform the reader to Christ (e.g. submission to bishop as God; exegesis only through a Christological lens), the Long Recension explicitly constructs religious conformity as something that of necessity involves belief.

Like *Magnesians* 8–10, *Philadelphians* 6 has played an important role in attempts to locate the “Parting of the Ways” and discussions of the ways Christians inscribe “Jewishness” to articulate or evoke a corporate identity.<sup>378</sup> In particular, this passage has invited consistent attention as evidence for diaspora Jewish communities

---

<sup>378</sup> See, e.g. Dunn, *Partings of the Ways*, 344–345; Robinson, *Ignatius and the Parting*, 203–241. On the matters of identity in Ignatius, see especially Lieu, *Image and Reality*, 23–56.

that did not require circumcision for full inclusion.<sup>379</sup> Unlike *Magnesians* however, the Long Recension of *Philadelphians* 6 lacks any reference to *χριστιανισμός* or *ιουδαϊσμός*. The passage from the Middle Recension that has caused so much scholarly speculation about uncircumcised Jews has no direct parallel in the Long Recension. Instead of amending and clarifying the Middle Recensions terminology, the Long Recension replaces talk of *χριστιανισμὸν* or *ιουδαϊσμὸν* with a list of Christological errors, some of which are explicitly connected to Jewishness. The differences illustrate the kinds of reading and writing practices that helped make early Christian rhetoric intelligible and useful for later readers.

The passage which has generated the most attention in modern scholarship reads:

If someone expounds Judaizing (*ιουδαϊσμὸν ἐρμηνεύη*) to you, do not listen to him. It is better to hear Christianizing (*χριστιανισμὸν*) from a man who has a circumcision (*περιτομὴν ἔχοντος*) than Judaizing (*ιουδαϊσμὸν*) from a foreskinned (*ἀκροβύστου*) one. If both do not speak about Jesus Christ, they are to me steles and tombs of corpses (*τάφοι νεκρῶν*), upon which are written only the names of men (*Phild* 6.1, MR).

These brief lines, with their hints of circumcised Christians and foreskinned Jews have generated a surprising degree of debate with regard to distinguishing rhetoric from reality. Multiple readers have used these passages to reconstruct something of the history of the churches in Asia Minor and to make a claim as to which figure in this comparison was the target of Ignatius's rhetoric.<sup>380</sup> Typically, scholars see one as a purely rhetorical formulation while the other has a specific, real-world referent. Most claim the circumcised Christianizer is identified with Paul, early apostles, or even Jewish

---

<sup>379</sup> Gaston, "Judaism of the Uncircumcised," 33–44; Barrett, "Jews and Judaizers, 220–244; Speigl, "Ignatius in Philadelphia," 360–376; Donahue, "Jewish Christianity," 81–93; Wilson, *Related Strangers*, 164–165.

<sup>380</sup> Barrett, "Jews and Judaizers," 234; Niebuhr, "'Judentum' und 'Christentum,'" 229–231; Lieu, *Image and Reality*, 31–32; Gaston, "Judaism of the Uncircumcised," 37; Wilson, *Related Strangers*, 164; Trebilco, *Jewish Communities*, 28.



Christians while the foreskinned Judaizer is interpreted as referring to Gentiles who espoused and expounded Judaism.<sup>381</sup> That is, the circumcised Christian has a historical referent while the foreskinned Judaizer is a contemporary person or group.

Shaye Cohen has challenged these readings, arguing that they do not go far enough. He suggests both figures were invented for the sake of creating a rhetorically effective antithesis.<sup>382</sup> In a compelling argument, Cohen identifies the paradoxical aspect of the comparison as that which gives the figure its rhetorical punch. Within two nested comparisons (Christianizing is better than Judaizing; foreskinned is better than circumcised), the combination of Christianizing and circumcision alongside a foreskinned Judaizer creates a more memorable paradox than simply asserting that Christianizing is always and everywhere better than Judaizing regardless of the state of a man's prepuce.<sup>383</sup>

While persuasive on many levels, this reading of the Middle Recension raises questions as to why such a position would be so dramatically altered in the Long Recension. If the scribe of the Long Recension and other ancient readers read this as Cohen argues it should be read, why alter the text so dramatically? According to Cohen's analysis, the rhetorical goal is to memorably remind (or persuade) the reader that Christianizing is of central importance for participating in the realities of the resurrection. Such a sentiment is hardly out of place in the fourth century, especially at Antioch where John Chrysostom preached his famous sermons "Against the Judaizers." This idea is equally at home with the Long Recension's assertion that *ιουδαϊσμός* is

---

<sup>381</sup> E.g. Gaston, "Judaism of the Uncircumcised"; Wilson, *Related Strangers*, 164–165.

<sup>382</sup> Cohen, "Judaism without Circumcision," 408.

<sup>383</sup> Cohen calls this a "paradoxical bipolar antithetical comparison" (Cohen, "Judaism without Circumcision," 409–412) and identifies similar structures in a number of ancient sources. In each case, the structure is used to create a more memorable assertion of the precedence of some value or practice over a variety of other goods. It creates a hierarchy of value where an assertion of a single supreme value provides no such clear ordering of value.

something that has ceased to exist (*Magn* 10.1 LR). Yet, this is part of the Middle Recension is not reproduced in the Long Recension.<sup>384</sup>

I suggest that, in part, the difference arises from the scribe of the Long Recension's pedagogical orientation to the Middle Recension.<sup>385</sup> The Middle Recension's rhetoric creates difficulties for someone primarily seeking instruction and information. Talk of circumcised Christianizers and foreskinned Judaizers highlights the justificatory, persuasive thrust of the Middle Recension's rhetoric rather than providing a clear exposition of an agreed upon position.<sup>386</sup> The concluding conditional statement in the Middle Recension creates analogous issues for a pedagogically oriented reader. The text reads, "if both do not speak about Jesus Christ, they are to me steles and tombs of corpses (6.1 MR)." The statement's hypothetical aspect relativizes even the comparative worth of "hearing Christianizing" as it raises the possibility that even the one "Christianizing" may fail to "speak about Jesus Christ." Just as the first conditional claims it is always better to hear *χριστιανισμόν*, the concluding conditional implies that such a label is no guarantee that the speaker actually preaches Jesus Christ. Both someone Christianizing and someone Judaizing are portrayed as equally capable of failing to speak properly about Jesus Christ. The former signifier may be better than the latter, but it too can be an empty category, a human name inscribed on a tomb. For a

---

<sup>384</sup> There is a general trend in the Long Recension to use *χριστιανισμός* and *ιουδαϊσμός* with less frequency. *χριστιανισμός* appears five times in the Middle Recension but only three times in the Long Recension. The same is true for *ιουδαϊσμός* which is used four times in the Middle Recension and only three times in the Long Recension. What is perhaps more revealing of the redactors' understanding of such terminology is the fact that none of the additional letters of the Long Recension use the term, though they do mention Jews and "Jewish" ways of doing things on multiple occasions.

<sup>385</sup> While this orientation is clear in the Long Recension, it would be useful to determine if this orientation persists in other likely by the same scribe, the *Apostolic Constitutions* and a commentary on Job by an "Arian" named Julian. On this connection, see Hagedorn, *Der Hiobkommentar*, xli–lvii.

<sup>386</sup> It seems to me that we see a similar pattern in the relationship between Pauline and deutero-Pauline letters. Justificatory aspects of Pauline rhetoric are minimized in favor of portraying Paul as a purveyor of clear, practical teaching.

reader seeking instruction from this text, it clearly answers what is important—speaking Jesus Christ—but not how such a thing is properly done. The Middle Recension’s forceful rhetoric and its theatrical play on (some) reader’s expectations about the relationship between circumcision and Jesus-devotion serves only to highlight the distance between reader and text.

As in *Magnesians*, the Middle Recension primarily evaluates χριστιανισμός and ιουδαϊσμός in terms of action and directionality. Both must be evaluated in terms of their effectiveness at leading people toward the absolute centrality of Jesus Christ. Without the correct focus on the messiah Jesus, “Christianizing” is itself an empty term, capable of leading the hearer astray. The comparison of anyone who fails to “speak about Jesus Christ” to “steles and tombs of corpses, upon which are written only the names of men (6.1 MR),” suggests a concern about appearance and reality reflected elsewhere in the Middle Recension.<sup>387</sup> Just as a tombstone carries only a name and not the reality of a person, so too designations like “Christianizing” are human names that do not necessarily reveal what they ought.

Curiously, it is this aspect of names on tombs that remains similar between the Middle and Long Recensions. The Long Recension concludes its pedagogical list of erroneous beliefs and practices by saying “all such people are steles and tombs of the dead upon which are written only names of dead men (6.7 LR).”<sup>388</sup> Here however, the “names of dead men” are not the human labels adopted by or expounded to the assembly. Instead, they are the names of the “heretics” given as *exempla* of erroneous beliefs. The pedagogical list consists of a series of conditionals that culminates in

---

<sup>387</sup> E.g. *Romans* 3.

<sup>388</sup> The only difference between the Middle and Long Recensions in this phrase is the inclusion of the adjective νεκρῶν to modify ἀνθρώπων. This subtle difference reflects the larger differences found in this section of the Long Recension. The Long Recension makes “names” refer to heretics while the Middle Recension appears more concerned with the limits of classification.

identifying all those mentioned in the list as “steles and tombs.” Simon Magus (6.2), Ebion<sup>389</sup> (6.3), and Nikolaios<sup>390</sup> (6.6) are named as negative *exempla*, as deviants from correctly Christian ideas. Other errors are explicitly associated with the designation Jew, either through the term ψευδοϊουδαῖος<sup>391</sup> (6.1) or by association with the “Christ-murdering Jews (χριστοφόνων ιουδαίων, 6.5).” By adopting such labels and deviant beliefs, the people involved attach themselves to the names of dead men rather than the name of the resurrected Christ.

Rather than looking to other portions of the letter to establish how someone speaks correctly about Jesus Christ, the scribe of the Long Recension takes the Middle Recension’s discussion of Judaizing, Christianizing, and speaking Jesus Christ as a springboard for addressing the question of *how* to speak about Jesus Christ. The Long Recension employs a consistent formulation: “if someone (ἐάν τις) confesses/says

---

<sup>389</sup> It is not completely clear whether this is treated as a proper name or not. Given that the Long Recension refers to one “named Ἐβίων” as a “poor man (πέννης),” the redactor appears to know the Aramaic root of the term (at least from Origen, as did Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 3.27 and *Ecclesiastica Theologia* 1.14). Nevertheless, the use of the term ἐπίκλην connotes personal names rather than merely an adjective for impoverishment and suggests that at least some authors who knew of the word’s roots thought that it had been adopted as a personal name.

<sup>390</sup> In most manuscripts of the LR, the “Nikolaitans” are referred to as “falsely-named.” It seems likely that the redactor wished to make clear that those who called themselves or were called by this name had in some way misunderstood the intentions of Nikolaios. Cf. Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis* 3.4. In Epiphanius, Nikolaios is no longer depicted as misunderstood (*Panarion* 25.1). Instead, he is unable to maintain the demands of continence in marriage and thus makes his sexual activity a component of access to salvation. Epiphanius’ account seems to draw from a stream of tradition leading back to Irenaeus (*Adversus haereses* 1.26) while a competing tradition runs through Clement of Alexandria, Eusebius (*Historia ecclesiastica* 3.29), and the Long Recension (*Trallians* 11.2, *Philadelphians* 6.6). All seem to agree that the Nikolaitans advocate sexual immorality (presumably on the basis of Revelation 2:6 and 14–15 where Nikolaitans and those who hold to the “teaching of Balaam” and “practice fornication” are juxtaposed). However, they disagree on whether Nikolaios deliberately or accidentally gave rise to such errors.

<sup>391</sup> This term appears only in the Long Recension (*Philadelphians* 6.1; *Trallians* 10.5) and a citation of the Long Recension of *Trallians* in the *Chronicon Paschale*, p. 416, line 17. As Cohen notes in passing, a pseudo-Jew seems to be what we would mean by a “Jew,” that is someone who identifies themselves or is identified by others as having some marker of Jewishness deemed sufficient for inclusion in a larger class of people. Cohen, “Judaism without Circumcision,” 400. This is supported by *Trallians* 10.5 in which the “pseudo-Jews” are characterized as those who “judged” Jesus before his execution. This leaves open space for an understanding of “Jew” as a positive designation for others devoted to Christ, much as Paul says the “real” Jew is the one with circumcision of the heart (Rom 2:28–29), thus arguing for the possibility of gentile Jews.

(ὁμολογῆ/λέγει)<sup>392</sup> *x* and *y* but denies/thinks (ἀρνῆται/νομίζη) *z*, such a one is (ὁ τοιοῦτος ἐστίν)...” This clear and consistent structure creates an easily followed digest of correct and incorrect teaching about Christ.<sup>393</sup> Both readers and hearers would have had little trouble identifying correctly Christian attitudes, especially as the verb ὁμολογῆ (agree with, confess) consistently introduces those ideas which the audience should embrace. Repetitive formulations coupled with the example of specific heretics enable easy digestion and recall of correctly Christian attitudes. This format reduces the potential complexity that arises from the Middle Recension’s formulations of Judaizing and Christianizing and encourages the reader to see theological deviance as something easily identified and separated from Christian communities. By placing this on the pen of Ignatius, the Long Recension implies that such clarity has always been part of the Christian story.

This list contributes to the image of communal purity and peacefulness effected by both the similarities and differences between the recensions.<sup>394</sup> By using conditionals, the Long Recension provides an easy way to test belief, but the uncertainty inherent in

---

<sup>392</sup> The vocabulary for acceptable speech is very consistent with only two instances where ὁμολογῆ is not used for protasis of the conditional. The language for incorrect activity is highly varied, encompassing the activities of denying, thinking, believing, and speaking. This rhetorical structure itself inculcates the heresiological trope of united orthodoxy over and against a heretical diversity and competition.

<sup>393</sup> It has long been a staple of histories of heresiology that the digests of various sects and their teachings were rooted in doxographies produced by Hellenistic philosophical schools in order to inculcate an awareness of the teachings deemed most important for identifying the differences between the schools, though often without the explicit polemical intent found in most Christian sources. Recently, Smith, *Guilt by Association*, 1–48, has argued that we should look to the deutero-Pauline epistles for the proximate sources of early heresiology, in part, because this better explains the preference for polemical rather than pedagogical emphasis in Christian heresy catalogues. However, the rhetorical structure of *Philadelphians* 6 (LR) provides a clear case of polemical content that was composed with pedagogical purpose. That is, the distinction between pedagogy and polemic is an arbitrary one insofar as polemic often attempts to inculcate and bolster a specific set of values. Similarly, in his focus on early heresiology, Smith does not take into account the rapidity with which such catalogues were pressed into a simultaneously polemical and pedagogical role in monastic and other ecclesiastical settings. See, Cameron, “How to read Heresiology.”

<sup>394</sup> See Chapters 1 and 2 for examples and discussion.

conditionals effectively avoids any direct or indirect accusation that such proscribed beliefs exist among the audience. Similarly, the repetition of ὁ τοιοῦτος (such a one) reinforces the notion that this deviance is not present among the audience. It subtly encourages readers to see incorrectly Christian beliefs and statements as distinct and distant from themselves. Various glosses on the heretical *exempla* solidify this sense of separation between audience and heresy. The named offenders are identified as children of the devil (6.1–2), possessed by “the apostate dragon (6.4),” and strangers to Christ (6.6). Threats of false teaching and theological error all derive from outside. Nothing in the list’s rhetorical structure suggests that the reader will find themselves under censure.

Despite the lack of reference to Judaizing or Christianizing in the Long Recension, concern with Jewishness remains. The list constructs Jewishness as a form of Christological error, a failure to believe the correct things about Christ. The first conditional asserts that someone who “denies that Christ is the son of God is a liar, just like his father the devil, and such a one is a pseudo-Jew of the lower circumcision (6.1 LR).” Further on in the list, Jews are again employed as a sign of deviance. The Long Recension asserts that someone who says that “the incarnation was an appearance (δόκησιν)” and “is ashamed of (Christ’s) suffering...denies faith no less than the Christ-murdering Jews (6.5 LR).” Even a docetic Christology is dangerously Jewish. Surprisingly, it is not the Ebionites with their supposedly Jewish-Christian focus on the humanity of Christ who are identified with Jews.<sup>395</sup> Instead, the whole range of Christological deviance is on par with “Jewish” error, from a Christ who is not the Son of God to a Christ who is so ethereal as to only appear human. Incorrectly Christian beliefs

---

<sup>395</sup> This is striking given modern scholarship’s focus on “groups” such as Ebionites being “too” Jewish in their Christology. Here, the Long Recension identifies Jewish participation in Jesus’ death with Christological formulations that both deny “Son of God” status to Christ and assert absolute divinity such that incarnation and passion are in appearance only.

amount to the same thing, a denial or refusal of faith that is consistently figured as Jewish. Whatever else Jews might be, they are at base an example of Christological error.<sup>396</sup>

This reduction of Jewishness to Christological error is closely coupled with the Long Recension's presentation of Christianness as rooted in correct speech and cognition. The Long Recension's structure repeatedly emphasizes certain ways of speaking and the thoughts that precede such speech as excluding a person from relationship to God. Almost all forms of correct speech are identified throughout this section with the verb *ὁμολογέω*.<sup>397</sup> Through such terminology, correct speech and thought are always framed as agreement with some larger body of knowledge. By contrast, the terms used to characterize false speech (*λέγη* and *νομίζη*) lack the implicitly positive connotations of their counterpart, stressing the individuality and lack of distinction such speech and thoughts possess. They are not spoken in agreement or as part of a confession but stem from a lack of proper education (e.g. referring to one set of beliefs as "*πένης τὴν διάνοιαν*" [intellectually impoverished] or affiliation with the devil, 6.1–2, 4).

The Long Recension stresses the importance of correct cognition and speech in a way that the Middle Recension does not. The Middle Recension concludes its exhortation to listen only to those speaking Jesus Christ by urging the readers to "come together with an undivided heart (6.2 MR)." The Long Recension includes this same line

---

<sup>396</sup> Such an overlaying of anti-Jewish rhetoric with heretical Christian beliefs was an exceedingly common visual and textual strategy in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages, rooted in early attempts to define the boundaries of acceptable Christian teaching such as that of Irenaeus and deployed through the iconoclastic controversies and beyond. For a concise overview, see Cameron, "Jews and Heretics," 345–60.

<sup>397</sup> The only exceptions are the use of *κηρύττη* (6.1) and *λέγη* (6.3), though the latter also uses *ὁμολογῆ* separating what someone might say about God from what someone confesses or agrees to about Christ. Such a distinction suggests greater latitude in what a person might say about God alongside a perception that Christological language admits of no such ambiguity.

with some additions, urging the readers to “come together with undivided heart and willing soul, ‘being united in soul and thinking the same (σύμψυχοι τὸ ἐν φρονοῦντες, cf. Phil 2:2)’ always thinking (δοξάζοντες) the same concerning the same things (6.8 LR).” Supported by an allusion to Paul’s letter to the Philippians, the Long Recension amplifies the notion of an “undivided heart,” informing its readers that such unity is predicated on cognitive conformity.

For the Middle Recension, the desired unity of purpose is primarily characterized by participation in the assemblies of the bishop.<sup>398</sup> The disagreements present in Philadelphia, are framed as matters of practice, particularly reading practices (i.e. hermeneutics), that, given the bishop’s silence (1.1), likely happen apart from the bishop.<sup>399</sup> Thus, the dangers do not arise from incorrect cognition but from exposition (ἐρμηνεύη) that fails to start from speech about Jesus Christ (6.1 MR) and privileges activities that do not necessarily involve the bishop and other leaders’ authorization. For the Long Recension, the concern for participation in the assembly remains but is not presented as sufficient to guarantee unity. Rather, all people must believe and speak in ways that conform to the “confession” outlined in the pedagogical material. What the Middle Recension characterizes as μερισμός (8.1 MR), the Long Recension describes as διάστασις γνώμης (8.1 LR), highlighting once again the greater concern the Long Recension shows for unity in thought as well as physical unity.

These differences in the Long Recension suggest that concern with the terminology of “Judaism” and “Christianism” has radically altered in the reading tradition of the Ignatian corpus. The two recensions exhibit a very different set of concerns with regard to taxonomy and names. The Middle Recension, with its emphasis

---

<sup>398</sup> E.g. *Philadelphians* 7.1; *Magnesians* 7; *Trallians*, 2–3; *Ephesians* 13; *Smyrnaeans* 8.

<sup>399</sup> Those who repent must return “to the unity of God and the council of the bishop (*Philadelphians* 8.1 MR).”



on expounding and speaking “Jesus Christ” articulates a concern with the identifications “Jew” and “Christian” that the Long Recension subsumes in its efforts to inculcate theological homogeneity. In the Middle Recension’s second-century context, claims to speak or expound Christianizing are imagined as potentially failing to fulfill that promise. Self-identifications and the claims of speakers and teachers are not enough to be certain about the reality of their participation in the assembly. Rather, they must speak Jesus Christ before all else and visibly submit to the leadership of the assembly. A willingness to invest in an ambassador or two in order to deepen inter-congregational connections wouldn’t hurt either (e.g. *Phild* 10). The taxonomy itself has little value apart from a visible (and thus policeable) reality.

Such a concern with how people identify and are identified maps well onto reconstructions of second-century Jesus-devotion which focus on the pluriformity of beliefs and practices typically subsumed under the adjective “Christian.”<sup>400</sup> As James Carleton Paget articulates in his introduction to *Jews, Christians, and Jewish-Christians*, terms of identification like “Christian” were present enough in regional discourse that they came to the attention of Roman authorities such as Pliny in his letters to Trajan and Tacitus in his account of Nero’s atrocities.<sup>401</sup> However, the designation

---

<sup>400</sup> In the wake of the American academy’s reception of Walter Bauer, the studies that map the diversity of early Christianity have multiplied each year. The discovery and dissemination of Nag Hammadi texts and texts from Qumran have influenced this picture enormously, providing textual testimony for the diversity of Jewish and early Christian ideas not filtered by the processes of reception and canonization that ensured the preservation of retrospectively orthodox works. Few have done more to promote this picture than Peter Brown (especially in *Rise of Western Christendom*), but the scholarship is far more pervasive as evidenced by the place given to non-canonical materials in widely used introductory textbooks. See, e.g. Ehrman, *The New Testament and idem, After the New Testament*; Mason and Robinson, *Early Christian Reader*.

<sup>401</sup> Pliny the Younger, *Letters* 10.96–97; Tacitus, *Annales* 15. Carleton Paget, *Jews, Christians, and Jewish Christians*, 10. A recent article on Book 10 of Pliny’s letters as reopened the possibility of Christian interpolation in this letter collection. Using stylometric analysis, Tuccinardi argues that the style of the Pliny’s letter concerning the Christians is highly different from the rest of Book 10 as well as the rest of the letter collection. Tuccinardi, “Application of Profile-Based Method,” 1–13. The analysis does not provide any conclusions as to where in this letter

“Christian” came primarily as an accusation that could only be substantiated to the degree that those accused refused to sacrifice to the emperor or to the gods on behalf of the emperor.<sup>402</sup> As such, people who identified as Jews or Christians could easily have fallen under the censure of such a method of discovery if their neighbors wished to identify them with Christians. In each case, the identification of a person as Christian occurs through a complex interplay between accusations and self-identifications.<sup>403</sup> The Middle Recension’s attempts to define the content of these terms through inscription of the twin ideals of bishop-centered assembly and the orienting of all sources of authority toward Christ belie any attempt to see this rhetoric as a statement about Christianity and Judaism. Rather, the Middle Recension participates in a larger discourse concerning the management of the relative autonomy and diversity of congregations devoted to Jesus Christ. As the unusual comparison of foreskinned Judaizers and circumcised Christianizers vividly articulates, labels, identifications, and identity markers are not enough to effect a coherent system.<sup>404</sup> Names can mask as much as they disclose.

---

interpolation is present, but it encourages caution in putting too much weight on Pliny’s testimony.

<sup>402</sup> Charges could also be substantiated by personal claims such as the oft-quoted *Christianus sum* present in many martyrdom narratives. Somewhat curiously, scholars rarely consider the possibility that such an approach would have resulted in at least some Jews also being unable to prove their innocence as at least some considered such sacrifices to be forbidden to them as well. That is, once accused of being a Christian, even an observant Jew has no means to assert their innocence.

<sup>403</sup> On this issue in the development of the term “Christian,” see the perceptive article by Philippa Townsend, “Who were the First Christians?” 212–230. There Townsend argues that scholars err both in their tendency to classify early followers of Jesus as “Christians” and in the tendency in some scholarship to identify all followers of Jesus as indistinguishable from Jews. By connecting the terminology of accusations in the likes of Pliny and Tacitus to the designation of Paul’s followers as *hoi tou Xristou*, Townsend articulates a model in which self-identifications and external identifications create a concept that is then deployed in a variety of ways to crystallize new group configurations. See, also, Castelli, *Martyrdom and Memory*, 33–68, who emphasizes the role of audience, retelling, and other memorial practices in the making of martyrdom. Ultimately, it is the external identifications of later Christians who give the category coherence, not the first people to call themselves and/or be called Christians.

<sup>404</sup> The Middle Recension of *Ephesians* exhibits a similar concern with regard to “the name” (7.1). There, the name seems to refer directly to the name of Jesus Christ rather than any name

The Long Recension does not exhibit the same unease with taxonomy present in the Middle Recension of *Philadelphians* or share the Middle Recension's concern with a completely Christocentric approach to the place of "Jewish" prophets (5) and priesthood (9) in the life of the assembly. To the extent that any names are important, it is the names of heretics which lead only to graves and death (6.8 LR). Instead, the Long Recension, with its repeated pedagogical additions, inculcates correctly Christian beliefs and the hierarchies of obedience necessary for a properly structured society (e.g. *Phild* 4, 9).

The primary effect of these differences on the history of Jewish-Christian relations is to frame Jewishness (and a variety of other possible identifications) as theological deviance. When incorporating terms such as "pseudo-Jew" and "Christ-murdering Jews" within a pedagogy of proper belief, the Long Recension not so subtly insinuates that Jews are defined by the absence of correct beliefs about Jesus. Whatever claims to ethnicity, practice, or antiquity they might make, Jews should be viewed by the Christian reader as guilty of an obvious and egregious theological error, the failure to recognize Jesus as Christ and Son of God. In the fourth century, such a characterization is not novel. Numerous ecclesiastical writers used "Jew" as an epithet for their Christian opponents or portrayed Jews as characterized primarily by stubborn resistance to divine dictates and revelations.<sup>405</sup> However, the Long Recension differs from these other

---

assigned to those following him, but there is a similar concern with the potential lack of conformity between those who use "the name" and what they actually do and say.

<sup>405</sup> For the former, the rhetoric of Athanasius provides a classic case. In both his festal letters and his orations against Arians, Athanasius frequently characterizes Jews by their failure to recognize Christ (*Orationes contra Arianos* 1.54) and uses this characterization of a fleshly, willful, particularistic Judaism to paint his theological and ritual opponents as no better than Jews. See, Boyarin and Burrus, "Hybridity," 431-441 and Brakke, "Jewish Flesh," 453-481 for detailed discussions of these rhetorical practices. For Jews as characterized by stubbornness, the most extensive example is Eusebius' *Praeparatio evangelica* 7.6 in which he frequently distinguishes "Jews" from "Hebrews" with the former primarily characterized by their disobedience toward

practices by effacing its relationship to contemporary discourse, presenting this construction of Jewishness as part of the worldview of earliest Christian thought and naturalizing the relative newness of these modes of articulating Jewish–Christian difference.<sup>406</sup> By incorporating anti-Jewish rhetoric as asides in a terse heresiology, anti-Judaism is treated as one of the reader’s basic assumptions. All readers are imagined to share an awareness of themselves as something other than Jews.

Scholars have, at least since the post-World War II era, discussed this way of imagining and representing Jews and Judaism in Christian literature.<sup>407</sup> In attempting to map the origins of anti-Judaism, several scholars have pointed to the theological demands that generate many of the most strongly anti-Jewish claims, seeing anti-Judaism as in some sense an effect of Christology.<sup>408</sup> The literary context of the Long Recension’s assertions suggests that the reinvigoration and amplification of earlier patterns of anti-Judaism we witness in polemical, homiletical, and pedagogical texts in the fourth and fifth is an effect of attempts at theological homogenization. The ideological assumptions of Christian unity and essential changelessness that make such a project desirable affect the way textual traditions are read and transmitted, fostering approaches to past writings that see them as primarily pedagogical (ethically and theologically). Anti-Jewish statements previously directed toward encouraging social

---

divinely appointed leaders like Moses and their disobedience toward God according to prophetic literature. For a discussion, see Johnson, *Ethnicity and Argument*, 94–125.

