

Loyola University Chicago
Loyola eCommons

Dissertations | Theses and Dissertations

1997

The Gospel and Ignatius of Antioch

Charles Thomas Brown
Loyola University Chicago

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss

 Part of the Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons

Recommended Citation

Brown, Charles Thomas, "The Gospel and Ignatius of Antioch" (1997). *Dissertations*. 3708.
https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/3708

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License.
Copyright © 1997 Charles Thomas Brown

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY CHICAGO

THE GOSPEL AND IGNATIUS OF ANTIOCH

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO

THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF THEOLOGY

BY

CHARLES THOMAS BROWN, S.C.J.

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

MAY, 1997

Copyright © 1997 by Charles T. Brown
All rights reserved

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am very grateful to my dissertation committee. My director, Thomas H. Tobin, S.J., Ph.D., guided me through this project with patience, professionalism, and careful consideration. Invariably, his comments and suggestions were not only perceptive, but they also enabled me to press forward on my own with confidence. I have also benefited greatly from the assistance of my readers, Urban C. von Wahlde, Ph.D. and Jon Nilson, Ph.D.

I thank also my religious congregation, the Priests of the Sacred Heart, for its care and support. The community at St. Joseph Retreat in Baileys Harbor, Wisconsin always welcomed me with kindness and generously provided a lovely, reflective atmosphere in which to work.

This dissertation is dedicated to my parents: to my mother, Dorothy Catherine Brown and to the memory of my father, Andy Earl Brown.

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS iii

INTRODUCTION: THE GOSPEL AND IGNATIUS OF ANTIOCH 1

PART ONE

THE IGNATIAN GOSPEL AND ITS ENVIRONMENT

INTRODUCTION TO PART ONE 18

CHAPTER I: THE GOSPEL OF IGNATIUS 20

A. IGNATIAN USE OF ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ 20

B. THE CONTENT OF THE IGNATIAN GOSPEL 33

CHAPTER II: THE EARLY CHRISTIAN GOSPEL ENVIRONMENT 76

A. PAUL 77

B. THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS 89

C. THE REMAINDER OF THE NEW TESTAMENT 108

D. THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS 119

E. SUMMARY: THE GOSPEL OF IGNATIUS AMONG THE GOSPELS 130

CHAPTER III: THE ENVIRONMENT OF THE IGNATIAN GOSPEL 137

A. VERBS OF TRANSMISSION AND ACCEPTANCE 138

B. ΛΑΛΕΙΝ ΙΗΣΟΥΝ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΝ 148

C. OTHER INDICATIONS OF AN ORAL ENVIRONMENT 171

CONCLUSIONS TO PART ONE: THE GOSPEL OF IGNATIUS 185

PART TWO

THE FUNCTION OF THE IGNATIAN GOSPEL

INTRODUCTION TO PART TWO 191

CHAPTER IV: WITHIN THE BOUNDARIES: THE GOSPEL OF IGNATIUS AND CHRISTOLOGY 193

A. THE INCARNATION 194

B. IGNATIAN TITLES FOR JESUS 207

C. SUMMARY: THE GOSPEL OF IGNATIUS AND CHRISTOLOGY 249

CHAPTER V: OUTSIDE THE BOUNDARIES: OPPOSITION TO THE GOSPEL OF IGNATIUS 254

A. ERROR AND THE IGNATIAN LETTERS 255

B. THE TWO ERRORS AND THE GOSPEL OF IGNATIUS 268

C. SUMMARY: ERROR AND THE IGNATIAN GOSPEL 302

CONCLUSIONS: THE GOSPEL AND IGNATIUS OF ANTIOCH 304

BIBLIOGRAPHY 313

VITA 330

INTRODUCTION

THE GOSPEL AND IGNATIUS OF ANTIOCH

The seven letters of Ignatius of Antioch, written in Asia Minor between 110-118 C.E., stand as a primary witness to the beginnings of Christianity's movement toward the consolidation of local varieties of church structure and belief into a larger, more institutionalized, form.[1] Because of Ignatius' pivotal place in the history of the early church, modern scholarly discussion of Ignatius has often focused on the nature of the traditions about Jesus in the Ignatian corpus. Hence, the relationship between the letters of Ignatius and the canon of the NT has been a major scholarly concern. This dissertation addresses the question of Ignatius and the NT Jesus traditions by focusing on a

---

[1]Concerning the date of the Ignatian corpus, see W. Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985) 5.