<sup>406</sup> This strategy may itself be an effect of the kinds of claims to antiquity of more “Jewish” views of devotion to Jesus such as those preserved in the Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies*. Recently, scholars have argued that such claims are in conversation with the Eusebian narrative of Church history in which Jewish elements of the Jerusalem church are subsumed into Gentile Christianity shortly after the Bar Kochba revolt and the *Adversus Iudaeos* homilies of John Chrysostom. For the former, see Reed, “‘Jewish-Christianity’ as Counter-history?,” 173–216, and, for the latter, see Côté, “Le problème,” 339–370. Most of the literature cited in such discussions has close connections to Antioch and Syria more broadly which itself would suggest a connection to the Long Recension.

<sup>407</sup> E.g. Cameron, “Jews and Heretics.”

<sup>408</sup> E.g. Ruether, *Faith and Fratricide*, 95, who refers to anti-Judaism as the “left hand of Christology,” and Taylor, *Anti-Judaism and Early Christian Identity*, esp. 127–188.

cohesion become individual benchmarks by which the reader can evaluate their own adherence to an eternal, correctly Christian mode of cognition. By writing these modes of reading into the Ignatian textual tradition, a fourth-century scribe contributed to an image of the past and present in which everyone has always believed and should always believe “the same about the same things (*Phil* 6.8 LR).”

When considered in a literary context that imagines the past as harmoniously unified and demands cognitive conformity from its readers, the reduction of Jewishness to Christological error becomes an effect of conceiving of Christian devotion and belonging in cognitive terms.<sup>409</sup> By marking correct belief as a fundamental to Christianness, belief becomes an essential category by which to evaluate other identifications. This is most visible in the construction of the list of deviance in which every instance of error involves some aspect of incorrect assertion about the divine.<sup>410</sup> Each portion of the heresy list in *Philadelphians* starts from beliefs that every person should share and indicates additional beliefs that take a person away from correctly

---

<sup>409</sup> Scholars have noted a similar effect with regard to Julian’s push for the revitalization of “Hellenism” as a system of belief and ritual rooted in philosophy and Iamblichian theories of theurgy. See Elm, *Sons of Hellenism*, esp. 88–146. The debate there is frequently over the source of his desire for homogenization. Often this is seen as a product of his Christian education and upbringing, but the impulse for homogenization was already present at least from the Diocletianic reforms and in the widely shared Platonism of this period. In Platonism’s tendency to see truth as singular and in the tetrarchy’s attempts at roping ritual into legal and other modes of achieving political unity and stability, we see a larger cultural tendency toward homogenization. This framework helped create a receptive audience among Christians and non-Christians for ideals of ritual and cognitive conformity. For the effects of the tetrarchy on the creation of a Christian empire, see Digeser, *Making of a Christian Empire*, esp. 46–63 and eadem, *Threat to Public Piety*, esp. 72–97. We also see aspects of this idealization of uniformity in philosophical attempts at taxonomy and systematization among the likes of Origen and Porphyry in the second and third centuries as well as Iamblichus in the fourth-century. See Marx-Wolf, *Spiritual Taxonomies and Ritual Authority*, esp. 100–125, though I am hesitant to fully embrace her arguments about the importance of agonistic competition with local priests as the impetus for when such taxonomies were produced.

<sup>410</sup> The only possible exception to this is *Phil* 6.6 which connects sexual deviance to incorrect belief. Here too, however, the deviance arises from a belief that both the Logos and a human soul inhabited the body of Christ. Incorrect practice is a product of incorrect belief structures. There is no sense of a demand for ritual conformity, though that certainly did occur in early Christian debates over the date and celebration of Easter as well as the timing of pre- and post-festival fasts.

Christian thought. In stark contrast to the Middle Recension, Judaizing is not imagined in terms of ritual or praxis. Rather, one Judaizes by failing to affirm correct teachings about Christ. In emphasizing theological homogeneity for Christian readers, the redactor reduces Jews and Judaism to deviant Christian beliefs, transforming Jewish history and memory into a failed attempt to believe correctly about the things that really matter.

### **Jews and Judaism Elsewhere in the Long Recension**

Thus far we have evaluated the effect of theological harmonization and pedagogically-oriented reading practices on the kinds of differences and similarities we see between the Middle and Long Recensions of *Magnesians* and *Philadelphians*. The connection between theological harmonization, inculcation of correct cognition, and anti-Judaism is not limited to these epistles. These connections are evident in another letter found in both recensions (*Trallians*) and a letter wholly absent from the Middle Recension (*Philippians*). These examples in which there was no language about Jews or Judaism in the exemplar further demonstrate the ways in which such anti-Judaism is an effect of larger cultural assumptions and trends.

*Trallians* contains two sections in which the Long Recension includes references to Jews where the Middle Recension does not. The first comes as part of a creedal formulation. The Middle Recension urges readers not to listen “when someone speaks apart from Jesus Christ (9.1).” The Middle Recension describes Jesus as

from the race (γένους) of David and from Mary, who was truly born, ate, and drank, was truly persecuted under Pontius Pilate, was truly crucified and died, while those heavenly, earthly, and subterranean looked on (9.1, MR).

The Long Recension, by means of scriptural citation and expansion, gives this passage greater precision and clarity. The Long Recension adds such statements as “the Son of

God...who was truly begotten of God and of the virgin, but not in the same manner (ὡσαύτως) for God and human are not identical (ταύτων, 9.1 LR).” The reference to “Jews” appears as part of additional materials that explain the heavenly, earthly, and subterranean witnesses to the crucifixion. The Long Recension preserves the Middle Recension’s formulation and then adds:

...while those heavenly, earthly, and subterranean looked on. Heavenly ones are those of bodiless natures (τῶν ἀσωμάτων φύσεων), earthly ones are Jews and Romans and those others present (τῶν παρόντων) at that time when the Lord was crucified, and the subterranean ones are the multitude who were raised with (συναναστάντος) the Lord for “Many,” it says, “of the bodies of the holy ones who slept were raised when the tombs were opened (Mt 27:52).” He descended into Hades alone but returned with a multitude, cleaved the eternal fence, and broke down its dividing wall (cf. Eph 2:14, *Trall* 9.3–4 LR).

The Long Recension takes each term—heavenly, earthly, subterranean—and provides a gloss. The Jews appear as the most prominent of earthly witnesses, along with the Romans and a catch-all for anyone those names might leave out. Such ethnic identifiers were unimportant in the Middle Recension with its focus on the totality of the cosmos as witness to the reality of the crucifixion. Such glosses make clear the scholastic orientation of the scribe of the Long Recension. We can easily imagine such comments initially occurring as marginal notes on the text or as instructional asides in a didactic setting. What is striking here, however, is that such clarification involves explicit identification of Jewish presence at the crucifixion. That is, memories of Jewish presence (and involvement?) in the crucifixion are part and parcel of how readers are taught to remember Christ correctly.

The second reference to Jews in the Long Recension of Trallians comes as part of a heresiological list similar to that found in *Philadelphians* discussed above. The Middle Recension of this section contains the final exhortation of the letter, encouraging the reader to flee those who think Jesus suffered in appearance only.

Flee, therefore, the wicked offshoots that bear deadly fruit, which if someone tastes, they will die from it. For these are not the Father's planting. For if they were, they would appear as branches of the cross and their fruit would be incorruptible (11.1 MR).

The Long Recension expands this section by providing a series of glosses on just who the "wicked offshoots" are. Having just warned the reader to flee "godless heresies" because they are "inventions (ἐφευρέσεις) of the devil (10.8 LR)," the Long Recension expounds on these dangers.

Flee him (i.e. the devil) and the wicked offshoots, Simon his first-born son and Menander and Basilides and all of his evil racket (ὀρυγμαδόν), the human-worshippers (ἄνθρωπολάτραις)—the Ebionites—whom the prophet Jeremiah called accursed (cf. Jer 17:5). Flee the impure Nikolaitans, the falsely-named, the lovers of pleasure, the swindlers (συκοφάνταις). For the Nikolaios of the apostles was not such a one.<sup>411</sup> Flee those offspring of evil, Theodotus and Cleobulus, those bearers of deadly fruit, which if someone tastes, they will die immediately, not a transient death, but eternal. They are not a planting of the Father, but accursed offspring. "Every planting," says the Lord, "that was not planted by my heavenly Father, let it be uprooted (Mt 15:13)." For if they were branches of the Father, they would not be "enemies of the cross of Christ (cf. Phil 3:18)," but of those who killed "the Lord of glory (cf. 1 Cor 2:8)." Now, by denying the cross and being ashamed of the passion, they conceal (καλύπτουσι) the transgression (παρανομίαν) of the Jews, the God-fighters and Lord-slayers, for it is too little to call them prophet-slayers (μικρόν γὰρ εἰπεῖν προφητοκτόνων, 11.1–5 LR).

The Long Recension presents a kind of heresiological laundry list—Simon, Menander, Basilides, Ebionites, Theodotus and Cleobulus, and the "impure Nikolaitans." The list performs a knowledge of second-century heresies drawn from the likes of Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Justin.<sup>412</sup> It glosses the Middle Recension's "wicked offshoots" with a

---

<sup>411</sup> Both here and in *Philadelphians* 6, the Long Recension takes care to defend Nikolaios from association with the Nikolaitans. See discussion of such traditions above in n. ?59?. In Acts, Nikolaios is connected to Antioch (Cf. Acts 6:5) which may explain why the Long Recension prefers a distinction between the Nikolaios of Acts and the Nikolaitans of Revelation. The Long Recension specifies Ignatius's relationship to Antioch in ways wholly absent from the Middle Recension (e.g. *Mary to Ignatius*, p.1).

<sup>412</sup> Such heresiologies have been one of the key textual indicators that the Long Recension is a later production as most text-critics recognized such people were later than the Eusebian dating for Ignatius's martyrdom, flourishing (if they were ever anything more than literary characters) in the decades after Ignatius died. The attempt to collect only second-century figures has often been identified as part of the artifice of the forger. Such lists, however, are less a product of the forger's efforts to dupe unsuspecting readers than a product of the gaps in fourth-century Christian



variety of figures whose Christologies were deemed insufficient by later ecclesiastical writers.

Here too, the Long Recension does not stop with the problems of Christian pluriformity. Apparently, the biggest issue with all these “heresies” is that they draw attention away from the “Jews.” Rather, all their errors literally “veil” or “cover up” the horrible thing done by Jews, making it seem as if Jewish participation in Jesus’ death was of little consequence. These evil *exempla* blur the distinction between Jew and Christian, causing people to forget the murderousness of Jews. To the extent that we can discern any reality behind these heresies, they likely had little affection for Jewish teaching or practices. Nevertheless, for the Long Recension, any Christological deviance, whether by making Jesus too human or too divine, is tantamount to contending with God and murdering the messiah all over again.

The bulk of the Long Recension letters that have no parallel in the Middle Recension bolster the image of Ignatius as teacher, thus supporting a pedagogical orientation to the letters’ contents. In most manuscripts, the letter collection begins with an exchange between a certain Mary and Ignatius.<sup>413</sup> The letter from Mary is ostensibly a request for Ignatius to assign a bishop and two others to Mary’s community so that they will “not be without administrators of the divine word (*Mary to Ign* 1.1).” However, the bulk of the brief letter is given over to a defense of potential bishop’s youthfulness that

---

knowledge. The Long Recension merely glosses the Middle Recension with names that would have been familiar to most of the ecclesiastical elite.

<sup>413</sup> In the response to Mary, Ignatius claims that he heard positive report of her from Linus, bishop of Rome (*Ign to Mary* 4.1). This identification seems to suggest a connection the Mary mentioned by Paul in Romans (16:6). Mary’s letter to Ignatius has confirmed the zeal and excellence that was mere rumor before. In addition to drawing closer connections between Ignatius and the church of Rome, the letter again encourages a particular attitude toward letters, making the knowledge obtained by such means more secure than other kinds of reports, even from trusted sources like fellow-bishops. The letter offers more secure knowledge than other kinds of tradition.

follows almost exactly a similar list of biblical exempla we saw in *Magnesians* 3.<sup>414</sup> Beginning with the example of Samuel before briefly discussing Daniel, Jeremiah, Solomon, Josiah, and David (*Mary to Ign* 2–4), Mary teaches Ignatius, commanding him to “dig up (ἀνάσκαλον) your reasoning (τὸν λογισμόν)...and you will know (γνώση)” that this defense of youthfulness is true. While a full account would take too much time, the putative author expresses hope that these examples will be a sufficient reminder (5.1). The list closes with expressions that distance Mary from the role of teacher, disavowing any didactic role: “Not for teaching (διδάσκουσά) you did I set forth these words, but for reminding my father in God (5.2).” Whether teaching someone something new or merely reminding them of what they already know, pedagogy is imagined as central to Ignatius’s epistles.

Ignatius’s response praises Mary’s instruction and wisdom as most worthy of emulation. The letter begins by addressing her as “most faithful, worthy of God, Christ-bearing.” With the last of these, he addresses her by his own cognomen, marking her activity as an imitation of his own (*Ign to Mary* p.1). Ignatius’s response explicitly notes Mary’s remembrance of “numerous quotations of scripture passages (τῶν γραφικῶν χωρίων)” as removing all doubt he might have had about her request (3.2).<sup>415</sup> Ignatius praises her “intelligence (σύνεσις),” particularly how it directs “us” to “partake of the divine springs flowing from (her) soul (1.3).” The letter includes encouragement to

---

<sup>414</sup> The list in *Magnesians* 3 adds the example of Timothy, follower of Paul, and a set of negative *exempla* who failed to properly obey the authorities put over them by God. The doubling of this list suggests that it was drawn from materials the scribe had taken the time to memorize or had to hand for copying. The question of the appropriate age for bishops was certainly a topic of conversation in the fourth and fifth centuries as different writers attempted to construct objective criteria for clergy such as age, marital status, and the like. See Sessa, “Cleric” 218–239.

<sup>415</sup> The Long Recension seems to embody pedagogical assumptions toward all texts, not just the epistles collected under Ignatius’s name. Knowledge of text is figured explicitly and implicitly throughout as the marker of essential knowledge. The clearest example of this is the repeated citation of scriptural supports for various statements. For a recent discussion of this shift to textual knowledge as essential knowledge, see Stroumsa, *Scriptural Universe*.

“avoid those that deny the passion” but acknowledges that it “is absurd to exhort (her)” since her letter had already demonstrated “readiness for every good work and word (5.1).” She has become the model Ignatian pupil, reflecting her teacher in name and speech.

It is only in the Long Recension’s *Philippians* that we see the letters once again invoking Jews in order to teach correctly Christian modes of cognition and practice. Near the close of the letter, the putative author includes a cautionary note for readers: “If anyone celebrates Passover along with the Jews or receives emblems of their feast, he is a partner (κοινωνός) with the killers of the Lord and his apostles (14.2).” Imitation of Jewish practice makes one a “partner” in the deaths of Jesus and the apostles. The letter conflates historical claims about Jews with contemporary Jews and anyone who participates in their rituals.

Although this claim comes as an afterthought embedded in the letter’s farewells, the conflation of historical Jews and contemporary error permeates the epistle’s rhetorical structure. The first section of the letter lays out the goal of the letter:

to remind you of your course (δρόμου) in Christ, ‘in order that you all say the same (1 Cor 1:10,’ ‘united in soul (σύμψυχοι), thinking the same (τὸ ἐν φρονοῦντες, Phil 2:2),’ ‘aligning (στοιχοῦντες) with the same standard (τῷ αὐτῷ κανόνι, cf. Phil 3:16)<sup>416</sup> of faith, as Paul reminded (ἐνουθέτει) you (1.1).

With these words, the entire epistle is constructed as a reminder of how to think and speak Christ correctly in accord with the voice of the apostles. Working from assumptions about the singularity of God, Christ, the Holy Spirit “who operated in Moses, the prophets, and the apostles (1.2),” baptism, and the church, the Long

---

<sup>416</sup> Though most modern editions of the New Testament adopt a different reading of Phil 3:16, the bulk of extant manuscripts include some variant on the formulation given here. Though there are strong text-critical reasons for preferring a reading that lacks any reference to τῷ αὐτῷ κανόνι, this is by far the most common reading of later scribes. Even the second corrector of the sixth-century uncial Claromontanus emended the text to follow this traditional reading.

Recension argues that there “should also be one faith with respect to Christ (ἡ κατὰ Χριστὸν πίστις, 1.2).”

This pedagogical course in theological homogeneity repeatedly appeals to Christian memories of Jews. In constructing a memorial of the incarnation, the scribe of *Philippians* emphasizes that it was the “Son alone” that became human, citing John 1:14 and Proverbs 9:1 in order to conflate Wisdom with the Logos while distinguishing the Son from the Father and the Holy Spirit (3.1). As part of this discussion, the Long Recension asserts that those who “do not believe these thing are under a curse no less than those who crucified the Lord (3.3).” Such disbelief or distrust leads the “ruler of this age to rejoice (3.3).” Apparently nothing delights him more than “someone denying the cross (3.3).”<sup>417</sup> The next section makes explicit the connection between “those who crucified the Lord” and Jews of the past and present. The scribe describes the devil’s folly in bringing about the cross and thus his own destruction. The devil worked in “Judas, the Pharisees, the Sadducees, the old people, the young people, and the priests (4.1)” to bring about the cross and continues to “ally (συμμάχεϊ) with the Jews to deny the cross (4.3).”<sup>418</sup> Together with the warning against sharing in Jewish festivals for fear of becoming a killer of Jesus and the apostles, these other confluences of historical memory and contemporary people participate in the construction of a “separatist” Christian identity. The bulk of the letter may be concerned with developing a “correct” understanding of Jesus as Christ and incarnate Logos, but the means of policing this

---

<sup>417</sup> This phrase closely parallels changes discussed above in *Magnesians* 8.1. The Long Recension is consistent in portraying difference and pluriformity as “denial” of the truth where the Middle Recension treated it as evidence that the community had not yet been fully conformed to Christ. The Long Recension’s position implies an ideal “Church” that exists apart from local congregations against which all individuals and communities can be judged. The Middle Recension imagines a “universal church” but does not seem to grant this ideology any particular ontological reality.

<sup>418</sup> The “ruler of this world” also allies with others. Hellenes ally with him in their pursuit of the “chicanery of magic (4.3)” and the heretics in “fantasy (4.3).” As in depictions of heresy more generally, the devil is here portrayed as pursuing many contradictory courses.

ideology and the rhetorical threats frequently center on inadvertently slipping into “Jewishness” whether by ritual action or theological misstep.

## Conclusions

As we have seen, Jews figure prominently in the Long Recension’s memory-making. In letters like *Magnesians* and *Trallians*, we see an expansion of anti-Jewish rhetoric. Jews are repeatedly remembered for their role in Jesus’ death and labelled “Christ-killers” and “Lord-slayers,” even in contexts where such identifications seem rhetorically superfluous.<sup>419</sup> In *Magnesians*, the Long Recension makes an explicit connection with Jews in instances where the Middle Recension remained silent. “Law” becomes “Jewish law;” Sabbath should be kept, just not “Jewishly;” “Judaism” has “ceased to exist.” An opposition between “Christianizing” and “Judaizing,” seemingly coined in the second century<sup>420</sup> becomes a full-blown anti-Jewish polemic in the hands of a fourth-century reader. The Long Recension of *Trallians* shares this venom, lumping everyone who “denies the cross” together with the “God-fighting, Lord-slaying Jews.” Wrong ideas serve only to “conceal the transgression of the Jews.” So too the Long Recension of *Philadelphians* amplifies the dangers of Jews and Jewishness. In its terse heresiology, we find offhand references to “pseudo-Jews” and “Christ-murdering Jews,” which casually imagine Jews as both a fiction or figment of the imagination and a threat to those who

---

<sup>419</sup> See, e.g. *Tarsians* 3.3 where the text discusses the proto-martyr Stephen. Those who kill Stephen are identified as “the Lord-slaying Jews.” The rhetorical thrust of the passage is an expansion of the idea that the willing suffering of martyrs proves the reality of Christ’s sufferings. While every example focuses on the suffering of saints (Peter, Paul, James, John, and Stephen), only the example of Stephen specifies an agent. When Christian culture-heroes are killed by non-Jews, the agent remains unmarked.

<sup>420</sup> See the discussion in Lieu, *Image and Reality*, 28–30. Lieu notes that *ioudaismos* had known (if not necessarily widely known) connotations in the early second century while creation of and pairing with *christianismos* seems to be an Ignatian invention, one not shared by even such close contemporaries as Polycarp.

identify with Christ. Opposition to “Jewish” ways of thinking and being becomes an essential component of correctly Christian thought.

Despite imagining “Judaism” as something that has long since ceased to have any cognitive or other value, the Long Recension consistently connects Jews with present danger. *Magnesiensians* takes note of Sabbath practices that could not be gleaned from the limited legal prescriptions found in the Pentateuch.<sup>421</sup> The reader is urged to avoid such practices as consuming day-old food and counting steps. Likewise, *Trallians* concern that heretics “conceal the transgression of the Jews” brings historical Jews into the present. Theological deviance makes Christians forget the real enemy of the cross. *Philippians* warns against participating in Jewish festivals for fear that the participant will become an enemy of the cross in the same way the Jews already are. Doing anything with living Jews makes one a participant in crucifying Christ all over again. In each case, the Long Recension makes clear that Jews in the reader’s own day are the same as those responsible for Jesus’ death.

In scholarship, such amplifications and expansions of polemics are typically treated as part and parcel of social conflict and competition.<sup>422</sup> Christian anti-Jewish polemics are themselves a sign of the cultural capital possessed by Jews and Jewish communities in different parts of the Roman Empire. Perhaps paradoxically however, this expansion in polemics takes place at a time when Christian elites enjoyed previously unimagined access to power and privilege. If there was competition, it took place on an uneven playing field. By the late fourth century when the Long Recension was produced,

---

<sup>421</sup> See, e.g. Cohen, “Dancing, Clapping, Meditating” who argues that these additional betray an awareness of actual Jewish practice.

<sup>422</sup> This position, which has its genesis for the study of Jewish–Christian relations in the work of Marcel Simon, has come under scrutiny. At least since Rosemary Radford Ruether’s *Faith and Fratricide*, scholars have grown increasingly aware of the role of internal theological, social, and discursive dynamics in shaping Christian anti-Judaism. Most recently, see, e.g. Joan Taylor, *Anti-Judaism* and Stroumsa, “Anti-Judaism.”

Christians had already begun to turn Palestine into a physical palimpsest, a landscape on which Christian ideals of sanctity were laid over sites from the Jewish past.<sup>423</sup> It is also at this time that Christians began to influence legal proscriptions, helping to shape the extent to which Jews, heretics, and “pagans” could participate in the civic structures and testamentary practices that played a central role in Roman life.<sup>424</sup> Anti-Judaism amplified as bishops and other ecclesiastical elites labored to Christianize the Roman Empire.

While such material and legal changes might fit comfortably with notions of competition and conflict between established entities (Christians and Jews; Christianity and Judaism), the competition model obscures the ways in which such identities were being constructed and the evidence that concern with identity intensified in the fourth and fifth centuries. We see clear interest in delineating religious identity in Christian texts like the *adversus iudaeos* homilies of John Chrysostom as well as tantalizing hints of rabbinic interest in matters of identity.<sup>425</sup> Shifts in how the rabbis employ terms like *minut* and *minim* participate in broader cultural patterns of identity formation.<sup>426</sup> The increase in identifiably Jewish and Christian material culture in the fourth and fifth centuries suggests a similar concern for marking identity materially. For example, while there is scattered evidence for synagogues and churches in the first to third centuries, architecturally identifiable churches *and* synagogues proliferate in the fourth and fifth

---

<sup>423</sup> See, e.g. Jacobs, *Remains of the Jews*.

<sup>424</sup> For a catalogue of laws directed against Jews, see Linder, *Jews in Roman Imperial Legislation*; Stemberger, *Jews and Christians in the Holy Land*, esp. 22–47. The legal evidence is drawn primarily from the Theodosian Code. On the issues related to interpreting such legal compilations, see Harries, *Law and Empire*.

<sup>425</sup> On the former, see Sandwell, *Religious Identity in Late Antiquity* and Maxwell, *Christianization and Communication*. On the rabbinic materials, see Boyarin, *Border Lines*.

<sup>426</sup> Boyarin, *Border Lines*, esp. 202–25.

centuries.<sup>427</sup> The evidence for widespread construction of monumental synagogues in Palestine has led Seth Schwartz to suggest that Christianization helped to produce a “rejudaization of the Jews.”<sup>428</sup> While Christian and Jewish elites often mutually reinforced the distinctiveness of religious identities, extant evidence suggest such efforts met with resistance. The Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies* promoted a different memory of the apostolic past than that propounded by Eusebius, articulating a different taxonomy of identity rooted in local Syrian contexts.<sup>429</sup> Similarly, the Ethiopic *Book of the Rooster* reworked earlier Jewish-Christian traditions to reassert Palestinian traditions against the incursion of Christians from other locales into the Holy Land.<sup>430</sup> Even apocryphal gospel traditions could be used to envision alternative entanglements between Jewishness and devotion to Jesus.<sup>431</sup> Seen alongside the polemics of John Chrysostom and others, texts like the Pseudo-Clementines, the *Book of the Rooster*, and the *Gospel of Nicodemus* evoke a picture of the fourth and fifth centuries as a time when religious identity has taken on new and increased importance.

The Long Recension intersects with this context on numerous fronts. It shares anti-Jewish terms like “Christ-slayer” and “Christ-murderer” with John Chrysostom along with a vivid articulation of the dangers inherent in celebrating Jewish festivals.

Unlike Chrysostom, the Long Recension imagines Christian continuation of such

---

<sup>427</sup> While numerous studies of synagogues and churches attempt to locate differentiation early, most indications of early synagogues and congregations are textual and epigraphical, rather than architectural. Clear architectural evidence is almost non-existent outside the remains from Dura-Europos until the late third century. See, e.g. Runnesson, et al. *The Ancient Synagogue*, Levine, *Ancient Synagogue*, and White, *Social Origins of Christian Architecture*. For a critique of Christian archaeology’s over-dependence on textual remains in its reconstruction of Christian architecture, see Bowes, “Early Christian Archaeology,” 575–619.

<sup>428</sup> Schwartz, *Imperialism and Jewish Society*, 179. The evidence from synagogues figures prominently in these arguments. See, 177–290. Schwartz helpfully analyzes the ways in which imperial legislation served to both “empower and marginalize” Jews.

<sup>429</sup> Reed, “‘Jewish Christianity’ as Counter-history?” 173–216. See also, Côté, “Le problème de l’identité religieuse dans Syrie,” 339–70.

<sup>430</sup> Piovanelli, “*Book of the Cock*.”

<sup>431</sup> Fackler, “*Adversus Adversus Iudaeos*.”



stereotypically Jewish practices as Sabbath observance. In describing for its readers *how* to observe Sabbath, the Long Recension delineates Jewish–Christian entanglement differently than many of its contemporaries. Sabbath is figured as part of Christian devotion insofar as it avoids certain halakhic dimensions, particularly those focused on the body at the expense of mind and soul. Just as for some rabbis, the pinnacle of Sabbath observance rests in pious study, the Christian correctly observes Sabbath by studying scripture.<sup>432</sup> Though largely agreeing with Chrysostom and other Christian elites on the need for clear separation between Christians and Jews, the Long Recension, like many modern Christians, lays claim to certain aspects of Jewish practice as part of Christian practice.<sup>433</sup> Jewish–Christian difference is managed by how one observes Sabbath rather than by reverence for the Sabbath itself.

The comparison of the Middle and Long Recensions allows us to see the ways in which amplification in anti-Jewish rhetoric is itself an effect of certain practices, particularly theological homogenization and a pedagogical orientation to the past. In the Middle Recension, only one theological “error” receives significant attention, the claim that Christ lived and died in appearance only. Given the importance of Jesus’ suffering for the validation of Ignatius’s own impending martyrdom, this is not surprising. Nevertheless, this theological claim never functions as a source for Christian unity. Unity is idealized not in theological terms, but in terms of communal practice and structure. Ecclesiastical hierarchies remain important in the Long Recension but unity is imagined

---

<sup>432</sup> See also, Cohen, “Dancing, Clapping, Meditating.” Yerushalmi Shabbat 15.3 15a includes an “exchange” in which (against R. Haggai) R. Berekhia asserts that Sabbath is primarily for private Torah study. Mishnah Beitzah 5.2 also seems to share the Long Recension’s concern that Sabbath not be observed with clapping and dancing, the discussion of which in the Bavli suggests that it was not widely observed (B. Beitzah 30a).