In this study I assume the authenticity—generally recognized since the late nineteenth century work of Zahn and Lightfoot—of the seven letters in the middle recension. J. B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers*, part two, vols. 1-3, *Ignatius and Polycarp* (London: Macmillan, 1889-90; reprint: Peabody: Hendrickson, 1989); T. Zahn, *Ignatius von Antiochien* (Gotha: Perthes, 1873). For a presentation on the textual history of the Ignatian corpus, see Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 3-7.

In this dissertation I will use the following abbreviations for the letters of Ignatius: *Eph.* [*Ephesians*], *Magn.* [*Magnesians*], *Trall.* [*Trallians*], *Rom.* [*Romans*], *Phld.* [*Philadelphians*], *Smyrn.* [*Smyrnaeans*], *Pol.* [*Polycarp*]. Unless otherwise noted, translations of Ignatius' letters are my own. Translations from the Bible are from B. Metzger and R. Murphy, eds., *The New Oxford Annotated Bible* (New York: Oxford, 1991).

specific aspect of the Ignatian theological world: the gospel.

With respect to the gospel and Ignatius, much of the scholarly discussion has been centered on the question of literary contact between Ignatius and various gospel texts. While, as I will point out, my present concern is only one facet of this larger question, it is necessary to regard this scholarship as an entry to my specific concern.

Because of several Ignatian passages which appear related to the Synoptic tradition, most notably the Gospel of Matthew (e.g., *Eph.* 6.1, 14.2; *Trall.* 11.1; *Smyrn.* 1.2; *Pol.* 2.2), literary contact between Ignatius and Matthew has been proposed by several scholars.[2] Thus, in 1905, W. R. Inge of the Oxford Society of Historical Theology examined some twenty proposed allusions to Matthew and determined that Ignatius

> was certainly acquainted either with our Matthew, or with the source of our Matthew, or with a Gospel very closely akin to it . . . the indications on the whole

---

[2]These include: A Committee of the Oxford Society of Historical Theology, *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1905); W.-D. Köhler, *Die Rezeption des Matthäusevangeliums in der Zeit vor Irenäus* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1987); Édouard Massaux, *The Influence of the Gospel of Saint Matthew on Christian Literature Before Saint Irenaeus*, bk. 1, *The First Ecclesiastical Writers*, N. J. Belval, S. Hecht, trans. (Macon: Mercer University, 1986); and J. P. Meier, "Matthew and Ignatius: A Response to William R. Schoedel," pages 178-186 in D. Balch, ed., *Social History of the Matthean Community* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991).

> favour the hypothesis that he used our Greek Matthew in something like its present shape.[3]

Two later studies by É. Massaux (1950) and W.-D. Köhler (1987) propose the same basic approach with variations concerning the degree of probable dependence involving specific passages. Thus, for example, Massaux finds that literary contact with Matthew is "certain" in seven Ignatian passages.[4] Köhler speaks of two Ignatian texts in which direct dependence on Matthew is clearly evident: *Smyrn.* 1.1 (=Matt 3:15) and *Phld.* 3.1 (=Matt 15:13). Köhler also considers literary dependence on Matthew highly probable in nine Ignatian passages.[5]

Still in regard to the Synoptic tradition, there is one Ignatian passage that ostensibly has affinity with the Gospel of Luke: the resurrection narrative Ignatius reports in *Smyrn.* 3.1-3 is paralleled by Luke 24:36-43. Recognizing that this narrative has a tradition history outside of Luke and Ignatius—as well as the fact that there are no other indications of Ignatian contact with Luke—, it is often held that in *Smyrn.* 3 Ignatius is dependent on a

---

[3]The Oxford Society, 79.

[4]*Eph.* 5.2 (=Matt 18:19-20), 14.2 (=Matt 12:33); *Trall.* 11.1 (=Matt 15:13); *Phld.* 3.1 (=Matt 15:13); *Smyrn.* 1.1 (=Matt 3:15); *Pol.* 1.2 (=Matt 8:17), 2.2 (=Matt 10:16). Massaux, 87-91.

[5]*Eph.* 5.2 (=Matt 18:19-20), 15.1 (=Matt 23:8), 17.1 (=Matt 26:6-13), 19.1-3 (=Matt 2:2, 9); *Phld.* 2.2 (=Matt 7:15), 6.1 (=Matt 23:27); *Smyrn.* 6.1 (=Matt 19:12); *Pol.* 1.2-3 (=Matt 8:17), 2.2 (=Matt 10:16). Köhler, 73-96.

resurrection tradition outside of Luke.[6] However, R. M. Grant believes that Ignatius is "paraphrasing" Luke, and Paulsen (who tends to the solution that Ignatius is not dependent on Luke) admits that a direct link with Luke cannot be completely discounted.[7]

With respect to the Synoptic tradition in general, a major study which takes another tack is that of H. Koester (1957).[8] For Koester, there is no evidence that Ignatius has any literary dependence on any of the Synoptic Gospels. Ostensible allusions to Matthew are best explained as Ignatius' use of the older "free tradition" which the Gospel of Matthew shares with Ignatius. The single possible contact with Luke (*Smyrn.* 3.1-3) is to be understood in the same way. Koester recognizes the Matthew-like quality of various passages but states that this is because of the ecclesial ("kirchlichste") content of Matthew (i.e., community rules and parenetical formulae). The older traditions behind this material in Matthew are interesting to Ignatius as well.[9] This explains, for example, the

---

[6]Thus, Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 226-229; P. Vielhauer and G. Strecker, "Jewish-Christian Gospels," pages 134-152 in W. Schneemelcher, ed. *New Testament Apocrypha*, R. Mcl. Wilson, trans. vol. 1 (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1991) 143-145.

[7]R. M. Grant, "Scripture and Tradition in St. Ignatius of Antioch," *CBQ* 25 (1963) 322-335, 327; Paulsen, *Studien*, 41.

[8]H. Koester, *Synoptische Überlieferung bei den Apostolischen Vätern* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1957).

[9]Ibid., 60-61.

seeming Matthean allusion at *Eph.* 6.1 on the "master of the house" (cf., Matt 10:40).[10]

In general agreement with Koester is J. S. Sibinga (1966).[11] Sibinga, through an analysis of thirteen supposed literary connections with Matthew, concludes that the evidence indicates Ignatius did not "quote Matthew."[12] What is more, turning to the Synoptic source theory, Sibinga suggests that Ignatius "knew the M-material or part of it in its pre-Matthean form." He calls this material "$M^{Ign.}$"[13] Thus, for Sibinga as for Koester, Ignatius is likely using traditions older than Matthew.

With a more recent study, Schoedel (1991) continues in this same vein.[14] While he recognizes the "almost certain" possibility that Ignatius uses Matthew "in one or two passages" (e.g., *Pol.* 1.3), Schoedel also recognizes—with an equal level of certainty—that in other passages (e.g., *Eph.* 19) Ignatius is using "gospel material of a Matthean type not derived from the Gospel."[15] Moreover, Schoedel underscores the telling lack of certainty that Ignatius knew *both* the Matthean Gospel and traditions behind it.

---

[10]Ibid., 39-42.

[11]J. S. Sibinga, "Ignatius and Matthew," *NovT* 8 (1966) 263-283.

[12]Ibid., 281.

[13]Ibid., 282.

[14]W. Schoedel, "Ignatius and the Reception of the Gospel of Matthew in Antioch," pages 129-177 in D. Balch, ed., *Social History of the Matthean Community* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991).

[15]Ibid., 175; on *Pol.* 1.3, 166; on *Eph.* 19, 156.

Therefore, with the either/or choice before him, Schoedel follows Koester in positing a "free tradition" behind the Matthew-like material in the Ignatian letters.[16]

Turning away from the Synoptic tradition, Ignatian texts such as *Phld.* 7.1, 9.1; *Rom.* 7.2 have raised the question of the relationship between Ignatius and the Gospel of John (and, to a lesser extent, the Johannine letters).[17] Earlier scholarship, such as H. J. Bardsley (1913) and C. Maurer (1949), finds direct dependence of Ignatius on the Gospel of John. So Maurer, for example, bases his argument on the way John is quoted elsewhere in the second century in comparison with how Ignatius cites other authors. This comparison for Maurer points to Ignatius' use of John.[18] However, later scholars such as H. Paulsen (1978) and W.

---

[16]Ibid., 176; idem, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 9.