<sup>433</sup> Denominations like the Seventh Day Adventists and others explicitly maintain Sabbath observance on the grounds that it was the practice of Jesus and his disciples.

more in cognitive terms. The act of “believing the same about the same” secures Christian life as much as any matter of practice or communal participation.<sup>434</sup>

The pedagogical orientation to the past is even more important in amplifying anti-Judaism. As we will see in the next chapter, not every reader of Ignatius imagined the text as bearing theological, ritual, or didactic authority. For those readers invested in the Middle Recension as a monument to Ignatius’s exemplary endurance or as an antiquarian artifact, the specific contours of epistolary context, historical situation, and theological vision remain marginal at best. For the scribe of the Long Recension, what the text teaches remains at the forefront, with each unit of the letter approached as if it contained specific didactic content.<sup>435</sup> This atomization of the letter results in very different approaches to the terminology of “Judaism” and “Christianity.” In the Middle Recension of *Magnesians*, Jews and Judaism are mentioned as the culmination of an argument about “living according to law” rather than “according to Jesus Christ (*Magn* 8).” It is, however, the Middle Recension’s extended discussion of Sabbath observance by the prophets (9) that draws the bulk of the redactor’s attention. The redactor of the Long Recension reads the Middle Recension as a discussion of *how* Jews and Christians are different rather than an exhortation to avoid things that distract from Christ. In *Philadelphians*, “Judaism” and “Christianism” are read differently. Rather than focusing on the unusual phrases of “Judaism” and “Christianism” that attract so much attention in contemporary scholarship, the Long Recension reads this section as teaching a person to “speak about Jesus Christ (*Phild.* 6.1, MR)” and do so with “an undivided heart (6.2,

---

<sup>434</sup> This assumption appears to have been widely shared. Nearly every theological controversy in the wake of Nicaea disagrees over the content of belief and the meaning of specific words, but nowhere is there preserved a clear voice dissenting from the ideal of theological homogeneity. It remains unclear, however, what practices undergird such assumptions though various strands of Platonism and ideologies of ideal governance seem implicated.

<sup>435</sup> We saw this previously in the ways expansions related directly to a phrase or sentence found in a particular section rather than to any sense of a larger goal or theme to each letter. That is, the letters are not imagined as rhetorically unified.

MR).” The redactor does not see these terms as having anything to do with Jewish–Christian difference. Instead, the Long Recension details the many ways of speaking correctly and incorrectly about Jesus Christ. Jews find a place as an example of Christological error. Even this portrayal of Jews stems from a pedagogical orientation to texts, as the examples from *Trallians* make clear. Jewish involvement in Jesus’s death functions as a historical memory of Christological error in the context of a statement of Christological truth.

This focus on what a text can teach the reader (along with rewriting to make that teaching clear) provides an indication of at least one of the ways in which rhetoric becomes reality. Rhetoric becomes reality when encountered through the practices of the school room.<sup>436</sup> Reading antiquarian artifacts in order to shape correct thought and praxis in the present was at the heart of *paideia*.<sup>437</sup> As Cribiore notes, “imitation of literary models was at the core of a program in rhetoric.”<sup>438</sup> While Ignatian writings likely never formed part of any formal curriculum, such deeply ingrained reading practices provided a set of assumptions that made it seem natural to read surviving early Christian texts for their theological and ethical content. Practices of imitation also provided the tools by which a scribe could produce new texts within a larger textual tradition by and about Ignatius. In a period when Christians had begun to closely examine their own past and to mark its fundamental changelessness and

---

<sup>436</sup> This seems to depend on the authority granted the teacher more so than the authority granted the text. That is, as the one who sets the curriculum, the teacher is trusted to provide the texts that will best model correct thought and praxis.

<sup>437</sup> See, e.g. Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind*, 220–244.

<sup>438</sup> Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind*, 225. At earlier educational levels, socialization took place through the contents of models and the repetitive practices of copying and memorization, as well as the submission to those in power inculcated in student-teacher relationships.

homogeneity,<sup>439</sup> the scribe of the Long Recension read the Middle Recension as if it exemplified that timelessness and thus had something to teach readers about how to think in correctly Christian ways in the midst of a fractious church. When implicitly anti-Jewish rhetoric is read with these assumptions, it gains a new purchase in the world. As part of a textual tradition that locates itself in the sub-apostolic age, it retrojects Jewish-Christian difference to the very historical foundations of the church. By connecting this difference with theological pedagogy, the text locates social and ritual separation as a means to achieving correctly Christian attitudes. Despite the fact that Christianization involves some level of Judaization,<sup>440</sup> the reduction of Jewishness to Christological error allows Christians to claim traditions like Sabbath observance without tainting their Christian subjectivity. Rhetoric aimed at fostering social cohesion becomes a tool for teaching people to become aware of themselves as Christians. Inscribing Judaism helps to make Christians.

In the next chapter, we will explore the reception of Ignatius's work, providing a more detailed context for the ways in which textual transmission shaped the Long Recension and provided the opportunity for its textual interventions to have a long afterlife. As we will see, the scribe of the Long Recension's pedagogical orientation toward Ignatius's writings was in no way an obvious, necessary, or natural outcome of the martyr bishop's authority. Rather, the Long Recension's close engagement with Ignatian textuality is itself unusual in the transmission of the Ignatian corpus. For many readers, Ignatius was a more useful icon and exemplum apart from his textual remains.

---

<sup>439</sup> E.g. Eusebius in the *Praeparatio, Demonstratio, and Ecclesiastical History*. A similar claim is made in Epiphanius' *Panarion*. On the latter, see Schott, "Heresiology as World History," 546–63.

<sup>440</sup> E.g. in identifying Jesus as Christ/Messiah and in claiming Jewish textual traditions. For a provocative treatment of some of these issues, see Reed, "Messianism."

## CHAPTER 4—REMEMBERING IGNATIUS, TRANSMITTING IGNATIUS: EXEMPLARITY AND THE RECEPTION OF THE IGNATIAN CORPUS

Up to this point, my analysis has been narrowly philological, focused on “language as concretized in texts”<sup>441</sup> and its rhetorical effect in various moments of history. What has remained unconsidered thus far is the history of the texts themselves, not (only) as interpreted, but as copied, carried, shared, read, and remembered. The goal of this chapter is to reconstruct the Ignatian corpus’s lines of transmission to the degree they are available in the literary record.

While dependent, as always, on the pioneering and detailed work of Lightfoot, my goal in this chapter is not merely to rehash his extensive list of certain, plausible, and possible citations and allusions to the Ignatian corpus.<sup>442</sup> Instead, this chapter represents an attempt to model another approach to textual analysis that accounts for the agency of readers and the materiality of texts. While critiques of contemporary notions of authorship abound,<sup>443</sup> these theorizations of composition and reading have only rarely been brought to bear on the actual scholarly practices and habits of reading texts.<sup>444</sup>

---

<sup>441</sup> Pollock, “Liberating Philology,” 19, argues that the proper object of philology is the “theory of language-as-used-in-texts,” thus occupying a unique disciplinary domain that covers the interpretation of a text “in its genesis, in its tradition of reception, and in its presence to our own subjectivity (19).” For a more detailed introduction, see Pollock, “Philology in Three Dimensions.”  
<sup>442</sup> See the unparalleled collection of possible and likely citations in Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 1.2.135–95.

<sup>443</sup> While the literature is extensive, scholars typically point to several foundational works: Foucault, “What is an Author?”; Barthes, “Death of the Author;” Chartier, *Order of Books*. To a lesser extent, the works of Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination* and Kristeva, *Desire in Language*, who first brought Bakhtin to the attention of Francophone and Anglophone scholars, have challenged and limited the agency of the author through a focus on intertextuality. Insofar as every inscription and utterance is “an intersection of textual surfaces” and a “dialogue among several writings: that of the writer, the addressee (or the character) and the contemporary or earlier cultural context (Kristeva, “Word, Dialogue, Novel,” 36),” the agency of the author is circumscribed on multiple fronts.

<sup>444</sup> In particular, Hindy Najman has gone a long way toward incorporating Foucauldian and, more recently, Nietzschean critiques of philological practice into the historical and philological analysis

Despite the regular invocation of theoretical paradigms, scholars of Christian antiquity continue to interpret and identify the meaning of texts as if the conditions which determine our own possibility of reading are largely transhistorical, rather than products of our own professionalization as scholars.<sup>445</sup> When we read texts like those of Ignatius, our inclination is to ask what it “meant” by identifying what its inert inscriptions “mean” in relation to other texts and events. But can we say what a text “meant” without exploring what reading means or what people thought a text was for? That is, what are the conditions which made reading possible? What expectations about reading did readers bring to the practice of reading? Reception history provides a potentially useful method for taking into account different relationships between text and reader and reckoning with the effects of those differences on how and what a text might mean.

It is questionable whether we could ever become aware enough of the practices that shape our own reading to fully appreciate the differences and similarities between scholarly expectations of texts and those of past readers. After all, even a focus on reception does not guarantee a recognition of the conditions that produce a particular kind of reading. For example in the last few decades, there has been a resurgence of interest in the *Nachleben* of texts, especially “biblical” texts.<sup>446</sup> Bible scholars, in particular, have looked to ancient readings of biblical texts in patristic and medieval

---

of ancient texts. See, e.g. *Secoding Sinai* and *Losing the Temple*. Johnson, *Readers and Reading Culture*, provides another example, looking at the ways in which reading practices and insights from the sociology of reading give insight into different ancient rhetorical practices.

<sup>445</sup> Bourdieu, “Readers, Reading, the Literate, Literature,” 95.

<sup>446</sup> E.g. Mitchell, *The Heavenly Trumpet*; Strawbridge, *The Pauline Effect*; Gregory and Tuckett, *Trajectories through the New Testament and Apostolic Fathers*; and Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*. Many more works focus on the reception of individual passages or pericopes. These trends in scholarship have also gained traction in the worlds of religious professionals and lay devotion. See, especially, the series *The Church’s Bible* edited by Robert Wilken and *Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture* edited by Thomas Oden. Both series are dedicated to premodern Christian exegesis of biblical texts (especially patristic) and compiled for wider audiences. The *Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture* series, in particular, is marketed as an aid to personal scripture study.

writers in order to understand what they thought scripture meant, especially ethically and theologically.<sup>447</sup> Such an approach to reception presumes that our own scholarly concern with meaning governed the reading practices of those who cited and transmitted texts.

We need not, however, explore reception and transmission through the lens of meaning. If we examine the reception history of a particular text through questions of interpretation and the kinds of reading practices brought to bear upon them, we can gain a better sense of what assumptions readers brought to different texts.<sup>448</sup> That is, we can begin to understand what a text was for and what made the reading of it possible and even desirable.

The reception of Ignatius of Antioch provides a useful test case for such methods. Because of the extensive text-critical work done on the corpus, the early transmission of the texts has been amply documented in scholarship. The likes of Lightfoot and Zahn collected numerous citations of and allusions to Ignatius and his epistles in order to demonstrate the chronological priority of the Middle Recension.<sup>449</sup> Such collections show that early readers invariably cite Ignatian letters in ways that conform to the extant text of the Middle Recension. In addition to a ready data set, the Long Recension offers an unusually detailed reading of an earlier text that provides a useful comparison to the engagement of other readers with the Middle Recension. How do the expectations and practices that produce the kind of close reading (and rewriting) we saw in the Long

---

<sup>447</sup> For an analysis and critique of this in relationship to “penitential” readings of the Hebrew Bible, see Lambert, *How Repentance Became Biblical*.

<sup>448</sup> We do not, after all, read a novel about time travel with the same set of questions and expectations that we bring to food labels or a software licensing agreement.

<sup>449</sup> The lists themselves embody a certain set of scholarly assumptions about the relationship between texts and readers. Such lists implicitly mark readers as derivative to the meaning and content of earlier texts without closely engaging or analyzing what kinds of relationships different readers cultivated with texts.

Recension compare with the practices of other readers?<sup>450</sup> Furthermore, the Long Recension's almost complete displacement of the Middle Recension in the manuscript tradition raises its own questions about reading and transmission? What conditions allow for the success of this kind of textual intervention? This data set, however, has rarely been considered as evidence for other kinds of historical questions.<sup>451</sup>

In this chapter, my goal is to tease out a narrative of remembering, forgetting, and (re)collecting. By tracing the reception of the Ignatian epistles between the second and sixth centuries, we see different refractions of Ignatius, from exemplar of endurance and icon of a universal church to Christological proof text. I contend that the words on the page serve not as depository of meaning, much less ethical and theological instruction, but as a monument, an object, whose meaning is repeatedly reinvented. As an object whose primary value did not necessarily rest in its meaning or rhetorical content, there were few barriers (beyond those inherent in any act of ancient textual production) to the reproduction and transmission of the Long Recension.

### **Inviting Exemplarity: Ignatius on How to Read His Letters**

As noted in the introduction, there is an extensive literature on the Ignatian epistles, covering everything from his anti-Jewish rhetoric and role in the formulation of

---

<sup>450</sup> The previous chapters have all analyzed some aspect of the scribe of the Long Recension's reading practices and central assumptions. This chapter will try to situate those practices and the success of the Long Recension within the reading assumptions of writers who engage with Ignatius or the Ignatian textual tradition.

<sup>451</sup> An important exception is a brief essay by Grant, "Apostolic Fathers' First Thousand Years." There Grant asks an important but typically overlooked question, "How and why were the writings of the Apostolic Fathers transmitted during the first thousand years of their existence (20)?" Though his conclusions are rather traditional (e.g. Ignatius is transmitted because of his ecclesiastical status and consonance with later "catholic" theology), he recognizes the importance of geographical, ethical, literary, and antiquarian concerns for the survival of some texts rather than others.



episcopacy and church order to his evidence for the theological and ecclesiastical concerns of Asia Minor and Antioch. While scholars frequently disagree as to the exact reasons for and location of Ignatius's opponents, there is general agreement that the Middle Recension addresses pressing concerns about conflict and communal fragmentation. As one scholar has noted, the letters focus especially on encouraging communal harmony or *homonoia*, a topic commonly addressed on the coinage of the High Empire and in speeches given to civic leaders or at civic festivals.<sup>452</sup> Rather than trying once again to locate the "opponents" of Ignatius or focusing on what effect Ignatius sought to have on the communities to which he wrote, this section will focus on the kinds of reading and textual engagement the letters imagine. That is, how does the letters' rhetoric assume and encourage a specific orientation between reader and text? How do the literary practices found in the second-century recension of the letters set the stage for later reading practices?

One literary practice that figures prominently in establishing the relationship between reader and text is the repeated characterization of letters and messengers as a suitable and sufficient means for encountering a person or group (e.g. *Eph* 1.3, 9.2; *Magn* 2.1, 6.1; *Trall* 1.1). While scholars have correctly identified the Middle Recension's references to seeing the entire community in its representatives as an extension of an epistolary trope,<sup>453</sup> little attention has been given to the role this trope plays in encouraging certain approaches to the letters.<sup>454</sup> Letters and their carriers were

---

<sup>452</sup> Lotz, *Ignatius and Concord*. This seems to be one more area in which Ignatius imitates Paul. Lotz acknowledges the influence of Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation* on his own analysis of Ignatius, but he does not ever explicitly consider the ways in which this aspect of the Ignatius corpus is as much an imitation of Paul and thus part of a Pauline reading culture as it is an effect of wider cultural discourse on *homonoia*.

<sup>453</sup> See, e.g. Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 43, and Koskenniemi, *Studien zur Idee und Phraseologie*, 172–180.

<sup>454</sup> When this issue is discussed (as in Fitzgerald and Hutchinson's essay in Morello and Morrison, *Ancient Letters...*), the focus remains on the ways in which the author exploits readers'

frequently characterized as vehicles for encountering an absent person despite occasional laments about the ways in which the letter could never fully embody its sender.<sup>455</sup> Ignatius goes to great lengths to encourage readers to see the letters as an embodiment of himself. In characterizing bishops and other ambassadors from the congregations of Asia Minor as embodiments of their communities, Ignatius suggests that the ambassadors were sent for just such a purpose. Their own actions were predicated on the possibility of their ambassadors making Ignatius present to them. In sending letters, Ignatius is merely responding in kind with a gift that embodies his own person. This comes through most clearly in the repeated references to his imprisonment. It is his chains that “hymn the churches (*Magn* 2.1),” “exhort” the reader (*Trall* 12.2), and make visible the reality of Christ’s own suffering (*Trall* 10.1; *Smyr* 4.2). In *Romans*, he goes so far as to suggest that his letter might be a better embodiment of himself than his material presence, urging the reader to be persuaded by what he writes rather than anything he might say when they meet in person (7.2). Ignatius not only encourages the reader to see the letter as an embodiment of himself but represents the imprisoned and suffering Ignatius as the truest version of himself. Both his person and his actions are embodied in the letters, marking them as a monument to his own exemplary action.

In constructing his letters as an embodiment of his exemplary action, Ignatius follows the pattern established by those communal representatives who visited with and aided him on his journey. Roman exemplary discourse, in the analysis of Matthew Roller, included four central components:

---

assumptions (e.g. using this aspect of letters to further a literary persona) rather than as an exchange between writer and reader in which even this aspect of letters must be encouraged and negotiated. See, e.g., Fitzgerald, “The Letter’s the Thing,” and Hoffer, “Cicero’s ‘Stomach,’” both in Morello and Morrison, *Ancient Letters*.

<sup>455</sup> Trapp, *Greek and Latin Letters*, 38–42. Letter writers could be equally cautious about this assumption as letters could be intercepted and altered in numerous ways before reaching the intended recipient. That is, the reception of letters likely depended a great deal on how much the recipient trusted the messenger who carried them.

1. An *action* held to be consequential for the Roman community at large and admitting of ethical categorization—that is regarded as embodying (or conspicuously failing to embody) crucial social values;
2. An *audience* of eyewitnesses who observe this action, place it in a suitable ethical category, and judge it “good” or “bad” in that category;
3. *Commemoration* of the deed—that is, commemoration not only of the action, but of its consequence to the community, and of the ethical valuation it received from the primary audience. Commemoration occurs by means of a *monument*, a device that calls the deed to memory...Monuments aim to make the deed more widely visible by constructing “secondary” audiences—person who were not eyewitnesses but learn of the deed through the monument;
4. Finally, *imitation*: any spectator to such a deed, whether primary or secondary, is enjoined to strive to replicate or surpass the deed himself.<sup>456</sup>

When read in light of these aspects of exemplary discourse, the Middle Recension occupies a mediating role in this discourse. It takes its structure from the audience who identified Ignatius’s action as important and provides the monument by which that deed will be presented to secondary audiences. The letters are a consequence, an effect, of those very communities who identified Ignatius’s action as exemplary.

Ignatius and his readers were already well-prepared for such an exchange. Exemplary discourse played a central role in literary and rhetorical practices from the classical Greek world into later Hellenistic and Roman educational practices.<sup>457</sup> While some philosophers and orators were critical of the content of *exempla*, especially the mythical content, few, if any, questioned the utility of the method.<sup>458</sup> Even the very practices of reading and writing themselves were shaped by the same assumptions of imitation, of achieving literacy as a pedagogical act. Students began to write by tracing

---

<sup>456</sup> Roller, “Exemplarity in Roman Culture,” 4–5 (emphasis in original).

<sup>457</sup> Morgan, *Literate Education*, 144–149. For a useful analysis of scholarship on exemplarity in the construction of *paideia*, see Reed, “Construction and Subversion,” 189–198.

<sup>458</sup> See, e.g. Isocrates, *Antidosis* 277, who recommends historical *exempla* over mythical but clearly values exemplarity as central to ethical education. Plato was also critical of this ethical approach to Homer, in particular. Nevertheless, Plato’s citations of and allusions to Homer do as much to perpetuate poetic exemplarity as to critique it. On this tension, see Stephen Halliwell, “Subjection of Muthos to Logos.” More generally, see Skidmore, *Practical Ethics*, 7–9.

model letters provided by their teachers and later learned the elements of style and oratory from imitating the writings of model rhetors whose exemplary value was perpetuated by generations of educational practice.<sup>459</sup> The very practices that made it possible to read and write already encouraged readers to evaluate literary writing<sup>460</sup> with regard to its exemplary value.

The rhetoric of the second-century Ignatian epistles and other early Christian texts suggests that the discourse of exemplarity played an important role in the construction and perpetuation of Christian communities. We see this most clearly in the reception of Paul. Deutero-Pauline epistles like Ephesians treat Paul as exemplary, providing new letters that extend and adapt Paul's language and style for new situations, frequently giving greater attention to suffering and imprisonment than those letters most closely associated with Paul. 1 Clement explicitly praises Paul as a "great example of endurance (ὑπομονῆς μέγιστος ὑπογραμμός, 5.7)" and enjoins the Corinthian congregation to "take up the epistle of the blessed apostle Paul (47.1)" to bring an end to the *stasis* that plagued the community.<sup>461</sup> Paul is memorialized as exemplary, both in his own endurance and in his ethical exhortation.<sup>462</sup>

---

<sup>459</sup> Criboire, *Gymnastics of the Mind*, 127–59; 220–244.

<sup>460</sup> By this, I mean only to distinguish literary writing from that of documentary writing, the kind necessary for drawing up lists of transactions or contracts (wills, marriage contracts, etc.). It is unclear whether these more functional forms of literacy were taught in the same ways as those of elites preparing for more formal grammatical and rhetorical education. There is evidence that some scribes inscribed both literary and documentary texts, but this does little to shed light on how artisans and other middling sorts who relied on basic literacy in their everyday work acquired that literacy or if they relied solely on hired scribes.

<sup>461</sup> Curiously, the kind of factionalism described by "Clement" as result of envy and jealousy is described as the reason why Paul and other noble *exempla* were persecuted and put to death (1 Clement 5.2). Not only is Paul a model of piety but also a warning against the kinds of behaviors that lead to suffering and death.

<sup>462</sup> Here I largely agree with Lindemann, "Paul, 'Clement,' and Ignatius," 9–16 though I find his emphasis on the search for the "influence of Pauline theology (16)" misplaced. What is most interesting about Paul in the deutero-Pauline letters, the Pastoral Epistles, and early Christian writings is that he emerges primarily as an ethical figure and curator of Christian community, not a theologian. His writings survive to become a theological touchstone primarily because he

For Ignatius as well, Pauline writings and Paul himself function as key parts of a discourse of exemplarity. In *Ephesians*, the addressees are identified as “fellow initiates (συνμύσται) with Paul” and Ignatius expresses a desire to “be found in his footsteps”<sup>463</sup> when he “attains to God (12.2).” The Ephesians imitate Paul in their adherence to the mysteries he proclaimed, and Ignatius follows the same path as Paul. Even though Ignatius distinguishes himself from Paul and the apostles in terms of his ability to command (*Rom* 4.3; *Trall* 3.3), he characterizes himself in ways reminiscent of Paul. He greets the Trallians “in an apostolic manner (p.1)” and constructs other epistolary greetings in ways reminiscent of Paul’s letters (e.g. *Magn* p.1, cf. 1 Cor 1.3).<sup>464</sup> Even his self-deprecation echoes Paul’s claim to be “someone untimely born (ἔκτρωμα)” and “least of the apostles (1 Cor 15:8–9).” Ignatius calls himself the “least” of the church in Syria (*Trall* 13.1; *Eph* 21.2; *Smyr* 11.1) and “one untimely born (*Rom* 9.2).” Like Paul, he claims insight into “things visible and invisible (*Trall* 5.3; cf. 2 Cor 12:4),” and suggests, on one occasion, that his audience is akin to “infants (*Trall* 5.1, cf. 1 Cor 3:1–2).” On no occasion does the Middle Recension present an exact Pauline citation or introduce Pauline language with any kind of citation formula.<sup>465</sup> Instead, Ignatius imitates and

---

provided an ethical model that was useful for creating and perpetuating a distinctive communal ethos.

<sup>463</sup> Many scholars see here an allusion to 2 Corinthians 12:18.

<sup>464</sup> Reis, “Following in Paul’s Footsteps,” 296. On the greetings, see also Carruth, “Praise for the Churches.”

<sup>465</sup> Scholars often explain this as a result of writing the letters under duress. See, e.g. Lindemann, “Paul, ‘Clement,’ and Ignatius,” 17. Given the extensive use, it seems likely that Ignatius knew Paul well enough to cite him directly and thus the lack of direct citation of Paul is a choice rather than a necessity. Cf. Massaux, *Influence of the Gospel of Saint Matthew*, 1:108 who claims that Ignatius knows Paul so well he “juggles...various Pauline texts to express his own thought.” Grant, *The Apostolic Fathers*, summarizes the issue well: “...sometimes (Ignatius) quoted, sometimes he alluded, sometimes he allusively quoted, and sometimes he quotingly alluded. Any idea of exactness in analyzing his usage must be read in by the analyst. It does not exist in Ignatius’ own writings (59).”

performs Paul in the style, language, and structure of his arguments.<sup>466</sup> As such, he treats Paul's letters as an artifact in a discourse of exemplarity rather than a repository of authorized teachings.<sup>467</sup>

Combined with the stylistic imitations and the parallel circumstances evoked by the lives of Ignatius and Paul that implicitly invite readings rooted in exemplarity,<sup>468</sup> the Middle Recension's own explicit calls to imitation create and encourage similar expectations. Where Paul located himself as an intermediary in exemplarity (cf. 1 Cor 4:16, 11:1), Ignatius maintains the divine, whether Christ or God, as the primary *exemplum*. He praises the Ephesians as "imitators of God (1.1)" and exhorts them to "imitate the Lord" in enduring mistreatment and rejection (10.3) rather than those who boast, blaspheme, and err (10.2). This imitation can involve different ethical expectations depending on who is doing the imitating. When speaking of himself, Ignatius associates his suffering and endurance with that of Christ. He pleads with the Roman congregation that they allow him "to be an imitator of the suffering of my God (6.3)." He describes himself as "enduring (ὑπομένω) all things in order to suffer with (συμπαθεῖν) Jesus Christ (*Smyr* 4.2) and closes his letter to the Roman congregation "in the endurance of Jesus Christ (10.2)." For others, however, the modes of imitating Christ's exemplarity depend more on interpersonal relationships, especially the ways in which people engage with Ignatius and the networks he encourages. Ignatius praises the Trallians as "imitators of God (1.2)" because they sent their bishop to support and

---

<sup>466</sup> For a list of words found in Ignatius that are prevalent or unique to the Pauline corpus, see Massaux, *Influence of the Gospel of St. Matthew*, 1:114–116. On structural similarity of argument, see Lindemann, "Paul, 'Clement,' and Ignatius," 19–23.

<sup>467</sup> This is in part an effect of Pauline language and reading practices that reinforced those expectations. Paul, after all, exhorts the Corinthian assembly to "be imitators of me, as I am of Christ (1 Cor 11:1)." For a detailed analysis of this language in Paul, see Castelli, *Imitating Paul*, esp. 89–118.

<sup>468</sup> Reis, "Following in Paul's Footsteps," 295. Both were church leaders who worked at Antioch, wrote letters to churches in Asia Minor and Rome, and journeyed to Rome in order to die.

encourage him (1.1–2). Certain individuals are even described with the rather rare Latin loan word, *exemplarion*, because of the love and kindness they have shown to Ignatius (*Trall* 3.2; *Eph* 2.1; *Smyr* 12.1).<sup>469</sup> For those unable to aid Ignatius directly, he enjoins imitation through obedience to the bishop. Congregations can imitate Christ by obeying the bishop just like Jesus obeyed the Father (*Phild* 7.2, cf. *Magn* 13.2) or by acting in concert with the bishop just as “the Lord did nothing apart from the Father (*Magn* 7.1).”

Ignatius and his contemporaries were already steeped in educational practices and civic rituals that utilized exemplarity for social reproduction.<sup>470</sup> Early evidence for the reception of Paul suggests that Christian communities had adopted Pauline exemplarity as a means to reproduce their own somewhat fragile place in the urban landscapes of Rome, Syria, and Asia Minor. In seeing Paul and Christ as *exempla* of his own imprisonment, Ignatius’s self-perception appears as an effect of exemplary discourse. His audience could certainly disagree with this assessment—as seems to have been the case in Philadelphia (*Phild* 7.1–8.1)—but the disagreement is not over Ignatian exemplarity itself but the ethical values attached to it.<sup>471</sup> As we trace the memory of Ignatius through later readers, the slippage between *exemplum* and its socio-ethical significance amplifies, helping to create the conditions for engagement with Ignatian traditions that does not depend on the contents of the texts. That is, Ignatius’s act of

---

<sup>469</sup> Ignatius is the earliest witness to this term in Greek. In a search of TLG, the word appears only fourteen times with seven of those in either the Middle or Long Recension. The term is usually translated with the generic sense of “embodiment” or “example.” Such generalizations seem to derive from the Latin term’s use for the exemplar in practices of textual reproduction. This suggests that thinking about exemplarity often meant thinking about people as texts which makes it remarkably easy to think about texts as people.

<sup>470</sup> Roller, “Exemplarity in Roman Culture,” notes the “cyclical dimension” in exemplary discourse (6). “Deeds generate other deeds, spawning ever more audiences and monuments, in an endless loop of social reproduction.”

<sup>471</sup> In particular, the idea that some Philadelphians suspected that Ignatius had advance knowledge of communal disputes and thus abused his status in picking the side of the bishop (7.2) hints at a positive valuation of Ignatius’s imprisonment that soured when he tried to tell them what to do.

writing succeeds in perpetuating the exemplarity of his imprisonment and death but is ultimately ineffective at managing the ethical significance of his deeds.