[17]Studies on this question include F. M. Braun, *Jean le théologien et son évangile dans l'église ancienne*, 3 vols (Paris: Gabalda, 1959); H. J. Bardsley, "The Testamony of Ignatius and Polycarp to the Writings of St. John," *JTS* 14 (1913) 207-220; R. Bauckham "The Study of Gospel Traditions Outside the Canonical Gospels: Problems and Prospects," pages 369-403 in D. Wenham, ed. *Gospel Perspectives: The Jesus Tradition Outside the Gospels* (Sheffield: JSOT, 1984); F.-M. Braun, *Jean le théologien et son évangile dans l'église ancienne*, vol. 1 (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1959) 270-282; W. Burghardt, "Did Saint Ignatius of Antioch Know the Fourth Gospel?" *TS* 1 (1940) 1-26; S. Johnson, "Parallels Between The Letters of Ignatius and the Johannine Epistles," pages 327-338 in E. W. Conrad, E. G. Newing, eds. *Perspectives on Language and Text* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1987); C. Maurer, *Ignatius von Antiochien und das Johannesevangelium* (Zűrich: Zwingli, 1949); H. Paulsen, *Studien zur Theologie des Ignatius von Antiochien*, (Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978) 36-37.

[18]Maurer, 100-102.

Schoedel (1985, 1991) hold that the evidence does not warrant any certainty in this regard.[19]

As we will see, in this study I favor Koester's position with respect to the relationship between Ignatius and the Synoptic tradition. So also regarding the Gospel of John, along with Paulsen and Schoedel, it is best to see no direct link between Ignatius and John. Yet, as I have already suggested, the literary relationship between Ignatius and the NT Gospels is not the main concern of the study to follow. The focus of this study, rather, is the Ignatian *idea* of gospel. Therefore, the cynosure of this study is the use of the term "gospel (τὸ εὐαγγέλιον)" in the Ignatian corpus. In my view, therefore, the analysis of literary parallels between Ignatius and proposed written sources often ignores the Ignatian concept of the gospel itself. To isolate and examine this εὐαγγέλιον in its matrix is the task I wish to attempt.

With this task in mind, a beginning point is to recognize that the Ignatian passages which are most often examined in regard to Ignatius and the NT Gospels are logia. It is striking that Ignatius never introduces these with a citation formula—as in *Magn.* 12.1c where "as it is written (ὡς γέγραπται)" introduces a quotation from Prov 18:17 (cf.,

---

[19]Paulsen, *Studien*, 36-37; Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 9, 206; idem, "Ignatius and the Reception of the Gospel of Matthew," 165.

Eph. 5.3)—; moreover, Ignatius never associates these sayings with Jesus or his authority.[20] Most significant for my concern, however, is the fact that Ignatius never links this material with the term τὸ εὐαγγέλιον.[21]

However, Ignatius uses τὸ εὐαγγέλιον eight times in five passages (*Phld.* 5.1, 5.2 [bis], 8.2, 9.2 [bis]; *Smyrn.* 5.1, 7.2). The scholarly discussion concerning this usage falls into two broad categories: those, on the one hand, who hold that τὸ εὐαγγέλιον for Ignatius refers to a written document of traditions about Jesus; and those, on the other hand, who opt for an oral or preached concept of gospel in the Ignatian letters.[22]

With respect to the first of these categories, we begin with the early work of T. Zahn (1873). For Zahn, three of the eight Ignatian occurrences of τὸ εὐαγγέλιον—*Phld.* 5.1, 8.2; *Smyrn.* 7.2—refer to a written text of Christian tradition; the other occurrences (*Phld.* 5.2 [bis], 9.2 [bis]; *Smyrn.* 5.1) refer to a message about the salvific events, presumably based on the text.[23] Thus, while Zahn

---

[20]Koester, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 60.

[21]As, for example, in *Did.* 8.2: "Neither pray like the hypocrites, but as the Lord commanded in his gospel (μηδὲ προσεύχεσθε ὡς οἱ ὑποκριταί, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐκέλευσεν ὁ κύριος ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ αὐτοῦ)."

[22]We will soon see, however, that Köhler fits in between these categories. Köhler, 74-77.

[23]Zahn, 430-434.

does recognize the preached gospel message, the εὐαγγέλιον is fundamentally a written document.

There is also a series of studies which sees the εὐαγγέλιον of Ignatius in light of the celebration of the Christian cult, the eucharist.[24] Thus, for G. P. Wetter (1921) and H. Schlier (1929) the study of Hellenistic mystery religions provides an approach to Ignatius. In this regard, the celebration of the eucharist for Ignatius is a reenactment of Jesus' passion. For Wetter, therefore, the εὐαγγέλιον is a text containing the Christian salvation myth which is read in conjunction with the ritual action to reenact the salvation events.[25] Schlier, on the other hand, distinguishes a "mystagogical" reading of the text containing the passion and death of Christ in which the listener shares in the sufferings ("Mitleiden") of Christ. This Schlier links with the suffering of Christian martyrs.[26]

In line with this is the work of H.-W. Bartsch (1940). Bartsch suggests that Ignatius does not always use τὸ εὐαγγέλιον in the same way. Thus, in the pivotal passage of

---

[24]Studies in this vein are H. Schlier, *Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den Ignatiusbriefen* (Gießen: Töpelmann, 1929); H.-W. Bartsch, *Gnostisches Gut und Gemeindetradition bei Ignatius von Antiochien* (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1940); G. P. Wetter, *Altchristliche Liturgien* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1921).

[25]Wetter, 121-122. Cf., Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 110-111.

[26]Schlier, 166-167.

Phld. 8.2, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον "perhaps" refers to a fixed text of early traditions to be read, much like for Wetter, within the context of ritual reenactment of the salvation events as in a mystery religion. However, Bartsch holds that Wetter has inaccurately combined two separate senses. Thus, while in *Phld.* 8.2 the text would be read to relive the events of Jesus, Bartsch finds another, "sacramental," meaning of τὸ εὐαγγέλιον in *Phld.* 5.1 where he sees the εὐαγγέλιον as a text which accompanied and interpreted the sacramental act, the eucharist.[27] In *Phld.* 5.1, then, the use of τὸ εὐαγγέλιον is much more than reliving the salvation events; it refers to the eucharistic presence of Jesus.

More recently, R. Joly (1979) and J. Rius-Camps (1980) find that Ignatius is using τὸ εὐαγγέλιον to refer to a text.[28] Both of these authors, however, are primarily interested in challenging the almost unanimous scholarly acceptance of the middle recension of Ignatius' letters. Thus, the use of the term τὸ εὐαγγέλιον for Joly is included in his argument for a date of 160-170 for the middle recension. In Rius-Camps' study, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον only occurs in two of the letters which are inauthentic.[29]

---

[27]Bartsch, 99-101, especially, 100.

[28]R. Joly, *Le Dossier d'Ignace d'Antioche* (Bruxelles: Éditions de l'Université de Bruxelles, 1979); J. Rius-Camps, *The Four Authentic Letters of Ignatius, the Martyr* (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1980).

[29]Joly, 65-67; Rius-Camps, 48-50.

Among those who see Ignatius' εὐαγγέλιον as an oral, preached message and not a fixed text, Koester's work is the most complete.[30] Koester holds that τὸ εὐαγγέλιον for Ignatius designates "the oral message of the facts of salvation (die mundliche Botschaft der Heilstatsachen)."[31] Pointing to the links Ignatius makes with the OT Prophets as figures and not as texts in the εὐαγγέλιον passages (all, except for *Phld.* 8.2), Koester states that Ignatius' εὐαγγέλιον is therefore not a text; the εὐαγγέλιον, rather, refers to Jesus himself through the preached message of the salvation he accomplished.[32] This is further confirmed for Koester by the fact that in *Phld.* 5.1 the εὐαγγέλιον is directly linked with the flesh of Jesus, and that in *Smyrn.* 5.1 the link is with the individual suffering of Christians. The preached gospel message, thus, is where the passion is revealed and the resurrection is completed (*Smyrn.* 7.2). Therefore, Koester suggests that with these links between τὸ εὐαγγέλιον and non-textual witnesses, Ignatius is referring to the

---

[30]Koester, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 6-10; idem, *Ancient Christian Gospels* (Philadelphia: Trinity, 1990) 7-8. For others who hold this position, see R. H. Gundry, "ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ: How Soon a Book?" *JBL* 115 (1996) 321-325; Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 9, 222; H. Paulsen. *Die Briefe des Ignatius von Antiochia und der Polykarpbrief.* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1985) 83.

[31]Koester, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 6.

[32]Cf., Köhler, 76-77.

preached message of salvation in which Christ is present as εὐαγγέλιον.[33]

What is more, Koester reads the pivotal text in *Phld.* 8.2 in light of the other Ignatian uses of τὸ εὐαγγέλιον.[34] Thus, in contrast to the appeal to the written documents of the OT (the "archives [ἀρχεῖα]") to which the opponents appeal with respect to the εὐαγγέλιον, Ignatius presents the only true archives as the preached message of the εὐαγγέλιον: Jesus and the salvation events.