## **The Ignatian Corpus before Constantine**

Compared to scholarly production on Ignatius, evidence for interest in Ignatius is relatively sparse and remarkably ambivalent.<sup>472</sup> Only three early Christian writers exhibit any knowledge of Ignatius: Polycarp, Irenaeus, and Origen. Allen Brent addresses this question directly, suggesting that the “fundamental enigma” of the Ignatian corpus is “why Irenaeus and, perhaps, Origen refer to him (Ignatius) circumspectly and even hesitantly, and only later in the second century” and why the “church order implied by the Ignatian letters and that of Polycarp’s *Philippians*” differ.<sup>473</sup> Brent helpfully identifies that the primary issue that gives rise to seemingly intractable debates over authenticity and forgery in the Ignatian textual tradition is the problem of reception.<sup>474</sup> If the letters are early, why do we find so few people engaging with them, much less treating them as authoritative? Brent’s solution is both plausible and provocative. He argues that readers approached Ignatius hesitantly because Ignatius recast the language of church order and ritual in terms redolent of civic processions related to imperial cult and the maintenance

---

<sup>472</sup> As Grant, “Apostolic Fathers’ First Thousand Years,” highlights, evidence for the reception of most of the Apostolic Fathers is sparse. The two most important in later tradition, Ignatius and Clement, were both first witnessed in Polycarp’s *Philippians*. They passed through similar channels of transmission as well, though Clement of Alexandria knew 1 Clement but does not appear to have known Ignatius suggesting possible geographical limitations on certain textual traditions.

<sup>473</sup> Brent, “Enigma of Ignatius,” 434. These issues are dealt with in more detail in idem, *Ignatius of Antioch and the Second Sophistic*.

<sup>474</sup> A recent paper at the Society for Biblical Literature annual meeting has questioned the authenticity of Ignatius’s *Polycarp* through an analysis of Christological titles that suggests different authors at work in *Smyrnaeans* and *Polycarp*. See Thompson, “Rubbish under the Name of Ignatius.”



of civic (and imperial) *homonoia*.<sup>475</sup> Despite Ignatius's attempt to inculcate church order for the communities of Asia Minor through reference to civic cult, Polycarp (and presumably others) found this grounding for church organization "unintelligible."<sup>476</sup>

While Brent may very well be right that the letters' contents were in some way unintelligible to early readers, we need not assume that the theological and ecclesiological content determined the reception of these letters. The early reception of Ignatius suggests that the content of the letters had little to do with how later readers used or encouraged their readers to make use of the Ignatian tradition. In both Polycarp and Irenaeus, exemplarity plays a key role in the transmission of Ignatius's letters. While these writers do not ignore content entirely, they treat the letters primarily as an embodiment of a person and his memory rather than a repository or vehicle for a specific teaching. By contrast, Origen reads (some?) of the letters apart from any memory of Ignatius, the monument of his letters remains but their exemplary value has vanished.

In the second century, Polycarp wrote to a congregation at Philippi in Asia Minor in response to their request for Ignatian memorabilia.<sup>477</sup> In fulfilling their request, Polycarp repeatedly frames Ignatius as exemplary and worthy of imitation alongside numerous other figures while providing different modes of correctly imitating Ignatius than those suggested by his letters. Polycarp's greeting frames the entire letter in terms of exemplary discourse praising the Philippians as those who "received the replicas (δεξαμένοις τὰ μιμήματα) of true love and escorted, when it fell to you, those wrapped in

---

<sup>475</sup> Brent, "Enigma of Ignatius," 434–56; idem, *Ignatius of Antioch and the Second Sophistic*, esp. 41–120 and 231–318. On the Ignatius and the ideal of *homonoia* more specifically, see Lotz, *Ignatius and Concord*, esp. 157–196 and Maier, "Politics and Rhetoric."

<sup>476</sup> Brent, "Enigma of Ignatius," 434; idem, *Ignatius of Antioch and the Second Sophistic*, 312–318.

<sup>477</sup> While there have been challenges to the authenticity of this letter (or letters) and its attribution to Polycarp, my arguments do not depend on the letter being correctly attributed. A revised date could very well alter the picture of how the Ignatian epistles were read and received, but would not entirely overturn my analysis as the references to this letter in Irenaeus and Eusebius both suggest a second-century dating for it. For details, see below.

fittingly holy (ἀγιοπρεπέσιν) chains (*Phil* 1.1).” The Philippians are praiseworthy because they possess an abundance of *exempla*. They knew the apostle Paul (1.2, 3.1, 9.1), Ignatius and his companions (9.1), and even members of their own assembly (9.1) who were worthy models. Each of these figures has in some way imitated Christ, whose endurance is identified as the model for all Christian life. Polycarp exhorts his readers:

Therefore, let us become imitators (μιμηταὶ) of (Christ’s) endurance (ὑπομονῆς), and if we suffer because of his name, let us glorify him. For he has set us this memorial (ὑπόγραμμα) and we have trusted this (8).

Christ’s endurance gives ways to other *exempla*.

Therefore, I exhort all of you to obey the Word of righteousness and to stand firm with all endurance (ὑπομονήν)<sup>478</sup>, which you also saw with your eyes not only in Ignatius and Zosimus and Rufus, but also in others from among you, and in Paul and the rest of the apostles (9).

In each case, exemplarity serves to underscore the fundamental value of “endurance.” As in the Middle Recension, Paul and others are identified as imitators of Christ. Where Ignatius’s rhetoric identifies primarily himself with Christ’s suffering, Polycarp places Ignatius alongside other memorials to Christ’s endurance.

Polycarp’s epistle situates the collection and transmission of Ignatius’s epistles in the context of this exemplary discourse.<sup>479</sup> After identifying Ignatius as one of the “replicas of true love” seen by the Philippian congregation, Polycarp describes what he has appended to the letter.

---

<sup>478</sup> There is a doubling here between the verbal form ὑπομένειν and the nominal form ὑπομονήν of a shared root. Endurance is such the focus here that the readers are exhorted, literally, to endure all endurance.

<sup>479</sup> It is far from certain exactly what letters Polycarp had in his possession. He mentions the letters written to him and the Smyrnaean *ekklesia*. It is also plausible, even likely, that Polycarp had the letters which were sent from Smyrna (*Romans, Ephesians, Magnesians, and Trallians*). The numerous letter collections that survive from antiquity demonstrate that many letter writers kept copies of their own correspondence (e.g. those of Cicero, Libanius, Gregory of Nazianzus, Jerome, etc.), often as part of a plan to cultivate and shape their own legacy. The possibility that letters could easily be lost or damaged in transit likely reinforced such a practice. The financial demands involved in reproduction (ink, papyrus, services of a scribe) and storage, however, should caution us against asserting that this practice was universal (*pace* Richards, *Paul and First Century Letter Writing*, 156–170 and 210–223).

We have sent to you the letters of Ignatius that he sent to us, along with all the others we had with us, just as you directed us to do. These accompany this letter; you will be able to profit greatly from them, for they deal with faith and endurance (ὑπομονήν) and all edification (οἰκοδομήν) that is suitable in our Lord. Let us know what you have learned more definitely about Ignatius himself and those who are with him (13.1–2).

Polycarp fulfills the Philippian congregation's request for Ignatian artifacts by sharing the letters with them. The letters will benefit them because they provide a tangible sign, an *aide-mémoire*, of Ignatius's endurance. This generic description of the epistles' contents and Polycarp's focus on instilling "endurance, long-suffering, and fortitude (12.2)" in his audience all effectively efface the specific arguments and concerns of Ignatius's letter. Nowhere is there any indication that Polycarp wants his readers to embody Ignatius's ideal church order nor does he connect Ignatius's epistles directly to his own anti-docetic polemics. Rather, Ignatius's letters serve as a reminder of that ideal ethos characterized by endurance in the face of adversity.

While sharing the concern with exemplarity we saw in the Middle Recension, Polycarp's letter directs it toward different ends. Where the letters of the Middle Recension located correct imitation of Ignatius in communal cohesion and adherence to a nascent church order, Polycarp encourages a different set of behaviors. The paraenetic portions of the letter focus on individual and communal purity, especially with regards to money (4; 5.2; 6.1; 10.2; 11.2) and interpersonal relationships (4.2–3; 5.3; 10.1).<sup>480</sup> Polycarp discusses the role of presbyters and deacons (5–6) and encourages submission to them (5.3). However, this is only to list the virtues demanded by the offices as part of

---

<sup>480</sup> Maier argues that the primary aim of the letter's rhetoric to "promote a purity-preserving and boundary-reinforcing ethos." Maier, "Purity and Danger," 229. Valens' activity (*Philippians* 11), whatever it was, threatened to undermine the purity of the Philippian *ekklesia* and thus the boundaries they had built up between themselves and their neighbors. This seems to me to fail to capture the ways in which the epistles ethical exhortations and call for patient endurance would work to make the community more acceptable to their neighbors, particularly in the aftermath of one of their leader's misbehavior. That is, if they show themselves ethically honorable, the ways in which they keep themselves apart are potentially less problematic.

encouraging virtue in all readers. There is no sense that correct imitation of Christ or Paul or Ignatius generates any particular communal organization. Polycarp happily employs Ignatius as an exemplar, marking him as someone worth remembering, while shaping his exemplarity in terms that have little to do with the content of the letters. Polycarp prays that God “build up (*aedificet*)” the Philippians “in faith and truth, in all gentleness and without passion (*sine mansuetudine*), in endurance (*patientia*), long-suffering (*longanimitate*), fortitude (*tolerantia*) and purity (*castitate*, 12.2).” The bulk of the list is constructed from a string of nearly synonymous terms, all encouraging the readers to stay the course despite adversity.<sup>481</sup> By connecting Ignatius to this ideal ethos, Polycarp redirects Ignatius’s exemplarity toward issues that were of greater concern to him (and, perhaps, his audience). Thus, it is not Ignatius’s theological or didactic authority that Polycarp seeks to preserve by transmitting his letters. These letters serve, first and foremost, as a monument to Ignatius’s patient endurance.<sup>482</sup>

The reception of Polycarp’s epistle reinforces this sense that exemplarity, rather than content, largely determined the transmission of both Ignatius and Polycarp’s work. Later writers did not deploy Polycarp’s writing to authorize theological positions.<sup>483</sup> Irenaeus and Eusebius both mention the letter.<sup>484</sup> Despite recommending *Philippians* to his audience and identifying Polycarp as a trustworthy bearer of apostolic tradition,

---

<sup>481</sup> Valens and his misuse of funds are the only named ills to befall the Philippians *ekklesia*. It may be that Polycarp intended for them to patiently endure as a community, perhaps without their primary benefactor, rather than to bolster them against outside persecutors.

<sup>482</sup> Roller, “Exemplarity,” 5 n. 8, notes that narratives are regularly labeled *monumenta* in Latin writing. I am not aware of specific cases where letter collections are referred to in this way, though the extant letter collections of such influential rhetoricians as Cicero and Libanius suggest that they could be understood in this way, even if not identified as such.

<sup>483</sup> Scholars have attributed this lack interest in Polycarp’s teaching as due to the letter’s lack of an “literary or theological merit (Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers* Ignatius, 2: 581).” Grant went so far as to describe the letter as “derivative rather than creative,” leading only to “dead ends.” Grant, “Apostolic Fathers’ First Thousand Years,” 28. As Hartog, *Polycarp and the New Testament*, notes, these kinds of judgments create a false dichotomy between “originality and transmitting tradition (237).” Such judgments efface Polycarp’s agency as an organizer and purveyor of prior Christian writings.

<sup>484</sup> Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.*, 3.3.4 and 5.33.4; Eusebius, *HE* 3.39, 4.14, and 5.20.5–6.

Irenaeus never once gives any specific indication of the contents. He describes the letter as “most sufficient (ικανωτάτη)” for those who wish to “learn the character of (Polycarp’s) faith and the preaching of truth (*Adv. Haer.* 3.3.4).” When Irenaeus gives details about Polycarp, it is to pass along a biographical story that quaintly illustrates his anti-Marcionite feelings (3.3.4). Eusebius does little more with the epistle, repeating Irenaeus’ recommendation along with the additional note that most of *Philippians*’ contents were drawn from 1 Peter (*HE* 4.14.9). Eusebius’ cites only those portions of *Philippians* that mention Ignatius (*HE* 3.39.13–15). Despite depicting him as a teacher of truth, neither Irenaeus nor Eusebius shows much interest in the content of his teaching. Eusebius’s use of Polycarp suggests that *Philippians* survives primarily because of its connection with the Ignatian corpus.<sup>485</sup>

The manuscript tradition of *Philippians* invites similar conclusions. It is nowhere preserved in its entirety and must be pieced together from the citations in Eusebius, Greek manuscripts that all end at chapter 9 before continuing with *Barnabas*, and Latin versions that were primarily transmitted as part of the Ignatian corpus.<sup>486</sup> Polycarp was reputed as a disciple of the apostle and evangelist John, a teacher of Irenaeus, the central character in one of the earliest martyr acts, and on friendly terms with Ignatius. Despite this, all that remains of his writings are a single letter, seemingly only preserved because it mentioned the preservation of other letters. Here, as with Ignatius, it seems the letter was first and foremost a reminder of Polycarp himself, rather than documentary evidence for the authoritative teachings of the church.

Despite Polycarp’s exhortation to endure in the same manner as Ignatius, later writers, even those who mention Polycarp, have little to say about him. Ignatius is largely

---

<sup>485</sup> Grant, “Apostolic Fathers’ First Thousand Years,” 20–21

<sup>486</sup> Ehrman, *Apostolic Fathers*, 1: 329–30.

ignored or seemingly unknown by other early Christian (and non-Christian) writers.<sup>487</sup> Apart from Irenaeus, no writing of the second century mentions his name or gives a clear citation of his writings. Tertullian identifies Polycarp as the successor to John at Smyrna and Clement as successor to Peter at Rome (*De praescriptione haereticorum* 32), but nowhere evinces any knowledge of Ignatius.<sup>488</sup> Neither Justin nor Tatian gives the slightest hint that they knew Ignatius or his writing. Even Theophilus, who hailed from Ignatius's home city and is identified by Eusebius as the fourth in succession from Ignatius (*HE* 4.19.1),<sup>489</sup> makes no mention of him.

We must, of course, tread carefully when dealing with silences and “gaps” in our textual tradition.<sup>490</sup> A failure to mention or cite someone can never prove an absence of knowledge much less convey an unspoken disapproval. Theophilus's *Ad Autolyicum* provides a useful caution in this respect. Not only is Ignatius absent from this work, but

---

<sup>487</sup> Lightfoot identifies numerous coincidences between Ignatius's epistles and other second and third century texts but most of these links are (even in Lightfoot's estimation) tenuous. For example, he identifies a similarity between the *Martyrdom of Polycarp* 3.1 and *Romans* 5. In both instances, the writers use the term προσβιάσμοι in connection with compelling beasts to kill them. A second coincidence occurs in *Martyrdom of Polycarp* 22 and *Ephesians* 12 where both writers use the phrase τὰ ἴχνη εὐρεθῆαι in reference to imitating important exemplars (Polycarp for the martyr acts and Paul for Ignatius). Such coincidences, even if derived from knowledge of Ignatius, do not explain why Ignatius is not mentioned or cited more explicitly in such texts. If the scribe(s) of the Polycarp's martyrdom narrative did in fact have Ignatius in mind when composing the extant account, the emulation of the *exemplum* is so complete that there is no longer a need to memorialize the originator. The imitation has been successful enough to supersede the exemplar.

<sup>488</sup> Tertullian also knows at least one other early second century writing, the *Shepherd of Hermas* which he cites in both *De orat.* 16 and *De pudic.* 10.

<sup>489</sup> Eusebius' *Chronicon* places the accession of Hero in 107 CE, Cornelius in 128 CE, Eros in 142 CE, and Theophilus in 169 CE. The relatively brief time span between the purported episcopates of Ignatius and Theophilus makes it unlikely that Theophilus had not heard of Ignatius.

<sup>490</sup> See, for example, Edwards, “Ignatius and the Second Century,” who briefly argues that silence on Ignatius is to be expected because apologists needed to stick to texts that might be reckoned “classical—chiefly the Old Testament and the Gospels (217).” Edwards also notes that several such writers fail to even mention Christ, particularly Tatian, Athenagoras, and Minucius Felix. We are left to wonder whether that absence was truly striking or whether there were early traditions of Christian life and devotion in which “Christ” was not as essential as later understandings of Christian tradition lead us to believe.

so too is any reference to Jesus or Paul.<sup>491</sup> The term *χριστὸν* appears only once in the sense of “anointed” rather than any Christological sense (1.12). The Logos figures much more prominently, along with Sophia, as heavenly powers with demiurgic and revelatory roles in creation and human history (e.g. 2.15). The role of the Logos is depicted in prophetic terms, as one sent to “teach and remind” people of the content of the law (e.g. 3.11). Given the absence of Jesus and Paul and the more philosophically minded audience presumed by the text, the absence of Ignatius does not necessarily indicate ignorance of or antagonism toward him.

Nevertheless, when comparing the ways in which Theophilus and Ignatius approach their roles as Christian teachers, there are several aspects that are hard to reconcile, making the absence of Ignatius from Theophilus’s writing more significant. The most obvious difference is in the relationship between textual exegesis and theological, ritual, and ethical argument. Much of *Ad Autolyicum* is devoted to a close reading and exposition of the first chapters of Genesis (2.11–34). Genesis is quoted at length along with its typological and allegorical significance. In terms of literary precedents, it is most closely related to Hellenistic philosophical exegesis that sought to give philosophically compelling readings of “traditional” literary texts.<sup>492</sup> And while Jesus is not explicitly mentioned, the theology of the Logos is shaped and informed in and around this kind of philosophical reading of Torah and the prophets. By contrast, Ignatius largely eschews any references to textual authorities and seems to decry his opponents at Philadelphia for allowing their exegesis of “the archives” to determine the limits of their Christology (*Philadelphians* 8). Such practices lead the practitioner too far

---

<sup>491</sup> Despite never naming either of these figures, Pauline letters are amply attested in his citations and allusions. See, Grant, *Theophilus of Antioch Ad Autolyicum*, 149–50. In citing words of Jesus found in Matthew 5:28, Theophilus identifies them as from “the gospel voice (ἡ εὐαγγέλιος φωνή).”

<sup>492</sup> See in particular, Schoedel, “Theophilus of Antioch?”

afield from the priority of Jesus. The prioritization of other witnesses creates the conditions for “Judaizing.” Even prophetic prooftexts should only be trusted because of Jesus’s testimony on their behalf (*Magn* 9).

Another difference that suggests a fault line in the reception of Ignatius at Antioch is the differences in language about Jews and Christians. Although both Theophilus and Ignatius self-identify as Christians, they position themselves very differently with regard to Jews and Jewishness. Ignatius applies the designation Christian to himself and his audience, reminding them it is “better to be a Christian than to be called one (*Rom* 3.2, *Magn* 4.1).” This reality only comes through living “according to Christ Jesus (*Magn* 8.2).” Often in the same context, he denigrates “Judaizing (*Magn* 10.3, cf. *Phild* 6.1)” and “Sabbatizing (*Magn* 9.1).”<sup>493</sup> Theophilus, too, identifies himself as Christian (*Ad Auto.* 1.1) but explains its significance in terms of the verb “to be anointed” and through a pun on the word “χρηστός (useful, 1.12).” The Christian is the one who is made useful by being “anointed with the oil of God (1.12).” It is not the personal name Christ or even its sense of belonging to the one identified as Messiah that gives the term its primary value.<sup>494</sup> What’s more, Theophilus speaks of (biblical) Jews (whom he also identifies as Hebrews) as positive models of devotion to God and bearers of the divine Law. Solomon, Moses and the Prophets as well as gospel sayings and the Pauline epistles (2.10, 2.38, 3.13–14) speak with the voice of the Logos.<sup>495</sup> These divergent approaches to Jewishness and Christianness color the reception of the two

---

<sup>493</sup> *Romans’* focus on Christianizing without any reference to Judaizing suggests that the two were not necessarily conceived of in oppositional terms. Conformity to Christ depends upon speaking and imitating him. Judaizing is not its opposite, merely an irrelevant and potentially misleading practice. See Chapter Three above for more details.

<sup>494</sup> See Rick Rogers, *Theophilus of Antioch: The Life and Thought*; *ibid.* “Theophilus of Antioch,” 223–23.

<sup>495</sup> Despite the lack of reference to contemporary Jews, the high valuation of “Law” as a salvific force suggests that author may have been more sympathetic to the kinds of practices Ignatius characterized as “Judaizing,” and, potentially, living, breathing Jews.



writers in recent scholarship. Ignatius is identified as marking an end to Antiochene Christianity's connection to Jewishness while, within the last three decades, scholars still debated the possibility that Theophilus was a "Jewish-Christian."<sup>496</sup> Certainly issues of audience play a role here as Theophilus is unlikely to raise the specter of Judaizing with a purportedly "idolatrous" audience. Still, it is difficult to reconcile Ignatius as an authoritative teaching presence in Theophilus's Antioch with *Ad Autolycum's* positive portrayal of Jews and the Law. This becomes even more significant when we consider that, despite the address to a specific polytheist, Christians likely constituted much of the text's real audience.<sup>497</sup>

The attempt to identify Theophilus as a "Jewish-Christian" has, perhaps unintentionally, reinforced the judgments of Christian scribal traditions in which Theophilus is anomalous and marginal while Ignatius is mainstream and authoritative. Scholars have too readily taken Theophilus's differences from "Catholic" tradition as a sign of his separation from the dominant streams of Christian thought and practice. However, there are no grounds on which to support this assessment. Theophilus' teachings about the salvific nature of the law, concern with the intersection of purity and obedience to the Law, and the connection of the Logos with a line of true prophets that seems to include Jesus map well onto the kinds of traditions we find two centuries later

---

<sup>496</sup> Schoedel, "Theophilus of Antioch?" answers this question in the negative, challenging the evaluation of his teacher Grant. Rogers largely agrees with this assessment and is inclined to see Theophilus as a (retrospectively?) "heterodox theologian, who upheld the conservative Christianity of Antioch." Rogers, "Theophilus of Antioch," 223. This discussion could be nuanced significantly by attending to the critiques and analysis of the fraught category, Jewish-Christian, provided by Carleton-Paget, *Jews, Christians, and Jewish Christians*, 289–324. See also, Reed, "'Jewish-Christian' Apocrypha" on the potentially heuristic value of texts traditionally labelled "Jewish-Christian" for the reconstruction of the history of Jewish-Christian relations.

<sup>497</sup> By "real audience" I mean the people who read, copied, and transmitted the text. This audience may include the addressee inscribed in the text but, given the broader sharing of the text, is not limited to that audience. Doering, *Ancient Jewish Letters*, 25–27 provides a useful schematization of the levels on which communication happens in the transmission and reception of the text. For a more detailed account of this theorization, see Link, *Rezeptionsforschung*, 16–38.

in the Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies*.<sup>498</sup> Likewise, the early reception of Theophilus suggests that he was, at least, no less marginal than Ignatius. Unlike Ignatius, this early reception is tied to the contents of Theophilus' work as it serves well the anti-Marcionite focus of Irenaeus and Tertullian.<sup>499</sup> Theophilus' writings also find their way into Novatian's treatise *De trinitate 2* and Lactantius' *Divine Institutes* (1.23).<sup>500</sup> Eusebius knows of Theophilus' works and happily claims him as part of the catholic tradition but never cites anything he had to say, describing him only generally as a bishop and heresy fighter.<sup>501</sup> Unlike with Ignatius, we have strong evidence that people read Theophilus and used his work in composing their own, granting him a degree of theological authority without ever commending him as an exemplary figure.

The single citation of Ignatius in Irenaeus' *Adversus haereses* helps to highlight the differences between Ignatius's and Theophilus' reception. Irenaeus writes:

As someone of ours said when sentenced to beasts on account of his witness to God, "I am the wheat of Christ and am being ground by the teeth of beasts so that I might be found pure bread (5.28.4 cf. *Romans* 4.1)."<sup>502</sup>

Irenaeus cites these words as part of his assertion that suffering and trial were necessary for purification and, ultimately, participation in the heavenly banquet (*Adv. haer.*5.28.4)

---

<sup>498</sup> E.g. *Homilies* 1.19; 2.5–6, 12; 3.11 on the True Prophet and 7.8; 11.2–3 on purity. In particular, *Homilies* 2.12 summary of the teaching of the True Prophet as one who teaches that there is one God who created the world who shall render judgment according to actions would serve well as a summary of Theophilus' work in which he explicates the role of God in creation towards the end of encouraging obedience to God. Despite these similarities, there are key differences as well, such as the incorporation of Pauline material in Theophilus and anti-allegorical polemics in *Homilies* 1–6 that Theophilus would be unlikely to share.

<sup>499</sup> See Grant, "The Textual Tradition of Theophilus of Antioch," 146–155. For Tertullian, cf. *Apologeticum* 19 to *Ad Autolyicum* 2 and 3; for Irenaeus, cf. *Adversus haereses* 3.23.5, 4.37–39, and 5.23 to *Ad Autolyicum* 2.25–26. While none of these are direct quotations, the similarity in argument and evidence all suggest a familiarity with Theophilus' writings. On Theophilus in Irenaeus, see Loofs, *Theophilus von Antiochien*, 24–28, 58–65, 69–70. Loofs argues that these passages that seem similar to *Ad Autolyicum* are actually taken from Theophilus' now lost work against Marcion.

<sup>500</sup> Lactantius is the only one of these to cite Theophilus by name and to explicitly draw from *Ad Autolyicum*.

<sup>501</sup> Eusebius, *HE* 4.24 and

<sup>502</sup> In most manuscripts, Ignatius identifies himself as the "wheat of God" rather than "Christ."

but does not name Ignatius as their author. The lack of a named speaker suggests a certain ambivalence about Ignatius and nothing in the quote or context suggests didactic, theological, or ritual authority attached to Ignatius. Rather, the inscription of his words is put forward as exemplary of a process that pertains to all Christians. The textual monument and its exemplary value have been subtly disconnected from any specific memories of Ignatius. The words require no author. Exemplarity continues to play a role in the transmission of Ignatius's letters, but Ignatius's words can serve as a monument apart from his name.

When compared to Irenaeus's use of other early Christian writers, the single citation from *Romans* suggests an ambivalence about Ignatius. Unlike with other so-called "Apostolic Fathers," Irenaeus gives no indication that the name Ignatius carried any authority.<sup>503</sup> Clement of Rome and Polycarp are both remembered as witnesses to the teaching of the apostles and identified as tradents of apostolic tradition (*Adv. Haer.* 3.3.3). Papias is even afforded the status of witness by virtue of hearing the apostle John and sharing fellowship with Polycarp (5.33.4). Ignatius, however, is given no such role. While Irenaeus's quote from Ignatius seems to keep alive the focus on exemplarity set in motion by Polycarp's epistle, the variety of silences that surround it make clear that the letters' exemplary value did not depend on a named author. Ignatius's words could be rearticulated as characteristic of Christian life and worthy of imitation but failed to signify continuity with tradition in ways that would have made him useful to Irenaeus.<sup>504</sup>

---

<sup>503</sup> It is possible that Irenaeus assumed his audience was familiar enough with Ignatius that his name was unnecessary, but the fact that others such as Polycarp and Clement were named makes this less likely.

<sup>504</sup> I do not think we need to go as far as Hübner, "Thesen zur Echtheit und Datierung," or Lechner, *Ignatius adversus Valentinianos?* in using this ambivalence to argue for forgery of the Middle Recension. The evidence for Valentinian use of Ignatius is just as ambivalent as that of other writers and less explicit in that none of them provide direct citations in the fashion we see in Irenaeus, much less mention his name. Were a later forger to claim Ignatius for "orthodoxy" against Valentinian teachings, the recommendation of Ignatius in Polycarp's epistle seems hardly

Within a generation, this decoupling of text from tradition appears largely complete. Origen's extant works include two citations of Ignatius.<sup>505</sup> In the prologue to his commentary on Song of Songs, Origen outlines his reasons for why the terminology of passionate love (*amor*) in Song of Songs should be read as reference, above all, to selfless love (*caritas*).<sup>506</sup> In this context, Origen offers Ignatius as an example of someone who referred to Christ as "eros." Origen writes:

So it makes no difference whether we speak of having a passion for God, or of loving him; and I do not think one could be blamed (*culpari*) if they called God *amorem*, just as John calls him *caritatem*. In fact, I remember that someone of the saints said, named Ignatius, about Christ (*aliquem sanctorum dixisse Ignatium nomine de Christo*): 'However, my love (*amor*) is crucified (*Rom. 7.2*),' and I do not blame (*reprehendi*) him for this worthy judgment.<sup>507</sup>

It remains uncertain whether or not Ignatius was named by Origen in the Greek original.<sup>508</sup> More certain though is that Origen exhibits little concern for the content of the letters or the literary context of the words he cites. Either through ignorance of the source or a faulty memory, he construes the Ignatian passage as Christological when its epistolary context suggests a "crucifixion" of material desires. Ignatius writes:

For while living, I write to you desiring to die (ἐρῶν τοῦ ἀποθανεῖν). My love is crucified (ὁ ἐμὸς ἔρωσ ἐσταύρωται), and there is no matter-loving (φιλόυλον) fire in me (*Rom. 7.2*).

---

sufficient to counter Valentinian teaching. Rather, it seems more likely that the admixture of exemplarity and ambivalence that characterizes the reception outlined thus far affects Ignatius's reception among Valentinians *and* other Christians. This largely agrees with the argument of Edwards, "Ignatius in the Second Century," made against Hübner. However, Edwards is more confident of Ignatius's authority than I am.

<sup>505</sup> Lightfoot identified a third in *De oratione* 20.2 however this connection depends on a shared three-word phrase which both authors use very differently.

<sup>506</sup> Origen's *In canticum canticorum* is only preserved in the Latin translation of Rufinus. The distinction made is between *amor/cupido* and *dilectio/caritas* which is the translator's way of capturing Origen's distinction between *eros* and *agape*. For a detailed comparison of the Latin version with the extant Greek fragments, see Vito Limone, "I nomi dell'amore." Limone argues that Rufinus' translation introduces additional complexity to Origen's linguistic distinctions while effacing other language of love (such as *filia* and *filanthropia*) almost entirely.

<sup>507</sup> My translation of Origen is adapted from Lawson, *Song of Songs*.

<sup>508</sup> For a more detailed account of arguments that Rufinus identified Ignatius as the author of the citation, see Lechner, *Ignatios adversus Valentinianos?*, 69–74.

Origen seems to assume that only Christ and references to him can be the subject of the verb “to be crucified.” Ignatius, however, parallels his *eros* with love of material things (φιλόυλον). That is, he identifies the thing crucified with exactly the kind of carnal, material love that Origen argues is erroneously identified with real, Godly love.<sup>509</sup> This representation of Ignatius suggests that either Origen, his audience, or both were unfamiliar enough with Ignatius to notice or care about the difference.

In addition to altering the referent of his source text, Origen frames the citation as evidence of his own erudition rather than as a support to his arguments. Ignatius’s words are framed by Origen’s own prodigious memory (“I remember that...” and his refusal to pass judgment on what he recalls (“and I do not blame him...”). Ignatius’s words are treated as an object of suspicion that it is up to Origen to rehabilitate. The quote is bracketed by language of blame, censure, and fault. Origen does not think that anyone should be censured (*culpari*) for identifying God with *eros/amor*. So too, Ignatius is not to be blamed (*reprehendi*) for his “worthy judgment.” Instead of using Ignatius’s words to directly authorize his own arguments, Origen uses his arguments to authorize Ignatius’s words. The text of *Romans* becomes an antiquarian artifact which serves Origen because of its unfamiliarity.

Origen’s only other citation of Ignatius suggests a similar antiquarian interest in his letters. In a homily on Luke 1:24–32, Origen cites Ignatius as part of an attempt to answer why the savior was born to a virgin who was betrothed and given to her husband rather than to a maiden who was not betrothed (cf. Lk 1:27). In response to this, he

---

<sup>509</sup> *In canticum canticorum*, Prologue (CPL 198,2 p. 71, line 20-21).

claims that, without the betrothal, “the state of virginity itself would be a cause of disgrace (*Hom. in Luc. 6.3*).”<sup>510</sup> This leads directly into a reference to Ignatius.

It is written eloquently (καλῶς) in one of the letters of a certain martyr<sup>511</sup>—I am speaking of Ignatius, the second bishop of Antioch after blessed Peter, who battled wild beasts at Rome during a persecution—“The virginity of Mary escaped the notice of the ruler of this age (*Ephesians 19.1*).”

Here, as in the citation of *Romans*, Origen introduces Ignatius indirectly, identifying the author as a “certain martyr.” Additional details are provided only secondarily and may very well be a later interpolation given that Origen does not show interest in episcopal succession lists anywhere else.<sup>512</sup> Likewise, Basil of Caesarea’s redeployment of Origen’s homily in his own *Homilia in sanctam Christi generationem* identifies the Ignatian passage as from “one of the ancients.”<sup>513</sup> Origen’s engagement with Ignatius is not predicated on the Antiochene bishop’s institutional authority.

Origen’s quotation of *Ephesians* is partial, just as his use of *Romans* was. In Ignatius’s rendering, the virginity of Mary was not the only thing hidden from “the ruler of this age.” Two additional mysteries, Mary’s “giving birth (ὁ τοκετὸς αὐτῆς)” and “the death of the Lord (*Eph 19.1*),” also escaped notice. Together they constitute “three mysteries of a cry which were accomplished in the silence of God (19.1).” Here, as in the

---

<sup>510</sup> My translations follow those of Lienhard, *Origen*. Virginity was a prominent concern of Origen thus it is important that nothing in the narrative would lead readers to question Mary’s virginity or the importance of virginity more generally. See, Lienhard, *Origen*, xxx. He dates the homilies between Origen’s move to Caesarea and his commentaries on Matthew.

<sup>511</sup> Origen, *Hom. in Luc. 6.4*. While the whole homily is extant only in Jerome’s Latin translation, the Greek of this passage survives in a later *catena*. See Crouzel et al, *Homélie sur s. Luc*. My translation follows the Greek. The only substantive difference between the two is in the introductory phrasing. Jerome’s version reads, “I found (*reperi*) an elegant statement written in a letter of a certain martyr...” The Latin emphasizes Origen’s discovery and gives no indication that the letter was one of several. Both versions agree in their identification of Ignatius as the second bishop after Peter.

<sup>512</sup> Despite voicing reservations about the authenticity of Ignatius’s biographical information in the prologue to *In canticum canticorum*, Lechner, *Ignatius adversus Valentinianos?*, 69–74, does not raise similar concerns about later interpolation for this passage. In searches of Origen’s works in both *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* and *Library of Latin Texts*, I found few references to bishops and no references to any formulation of episcopal succession.

<sup>513</sup> DelCogliano, “Tradition and Polemic,” 33–34.

commentary on Song of Songs, Origen excises the epistolary context, suggesting that he was either ignorant of that context or unconcerned with it. He does not offer Ignatius's words as authoritative or proof of the antiquity of any idea. Instead, Ignatian quotes serve as memorable articulations of Origen's own ideas, even if they bear little connection to Ignatius's theologizing.

In this antiquarian approach to Christian textual traditions, Origen differs from previous early Christian readers of Ignatius. In his work, we see no trace of the exemplary discourse that surrounded the second-century citations of Ignatius. Origen does not present Ignatius himself or his words as a model for audience imitation. He offers no encouragement to imitate Ignatius. If anything, Ignatius is made to emulate Origen.

Nevertheless, Origen's access to these words suggests that previous memorializations of Ignatius met with some success. The letters were preserved by at least some scribes such that Origen could read them. Origen betrays no knowledge of why such things were preserved. Perhaps as an antiquarian and text critic, he found their preservation self-evident, part of normal literary culture. Whether writing for the spiritual elite as in his commentary on Song of Songs or for a more diverse audience in a homily, Origen does not assume his readers have heard of Ignatius or have specific traditions about him in mind. Instead, Origen's words suggest he encountered the epistles outside any tradition of their purpose or significance. That is, the monument to Ignatius's exemplarity, his epistles, outlived the memory of him in Origen's ecclesial circles.<sup>514</sup> The fact that Origen preserves even a sliver of Ignatius seems to depend on his

---

<sup>514</sup> Determining the chronology, and thus geographical context, of Origen's work is quite difficult. Lienhard, following Pierre Nautin, places the homilies in Caesarea, between his arrival there ca. 233 and the composition of his *Commentary on Matthew* (ca. 244). Lienhard, *Origen*, xxiv. Given Origen's travel along with his rhetorical and philosophical education, it is unlikely that he thought of his audience as geographically delimited.

own prodigious efforts, with the support of his patron Ambrosius, to collect and read a broad selection of early Christian writings. For Origen and his audience, Ignatius has been reduced, in effect, to text. No one else is expected to have similar access to Ignatian texts and traditions.

As we will see in the next section, it is exactly this kind of scholarly activity that allows Ignatius to survive and burn brightly once again in Christian memory. Through the scholarly efforts of Eusebius and the wide reception of Origen, Ignatius gains new audiences, finding his way into church histories, homilies, martyr acts, revamped epistles, and Antioch's cemetery before becoming a new Tyche for Antioch in the sixth century. The scholarly activities of text collection, copying, and synthesis become the foundations for a renewed memory of Ignatius and a new memory of the Christian past.

### **Eusebius and the Re-collection of Ignatius**

After the scant references and ambiguity surrounding Ignatius in writers of the second and third centuries, the chronological, historical, and theological works of Eusebius provide unprecedented data for Ignatius and other "apostolic fathers." As Grant readily acknowledges, Eusebius is often our "most important early witness to the existence of the Apostolic Fathers."<sup>515</sup> However, despite the continuing richness of Eusebian scholarship, little attention has been given to how Eusebius fits into and subsequently shapes the trajectories of reception for these early Christian writings. Scholarship on Eusebius frequently tries to map the continuities and differences between Eusebius and his predecessors on matters of chronology,<sup>516</sup> the category religion,<sup>517</sup> citation

---

<sup>515</sup> Grant, "Apostolic Fathers' First Thousand Years," 22

<sup>516</sup> Barnes, *Eusebius and Constantine*, 106–126, emphasizes the creativity of Eusebius despite precedents set by Julius Africanus and other chronographers.



practices,<sup>518</sup> ethnography,<sup>519</sup> and even book culture.<sup>520</sup> One goal of this section will be to map the continuities and ruptures in memories of Ignatius that we can find in Eusebius.

We find mention and/or citations of Ignatius in three of Eusebius's works. The earliest is in his *Chronicon* where Ignatius's consecration as bishop of Antioch is placed in the first year of the 212<sup>th</sup> Olympiad (69 CE), during the rule of Vespasian. Ignatius's martyrdom also finds a place in the *Chronicon* in the tenth year of Trajan (ca. 108 CE). The chronological entries return in the *Church History* in expanded and altered form. Ignatius is mentioned in three separate chapters of the third book of the *Church History*, both as part of episcopal chronologies and in discussion of his letters and martyrdom.<sup>521</sup> The final reference to Ignatius in Eusebius is found in his *Quaestiones ad Stephanum*, a work which provides solutions to various potential problems in the gospels.

The brief entries in the *Chronicon* tell us little about the role Ignatius plays in Eusebius's understanding of Christian thought and history. In the entry on the 212<sup>th</sup> Olympiad, the accompanying text identifies Ignatius as the "second bishop of Antioch ordained after the apostles." The only other entry to mention Ignatius gives the notice of his martyrdom in the tenth year of Trajan, suggesting an almost forty-year period as bishop of the Christian community at Antioch. Eusebius gives no indication as to the sources of his dating, but the notices confirm that knowledge of Ignatius reached him, most likely through Origen's collection preserved by Pamphilus and the church at Caesarea Maritima.<sup>522</sup>

---

<sup>517</sup> Schott, *Christianity, Empire*.

<sup>518</sup> Sabrina Inowlocki, *Eusebius and the Jewish Authors*; Devore, "Character and Convention."

<sup>519</sup> Johnson, *Ethnicity and Argument*.

<sup>520</sup> Grafton and Williams, *Christianity and the Transformation of the Book*.

<sup>521</sup> *HE* 3.22; 3.36; 3.38.

<sup>522</sup> Carriker, *Library of Eusebius*, 1–36. Grant notes that Origen and Eusebius do not seem to share an identical library of "Apostolic Fathers" – suggesting that his references to such figures follow Irenaeus rather than the sources identified by Origen. He argues that he prefers Irenaeus because of the succession indicated by the connections between Ignatius and Polycarp, who was a

When these notices are compared to the dates given in the *Church History*, they seem more like guesswork than an established chronographical tradition. In the *Church History*, Eusebius first mentions Ignatius in the context of episcopal chronologies at Alexandria, Rome, Jerusalem, and Antioch. Unlike in the *Chronicon*, the transition between the reigns of Nerva and Trajan provides the general date for the succession lists (*HE* 3.21.1). At that time, Cerdon succeeds Abilius as bishop of Alexandria, Clement continues as bishop of Rome (3.21.2), and Ignatius “was known (ἐγνωρίζετο) as the second bishop of Antioch (3.22).” Eusebius avoids any direct contradiction with the dates provided in the *Chronicon* but also lacks any specificity about the timing or duration of Ignatius’s episcopate. Instead, he uses a passive verb “was known (ἐγνωρίζετο)” without any indication of the agent.

This term appears twelve times in the *Ecclesiastical History* and has a surprisingly consistent usage.<sup>523</sup> In nearly every case where this word describes the “fame” of an individual, Eusebius depends on evidence internal to the texts written by that person to locate them chronologically.<sup>524</sup> This historical method is most clearly illustrated in his discussion of Hegesippus (4.8.1–2). After describing Hegesippus as “known (ἐγνωρίζετο)” among all those who fought against heresy (4.7.15–4.8.1), Eusebius documents how he knows the time when Hegesippus flourished, writing that Hegesippus “indicates the time in which he was known (ἐγνωρίζετο)” by writing about

---

teacher of Irenaeus. That is, he prefers evidence for networks of transmission to those texts which come without the same kind of prestigious network.

<sup>523</sup> *HE* 2.4.2; 3.22; 3.36.2; 4.8.1–2; 4.15.47; 4.20.1; 5.11.1; 5.12.1; 5.22.1; 6.31.1; 7.32.30. In the imperfect plural middle passive, the verb is a catch-all for the countless others who “were known” but for whom Eusebius has no evidence. E.g. *HE* 3.37.1. The *Ecclesiastical History* also uses the middle passive infinitive, γνωρίζεσθαι, to place Cerdon and Marcion at Rome in the episcopate of Hyginus (*HE* 4.10.1). Here too, the evidence is textual, though drawn from notices in Irenaeus rather than the named individuals’ own writings.

<sup>524</sup> The exceptions are for Narcissus, bishop of Jerusalem, in *HE* 5.12.1 and the presbyter Achillas who “was known” as the head of Alexandria’s catechetical school in the generation before Eusebius (*HE* 7.32.30)

the idolatry of Hadrian in erecting a temple to Antinous (4.8.2). Even the most general details of Hegesippus's life, the time of his literary activity, is known only from the text itself rather than any other sources of tradition. Others receive similar treatment—Philo, Papias, Pionius, Theophilus, Clement of Alexandria, Serapion of Antioch, and Julius Africanus. Each of them finds a place in Eusebius narrative based on chronological indicators in their writings that Eusebius had access to. Eusebius's claim that these figures "were known" depends entirely on his access to their texts. He assumes that because he had access to those texts that these figures were known or even celebrated<sup>525</sup> by their contemporaries. Eusebius exploits the fact of textual transmission to assert the importance of his sources for the history of the Church, suggesting that what survived to his own day, for whatever reasons, was the story of the whole Church.<sup>526</sup>

In the case of Ignatius, this suggests that Eusebius had no documents or traditions that identified a clear place in the line of Antiochene bishops apart from Ignatius's own claims to be the "bishop of Syria (*Rom* 2.2)." The survival of his writings, alongside connections to Polycarp and Irenaeus, make Ignatius a person of interest for Eusebius. However, he lacks any other traditions by or about Ignatius that would allow him to locate the bishop more clearly in time. Thus his remarkably long tenure as bishop (according to the *Chronicon*) is deemphasized in the *Church History* in favor of a general renown at the time of Nerva and Trajan. Like Origen, Eusebius's information about Ignatius is purely textual. However, where Origen presents Ignatius as relatively

---

<sup>525</sup> Only Pionius (*HE* 4.15.47) and Narcissus (5.12.1) are described as celebrated or famous. The others are merely known.

<sup>526</sup> Not every text mentioned by Eusebius has a significant afterlife, and in some cases (as with Papias) this seems to align with his own hopes. He does not necessarily want people to encounter the texts he has access to except through his collection of them and his identification of their significance/value. We can see this in his recommendation that readers consult his no longer extant collection of martyr acts to read the letter about Pionius (*HE* 4.15.47) and in his habit of citing only specific portions of texts, like the greeting and farewell portions of letters (e.g. *HE* 5.19.2–3; see also discussion in Devore, "Character and Convention").

unknown to himself and his audience, Eusebius uses the letters to locate Ignatius at the crux between the apostles and the later church at Antioch and to paint a picture of a universal church whose most important figures were connected despite geographical distance.

Ignatius's presence in succession lists gives way to a more detailed treatment of Ignatius and his letters (3.36.2–15). In this section, Eusebius remembers Ignatius in two distinct ways. The first—Ignatius's place as a receiver and transmitter of apostolic teaching—was already hinted at in *Chronicon* and the initial reference to Ignatius in the *Church History* (3.22). In recounting Ignatius and his epistles, Eusebius begins with Ignatius's place in the succession of bishops at Antioch, marking him as the second bishop after Peter and someone who is “still famous now to a great many (παρὰ πλείστοις εἰς ἔτι νῦν διαβόητος, 3.36.2).” Eusebius continues by establishing his credentials as a martyr, indicating a “report (λόγος)” as his source of information that Ignatius was sent to Rome and was executed because of “his testimony to Christ (3.36.3).” Despite this hint of other avenues of information, Eusebius tells us only things that could be gleaned from reading the letters. He presents Ignatius as delivering “spoken addresses and exhortations (διὰ λόγων ὁμιλίας τε καὶ προτροπαῖς)”<sup>527</sup> primarily for the purpose of guarding against heresies through adherence to apostolic traditions (3.36.4). In Eusebius's narration, the letters support that preaching and result from Ignatius's desire to give the apostolic tradition a “fixed form (διατυποῦσθαι) for the sake of security (3.36.4).” By framing the letters as the work of a man with apostolic connections and the authority of a martyr, his letters are made an icon of an ill-defined apostolic tradition. The letters are a secure means of obtaining apostolic tradition.

---

<sup>527</sup> We see hints of such activity in *Philadelphians* 7, where Ignatius indicates that he had preached to the community while he was with them.

Despite these lofty claims, Eusebius's quotations from the letters and descriptions of their contents serve a different purpose. They document the ecclesiastical network implied by Ignatius's letters. Eusebius notes each city the letters mention as well as the names of the bishops that Ignatius corresponded with (3.36.5). He gives special emphasis to the connection with Polycarp, characterizing Ignatius's request that Polycarp send a suitable ambassador to the church in Syria (*Poly* 7.2) as a request that he care for the church at Antioch in his episcopal capacity. He reports that Ignatius asked him to look after "the flock of Antioch like a true and good shepherd (3.36.10)." He thus ignores Ignatius's other requests that assemblies send ambassadors to Antioch (*Smyr* 11.2; *Phil* 10.1) in a way that implies a special role for an important bishop like Polycarp. He bolsters this impression of a strong inter-ecclesial network by concluding his discussion of Ignatius and his letters with the witnesses of Irenaeus and Polycarp (3.36.12–14). He presents Irenaeus's anonymous citation of *Romans* as evidence that the famous heresiologist knew of Ignatius's martyrdom and all his epistles. Here too, we have the only quotations of Polycarp's writings to be found in the *Church History*. Despite the repeated characterization of Polycarp as an "apostolic man" and bearer of apostolic tradition, he is only cited to support the image of Ignatius as a well-known transmitter of apostolic tradition.<sup>528</sup>

Eusebius quotes from two of the Ignatian epistles, but neither citation supports his contention that Ignatius wrote to secure apostolic tradition. The first and longest quotation is from *Romans* where Ignatius describes his treatment at the hands of guards on the way to Rome and vividly imagines compelling beasts to devour him, even if they

---

<sup>528</sup> In general, Eusebius seems confident that he and his audience share access to an agreed upon "deposit" that is unchanging from apostolic times. That is, there is no history of doctrine to be written. Whatever true doctrine there is has always been. This seems to explain his lack of interest in explicating the teachings of early figures, whether heretics or adherents of the true church. See, Grant, *Eusebius as Church Historian*, 60–96.

are unwilling (5.2). Eusebius states that this quotation is given in order “to provide a worthy demonstration of what has been said (*HE* 3.36.6).” That is, his desire for martyrdom serves to prove the whole of Eusebius’s knowledge of Ignatius. The other quotation is taken from *Smyrnaeans* and touches on theological matters. In it, Ignatius recalls a conversation between Peter and Christ that proves that the resurrection was in the flesh (*Smyr* 3.2). Eusebius records Ignatius as follows:

The same man, when writing to the Smyrnaeans, was furnished (συγκέχρηται) with words (from where I do not know) such as these concerning Christ that he recounts, “But I know and believe that he was in the flesh after the resurrection. And when he came to Peter and his companions, he said to them, ‘Take, handle me, and see that I am not a bodiless demon.’<sup>529</sup> And immediately they touched him and believed (*HE* 3.36.11).

While this passage does serve to underscore an aspect of Christian theology that Eusebius and his contemporaries were eager to uphold, it paints a picture of uncertainty rather than security. Eusebius emphasizes his own ignorance of Ignatius’s sources, claiming not to know where they are from (3.36.11). Origen attributes similar words to an otherwise unknown *Doctrina petri* (*De prin.* Pref. 8) and Jerome later identifies this dominical tradition as from the *Gospel of the Nazarenes* (*De vir.* 3) so it is somewhat unusual that Eusebius doesn’t have a suggestion for its origin. Eusebius’s ignorance, real or feigned, disconnects Ignatius’s writing about Christ from the rest of “apostolic tradition,” placing it outside any sense of textual or personal succession.

Thus, despite describing Ignatius as an authoritative teacher and transmitter of Christian tradition, Eusebius gives no evidence from the letters to support this contention. Instead, Ignatius and his writings serve an exemplary purpose. They provide

---

<sup>529</sup> There is now a widespread literature on ancient imaginings of the materiality and immateriality of spirits and demons. See, e.g., Smith, “How Thin is a Demon.” On this passage in Ignatius, see Proctor, “Bodiless Docetists.”

an exemplum or icon of a desired ethos and memory of the past.<sup>530</sup> In Eusebius's hands, the letters become a monument to the kind of interconnectedness and episcopal authority he imagines for all the church. Without giving Ignatius's teachings much of a place, he nevertheless upholds him as representative of the ways in which apostolic authority has reached the church of Eusebius's day. The fact that Ignatius survives in writing is vitally important inasmuch as Eusebius seems acutely aware of how little survives<sup>531</sup> and suspicious of much that does.<sup>532</sup> The kinds of textual connections Eusebius can forge between Ignatius, Polycarp, and Irenaeus provide evidence that justifies such a method in other cases.

Ignatius appears one final time in the extant works of Eusebius. In his *Quaestiones ad Stephanum*, Eusebius quotes the same part of *Ephesians* that Origen included in his homily on Luke. As part of his own response to questions about why Jesus' genealogy is traced through Joseph, Eusebius sets up his answer by suggesting that many parts of Jesus' life were hidden from public knowledge, the miracle of his birth

---

<sup>530</sup> In this way, the Eusebian image of Ignatius closely corresponds with that of the Long Recension. Such an image of Ignatius and his letters likely contributed to the positive reception of the Long Recension insofar as the kinds of alterations found in the Long Recension make Ignatius's letters better fit Eusebius's description. In both, Ignatius is more explicitly a heresiologist and more explicitly a vehicle of apostolic teaching. Curiously, just such an impression of plausibility undergirded William Whiston's arguments concerning the priority of the Long Recension. He argued, for example, that Eusebius has knowledge of various things like the deaths of certain apostles that could come from no other source than the Long Recension. Whiston, *An Essay upon the Epistles of Ignatius*, 34–35. Given the Long Recension's close similarities with the *Apostolic Constitutions* and the ways in which both parallel Eusebius' historical work, it would be useful to analyze these texts as part of the reception of Eusebius.

<sup>531</sup> E.g. the identification of Ignatius's Jesus-tradition as from an unknown source. Despite giving a place to oral traditions and teachings, Eusebius seems keen to imagine and remember important people as textualists like himself.

<sup>532</sup> This is clearest in Eusebius's treatment of Julius Africanus. Despite likely making frequent use of Africanus's *Chronographiai* in both the *Chronicon* and *Ecclesiastical History*, Eusebius does not acknowledge any debt to him and quotes him only once with regard to discrepancies in the genealogies of Matthew and Luke (1.7.2–16). A similar hesitancy surrounds Papias whose writings Eusebius knows. In an unusual move, Eusebius disagrees with Irenaeus, claiming that Papias did not himself hear the apostles but was in the third generation (3.39.1–2). Writers such as these are granted an extremely delimited authority because they are important textual sources for the *Ecclesiastical History*, but Eusebius attempts to distance them from any status as transmitters of apostolic tradition.

was “just one particular example of the matters he decided not to divulge.”<sup>533</sup> Ignatius’s words then serve as an example:

The holy man, named Ignatius, who became the second bishop of the church of Antioch after the apostles says somewhere that it seems even (ὡς ἄρα καὶ) by the ruler of this age, the virginity of Mary went unnoticed, and also the birth of the Savior from her. He says this: “And the virginity of Mary went unnoticed by the ruler of this age, and her childbirth, and, in the same way, the death of Christ. Three screaming mysteries that were brought about in the silence of God (*Ephesians* 19.1).” It is then reasonable (λογισμῶ) to assume that not everyone living in the flesh who saw God’s Christ living an ordinary life among mankind was able to believe that he was born without a father from an unmarried girl (*Quaes. ad Steph.* 1.3).

Unlike in the *Church History*, Eusebius is little concerned with where in Ignatius’s writing this comes from. Moreover, the extensive introduction, which mirrors those found in Origen, indicates that he did not expect his audience to know much about Ignatius. If Ignatius was as well-known as Eusebius claimed in the *Church History* (3.36.2), such details would have been superfluous in this kind of catechetical work.

Eusebius also indicates an uncertain value for Ignatius’s words, again undermining any place for him as an authoritative teacher. The phrase ὡς ἄρα καὶ was a relatively common way of introducing the words of others, usually to indicate that the words cited were to be rejected by the reader.<sup>534</sup> Unlike Origen, Eusebius is not here concerned with the elegance of the Ignatian phrase. Instead, he exploits its unusualness and unfamiliarity in a different way, to support his own arguments about the interplay between public dissemination and secret knowledge with regard to Jesus’s life. While the audience might (and perhaps should) find the idea of Satan’s ignorance implausible, the fact that a martyr-bishop so closely connected to the apostles would even suggest it makes Eusebius’s claims that ordinary people were ignorant of the fact much more likely.

---

<sup>533</sup> Unless otherwise noted, I follow the translation of David J.D. Miller in Pearse, ed. *Eusebius of Caesarea*.

<sup>534</sup> On this and the many other uses of the particle ἄρα, see Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, 636, § 2798.



Ignatius's words serve to demonstrate Eusebius's position by making it seem like a middle way between the assumption that all Jesus' life was equally public and the outlandish claim that not even nonhuman powers were aware of it. Whether he remembers this use of Ignatius from his study of Origen or from his own reading of Ignatius's letters, Eusebius indicates no didactic authority for Ignatius. Rather, it seems that only his status as a martyr and his place in the succession of Antioch keeps Eusebius from treating the idea as outright laughable.

In Eusebius, we see a continuation of prior generations ambivalence about the letters' contents. In the context of the *Church History*, Eusebius has no qualms about identifying Ignatius as someone who secured the apostolic deposit in writing, but outside that work, Ignatius seems an outlier to what Eusebius sees a logical and sensible. As a martyr and bishop of an important city whose writings reached Eusebius and were mentioned by Polycarp and Irenaeus, Ignatius cannot be overlooked. His writings demonstrate too many themes that are important to Eusebius: apostolic succession, martyrdom, and the identification of important people and events.<sup>535</sup> Because of this, Ignatius serves an exemplary rather than didactic purpose. As a martyr, he is exemplary of endurance and the willingness of Christian martyrs to set aside everything, even life, in their devotion to Christ. This concern, however, is passed over relatively quickly in favor of documenting Ignatius's relationship with other churches and his transmission by means of Irenaeus and Polycarp. Ignatius's writings make explicit inter-Christian connections that are only hinted at or part of Christian ideology in earlier writings. These

---

<sup>535</sup> For brief yet provocative discussion of the major themes in the *Ecclesiastical History*, see Grant, *Eusebius as Church Historian*, 45–165.

connections are exemplary of the unity of apostolic Christianity in the face of Hellenistic, Jewish, and heretical fractiousness.<sup>536</sup>

While Eusebius shares earlier generations' lack of interest in the content of Ignatius's letters, he exploits the knowledge gaps created by this disinterest in creative ways. Eusebius was not the first Christian writer to collect texts or use libraries for knowledge production. The *Ecclesiastical History*, *Demonstratio evangelica*, and *Praeparatio evangelica* all identify and synthesize the collections and syntheses of his predecessors, especially Josephus, Irenaeus, Julius Africanus, Justin, and Hegesippus. Origen too had access to an extensive text collection, most likely providing Eusebius with many of the manuscripts to which he had access, but he pursues a primarily exegetical mode of knowledge production, utilizing that text collection to collate bible versions and synthesize philosophical and biblical knowledge. In contrast to his predecessors, he collects Christian texts to synthesize Christian self-knowledge. Eusebius plucks from a text collection in order to present a unified body of Christianity in the form of a historical narrative (cf. *HE* 1.1.4–5). Whatever purposes these works served before he collected them, Eusebius has woven them into a narrative monument which is itself exemplary of what Christianity has always been and thus what it should be.