Most recently, in a brief article R. Gundry (1996) has followed Koester by underscoring not only Ignatius' distancing the εὐαγγέλιον from the OT but also the close parallels Ignatius makes with the εὐαγγέλιον and unwritten witnesses to the message.[35]

W.-D. Köhler takes a different tack. In a brief discussion which in part responds to Koester, Köhler attempts a delicate distinction with respect to Ignatius' use of τὸ εὐαγγέλιον.[36] As we have seen, Köhler argues for Ignatius' direct use of the Gospel of Matthew. However, for Köhler this does not mean that τὸ εὐαγγέλιον refers to the Matthean Gospel; indeed, Köhler states that the question of a written or unwritten εὐαγγέλιον is not a proper question in

---

[33]Koester, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 7.
[34]Ibid., 8.
[35]Gundry, 324-325.
[36]Köhler, 74-77.

the Ignatian context. Hence, Köhler holds that τὸ εὐαγγέλιον for Ignatius refers neither to a preached message nor to a fixed gospel text of that message; it refers, rather, to the *content* of that message, which is Jesus Christ (". . . sondern den Inhalt dieser Botschaft selbst: Jesus Christus").[37] This distinction between the preached message and the content of the message allows Köhler to separate the Ignatian use of τὸ εὐαγγέλιον from the posited use of a written Matthew. The implication here is that Ignatius does not invest any written Christian source, including Matthew, with the authority that is given the OT, or "γραφή." The preached message for Köhler, therefore, includes Matthean material; however, this is to be distinguished from the content of that message—the εὐαγγέλιον—which is Jesus Christ.

Finally, we may return briefly to Schoedel. As we have seen, Schoedel is in basic agreement with Koester regarding Ignatius and Matthew. While Schoedel does not treat the term εὐαγγέλιον *per se*, in his discussion on the relationship between Matthew and Ignatius he approaches the gospel of Ignatius by suggesting "what a gospel written by Ignatius himself would have looked like if he had chosen to write one."[38] Hence, with this exercise as a frame, Schoedel is able not only to address supposed contacts with Matthew, but

---

[37]Ibid., 76-77.

[38]Schoedel, "Ignatius and the Reception of Matthew," 154.

he is also able to highlight the content of the various traditions about Jesus to which Ignatius has access. Yet, as we have seen, with respect to the use of the term τὸ εὐαγγέλιον itself, Schoedel follows Koester.

So, to return to the study which follows, the task of this dissertation is centered on the concept of the gospel in the letters of Ignatius. As I have suggested, in my view the proposed direct literary contacts between Ignatius and the NT Gospels are unconvincing. Koester's position (as well as Schoedel's) that Ignatius appeals to free traditions of various characteristics is the most plausible. Yet, the question of Ignatius' use of τὸ εὐαγγέλιον itself remains to be fully explored.

In this regard, the proposed approaches from Hellenistic mystery religions in the studies of Wetter, Schlier, and Bartsch depend on Ignatius' use of a cultic text; this sort of usage, in my opinion, is not supported by the evidence in the letters. Koester's examination of τὸ εὐαγγέλιον in Ignatius (as well as in the other Apostolic Fathers), however, is not only the most complete, but it also presents the most logical solution. Thus, Koester's view of the Ignatian εὐαγγέλιον in light of the non-written witnesses with which it is directly linked, provides a viable approach to the question. On the other hand,

Köhler's attempted distinction between the preached message and the content of that message seems forced and therefore untenable. Finally, Schoedel's latest article (1991) provides valuable insights into the nature and content of the Jesus traditions in the Ignatian corpus

Hence, we are left with Koester's basic approach to Ignatius' use of τὸ εὐαγγέλιον. With Koester's study as a starting place, therefore, I propose to treat fully the concept of τὸ εὐαγγέλιον in the letters of Ignatius. Along with Koester's work, Schoedel's imagined written 'Gospel According to Ignatius' will provide a frame for considering the motifs and themes that make up the Ignatian idea of εὐαγγέλιον.

I will attempt this study in two parts. In Part One, I will examine the gospel of Ignatius first through a consideration of the eight Ignatian uses of the term τὸ εὐαγγέλιον. Part One will include as well a discussion of the motifs and themes which are the content of Ignatius' gospel. The final task of Part One will be to examine the environment of the Ignatian gospel. This will involve first a treatment of the concept of τὸ εὐαγγέλιον in the broader environment of early Christianity; and second, an examination of τὸ εὐαγγέλιον and the internal environment of the Ignatian corpus. Thus, Part One will establish the nature and content of the εὐαγγέλιον for Ignatius.