In focusing on his presentation of Ignatius, we can better see the seams of this monumental project and the ways it depends on ignorance, on gaps in memory, to construct knowledge. Ignorance of the actual dates of Ignatius's life coupled with the evidence of his connection to Polycarp serve to cover a gap in Christian memories of Antioch after Paul and portray him as overlapping with the apostles. His status as a

---

<sup>536</sup> These three strands are woven throughout the *Ecclesiastical History* (see Grant, *Eusebius as Church Historian* for a summary). They are also important threads in the *Praeparatio evangelica* and *Demonstratio evangelica*. On the former, see now Johnson, *Ethnicity and Argument*. For a treatment of Eusebius's presentation and use of Jewish materials that includes the *Demonstratio*, see Inowlocki, *Eusebius and the Jewish Authors*. Kofsky, *Eusebius of Caesarea against Paganism*, treats the anti-pagan polemic of both the *Praeparatio* and the *Demonstratio*.

martyr fits well with the Christian ethos cultivated elsewhere by Eusebius (e.g. *Martyrs of Palestine*) and with Eusebius's contemporaries' memories of what it meant to be Christian under the Tetrarchy.<sup>537</sup> The lack of widespread knowledge of what Ignatius wrote meant that few were positioned to question his characterization of the Ignatian corpus as a secure deposit of apostolic tradition. By collecting Ignatius alongside other early Christian writings, Ignatius's writings become one monument among many that exemplify the nature of the Church, setting the stage for an Ignatian revival in the later fourth century.

### **Imagining Ignatius after Eusebius**

In the late fourth and fifth centuries, Eusebius's image of Ignatius as an apostolic man takes hold, creating new ways of memorializing Ignatius and authorizing his writings. After Eusebius, the memory of Ignatius flourishes. He is cited and memorialized in polemical works like Athanasius's *De synodis*, cataloged with other Christian culture heroes by Jerome, honored with one of John Chrysostom's eloquent homilies, made the hero of multiple martyr acts, and given credit for entirely new epistles by the scribe of the Long Recension. By some, he is remembered as a liturgical innovator,<sup>538</sup> and others install his remains into Antioch's Tychaeum, thus closely associating Ignatius with the

---

<sup>537</sup> While numerous scholars have pointed out the primacy of place given martyrdom in Eusebius, this is largely treated as a natural outgrowth of early Christian interest in martyrs. However, it would bear closer scrutiny as to what extent the interest in texts by and about martyrs (as well as the production of new martyrdom narratives) is itself an effect of the Great Persecution, rather than any continuous tradition of suffering as central to Christian life.

<sup>538</sup> Socrates Scholasticus, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 6.8, credits him with the invention of antiphonal singing used in churches. While it was innovative in human practice, it came as the result of a heavenly vision in which Ignatius saw the angels praising God with antiphonal chant.

fate of the city.<sup>539</sup> In this section, we will examine the ways in which Ignatius's exemplarity is reinforced and mined for new rhetorical purposes. In doing so, we encounter Christian scholars for the first time presenting Ignatius as a theological authority and staunch defender of their brands of Christian orthodoxy. However, alongside this flowering of Ignatian memory and cult, there is strong evidence for limited access to and interest in reading or possessing copies of the Ignatian epistles. Ultimately, the image of Ignatius as "apostolic man" coupled with the narrow distribution of texts creates the conditions in which various acts of Martyrdom and the Long Recension of Ignatius's letters all find a ready reception.

As we saw in previous chapters, the Long Recension dealt directly with the textual remnants of Ignatius. It expanded the Middle Recension through the addition of scriptural citations, biblical exempla, and Christological statements that struck a conciliating tone in fourth-century theological disputes. While such additions altered the character of the textual tradition in important ways, they had much the same effect as Eusebius's practices of history writing. In both the *Ecclesiastical History* and the Long Recension, the Ignatian corpus becomes an icon of an unchanging, irenic, bishop-led church. The past is made intelligible insofar as it is understood to mirror fourth-century ideologies of ecclesiastical order and Christian universality.

Other fourth-century Ignatian textual traditions show interest in and engagement with the text of the Middle Recension. Both forms of the Ignatian martyr acts engage directly with the epistolary tradition. The Antiochene version, so-called because Ignatius's trial takes place at Antioch under the supervision of Trajan, makes mention of Ignatius's activity as a letter writer and gives the text of *Romans* as an example of this

---

<sup>539</sup> Mayer and Allen, *Churches of Syrian Antioch*, 81–82, 146–154; Evagrius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 1.16.

activity (*Martyrdom of Ign* A 4). The Roman version in which the trial takes place at Rome also engages directly with the epistolary tradition. Rather than incorporating the letters or characterizing Ignatius as a letter writer, various quotations from the epistles are placed in the mouth of Ignatius when he speaks to Trajan. In one case, Ignatius speaks an excerpt from *Romans* (*Martyrdom of Ignatius* B 10). Ignatius's oft-repeated words about being "ground by the teeth of wild beasts" in order to become "pure bread (*Rom* 4.1)" are placed on his lips as he is mauled by lions. Here and elsewhere, it appears as if the scribe of this martyrdom tale read the letters—at least *Romans*—as inspiration for constructing the voice of Ignatius.<sup>540</sup> Much like in *prosopopoeia* exercises in school settings, the literary remnants of an historical character contributed to imagining what that character might have said in a particular historical situation.<sup>541</sup> Despite different orientations to the letters, both narratives engage with these textual remains to construct new stories about Ignatius.

The Short Recension also demonstrates engagement with the text of Ignatius's letters, providing an epitome of *Polycarp*, *Ephesians*, and *Romans* (in that order) along with a portion of *Trallians* included as the conclusion of *Romans*. In selecting what materials to keep, the scribe seems to have selected portions that could be read for personal pedagogy. Almost the entirety of *Polycarp* is retained in the Short Recension. The closing sections of that epistle, however, are almost entirely absent. While much of the letter involves ethical exhortation, the sections that were left out include requests for the Smyrnaean congregation to send ambassadors to Syria (7–8.1) and greetings from Ignatius to specific individuals at Smyrna (8.2–3). In condensing this epistle, the redactor removes material that identifies the letter as occasional rather than more

---

<sup>540</sup> E.g. *Martyrdom of Ignatius* B 2 which includes allusions to *Rom* 6 and *Eph* 18.

<sup>541</sup> This practice was strongly encouraged by the likes of Quintilian, *Institutes* 9.2.

universally directed. Similarly, the epitome does not include portions of *Ephesians* that were specific only to the letter's ascribed occasion. The Short Recension does not include any discussion of the Ephesian ambassadors who came to visit Ignatius (2) or the portions of the Middle Recension that mention Ignatius's hope to send another letter (20). The portions of *Ephesians* that were retained tend to be those that provide direct pedagogical exhortation. The letters become almost aphoristic at times. For example, two sections of *Ephesians* become only a few sentences in the Short Recension:

The work is not of promise, unless a man be found in the power of faith even to the end. It is better that a man should be silent while he is something than that he should be talking when he is not so that by those things which he speaks, he should act, and by those things of which he is silent, he should be known (cf. *Eph* 14–15, MR).

Ignatius appears more as a teacher and dispenser of wisdom than anything else. The Short Recension of *Romans*, while less pedagogically oriented than *Polycarp* and *Ephesians*, also condenses by removing the specific requests made as part of the farewell. In its place, the Short Recension incorporates material from *Trallians* (4–5) that, like the bulk of *Romans*, deals with Ignatius's desire to die. In combining these letters, the Short Recension creates a more holistic picture of Ignatius as martyr that accounts for Ignatius's confidence in the face of death and gives expression to his concerns that he might become too puffed up or not prove worthy of such a testimony to God. Overall, the Short Recension retains elements that emphasize Ignatius's standing as martyr and provide pedagogical instruction and inspiration to the reader. Thus, it exhibits close engagement with at least some part of the epistolary corpus.<sup>542</sup>

---

<sup>542</sup> The engagement of the scribe of the Short Recension with the Middle Recension would benefit from a fuller treatment. The practice of epitomizing also remains under-theorized. For some preliminary efforts, see the essays in Horster and Reitz, *Condensing Texts – Condensed Texts*. See also, MacGillivray, "Epitomizing Philosophy," who suggests that Epicureans provided epitomes as a kind of marketing tool for potential students and interested outsiders.

Aside from the works which make up the Ignatian textual tradition, however, fourth-century writers largely divorce the importance of Ignatius from the text of his letters. Basil of Caesarea, Jerome, and John Chrysostom all include citations of Ignatius, but none of these writers exhibits much interest in the letters or recommends them to other readers for their benefit.

The references to Ignatius in Basil and Jerome exhibit no direct knowledge of the Ignatian epistles. Basil cites the same passage from *Ephesians* as Origen and Eusebius as part of his own homily on the theophany. Like Origen, he truncated the reference to “three mysteries,” focusing only on the concealment of Mary’s virginity from “the ruler of this age (*Homilia in sanctam Christi generationem* 3, 111–119).” Unlike Eusebius in *Quaestiones ad Stephanum*, Basil does not seem to have bothered to consult Origen’s source for the quotation as it is preserved in the same form as Origen, though introduced more abruptly.<sup>543</sup> Basil expresses nothing of Origen’s admiration for Ignatius’s eloquence, merely identifying the quotation as from “one of the ancients (τῶν παλαιῶν τινι).” What matters here for Basil is that tradition, whoever might have been its author, has something useful to say on the topic which he can expand and innovate upon for his own theological purposes.<sup>544</sup> Ignatius’s words are, thanks to Origen, part of Basil’s teaching tradition but Ignatius himself is irrelevant.<sup>545</sup>

---

<sup>543</sup> Pace Lightfoot who takes Basil’s phrase “κατάλυσιν τῆς ἰδίας ἀρχῆς” as evidence that Basil was familiar with the epistolary context of the citation. Ignatius does go on to mark the incarnation as the end of magic and the ruin of the “ancient kingdom (*Eph* 19.3),” but Basil’s vague reference to the devil’s concern for the dissolution of his power need not be supplied from Ignatius’s more distinctive interest in how the “Lord” became manifest to the “aeons.”

<sup>544</sup> For more on the homily, see DelCogliano, “Tradition and Polemic.”

<sup>545</sup> Basil is sometimes identified as the first church father to explicitly deploy arguments based on the authority of previous church fathers, usually because of the conclusion of *De spiritu sancto* which cites numerous predecessors for his own formulation of the doxology (29). This propensity to establish a teaching tradition behind specific ideas makes it all the more likely that Ignatius was not seen as authoritative in his own right. It also gives greater credence to the possibility that Origen’s citation of Ignatius was originally unattributed with later scribes filling in the additional information.

Jerome mentions Ignatius in a variety of works. The fullest reference comes in *On Illustrious Men*. There Jerome provides a summary of Eusebius's testimony about Ignatius: Ignatius is a successor of Peter at Antioch; he sent letters to various churches and people on his way to his death under Trajan; and he knew Polycarp, who knew the apostle John. He goes on to quote the same passages from *Smyrnaeans* and *Romans* as Eusebius, only altering the order of presentation and providing a brief comment that the Jesus tradition in *Smyrnaeans* came from a gospel recently translated by Jerome (*de evangelio quod nuper a me translatum est, De viris* 16).<sup>546</sup> In repeating and summarizing certain details, Jerome betrays his own ignorance of the corpus.<sup>547</sup> He treats *Smyrnaeans* and *Polycarp* as a single epistle, identifying Eusebius's quotation of *Smyrnaeans* 3.1–2 as from the letter to Polycarp. His translation of that passage also suggests that he mistook the entire passage as the quotation of Ignatius's Jesus tradition rather than as a combination of Ignatius's own voice and a reference to another text. Jerome translates the first line: *Ego vero et post resurrectionem in carne eum vidi*. Where manuscripts of the Middle Recension and Eusebius have Ignatius claim, "I know (οἶδα)" Jesus was in the flesh after the resurrection, Jerome translates "I saw (*vidi*)."<sup>547</sup> Thus, Jerome translates as if the "I" in the quotation was an eyewitness rather than someone a generation or more removed from the resurrection. In addition, the new pieces of information provided by Jerome do not depend on access to the epistolary corpus. Neither his certainty that he knows the source of Ignatius's Jesus tradition nor his location of Ignatius's remains "in the cemetery outside the Daphne gate (16)" suggest access to or interest in the letter collection itself.

---

<sup>546</sup> He does not name that gospel here but elsewhere identifies it as the Gospel of the Hebrews.

<sup>547</sup> Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2.1.156.



What Jerome's works do suggest is a growing interest in Ignatius on the part of Christian communities in the Roman Empire. Jerome is the first Latin writer to demonstrate knowledge of Ignatius, deeming him sufficiently important to his audience to include him in not only *On Illustrious Men* but also in two polemical treatises and a commentary on Matthew. In these other genres, Jerome displays the same ignorance of the epistles as he did in *On Illustrious Men*. In one case, he describes Ignatius as one of a whole series of ancient writers who opposed "Ebion, Theodotus of Byzantium, and Valentinus (*Adv. Helv.* 17)" for their views that Jesus had brothers and sisters by "nature" rather than "kinship." Nowhere in the Middle Recension of the Ignatian epistles do we find any interest in Jesus's family, much less attacks on the likes of Ebion, Theodotus, and Valentinus.<sup>548</sup> The Long Recension does include passages that mention Ebion (*Phil* 6) and Theodotus (*Trall* 11) by name, but nothing in Jerome's writings suggest that he was any more familiar with the Long Recension than he was with the Middle Recension.<sup>549</sup> Rather, both the Long Recension and Jerome seem to operate off a similar assumption that early writers were heresiologists just like later ecclesiastical writers. In another treatise, Jerome identifies a quotation from *Barnabas* as belonging to the "apostolic man and martyr Ignatius (*Adv. Pel.* 3.2)." Lightfoot suggests that Jerome here misremembered a quotation from Origen (*C. Cels.* 1.63), but whatever the reason, it does not indicate direct knowledge of the epistles.<sup>550</sup> The only other citation of Ignatius also seems to be drawn from Origen. Like Basil and Eusebius before him, Jerome cites Ignatius in his discussion of the reasons why Mary was married. He attributes a "fourth reason" for why Mary was betrothed to the "martyr Ignatius (*Comm. in Matt.* 1.1)." Here

---

<sup>548</sup> Hübner, "Thesen," and Lechner, *Ignatius adversus Valentinianos?* have both argued that the Middle Recension was forged to counter Valentinian use of Ignatius. It seems unlikely that such an indirect attack on these figures is what Jerome is imagining.

<sup>549</sup> On the inclusion of such heretical figures in the Long Recension, see Chapter 2 which deals with the Long Recension's portrayal of Ignatius as heresiologist.

<sup>550</sup> Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers* 2.1.157.

too the citation appears to be from memory as he alters the quote into more familiar terms, writing, “So that the birth was hidden from the devil.” Origen, Eusebius, and Basil all followed (or remembered) Ignatius more closely by identifying the devil as “the ruler of this age.” Jerome substitutes a more familiar term for this phrase. In each of these cases, Ignatius is identified as a figure of some importance—an apostolic man, a martyr or heresiologist. Even the faulty memory that leads Jerome to attribute *Barnabas* to Ignatius suggests that Ignatius was more firmly in his own mind (and perhaps the mind of his audience) than another otherwise unmemorable early Christian writer.<sup>551</sup> Ignatius’s significance is largely divorced from any access to or concern with the content of texts bearing his name.

John Chrysostom exhibits a comparable interest in Ignatius coupled with an uncertain relationship to the epistles themselves. The only definite references to Ignatius all appear in a single homily given at Antioch on Ignatius’s feast day.<sup>552</sup> Despite the length of the sermon—nine pages in the Migne edition—the text of Ignatius’s letters plays almost no role. Chrysostom repeatedly cites Pauline texts (Gal 3:28; 1 Cor 15:11; Ti 1:7–9, 1 Tim 5:22, Col 1:24, 2 Cor 11:29, 12:21) and even the words of Christ (John 4:38, 10:11) to justify his praise of Ignatius but only cites a single Ignatian epistle a single time.<sup>553</sup> As proof of his claim that Ignatius met his fate with joy, Chrysostom stands in for his

---

<sup>551</sup> The inclusion of a large portion of *Barnabas* as part of the manuscripts of Polycarp’s *Philippians*, suggests that this conflation of *Barnabas* with a more famous figure did not just happen with Ignatius.

<sup>552</sup> John Chrysostom, *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem* PG 50: 587–96. In Chrysostom’s liturgical calendar that day is October 17, given the proximity to the feast of the martyr Pelagia (October 8) named in the homily as preceding this feast. Later calendars shifted the date to December 20. Homilies attributed to Chrysostom of uncertain date and provenance do mention Ignatius (e.g. Ps-Chrys. *Homiliae de legislatore* and *Homiliae de pseudoprophetae*). Lightfoot identifies another homily (*On Ephesians 3*) as exhibiting Chrysostom’s knowledge of Ignatius because he uses a construction crane as a metaphor as Ignatius did in *Ephesians 9*. Such reliance on similarity in metaphors fails to demonstrate dependence.

<sup>553</sup> See now on this issue, Eastman, “Ignatius, Pseudo-Ignatius, and the Art of Pauline Reception.” While Eastman and I reach similar conclusions regarding Chrysostom’s use of Paul to authorize Ignatius, they were developed independently. Eastman’s article was published after this chapter was composed and without communication between us.

audience, asking the question “From where is this evident?” He supplies the answer from the same portion of *Romans* known to Eusebius and Jerome. He answers his question: “From the words that he uttered when about to die, for when he heard that this manner of punishment awaited him, ‘May I have enjoyment,’ he said, ‘of these beasts (ἐγὼ τῶν θηρίων ἐκείνων ὀναίμην, *In s. Ign.* 5, PG 50: 594, 13–14; cf. *Rom* 5.2).” The demonstrative pronoun ἐκείνων—itself absent from the manuscript tradition of the either recension—helps create the impression that Ignatius spoke these words in the presence of the beasts just before his death rather than in a letter while such dangers were still hypothetical.<sup>554</sup> Thus, even when citing material taken from the letters, Chrysostom behaves as if they do not exist.<sup>555</sup>

In the course of the homily, Ignatius’s persona emerges as far more important than his letters. Chrysostom even portrays himself as having trouble deciding what part of his persona to praise asking, “Whose praises shall we sing first? The martyr or the bishop or the apostle? (*In s. Ign.* 1, PG 50: 588, 25–26).” Chrysostom remembers him first and foremost as a companion of the apostles, saying “he kept true company (συνεγένετω γνησίως)” with them, was “raised (συντραφέντα) with them,” and “kept company with them everywhere (*In s. Ign.* 1, PG 50: 588, 12-16).” These apostolic connections inform almost every aspect of Chrysostom’s portrayal of Ignatius. Rather than identifying any examples of Ignatius’s writing or life that illustrate his holiness, Chrysostom relies on Ignatius’s connection to the apostles to assert that he must have

---

<sup>554</sup> This aspect of the homily parallels the Roman version of the *Martyrdom of Ignatius* in taking the text of the letters and placing them on Ignatius’s lips during his trial and execution (e.g. *Martyrdom of Ignatius* B 10). While it is unlikely that Chrysostom knew this version because he claims Antioch as the locus of Ignatius’s relics, we can see how homiletical traditions of written works might prepare the way for the creative repurposing of text in the Roman martyr acts.

<sup>555</sup> It would be impossible to determine whether this was a conscious choice to efface the epistolary context of these words or rooted in ignorance. Whatever the case, this version of the words better accords with his homiletical purposes which seem to include making the martyr feel present to the audience before inviting them at the homily’s close to draw close to the martyr’s burial place to gain the spiritual fruits available there.

embodied every virtue that Paul outlined for bishops in the letter to Titus. Otherwise, the apostles who knew him so well would never have made him bishop (*In s. Ign. 2*). He also must have been great because he was bishop at such a difficult time when danger from outsiders was around every corner and insiders were like “newly-born babes,” needing constant care to prevent them from straying (*In s. Ign. 3*). Here too, Chrysostom returns to the idea that the apostles would not have entrusted such a situation to just anyone. Even Antioch’s size plays a role. Certainly the apostles would only have placed the most able leader over a church so large (*In s. Ign. 4*). It is only in his martyrdom that Ignatius’s own activities come to the foreground as he becomes an apostle in his own right. Here too his martyrdom is made to conform to apostolic archetypes with Paul’s journey to Rome forming an important precedent (*In s. Ign. 4*). His death, like those of Paul and Peter, helps to purify Rome of its idolatry and gives proof of the resurrection to the “whole city” in attendance at his death (*In s. Ign. 5*).

The very fact that Chrysostom gives a homily in honor of Ignatius illustrates that the Antiochene church of his day held Ignatius in esteem. Yet in the emphasis on the apostles as guarantors of Ignatius’s character, the homily suggests a slippage between the fact of memorialization and the reasons for it. Ignatius’s praiseworthiness is largely contingent on the idea that the apostles picked him for their team. Chrysostom exploits the gaps in his own and the audience’s knowledge to make Ignatius into a memory of the whole church. Like Eusebius, Chrysostom portrays Ignatius as enmeshed with the apostles and part of the process of knitting the church together, but rather than focusing on him as a writer and securer of apostolic tradition, he identifies him as an ethical link. Ignatius is specially selected for his role because he embodied everything about the apostolic way of life, shining brightly with their knowledge and their deeds. He lived temperately, governed the church in difficult times, and went with joy to his death, just

like his teachers. The audience is not called upon to imitate his endurance but to “pluck spiritual fruits from him (PG 50: 595, 7–8)” no matter their problems or station in life. Virtue and security are accessible by hearing, seeing, and even touching the martyr’s memorials (*In s. Ign.* 5). Like any useful and durable exemplum, Ignatius’s memory was easily molded to the rhetorical demands of new situations.

Not all inheritors of Ignatius’s memory ignored the epistles in the ways we have seen in Jerome and John Chrysostom. Several utilized the letters in order to bolster the credibility of their own theological positions and to assert the antiquity of positions that were often innovative. The earliest of these was Athanasius who cites *Ephesians* in his anti-Arian treatise, *De synodis*. Ignatius does not, however, serve as a straightforward demonstration of Athanasius’s own theological opinions. Rather, Ignatius is put forward as an example of the kind of controversy that develops when people read their predecessors writings too carefully. Admitting (at least for the sake of argument) that “the fathers” spoke in different ways about key theological terms, Athanasius exhorts his reader:

Let us not be contentious (φιλονεικῶμεν) but receive these things piously, most especially since they bore zeal for piety (ἕως μάλιστα τὴν σπουδὴν εἶχον εἰς εὐσέβειαν, *De synodis* 46.3).

That is, if we know the people responsible for a text were pious, we should read their writings in that regard, finding them in harmony rather than at odds. To illustrate this potential, Athanasius introduces a quote from Ignatius and another voice, acknowledging that these statements could be read as in disagreement about Christ’s status as either begotten or unbegotten. Athanasius reminds his readers that “Ignatius who was appointed bishop in Antioch after the apostles and became a martyr of Christ” wrote about Christ as “begotten and unbegotten,” while “some teachers after Ignatius” wrote that the father alone was “unbegotten” while the Son was the one “truly begotten

(*De synodis* 47.1).<sup>556</sup> In a reversal of the reading strategies he applies to “Arian” writers,<sup>557</sup> Athanasius argues that these differences are insignificant because the statements were meant to illustrate different points. Ignatius was distinguishing between Christ’s status as begotten according to flesh but unbegotten according to his divine nature while the unnamed writer is emphasizing the reality that the Father has no prior cause, suggesting that the Word was begotten and made (*De synodis* 47.2). According to Athanasius, the pious reader (as opposed to the contentious one) will realize that these ancient voices do not contradict one another.

What Athanasius exploits here is not Ignatius’s ideas or authority so much as the ideology of tradition speaking with a singular, harmonious voice. Ignatius and these other teachers are all recognized as part of a single Christian tradition. If read too critically or contentiously they seem to disagree. Athanasius argues that just as this disagreement is in appearance only, so too the disagreement some people identify between the council that deposed Paul of Samosata and those who proscribed “Arian” teaching is in appearance only (*De synodis* 47.3–4). The fact that one appears to deny the truth of the term *homoousios* and the other supports it should not be taken as disagreement. Rather, the “pious” reader will recognize that the statement that Christ is “not *homoousios*” was intended to counter Paul of Samosata’s teaching, not to deny the term itself as ever having or expressing the truth of Christian tradition.

---

<sup>556</sup> The quote of Ignatius comes from *Ephesians* 7, as part of a series of antitheses and paradoxes. The unnamed teachers are unknown, but their position bears some resemblance to a statement of Clement of Alexandria in *Stromateis* 6.7.58. Clement asserts God as the only unbegotten (ἀγέννητον) and the Son as the first-begotten (πρωγεννηθὲν). Athanasius’s articulation of this idea makes it seem as if it was a common way of articulating a traditional Christian theology.

<sup>557</sup> See *De synodis* 15–32 where Athanasius details the disagreements and fickleness of his Arian opponents. He does so at greater length in his *Historia Arianorum*. In both cases, he follows heresiological tropes established in the likes of Irenaeus and Eusebius in which a love of newness and invention rests at the heart of all heresies. Thus, Arians cannot even agree with one another, just as earlier heretics continually disagreed.

Despite not using Ignatius to authorize a particular position,<sup>558</sup> Athanasius's arguments suggest that it would have been plausible for he and his readers to do so. The argument depends on careful readers pitting the theological statements of early Christian writers against one another in an effort to ascertain the traditional, and thus definitive, statement of correct Christology. Whether he included Ignatius to undercut opponents who claimed him or because everyone identified Ignatius as part of traditional Christianity, Athanasius gives us the first hints that anyone was reading the text of Ignatius's letters for such a purpose. Eusebius's project of collecting extant texts into an authoritative tradition has met with some success and now it is up to later readers to sort through the content if they so choose to define orthodoxy for their time.

It is only in the middle of the fifth century that Ignatius's words first appear as examples of correct Christian theology.<sup>559</sup> Theodoret and Timothy Aelurus both collect lists of patristic citations, including some from the Ignatian corpus, in support of specific theological viewpoints. Best known as a biblical scholar and historian rather than a theologian, Theodoret was nevertheless active in the theological disputes of his day. He opposed Cyril of Alexandria in the Nestorian controversy and was despised by "Miaphysite" theologians for his staunch defense of two separate natures that remained unmixed in the person of Christ. In his epistles, Theodoret behaves much as earlier writers did, including Ignatius among lists of authoritative teachers, whether or not Ignatius addressed the issues under discussion in the letter.<sup>560</sup> However, he goes beyond this in his theological treatises by providing select quotations from teachers he deems

---

<sup>558</sup> In fact, Athanasius clearly recognizes that were Ignatius's statement deemed authoritative on its own, it would undermine his own position.

<sup>559</sup> A Syriac writer called John the Monk uses *Romans* in the *Epistula ad Eutropium et Eusebium* in order to illustrate his argument that saints had to die to the flesh in order to become a "word of God." Lightfoot dates this work to the end of the fourth but admits that it may belong to other Johns who lived in the fifth and sixth centuries.

<sup>560</sup> See *Epistles* 89, 145, and 151.

authoritative (in contrast to his opponents who create a patchwork from heretics).<sup>561</sup> Combining his penchant for church history with theological arguments, Theodoret collected numerous citations from Ignatius to support his contention that Christian tradition agreed on the immutability of the Logos and the lack of confusion between Christ's human and divine natures. Theodoret's list of citations begins from Ignatius and stretches through his successors like Flavian of Antioch and John Chrysostom. Ignatius is the first of those who explained apostolic tradition. In serial fashion, Theodoret quotes some of the many instances where Ignatius opposes "docetic" teachings by asserting the reality of Christ's flesh, both by being of the family of David and by participating in human activities like eating, drinking, and dying.<sup>562</sup> He provides a similar list of holy predecessors to argue that there remained a distinction between the human and divine natures in Christ even after the resurrection.<sup>563</sup>

Even here, Ignatius does not present the didactic authority we might expect. Theodoret never provides close readings of his source texts. Rather, he persuades by overwhelming his imaginary interlocutor with numerous people whom he identifies as speaking harmoniously. When the imaginary interlocutor hesitantly highlights the "considerable divisions in the words (πολλήν...ἐν τοῖς λόγοις διαίρεσιν)" of the fathers, the voice of "orthodoxy" reminds him that these "men are the successors (διάδοχοι) of

---

<sup>561</sup> Theodoret, *Eranistes* Prologue (Ettliger, ed. p. 62, lines 6–10).