Part Two will be a treatment of the function of the Ignatian gospel. In this part I will focus specifically on the boundary-setting function of the εὐαγγέλιον. Thus, I will treat first the εὐαγγέλιον and Christology in the Ignatian letters. In this I will consider how the Ignatian gospel serves to delineate belief within the boundaries of what is for Ignatius proper Christianity. Second, I will discuss how the Ignatian εὐαγγέλιον serves to isolate the belief which for Ignatius is outside the boundaries of Christianity. Thus, this final discussion will treat error in the letters in relation to the εὐαγγέλιον.

PART ONE

THE IGNATIAN GOSPEL AND ITS ENVIRONMENT

INTRODUCTION TO PART ONE

In Part One my goal is to isolate the Ignatian gospel and examine it in its environment. Thus, the task here is to pay particular attention to the actual use of the term τὸ εὐαγγέλιον not only with respect to Ignatius, but also as its use elsewhere relates to Ignatius.

The program in Part One, therefore, is threefold. In Chapter I, first I will introduce Ignatius' gospel through a treatment of the use of τὸ εὐαγγέλιον in the Ignatian corpus. The second section of Chapter I will be an examination of the leitmotifs in the 'defining passsages' which identify the content of the εὐαγγέλιον for Ignatius.

Chapters II and III will be a consideration of what I refer to as the *environment* of the εὐαγγέλιον. Thus, Chapter II will be an examination—with Ignatius as the lens—of the broader environment of early Christianity's efforts to articulate its message as τὸ εὐαγγέλιον. This discussion will center on not only the use of the term τὸ εὐαγγέλιον in the NT and the Apostolic Fathers, but it will also involve the motifs and themes which constitute the content of the various gospel expressions. Next, in Chapter III, with the broader early Christian environment before us, I will examine the internal environment of the Ignatian letters

themselves to discover how that specific environment relates to Ignatius' idea of the εὐαγγέλιον.

With these three chapters completed, I will then, in Part Two, consider how this gospel functions in Ignatius' particular view of Christianity.

CHAPTER I

THE GOSPEL OF IGNATIUS

A. IGNATIAN USE OF ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ

In his seven letters Ignatius refers to the "gospel" (εὐαγγέλιον) eight times: all are found in either the letter to the Philadelphians or to the Smyrnaeans (*Phld.* 5.1, 5.2 [bis], 8.2, 9.2 [bis]; *Smyrn.* 5.1, 7.2). Ignatius never uses the verb εὐαγγελίζεσθαι.[1] In this section I will examine each of these occurrences within the Ignatian context by considering them in their immediate settings in the two letters.

1. PHILADELPHIANS 5.1-2

In *Phld.* 5.1 Ignatius commends the Philadelphians by telling them that their prayer will enable him to be made perfect εἰς θεόν. He thus attains the lot of mercy by "taking refuge in the gospel as in the flesh of Jesus" (προσφυγὼν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ ὡς σαρκὶ Ἰησοῦ).[2] According to *Smyrn.* 7.1, "the flesh

---

[1]I will, however, return to this term and discuss its equivalents.

[2]Ignatius speaks of this as attaining the "lot in which I was granted mercy" (ἵνα ἐν ᾧ κλήρῳ ἠλεήθην ἐπιτύχω . . .). Ἐπιτυγχάνω is one of the characteristic expressions in Ignatius' rhetoric. Here, as in *Trall.* 12.3 and *Rom.* 1.2, the object is Ignatius' "lot" or destiny (κλῆρος); other occurrences are: *Eph.* 12.2; *Magn.* 14; *Trall.* 12.2, 13.3; *Rom.* 2.1, 4.1, 9.2; *Pol.* 2.3, 7.1 all of which have the genitive θεοῦ as

of Jesus" refers to the eucharist, but it also refers to the flesh of the historical Jesus "which suffered for our sins, [flesh] which the father raised in his goodness (. . . τὴν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν παθοῦσαν, ἣν τῇ χρηστότητι ὁ πατὴρ ἤγειρεν)."[3] We will soon see that the content of the εὐαγγέλιον is centered on Jesus' life, death and resurrection (as in *Phld.* 8.2, 9.2). So, here in *Phld.* 5.1, the flesh of Jesus is a synonym for the εὐαγγέλιον; it thus suggests the historical events of salvation that occured in the past, and—through the eucharist—in the present church as well.[4]