<sup>562</sup> Theodoret cites *Smyrnaeans* 1, 4.2, 5.2; *Ephesians* 7.2, 18.2, 20.2; and *Trallians* 9.1. Curiously, he does not cite the passages in the order of individual letters. Rather, in each case the first citations given from a particular letter relate directly to a statement of being born according to the flesh and according to divinity. The statements that are included out of their order in the epistles (*Smyr* 4.2 and *Eph* 7.2) do not clearly relate to one another in any way. The ordering of the citations makes it seem that Theodoret was not working directly from the letters themselves but from his own notebooks. Those quotations that appear out of order were likely organized under different categories and then collected again under their source title here. As context was not important in the process of collection, so too it was not important in weaving the words back together. For more on this practice, see the essays in Morlet, ed. *Lire in extrait*.

<sup>563</sup> In the second dialogue of *Eranistes* he cites *Smyrnaeans* 3.2–3, but leaves out a portion of the passages which might be read to suggest a mixing of the two natures. He also cites Ignatius in the third dialogue of the *Eranistes*, drawing from *Smyrnaeans* 7.1.



the divine apostles” and it is verging on blasphemy to suggest they disagreed.<sup>564</sup> He does nothing to dissuade the unsympathetic reader that the differences are real rather than apparent. Instead, he cites Apollinarius, whom he identifies as a heretic, as proof that everyone must have thought Christ to be unchangeable (ἀτρέπτος) and born of the flesh because even a heretic agrees (and we all know they never agree).<sup>565</sup> No person in the chain holds the weight of all, only their fame as apostolic men and martyrs and a vague sense of harmony (συμφωνία) or concord in their speech carries authority.

In this regard, the differences between Theodoret and his historical and theological predecessor Eusebius are instructive. Throughout the *Church History*, Eusebius provides images of exemplary action, especially martyrdom, and ecclesiastical interconnection. Especially for early writers, he rarely ever articulates their teachings. Instead, his attempts to identify people who were alive around the same time creates images of interconnection and amplifies the few instances where there seem to be direct connections between writers. Theodoret largely eschews such interpersonal connections. Instead, he identifies the harmony between ecclesiastical writers as all the more authoritative because they were chronologically and geographically distant. He writes, “Mountains and seas keep them far from one another, but distance (διάστασις) does not damage the harmony.”<sup>566</sup> Where succession of the sort that characterized Hellenistic philosophical schools governed many of Eusebius’s claims concerning the succession of apostles and bishops, Theodoret claims “they were all led by one spiritual gift.”<sup>567</sup> Thus, the text of ancient writings is important for Theodoret in a different way than for Eusebius. He must show the content of these writings in order to provide the clearest

---

<sup>564</sup> Ettlenger, ed. *Eranistes* p. 109, lines 10–17.

<sup>565</sup> Ettlenger, ed. p. 109, lines 20–25

<sup>566</sup> Ettlenger, ed. p. 95, lines 3–5.

<sup>567</sup> Ettlenger, ed. p. 95, lines 4–5.

impression of harmony possible from what he has at his disposal. As part of such a project, Theodoret is the first to give Ignatius a clear theological voice.

One of Theodoret's contemporaries, Timothy Aelurus, an anti-Chalcedonian bishop from Alexandria, produced works that anthologized early Christian writers to create a similar impression of unity in the teachings of the fathers. However, he parlayed his collections of citations into support for a single nature in Christ, rather than two natures unmixed. Two works of Timothy's survive in Syriac translation, *Against the Diphysites* and *Testimony of the Fathers*. In much the same fashion as Theodoret, though without the literary frame of a dialogue, Timothy collected series of testimonies to monophysite Christology. He begins his collection of ancient testimonies from Ignatius and follows them with citations of Polycarp (*Phil* 5.2, 12.2) and 2 Clement (1.1). Notably, he cites letters or parts thereof which are absent from Theodoret. He quotes Ignatius's request from *Romans* that he be allowed to be an "imitator of the suffering of God (6.3)" as a demonstration of the single nature present in Christ. Where Theodoret cited *Smyrnaeans* 5.2 to support his cause, Timothy cites the portions immediately following those to identify the "blood of Christ" as intermingled with his divinity (cf. *Smyr* 5.3–6.1). Sometimes, they both cite the same passage (e.g. *Eph* 18.1) as definitive support for diametrically opposed positions.

That writers who draw different theological conclusions read texts differently is hardly surprising. Nevertheless, the attempt to corral Ignatius's letters into a definite theological position suggests the emergence of a wider consensus about the importance of Ignatius for Christian memory.<sup>568</sup> By and large, what he actually wrote is of little importance except for the occasional decontextualized statement that can be lobbed at

---

<sup>568</sup> E.g. Severus of Antioch, another "miaphysite" writer also extensively quotes from the Ignatian epistles.

opponents or passed to friends for reassurance. Rather, the idea of him as an apostolic man, martyr and bishop makes him too useful to let go. The letters themselves are of little use in establishing the apostolic connections, but once those take hold in the Christian imagination, there is little that cannot be plausibly attributed to Ignatius. By the middle of the fifth century, Ignatius's cult is firmly established in the Christian imagination. Only then do his epistolary remains garner the kind of detailed attention we might expect from a theological authority, and even then, his actual words create as many theological problems as answers.

## **Conclusion**

Both before and after Eusebius, the texts are transmitted not as depositories of authoritative teaching or wisdom, but as monuments in themselves. Not everyone needs to have them, and often times, it is enough to merely know that they exist to put them to use. Ignatius's exemplary activity leads at least one scribe to share the epistles with others as a monument to his example. The saint slowly goes out of fashion before being rediscovered by Christian scholars and antiquarians who successfully reinvigorate his memory. In their practices of collecting and synthesizing extant knowledge, ecclesiastical writers help to create the conditions for new Ignatian productions—expanded letters, martyr acts, and theological florilegia. Despite his epistolary remains, Ignatius remains a blank parchment on which to imagine the history of Christianity.

## CONCLUSION

In this dissertation, I have argued that a focus on the *effects* of texts and textual production provides an avenue for addressing the impasse of the rhetoric vs. reality divide so prevalent in social histories of early Christianity and concomitant examinations of Jewish–Christian relations. Historians have long debated the degree to which texts either reflect or evoke specific worldviews and social formations but have less often explored how those objects came to be data in the first place and what sorts of practices gave any particular worldview or claim traction. Scholarly practices of reading and analysis tend implicitly and explicitly to locate the historical value of texts with the originary or initial text, thus privileging texts that mirror the modern author function. While providing important insights into the ancient world, such practices often miss the ways in which the reproduction of these materials depended on factors that had little to do with authorial intent or the immediate concerns of the initial audience. Reproduction and dissemination did not necessarily depend on the “message” of a given text.

While my approach draws on practices of reception history, the study of textual *nachleben*, and text criticism, I bring these scholarly activities into conversation with the recent turn to materiality in the humanities, particularly as exemplified in studies of ancient education, scribal culture, the history of the book, and the sociology of science. Studies of education, such as the work of Rafaella Cribiore and Teresa Shaw, have brought to the fore the institutional settings, practices, and ideologies that shaped the habits of all literate and rhetorically skilled people. Similarly, studies of scribal culture such as those by Kim Haines-Eitzen and Karel van der Toorn have emphasized the complex mixture of repetition and creative action, the interplay of production and

reproduction, that characterized most ancient scribal work. Whether working in temple schools or in the relative privacy of the home, scribes regularly made decisions about what to keep and emend based on their assumptions about the putative author and their trust in the networks through which they received the text. Similarly, scholars dealing with the history of the book (Roger Chartier and William Johnson) and the sociology of science (esp. Bruno Latour and John Law) have argued for the need to pay close attention to the work done by the material form a text (or other artifact), to the limitations and potencies imposed by materiality. In building on this rich and diverse body of scholarship, I ask what it looks like to read ancient texts when we take into account these multiple and overlapping agencies and practices. I seek not only the historical reading that makes sense of a given text in a given setting but to explore what kinds of concerns, agents and practices texts were subject to in becoming for us documents of antiquity.

To focus such wide-ranging questions and methods, I narrowed my research to a single textual tradition, the letters attributed to Ignatius of Antioch. These letters have played an important role in scholarship on early Christianity and the history of Jewish-Christian relations. With their multiple extant recensions and well-documented history of citation and allusion, they provide a perfect test-case for how a wide variety of agents and practices of reproduction in different institutional contexts serve to construct the authority of a given person and textual tradition while deploying the same texts to different ends.

Chapters 1 and 2 each provided a close comparison of a second-century letter from the Middle Recension with its fourth-century counterpart in the Long Recension. Chapter 1 compared the recensions of *Magnesians*, and Chapter 2 compared the recensions of *Philadelphians*, both of which are frequently cited in studies of early

Jewish–Christian relations. In comparing the differences between recensions, we saw a scribe at work and explored the ways in which both difference and similarity between the recensions could contribute to news readings of the text. With each letter, the comparison illustrated the ways in which a scribe’s actions helped map contemporary expectations of scriptural literacy, episcopacy, Christology, and an idealized Christian community onto an earlier textual tradition. These differences created a new epistolary structure in which to evaluate and interpret those portions of the letters that remained relatively unchanged between recensions. Close attention to similarity, to what was reproduced, between the recensions highlighted the ways in which copying, emendation, and addition worked hand in hand to effect a new version of the letters that conformed more closely to fourth- and fifth-century expectations and ideologies of Christian history and identity. These chapters highlight how both alteration and retention emerge not only from the intent of a single scribe but from the interplay of individual goals with institutional, ideological, and other constraints. I argued that whatever the intent of the scribe of the Long Recension might have been, the effects of textual change and retention were to construct a chain of intelligibility between the second and fourth century, marking Ignatius as both familiar and relevant to contemporary concerns and early Christian communities as intelligible in fourth-century terms and categories.

Chapter 3 asked how these patterns might affect the way we understand the role of texts like the Ignatian corpus in scholarly debates about the so-called “Parting of the Ways” between Judaism and Christianity. Rather than adjudicating the rhetoric vs. reality of any given statement of the Middle Recension, I used the fourth-century Long Recension as a test case for exploring the effects of the Middle Recension’s rhetoric about the distinctiveness of *Christianismos* from *Ioudaismos*. I argue that the Long Recension’s increased attention to Jewishness is itself symptomatic of an increasing

concern with correct cognition as the essential or defining mode of religious adherence. The Long Recension shares with contemporary writers such as church historians and Christian homilists a pedagogical orientation to the textual heritage of early Christianity. The ways in which the Long Recension repeats and alters passages from the Middle Recension that refer to Jews and Judaism reflects a pedagogical orientation to the source material. These texts survive to teach readers something and it is up to both the scribe and the preacher to clarify what. Through such an ideology and the practices it entails, the anti-Jewish rhetoric of the Middle Recension gained a new purchase in the world because it became a means by which people were taught to think of themselves in Christian terms. Writing Judaism provided tools for creating and policing individual Christian subjectivity.

Whereas Chapters 1, 2, and 3 drilled progressively deeper into Ignatian textual details and the changing contexts of writing, reading, and rewriting the epistles, Chapter 4 pulled back to capture the wider panorama of textual composition and transmission which made the interventions of the Long Recension possible and plausible, allowing this later and, to modern readers, obviously spurious collection to largely eclipse the second-century Middle Recension on which it was constructed. In this chapter I argue that reading practices rooted in traditions of exemplarity along with the tradition of Ignatius's martyrdom were sufficient to guarantee the material survival of the letters apart from any concern or interest in what the letters argued or taught. That is, the letters were preserved as a monument, the material object that commemorated an exemplary action, rather than as a document of authoritative ideas. This allowed numerous fourth- and fifth-century writers to deploy Ignatius in creative and constructive ways with little concern on the part of writers or readers for what he actually wrote. It was the existence of the letters that mattered, not their contents. This provided

the foundation on which new Ignatian memories (e.g., multiple martyrdom accounts, at least two new recensions of the letters, etc.) were constructed, memories in which Ignatius first emerges as a didactic and theological authority.

It is my hope that the foregoing analyses have been suggestive of scholarly reading and analytical practices that could be profitably employed and refined in the study of other textual traditions, especially those with relatively long afterlives. The Ignatian textual tradition is far from the only early Christian textual tradition that underwent revision in a variety of settings. An obvious analogue exists in the extensive Clementine textual tradition with its combination of epistolary, homiletical, and novelistic elements. While this project remains firmly located in Late Antiquity, there is ample reason to think its questions could be pushed forward in time. Why were texts like the Ignatian epistles so central to the scholarship of Early Modern text critics and Church Historians? How have those factors continued to influence the practices of contemporary scholarship?

Ultimately, the dissertation will have been successful if it draws increased attention to the ways in which rhetorical claims, but especially those evoking and demarcating group identities, depend on a complex assemblage of actors (scribes, teachers, clergy, etc.) and practices (reading, copying, teaching, circulating, storing, etc.). While situating a study in terms of effects is not always easy and frequently pushes scholars up against the limits of disciplinary competence, it profitably directs our gaze to the ways in which any act of inscription may bear a contingent and tangential relationship to how that inscription is invoked, used, and understood.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Primary Texts

1 *Clement*

2 *Enoch*

2 Maccabees

4 Maccabees

*Apocalypse of Paul*

*Apostolic Constitutions*

Athanasius, *Letters, Historia Arianorum, Orationes contra Arianos, De synodis*

Augustine of Hippo, *De doctrina, De civitate dei,*

Babylonian Talmud, *Beitzah*

Bardaisan, *Book of the Laws of Countries*

*Barnabas*

Basil of Caesarea, *De spiritu sancto*

*Chronicon Paschale*. Ed. L. Dindorf. Corpus scriptorium historiae Byzantinae.

Bonn: Weber, 1832, 3–737.

Clement of Alexandria, *Protrepticus*

Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catecheses*

*Didache*

Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica, Martyrs of Palestine, Onomasticon, Contra Marcellum, Commentaria in Psalmos*

Evagrius, *Historia ecclesiastica*

Galen, *De libris propriis liber*

*Gospel of Nicodemus*. Constantine Tischendorf. *Evangelia Apocrypha*. Leipzig: Mendelssohn, 1876, 203ff.

Gregory of Nazianzus, *Carmina dogmatica*

Ignatius of Antioch, *Epistles*

Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses*

Isocrates, *Against the Sophists, Antidosis*

Jerome, *De viris illustribus, Adversus Jovinianum, De scriptoribus ecclesiasticis*

John Chrysostom, *In sanctum Ignatium martyrem, Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, Adversus Iudaeos, Homilies in First Timothy*

Josephus, *Contra Apionem*

Lactantius, *Divine Institutes*

*Martyrdom of Ignatius* (Antiochene and Roman versions)

*Martyrdom of Polycarp*

Mishnah, *Beitzah*

Origen, *De oratione, In canticum canticorum, Homiliae in Lucam*

Palestinian Talmud, *Shabbat*

Plato, *Gorgias*

Pliny the Younger, *Letters*

Ps.-Demetrius, *On Style*. Text and translation in *Ancient Epistolary Theorists*. Edited by Abraham Malherbe. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1988.

Ps.-Clement, *Homilies*

Polycarp, *Philippians*

Porphyry, *De philosophia* (fragments)

Severus of Antioch, *Homilies, Epistles Shepherd of Hermas*

Socrates Scholasticus, *Historia ecclesiastica*

Tacitus, *Annales*

Tatian, *Against the Greeks*

Tertullian, *De anima, De baptismo, De cultu feminarum, De idolatria, Adversus Marcionem, Adversus Valentinianos, Against All Heresies, De oratione, De pudicitia, Apologeticum*

Theodoret, *Eranistes*,

Theophilus of Antioch, *Ad Autolyicum*

Timothy Aelurus, *Testimonia Patrum, Against the Diphysites*

## Secondary Texts

- Bakhtin, Mikhail. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Edited by Michael Holquist. Translated by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Revised edition. Austin, TX: University of Texas, 1982.
- Barrett, C. K. "Jews and Judaizers in the Epistles of Ignatius." In *Jews, Greeks, and Christians: Studies in Honour of W.D. Davies*. Ed. R. Hamerton-Kelly and R. Scroggs. Leiden: Brill, 1976, 220–244.
- Barthes, Roland. "The Death of the Author [1968]." In *Image Music Text*, 142–149. Translated by Stephen Heath. New York: Hill and Wang, 1977.
- Barnes, Timothy D. "Date of Ignatius." *Expository Times* 120 (2008): 119–130.
- Barnes, Timothy D. *Eusebius and Constantine*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 1981.
- Bauer, Walter. *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*. Ed. and trans. Robert Kraft, Gerhard Krödel, and Georg Strecker (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971 [1934]).
- Beard, Mary. "Ciceronian Correspondences: Making a Book out of Letters." In *Classics in Progress: Essays on Ancient Greece and Rome*. Edited by T.P. Wiseman. Oxford: Oxford University for the British Academy, 2002.
- Becker, Adam, and Annette Yoshiko Reed. *The Ways that Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007 [2003].
- Berzon, Todd. "The Problem with Identity in Late Antiquity." Review of Aaron P. Johnson, *Religion and Identity in Porphyry of Tyre: The Limits of Hellenism in Late Antiquity*. *Marginalia Review of Books*. November 2014. <http://marginalia.lareviewofbooks.org/problem-identity-late-antiquity/>

- Bihlmeyer, Karl. *Die Apostolischen Väter: Neubearbeitung der Funkschen Ausgabe*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1956.
- Boin, Douglas. "Hellenistic 'Judaism' and the Social Origins of the "Pagan-Christian" Debate." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 22.2 (2014): 167-196.
- Borges, Jorge Luis. "Pierre Menard, Author of the Quixote," 45–55. In *Ficciones*. Translated by Anthony Bonner. New York: Grove Press, 1962.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. *The Field of Cultural Production*. Translated by Randal Johnson. New York: Columbia University, 1993.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. "Readers, Reading, the Literate, Literature [1987]," 94–105. In *In Other Words: Essays Towards a Reflexive Sociology*. Translated by Matthew Adamson. Stanford: Stanford University, 1990.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Translated by Richard Nice. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1987.
- Bowes, Kim. *Private Worship, Public Values, and Religious Change in Late Antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2008.
- Bowes, Kim. "Early Christian Archaeology: A State of the Field." *Religion Compass* 2.4 (2008): 575–619.
- Boyarin, Daniel. *Border Lines: The Partition of Judaeo-Christianity*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 2004.
- Boyarin, Daniel and Virginia Burrus. "Hybridity as the Subversion of Orthodoxy: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity." *Social Compass* 52.4 (2005): 431–441.
- Brakke, David. "Jewish Flesh and Christian Spirit in Athanasius of Alexandria," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 9.4 (2001): 453–81.
- Brent, Allen. *Ignatius of Antioch: A Martyr Bishop and the Origin of Episcopacy*. London: T&T Clark, 2007.
- Brent, Allen. *Ignatius of Antioch and the Second Sophistic: A Study of an early Christian Transformation of Pagan Culture*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.
- Brent, Allen. "The Enigma of Ignatius of Antioch." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 57.3 (2006): 429-456.
- Brown, Charles T. *The Gospel and Ignatius of Antioch*. Studies in Biblical Literature 12. New York: Peter Lang, 2000.
- Brown, Milton. "Notes on the Language and Style of Pseudo-Ignatius." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 83.2 (1964): 146–152.
- Brown, Milton. *The Authentic Writings of Ignatius: A Study of Linguistic Criteria*. Durham, NC: Duke University, 1963.
- Brown, Peter. *Through the Eye of a Needle: Wealth, The Fall of Rome, and the Making of Christianity*. Princeton: Princeton University, 2012.
- Brown, Peter. *The World of Late Antiquity* [1971]. Norton reprint. New York: W.W. Norton, 1989.
- Brown, Peter. *The Body and Society*. 20th Anniversary Edition. New York: Columbia University, 2008 [1988].
- Brown, Peter. *The Rise of Western Christendom*. 2nd Edition. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2003.

- Brown, Peter. *Poverty and Leadership in the Later Roman Empire*. The Menahem Stern Jerusalem Lectures. Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 2002.
- Brown, Peter. "St. Augustine's Attitude to Religious Coercion." *Journal of Roman Studies* 54.1–2 (1964): 107–116.
- Brubaker, Rogers and Frederick Cooper, "Beyond 'Identity [2000]'" In Rogers Brubaker, *Ethnicity without Groups*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 2004.
- Brubaker, Rogers. *Ethnicity without Groups*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 2004.
- Burrus, Virginia. *Saving Shame: Martyrs, Saints, and Other Abject Subjects*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 2007.
- Camelot, P.T. *Ignace d'Antioche. Polcarpe de Smyrne. Lettres. Martyre de Polycarpe*. Sources chrétiennes 10. 4th Edition. Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1969.
- Cameron, Averil. "Jews and Heretics—a Category Error?" *The Ways that Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*. Ed. Adam H. Becker and Annette Yoshiko Reed. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007 [2003], 345–360.
- Cameron, Averil. *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire: The Development of Christian Discourse*. Berkeley: University of California, 1991.
- Cameron, Averil. "How to Read Heresiology." *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 33.3 (2003): 471–492.
- Carleton Paget, James. *Jews, Christians, and Jewish Christians in Antiquity*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 251. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
- Carr, David. *The Formation of the Hebrew Bible: A New Reconstruction*. Oxford: Oxford University, 2011.
- Carr, David. *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University, 2005.
- Carriker, Andrew James. *The Library of Eusebius of Caesarea*. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Carruth, Shawn. "Praise for the Churches: The Rhetorical Function of the Opening Sections of the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch," 295–310. In *Reimagining Christian Origins: A Colloquium Honoring Burton L. Mack*. Edited by Elizabeth A. Castelli and Hal Taussig. Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press, 1996.
- Castelli, Elizabeth A. *Martyrdom and Memory: Early Christian Culture Making*. New York: Columbia University, 2004.
- Castelli, Elizabeth A. *Imitating Paul: A Discourse of Power*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1991.
- Cave, William. *Scriptorum ecclesiasticorum historia literaria*. ????? 1688.
- Chartier, Roger. *Order of Books: Readers, Authors and Libraries in Europe between the 14<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> Centuries*. Stanford: Stanford University, 1994.

- Clark, Elizabeth A. "From Patristics to Early Christian Studies," 7–41. In *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Studies*. Edited by Susan Ashbrook Harvey and David G. Hunter. Oxford: Oxford University, 2008.
- Clark, Elizabeth A. *History, Theory, Text: Historians and the Linguistic Turn*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 2004.
- Cohen, Shaye J.D. "Dancing, Clapping, Meditating: Jewish and Christian observance of the Sabbath in Pseudo-Ignatius." In *Judaea-Palaestina, Babylon and Rome: Jews in Antiquity*. Edited by Benjamin Isaac and Yuval Shahar, 29–53. Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 147. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.
- Cohen, Shaye J.D. "Judaism without Circumcision and 'Judaism' without 'Circumcision' in Ignatius." *Harvard Theological Review* 95.4 (2002): 395–415.
- Cooper, Kate. *The Virgin and the Bride: Idealized Womanhood in Late Antiquity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 1999.
- Costache, Doru. "Living above Gender: Insights from Saint Maximus the Confessor." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 21.2 (2013): 261–90.
- Côté, Dominique. "Le problème de l'identité religieuse dans Syrie du IV<sup>e</sup> siècle: Le cas des Pseudo-Clémentines et de l'Adversus Judaeos de saint Jean Chrysostome." In *La croisée des chemins revisitée*. Ed. Simon Claude Mimouni and Bernard Pouderon. Paris: Cerf, 2013, 339–370.
- Criboire, Rafaella. *The School of Libanius in Late Antique Antioch*. Princeton: Princeton University, 2007.
- Criboire, Rafaella. *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*. Princeton: Princeton University, 2001.
- Crouzel, Henri, François Fournier, and Pierre Périchon, eds. *Homélies sur s. Luc, texte latin et fragments grecs*, SC 87. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1962.
- DelCogliano, Mark. "Tradition and Polemic in Basil of Caesarea's Homily on the Theophany." *Vigiliae Christianae* 66 (2012): 30–55.
- DeVore, David J. "Character and Convention in the Letters of Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History." *Journal of Late Antiquity* 7.2 (2014): 223–252.
- Diekamp, Francis and Francis Xavier Funk, ed. *Patres Apostolici*. 2 volumes. 3rd Edition. Tübingen: Laupp, 1913.
- Digester, Elizabeth DePalma. *A Threat to Public Piety: Christians, Platonists, and the Great Persecution*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University, 2012.
- Digester, Elizabeth DePalma. *The Making of a Christian Empire: Lactantius and Rome*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University, 2000.
- Dilley, Paul. "The Invention of Christian Tradition: 'Apocrypha,' Imperial Policy, and Anti-Jewish Propaganda." *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 50 (2010): 586–615.
- Doering, Lutz. *Ancient Jewish Letters and the Beginnings of Christian Epistolography*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 298. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.
- Dohrmann, Nathalie. "Law and Imperial Idioms: Rabbinic Legalism in a Roman World." *Jews, Christians, and the Roman Empire: The Poetics of Power in*

- Late Antiquity*. Edited by Nathalie Dohrmann and Annette Yoshiko Reed. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 2013, 63-78.
- Donahue, Paul J. "Jewish Christianity in the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch." *Vigiliae Christianae* 32.2 (1978): 81-93.
- Douglas, Mary. *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of the Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*. London: Routledge, 1966.
- Draper, Jonathan A. "Torah and Troublesome Apostles in the *Didache* Community." *Novum Testamentum* 33.4 (1991): 347-372.
- Dunn, James D.G., ed. *Jews and Christians: The Parting of the Ways, A.D. 70 to 135; the Second Durham-Tübingen Research Symposium on Earliest Christianity and Judaism (Durham, September 1989)*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 66. Tübingen: Mohr, 1992.
- Dunn, James D.G. *The Partings of the Ways between Christianity and Judaism and their Significance for the Character of Christianity*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. London: SCM, 2006 [1991].
- Eastman, David. "Epiphanius' and Patristic Debates on the Marital Status of Peter and Paul." *Vigiliae Christianae* 67.5 (2013): 499-516.
- Edwards, Mark J. "When the Dead Speak: The Refashioning of Ignatius of Antioch in the Long Recension of his Letters." In *The Author's Voice in Classical and Late Antiquity*. Edited by Anna Marmodoro and Jonathan Hill. Oxford: Oxford University, 2013, 341-55.
- Edwards, Mark J. "Ignatius and the Second Century: An Answer to R. Hübner." *Zeitschrift für Antikes Christentum* 2.2 (1998): 214-226.
- Edwards, Mark J. "Ignatius, Judaism and Judaizing." *Eranos* 93 (1995): 69-77.
- Ehrman, Bart. *Forgery and Counterforgery: The Use of Literary Deceit in Early Christian Polemics*. Oxford: Oxford University, 2013.
- Ehrman, Bart. *The New Testament: A Historical Introduction to the Early Christian Writings*. 6<sup>th</sup> edition. Oxford: Oxford University, 2015.
- Ehrman, Bart. *After the New Testament*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Oxford: Oxford University, 2014.
- Ehrman, Bart. *Apostolic Fathers*. Loeb Classical Library 24. 2 volumes. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 2003.
- Ehrman, Bart. *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament*. Oxford: Oxford University, 1993.
- Elm, Susanna. *Sons of Hellenism, Fathers of the Church: Emperor Julian, Gregory of Nazianzus, and the Vision of Rome*. Berkeley: University of California, 2012.
- Elsner, Jaś. "Archaeologies and Agendas: Reflections on Late Ancient Jewish Art and Early Christian Art." *Journal of Roman Studies* 93 (2003): 114-28.
- Epp, Eldon Jay. "It's All about the Variants: A Variant Conscious Approach to New Testament Textual Criticism." *Harvard Theological Review* 100.3 (2007): 275-308.

- Fackler, Phillip. "Adversus Adversus Iudaeos?: Countering Christian Anti-Jewish Polemics in the *Gospel of Nicodemus*." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 23.3 (2015): forthcoming.
- Ferry, Anne. *Tradition and the Individual Poem: An Inquiry into Anthologies*. Stanford: Stanford University, 2001.
- Fish, Stanley. *Is there a Text in this Class?: The Authority of Interpretive Communities*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 1982.
- Fishman, Talya. *Becoming the People of the Talmud: Oral Torah as Written Tradition in Medieval Jewish Cultures*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 2011.
- Fonrobert, Charlotte. "The *Didascalia Apostolorum*: A Mishnah for the Disciples of Jesus." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 9.4 (2001): 483–509.
- Foucault, Michel. "What is an author?" Translated by Josué Harari. In *The Essential Works of Foucault, Volume 2: Aesthetics, Methods, and Epistemology*. Edited by James D. Faubion. New York: The New Press.
- Gager, John G. *Reinventing Paul*. Oxford: Oxford University, 2000.
- Gallagher, Edmon. "The Old Testament 'Apocrypha' in Jerome's Canonical Theory." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 20.2 (2012): 213–33.
- Gaston, Lloyd. "Judaism of the Uncircumcised in Ignatius and Related Writers." *Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity, Volume 2: Separation and Polemic*. Ed. Stephen Wilson. Waterloo, Ont: Wilfrid Laurier University, 1986, 33–44.
- Gieschen, Charles A. *Angelomorphic Christology: Antecedents and Early Evidence*. *Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums* 42. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Goldhill, Simon. "Introduction, Setting an Agenda: 'Everything is Greece to the Wise,'" 1–25. In *Being Greek Under Rome: Cultural Identity, the Second Sophistic, and the Development of the Empire*. Edited by Simon Goldhill. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2001.
- Grafton, Anthony and Megan Williams. *Christianity and the Transformation of the Book: Origen, Eusebius, and the Library of Caesarea*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 2006.
- Grant, Robert M. *Eusebius as Church Historian*. Reprint. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2006 [1980].
- Grant, Robert M., ed. and trans. *Theophilus of Antioch Ad Autolyicum*. Oxford Early Christian Texts. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970.
- Grant, Robert M. "Apostolic Fathers' First Thousand Years." *Church History* 31 (1962): 421–429.
- Grant, Robert M. "The Textual Tradition of Theophilus of Antioch." *Vigiliae Christianae* 6.3 (1952): 146–159.
- Gregory, Andrew F. and Christopher M. Tuckett, eds. *Trajectories through the New Testament and Apostolic Fathers*. Oxford: Oxford University, 2005.
- Hagedorn, Dieter. *Der Hiobkommentar des Arianers Julian*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1973.
- Haines-Eitzen, Kim. *Guardians of Letters: Literacy, Power and the Transmitters of Early Christian Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University, 2000.

- Halliwell, Stephen. "The Subjection of Muthos to Logos: Plato's Citations of the Poets." *Classical Quarterly* 50.1 (2000): 94–112.
- Hannah, Jack. "Setting of the Long Recension." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 79.3 (1960): 221–238.
- Harland, Philip. *Associations, Synagogues, and Congregations: Claiming a Place in Ancient Mediterranean Society*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003.
- Harries, Jill. *Law and Empire in Late Antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2001.
- Hartog, Paul. *Polycarp and the New Testament: The Occasion, Rhetoric, Theme, and Unity of the Epistle to the Philippians and Its Allusions to New Testament Literature*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2, 134. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002.
- Havrda, Matyáš. "Grace and Free Will according to Clement of Alexandria." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 19.1 (2011): 21–48.
- Hodkinson, Owen. "Better than Speech: Some Advantages of the Letter in the Second Sophistic." In *Ancient Letters: Classical and Late Antique Epistolography*. Oxford: Oxford University, 2007, 283–300.
- Hoffer, Stanley E. "Cicero's 'Stomach': Political Indignation and the Use of Repeated Allusive Expressions in Cicero's Correspondence," 87–106. In *Ancient Letters: Classical and Late Antique Epistolography*. Edited by Ruth Morello and A.D. Morrison. Oxford: Oxford University, 2007.
- Holmes, Michael W. *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*. Third Edition. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2007.
- Horster, Marietta and Christiane Reitz, eds. *Condensing Texts – Condensed Texts*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 2010.
- Hübner, Reinhold. "Thesen zur Echtheit und Datierung der sieben Briefe des Ignatius von Antiochien." *Zeitschrift für Antikes Christentum* 1.1 (1997): 44–72.
- Inowlocki, Sabrina. *Eusebius and the Jewish Authors: His Citation Technique in an Apologetic Context*. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Jacobs, Andrew S. "Epiphanius of Salamis and the Antiquarian's Bible." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 21.3 (2013): 437–464.
- Jacobs, Andrew S. *Remains of the Jews: The Holy Land and Christian Empire in Late Antiquity*. Stanford: Stanford University, 2004.
- Jefford, Clayton N. "The Milieu of Matthew, the Didache, and Ignatius of Antioch: Agreements and Differences," 35–47. In *Matthew and the Didache: Two Documents from the Same Jewish-Christian Milieu?* Edited by Huub van Sandt. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005.
- Johnson, Aaron. *Ethnicity and Argument in Eusebius' Praeparatio Evangelica*. Oxford: Oxford University, 2006.
- Johnson, William A. *Readers and Reading Culture in the High Roman Empire: A Study of Elite Communities*. Oxford: Oxford University, 2010.
- Johnson, William A. "Toward a Sociology of Reading in Classical Antiquity." *The American Journal of Philology*. 121.4 (2000): 593–627.



- Joly, Robert. *Le dossier d'Ignace d'Antioche*. Bruxelles: Éditions de l'Université de Bruxelles, 1979.
- Kelley, Nicole. *Knowledge and Religious Authority in the Pseudo-Clementines*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament II.213. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.
- Kelley, Nicole. "Problems of Knowledge and Authority in the Pseudo-Clementine Romance of Recognitions." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 13.3 (2005): 315–348.
- Kelly, C.M. "Going through the archives," 161–76. In *Literacy and Power in the Ancient World*. Edited by A. Bowman and G. Woolf. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1994.
- Kim, Young Richard. *Epiphanius of Cyprus: Imagining and Orthodox World*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, 2015.
- Koester, Helmut. *Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development*. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity, 1990.
- Koester, Helmut. *Synoptische Überlieferung bei den apostolischen Vätern*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1957.
- Kofsky, Aryeh. *Eusebius of Caesarea against Paganism*. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Kondoleon, Christine, ed. *Antioch: The Lost Ancient City*. Princeton: Princeton University, 2000.
- Koskenniemi, Heikki. *Studien zur Idee und Phraseologie des griechischen Briefes bus 400 n. chr.* Annales Academia Scientiarum Fennica B 102.2. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1956.
- Krautheimer, Richard. *Rome: A Profile of a City*. Princeton: Princeton University, 1980.
- Kristeva, Julia. *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*. Edited by Leon Roudiez. Translated by Thomas Gora and Alice Jardine. New York: Columbia University, 1980 [1969 and 1977].
- Kristeva, Julia. "Word, Dialogue, Novel [1966]." In *The Kristeva Reader*, 35–61. Edited by Toril Moi. Oxford: Blackwell, 1991.
- Krueger, Derek. *Writing and Holiness: The Practice of Authorship in the Early Christian East*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 2004.
- Lambert, David A. *How Repentance Became Biblical: Judaism, Christianity, and the Interpretation of Scripture*. Oxford: Oxford University, 2016.
- Lamoreaux, John C. "Episcopal Courts in Late Antiquity." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 3.2 (1995): 143–167.
- Latour, Bruno. *The Pasteurization of France*. Translated by Alan Sheridan and John Law. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 1988 [1984].
- Lawson, R.P., ed. and trans. *The Song of Songs: Commentary and Homilies*. Ancient Christian Writers. New York: Newman, 1957.
- Le Boulluec, Alain. *La notion d'hérésie dans la littérature greque II<sup>e</sup>–III<sup>e</sup> siècles*. 2 vols. Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1985.
- Lechner, Thomas. *Ignatius adversus Valentinianos?: chronologische und theologischeschichtliche Studien zu den Briefen des Ignatius von Antiochien*. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

- Levine, Lee I. *The Ancient Synagogue: The First Thousand Years*. Second edition. New Haven: Yale University, 2005.
- Lienhard, Joseph. "Two Friends of Athanasius." *Zeitschrift für Antikes Christentum* 10.1 (2006): 56-66.
- Lienhard, Joseph. *Contra Marcellum: Marcellus of Ancyra and Fourth-Century Theology*. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America, 1999.
- Lienhard, Joseph, ed. and trans. *Origen: Homilies on Luke, Fragments on Luke*. Fathers of the Church. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University, 1996.
- Lieu, Judith. *Christian Identity in the Jewish and Greco-Roman World*. Oxford: Oxford University, 2004.
- Lieu, Judith. *Image and Reality: The Jews in the World of the Christians in the Second Century*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1996.
- Lieu, Samuel N.C. *Manichaeism in Central Asia and China*. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Lieu, Samuel N.C. *Manichaeism in Mesopotamia and the Roman East*. Religions in the Greco-Roman World 118. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- Lightfoot, J.B. *Apostolic Fathers*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. 2 Parts. 5 Volumes. 1873.
- Limone, Vito. "I nomi dell'amore: Un'indagine sulla traduzione latina del Commento al Cantico dei Cantici di Origene." *Zeitschrift für Antike Christentum* 19.3 (2015): 407-429.
- Limor, Ora and Guy G. Stroumsa, editors. *Contra Iudaeos: Ancient and Medieval Polemics between Christians and Jews*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996.
- Lindemann, Andreas. "Paul, 'Clement,' and Ignatius," 9-24. In *Trajectories through the New Testament and Apostolic Fathers*. Edited by Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett. Oxford: Oxford University, 2005.
- Lindemann, Andreas. "Antwort auf die 'Thesen zur Echtheit und Datierung der Sieben Briefe des Ignatien von Antiochien.'" *Zeitschrift für Antikes Christentum* 1.2 (1997): 185-194.
- Lindemann, Andreas, and Henning Paulsen. *Die Aposolischen Väter: Griechisch-Deutsche Parallelausgabe*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992.
- Lindemann, Andreas. *Paulus im ältesten Christentum: Das Bild des Apostels und die Rezeption der paulinischen Theologie in der frühchristlichen Literatur bis Marcion*. Tübingen, Mohr 1979.
- Linder, Amnon. *The Jews in Roman Imperial Legislation*. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University, 1987.
- Link, Hannelore. *Rezeptionsforschung: Eine Einführung in Methoden und Probleme*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1976.
- Loofs, Friedrich. *Theophilus von Antiochien Adversus Marcionem und die anderen theologischen Quellen bei Irenaeus*. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1930.
- 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.
- MacMullen, Ramsay. *Christianizing the Roman Empire, A.D. 100-400*. New Haven: Yale University, 1984.

- MacMullen, Ramsay. "The Epigraphic Habit in the Roman Empire." *American Journal of Philology* 103.3 (1982): 233-46.
- Maier, Harry O. "The Politics and Rhetoric of Discord and Concord in Paul and Ignatius," 307-324. In *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers*. Edited by Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett. Oxford: Oxford University, 2005.
- Maier, Harry O. "The Politics of the Silent Bishop: Silence and Persuasion." *Journal of Theological Studies* 55.2 (2004): 503-519.
- Maier, Harry O. "Purity and Danger in Polycarp's Epistle." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 1.3 (1993): 229-247.
- Maier, Harry O. *The Social Setting of the Ministry as Reflected in the Writings of Hermas, Clement, and Ignatius*. Waterloo, Ont.: Wilfrid Laurier University, 1991.
- Malherbe, Abraham. *Ancient Epistolary Theorists*. Atlanta, GA: Scholar's Press, 1988.
- Malina, Bruce J. "The Social World Implied in the Letters of the Christian Bishop-Martyr (Named Ignatius of Antioch)." *Society of Biblical Literature 1978 Seminar Papers*. Ed. J. Achtmeyer. Missoula, MT: Scholars, (????): 71-119.
- Mandouze, André. *Saint Augustin. L'aventure de la raison et de la grace*. Paris: Études augustiniennes, 1968.
- Marshall, John W. "The Objects of Ignatius' Wrath and Jewish Angelic Mediators." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 56.1 (2005): 1-23.
- Marx-Wolf, Heidi. *Spiritual Taxonomies and Ritual Authority: Platonists, Priests and Gnostics in the Third Century C.E.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 2016.
- Mason, Steve and Tom Robinson. *Early Christian Reader*. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2013.
- Mason, Steve. "Jews, Judaeans, Judaizing, Judaism: Problems of Categorization in Ancient History." *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 38 (2007): 457-512.
- Massaux, Edouard. *The Influence of the Gospel of Saint Matthew on Christian Life before Saint Irenaeus* [1950]. Trans. Norman J. Belval and Suzanne Hecht. Ed. Arthur J. Bellizoni. *New Gospel Studies* 5/1-3. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1990-1993.
- Maxwell, Jaclyn L. *Christianization and Communication in Late Antiquity: John Chrysostom and his Congregation in Antioch*. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2009.
- Mayer, Wendy and Pauline Allen. *The Churches of Syrian Antioch (300-638 CE)*. Leuven: Peeters, 2012.
- McCarter, P. Kyle. *Textual Criticism: Recovering the Text of the Hebrew Bible*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986.
- McDonald, Lee Martin. *The Biblical Canon: Its Origin, Transmission, and Authority*
- Meade, David G. *Pseudonymity and Canon*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1986.

- Metcalf, Eric. "The Mint of Antioch," 105–111. In *Antioch: The Lost Ancient City*. Edited by Christine Kondoleon. Princeton: Princeton University, 2000.
- Meyer, Elizabeth A. *Legitimacy and Law in the Roman World: Tabulae in Roman Belief and Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2004.
- Meyer, Elizabeth A. "Explaining the Epigraphic Habit in the Roman Empire: The Evidence of Epitaphs." *Journal of Roman Studies* 80 (1990): 74-96.
- Mitchell, Margaret M. *The Heavenly Trumpet: John Chrysostom and the Art of Pauline Interpretation*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2002.
- 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.
- Molland, Einar. "The Heretics Combated by Ignatius of Antioch." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 5 (1954): 1–6.
- Morello, Ruth and A.D. Morrison, eds. *Ancient Letters: Classical and Late Antique Epistolography*. Oxford: Oxford University, 2007.
- Morello, Ruth and A.D. Morrison. "Editor's Preface," v–xii. In *Ancient Letters: Classical and Late Antique Epistolography*. Edited by Ruth Morello and A.D. Morrison. Oxford: Oxford University, 2007.
- Morgan, Teresa. *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds*. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1998.
- Morlet, Sébastien, ed. *Lire en extraits: Lecture et production des textes de l'Antiquité à la fin du Moyen Âge*. Paris: Presses de l'université Paris-Sorbonne, 2015.
- Musurillo, Herbert. *The Acts of the Christian Martyrs*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1972.
- Najman, Hindy. *Losing the Temple and Recovering the Future: An Analysis of 4 Ezra*. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2014.
- Najman, Hindy. *Seconding Sinai: Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism*. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Nautin, Pierre. *Origène: Sa vie et son oeuvre*. Christianisme antique 1. Paris: Beauchesne, 1977.
- Nichols, Stephen G. and Siegfried Wenzel, editors. *The Whole Book: Cultural Perspectives on the Medieval Miscellany*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, 1996.
- Niebuhr, Karl-Wilhelm. "'Judentum' und 'Christentum' bei Paulus und Ignatius von Antiochien." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 85 (1994): 218–233.
- Pearse, Roger, ed. *Eusebius of Caesarea: Gospel Problems and Solutions*. Ipswich: Chieftain Publishing, 2010.
- Perkins, Judith. *The Suffering Self: Pain and Narrative Representation in the early Christian Era*. London: Routledge, 1995.
- Perler, Otto. "Das vierte Makabaerbuch, Ignatius von Antiochien und die ältesten Martyrerberichte." *Rivista di Archeologia Cristiana* 25 (1949): 47–72.
- Piovanelli, Pierluigi. "The Book of the Cock and the Rediscovery of Ancient Jewish-Christian Traditions in Fifth-Century Palestine." In *The Changing Face of Judaism, Christianity, and Other Greco-Roman Religions in*

- Antiquity*. Edited by Ian H. Henderson and Gerbern S. Oegema. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2006, 308-322.
- Pollock, Sheldon. "Liberating Philology." *Verge: Studies in Global Asias* 1.1 (2015): 16-21.
- Pollock, Sheldon. "Philology in Three Dimensions." *postmedieval: a journal of medieval cultural studies* 5.4 (2014): 398-413.
- Porter, Stanley E. *How We Got the New Testament: Text, Transmission, Translation*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2013.
- Pouderon, Bernard. "La littérature pseudo-épistolaire dans les milieux juifs et chrétiens des premiers siècles. L'exemple des *Pseudo-Clementines*." In *Epistulae antiquae. Actes du I<sup>er</sup> colloque "Le genre épistolaire antique et ses prolongements" (Université François-Rabelais, Tours, 18-19 septembre 1998)*. Ed. Léon Nadjo and Élisabeth Gavoille. Louvain: Peeters, 2002, 223-241.
- Poster, Carol. "A Conversation Halved: Epistolary Theory in Greco-Roman Antiquity," 21-51. In *Letter-Writing Manuals and Instruction from Antiquity to the Present: Historical and Bibliographic Studies*. Edited by Carol Poster and Linda C. Mitchell. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina, 2007.
- Proctor, Travis. "Bodiless Docetists and the *Daimonic* Jesus." *Archiv für Religionsgeschichte* 14 (2013): 183-203.
- Rapp, Claudia. *Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity: The Nature of Christian Leadership in an Age of Transition*. Berkeley: University of California, 2005.
- Reed, Annette Yoshiko. "'Jewish-Christian' Apocrypha and the History of Jewish/Christian Relations," 87-116. In *Rediscovering the Apocryphal Continent: New Perspectives on Early and Late Antique Apocryphal Texts and Traditions*. Edited by Pierluigi Piovanelli, Tony Burke, and Timothy Pettepiece. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 1/349. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015.
- Reed, Annette Yoshiko. "Messianism between Judaism and Christianity," In *Rethinking the Messianic Idea in Judaism*, 23-62. Edited by Michael L. Morgan and Steven Weitzman. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University, 2014.
- Reed, Annette Yoshiko and Nathalie Dohrmann, "Introduction: Rethinking Romanness, Provincializing Christendom," 1-22. In *Jews, Christians, and the Roman Empire: The Poetics of Power in Late Antiquity*. Edited by Nathalie Dohrmann and Annette Yoshiko Reed. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 2013.
- Reed, Annette Yoshiko. "Parting Ways over Blood and Water? Beyond 'Judaism' and 'Christianity' in the Roman Near East." In *La croisée des chemins revisitée*. Edited. Simon Claude Mimouni and Bernard Pouderon. Paris: Cerf, 2013, 227-60.
- Reed, Annette Yoshiko. "The Construction and Subversion of Patriarchal Perfection: Abraham and Exemplarity in Philo, Josephus, and the *Testament of Abraham*." *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 40 (2009): 185-212.
- Reed, Annette Yoshiko. "'Jewish Christianity' as Counter-history?: The Apostolic Past in Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History and the Pseudo-Clementine

- Homilies.” In *Antiquity in Antiquity: Jewish and Christian Pasts in the Greco-Roman World*. Edited by G. Gardner and K. Osterloh. Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum 123. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008, 173-216.
- Reed, Annette Yoshiko. “Pseudepigraphy, Authorship, and the Reception of ‘the Bible’ in Late Antiquity.” In *The Reception and Interpretation of the Bible in Late Antiquity: Proceedings of the Montréal Colloquium in Honour of Charles Kannengiesser, 11-13 October 2006*. Edited by L. DiTommaso and L. Turcescu. Leiden: Brill, 2008, 467-90.
- Reis, David M. “Following in Paul’s Footsteps: Mimesis and Power in Ignatius of Antioch,” 287–305. In *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers*. Edited by Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett. Oxford: Oxford University, 2005.
- Rius-Camps, Josep. *The Four Authentic Letters of Ignatius, the Martyr*. Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1980.
- Robinson, Thomas. *Ignatius of Antioch and the Parting of the Ways*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2009.
- Roller, Matthew B. “Exemplarity in Roman Culture: The Cases of Horatius Cocles and Cloelia.” *Classical Philology* 99.1 (2004): 1–56.
- Rogers, Rick. “Theophilus of Antioch.” *Expository Times* 120.5 (February 2009): 214–224.
- Rogers, Rick. *Theophilus of Antioch: The Life and Thought of a Second-Century Bishop*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2000.
- Rosenmeyer, Patricia. *Ancient Epistolary Fictions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2001.
- Ruether, Rosemary Radford. *Faith and Fratricide: The Theological Roots of Anti-Semitism*. New York: Seabury Press, 1974.
- Runneson, Anders, Donald D. Binder, and Birger Olsson. *The Ancient Synagogue from its Origins to 200 C.E.: A Source Book*. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Rutgers, Leonard V. *The Jews in Late Ancient Rome: Evidence of Cultural Interaction in the Roman Diaspora*. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Sanders, E.P. *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1977.
- Sandwell, Isabella. *Religious Identity in Late Antiquity: Greeks, Jews, and Christians in Antioch*. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2011.
- Schoedel, William. “Theophilus of Antioch: Jewish Christian?” *Illinois Classical Studies* 18 (1993): 279–297.
- Schoedel, William. *Ignatius of Antioch: A Commentary on the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.
- Schoedel, William. “Ignatius and the Archives.” *Harvard Theological Review* 71.1–2 (1978): 97–106.
- Schott, Jeremy M. *Christianity, Empire, and the Making of Religion in Late Antiquity*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania, 2008.
- Schott, Jeremy M. “Heresiology as Universal History in Epiphanius’s Panarion.” *Zeitschrift für antikes Christentum* 10 (2007): 546–563.

- Schwartz, Seth. "How Many Judaisms Were There?" *Journal of Ancient Judaism* 2 (2011): 208–38.
- Schwartz, Seth. *Imperialism and Jewish Society, 200 B.C.E. to 640 C.E.* Princeton: Princeton University, 2001.
- Sessa, Kristina. "Cleric." In *Late Ancient Knowing: Explorations in Intellectual History*. Edited by Catherine M. Chin and Moulie Vidas. Berkeley: University of California, 2015, 218–239.
- Shepardson, Christine. *Controlling Contested Places: Late Antique Antioch and the Spatial Politics of Religious Controversy*. Berkeley, CA: University of California, 2014.
- Shepardson, Christine. "Controlling Contested Places: John Chrysostom's Adversus Iudaeos Homilies and the Spatial Politics of Religious Controversy." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 15.4 (2007): 483–516.
- Sibinga, J. Smit. "Ignatius and Matthew." *Novum Testamentum* 8.2 (1966): 263–283.
- Skidmore, Clive. *Practical Ethics for Roman Gentlemen: The Work of Valerius Maximus*. Exeter: University of Exeter, 1996.
- Smith, Geoffrey S. *Guilt by Association: Heresy Catalogues in Early Christianity*. Oxford: Oxford University, 2014.
- Smith, Gregory A. "How Thin is a Demon?" *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 16.4 (2008): 479–512.
- Smith, James D., III. "The Ignatian Long Recension and Christian Communities in Fourth Century Syrian Antioch." PhD Diss. Harvard University, 1985.
- Smith, Jonathan Z. "In Comparison a Magic Dwells," 19–36. *Imagining Religion: From Babylon to Jonestown*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1982.
- Smith, Jonathan Z. "What a Difference a Difference Makes [1985]," 251–302. In *Relating Religion: Essays in the Study of Religion*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 2004.
- Smyth, Herbert Weir. *Greek Grammar*. Revised edition. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 1956.
- Sotinel, "Le personnel épiscopal. Enquête sur la puissance de l'évêque dans la cite." In *L'évêque dans la cité du IVe au Ve siècle*. Edited by Eric Rebillard and Claire Sotinel. Rome: Ecole française de Rome, 1998, 105–24.
- Speigl, Jakob. "Ignatius in Philadelphia: Ereignisse und Anliegen in den Ignatiusbriefen." *Vigiliae Christianae* 41.4 (1987): 360–76.
- Speyer, Wolfgang. *Die literarische Fälschung im heidnischen und christlichen Altertum: Ein Versuch ihrer Deutung*. München: Beck, 1971.
- Staples, Jason A. "What do the Gentiles have to do with 'All Israel': A Fresh Look at Romans 11:25–27." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 130.2 (2011): 371–90.
- Stead, Christopher. *Divine Substance*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1977.
- Stemberger, Günter. *Jews and Christians in the Holy Land: Palestine in the Fourth Century*. Translated by Ruth Tuschling. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000 [1987].

- Stern, David. "The Anthology in Jewish Literature: An Introduction," 3–11. In *The Anthology in Jewish Literature*. Edited by David Stern. Oxford: Oxford University, 2004.
- Stern, Karen. *Inscribing Devotion and Death: Archaeological Evidence for Jewish Populations of North Africa*. Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 161. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Stowers, Stanley K. *A Rereading of Romans: Justice, Jews, and Gentiles*. New Haven: Yale University, 1994.
- Strawbridge, Jennifer R. *The Pauline Effect: The Use of Pauline Epistles by Early Christian Writers*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2015.
- Stroumsa, Guy G. "From Anti-Judaism to Antisemitism in Early Christianity?" In *Contra Iudaeos: Ancient and Medieval Polemics between Christians and Jews*. Edited by Ora Limor and Guy G. Stroumsa. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996, 1–26.
- Stroumsa, Guy G. "The New Self and Reading Practices in Late Antique Christianity." *Church History and Religious Culture* 95 (2015): 1–18.
- Stroumsa, Guy G. *The Scriptural Universe of Ancient Christianity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 2016.
- Stuckenbruck, Loren. *Angel Veneration and Christology: A Study in Early Judaism and in the Christology of the Apocalypse of John*. WUNT 2/70. Tübingen: Mohr, 1995.
- Sumney, Jerry L. "Those Who 'Ignorantly Deny Him': The Opponents of Ignatius of Antioch." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 1.4 (2005): 345–65.
- Taubes, Jacob. *Political Theology of Paul*. Edited by Aleida Assmann. Translated by Dana Hollander. Stanford: Stanford University, 2004 [1993].
- Taylor, Miriam S. *Anti-Judaism and Early Christian Identity: A Critique of the Scholarly Consensus*. Studia post-biblica 46. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- Thompson, Trevor. "‘Rubbish under the Name of Ignatius.’ Authenticity of the Ignatian Corpus: A Reconsideration of the Letter from Ignatius to Polycarp." Paper delivered at the 2016 Society of Biblical Literature Annual Meeting, Inventing Christianity Section: Apostolic Fathers, Apologists, and Martyrs, November 22.
- Townsend, Philippa. "Who were the First Christians? Jews, Gentiles and the *Christianoi*." In *Heresy and Identity in Late Antiquity*. Ed. Eduard Iricinschi and Holger M. Zellentin. Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 119. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008, 212–230.
- Trapp, Michael. *Greek and Latin Letters: An Anthology with Translation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2003.
- Trebilco, Paul. *Jewish Communities in Asia Minor*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 69. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1991.
- Trevett, Christine. *A Study of Ignatius of Antioch in Syria and Asia*. Lewiston, NY: Mellen, 1992.
- Tuccinardi, Enrico. "Application of Profile-Based Method for Author Identification." *Digital Scholarship in the Humanities* (2016): 1–13



- van der Toorn, Karel. *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 2009.
- Vessey, Mark. “‘La patristique, c’est autre chose’: André Mandouze, Petter Brown, and the Avocations of Patristics as a Philological Science,” 443–72. In *Patristic Studies in the Twenty-First Century: Proceedings of an International Conference to Mark the 50<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the International Association of Patristic Studies*. Edited by Brouria Bitton-Ashkelony, Theodore de Bruyn, and Carol Harrison. Turnhout: Brepols, 2015.
- Vessey, Mark. “Literature, Patristics, Early Christian Writing,” 42–65. In *Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Studies*. Edited by Susan Ashbrook Harvey and David G. Hunter. Oxford: Oxford University, 2008.
- Weijenborg, Reinoud. *Les lettres d’Ignace d’Antioche: étude de critique littéraire et de théologie*. Leiden: Brill, 1969.
- Westerholm, Stephen. *Perspectives Old and New on Paul: The “Lutheran Paul” and His Critics*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2004.
- Whiston, William. *An Essay Upon the Epistles of Ignatius*. London: Benjamin Cooke, 1710.
- White, L. Michael. *The Social Origins of Christian Architecture, Volume 1: Building God’s House in the Roman World*. Valley Forge, PA: Trinity, 1990.
- Whitmarsh, Tim. “Thinking Local,” 1–16. In *Local Knowledge and Microidentities in the Imperial Greek World*. Edited by Tim Whitmarsh. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2010.
- Wilken, Robert. *John Chrysostom and the Jews: Rhetoric and Reality in the Late 4<sup>th</sup> Century*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2004 [1983].
- Williams, Megan H. “No More Clever Titles: Observations on Some Recent Studies in the History of Jewish–Christian Relations in the Roman World.” *Jewish Quarterly Review* 99 (2009): 37–55.
- Wilson, Stephen G. *Related Strangers: Jews and Christians, 70–170 C.E.* Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005.
- Wittgenstein, Ludwig. *Philosophical Investigations*. Translated by G.E.M. Anscombe. Third edition. London: Pearson, 1973.
- Woolf, Greg. “‘Becoming Roman, staying Greek: Cultural Identity and the Civilizing Process in the Roman East.’” *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 40 (1994): 116–143.
- Woolf, Greg. “Monumental Writing and the Expansion of Roman Society in the Early Empire.” *Journal of Roman Studies* 86 (1996): 22–39.
- Wyrick, Jed. *The Ascension of Authorship: Attribution and Canon Formation in Jewish, Hellenistic, and Christian Traditions*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 2004.
- Young, Frances M. *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1997.
- Young, Frances M. “Did Epiphanius Know What He Meant by Heresy?” *Studia Patristica* 17.1 (1982): 199–205.
- Zetterholm, Magnus. *The Formation of Christianity in Antioch*. London: Routledge, 2003.

Ziegler, Joseph and Olivier Munnich, editors. *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum XVI.2: Susanna Daniel Bel et Draco*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999.