Ignatius then immediately links this comparison between the flesh of Jesus and the εὐαγγέλιον, with a parallel comparison between the Apostles and the presbytery of the church (*Phld.* 5.1c). Ignatius is here reminding the Philadelphians of the authoritative supports—again, up to the present—of his position as he moves toward his expected end.[5] The Apostles are the past witnesses of the εὐαγγέλιον accomplished by the historical flesh of Jesus; and the presbytery of the Ignatian church is the witness to the εὐαγγέλιον subsisting in the eucharistic flesh of Jesus. In

---

their object (and all, excepting *Pol.* 2.3 which has a second person pronoun as subject, have first person subjects); also, in *Rom.* 5.3 the object is Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, and in *Rom.* 1.2a Ignatius has attained his request to God.

[3]Here, in *Smyrn.* 7.1, Ignatius is speaking of the schismatics who avoid the Eucharist διὰ τὸ μὴ ὁμολογεῖν τὴν εὐχαριστίαν σάρκα εἶναι τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τὴν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν παθοῦσαν, ἣν τῇ χρηστότητι ὁ πατὴρ ἤγειρεν.

[4]Cf., Bartsch, 100.

[5]Schoedel entitles this pericope "Ignatius' Authority and His Theological Authorities." Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 200-203.

his righteous suffering Ignatius' hope is the gospel that exists throughout history.

Next, in *Phld.* 5.2, the bishop intensifies this appeal to authority by pointing out that the chain of authority is in direct line with the OT Prophets. They "made their proclamation with the gospel in view (εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον κατηγγελκέναι)," hoping and waiting for Jesus "in whom by believing they were also saved (ἐν ᾧ καὶ πιστεύσαντες ἐσώθησαν)."[6] Because of this, the Prophets are included, as saints of the church, in the "gospel of the common hope" (ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ τῆς κοινῆς ἐλπίδος).[7]

Therefore, in *Phld.* 5, clearly Ignatius is placing his own situation within the history of apostolic (5.1c) and prophetic (5.2) witness to the gospel. This history itself confirms the legitimacy of Ignatius' position. He is part of the gospel in the present.

However, it must be pointed out that in *Phld.* 5 Ignatius, through the reference to the flesh of Jesus, only suggests the content of the εὐαγγέλιον that lies at the center

---

[6]This is Schoedel's translation. Ibid., 200.

[7]In *Magn.* 8.2, another text countering judaistic practices, Ignatius makes the same point: "For the godly prophets lived according to Jesus Christ." Thus, there is little chance that *Phld.* 5.2 refers to Christian prophetic activity such as that in *Hermas* and the *Didache*.

D. Aune, however, holds that *Phld.* 5.2, of all the Ignatian references to prophets, is the only mention of Christian Prophets in Ignatius' letters. D. Aune, *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983) 291.

of his appeal. In our next passage for consideration, *Phld.* 8.2, he provides us with an idea of that content.

2. PHILADELPHIANS 8.2

In *Phld.* 8.2 Ignatius is recalling a discussion between himself and someone who disagrees about whether an ostensibly unnamed aspect of Christian teaching (κατὰ χριστομαθίαν) is included in the gospel.[8] With its unusual language (ἡ χριστομαθία, τὰ ἀρχεῖα) and its ambiguous syntax (does ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ refer to the ἀρχεῖα, or is it the object of οὐ πιστεύω?), this passage is pivotal for understanding Ignatius' relationship to both the OT and Jesus traditions.[9]

The exchange is recorded by Ignatius:

> ἐπεὶ ἤκουσά τινων λεγόντων, ὅτι ἐὰν μὴ ἐν τοῖς ἀρχείοις εὕρω ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ οὐ πιστεύω· καὶ λέγοντός μου αὐτοῖς ὅτι γέγραπται, ἀπεκρίθησάν μοι ὅτι πρόκειται.
>
> For I heard some say, "If I do not find (it) in the archives, I do not believe (it to be) in the gospel." And when I said, "It is written," they answered me, "That is just the question." (8.2b)[10]

---

[8]Χριστομαθία is an hapax legomenon in early Christian literature. Further along, we will observe the link between this term and the εὐαγγέλιον.

[9]See W. Bauer/H. Paulsen, *Die Briefe des Ignatius von Antiochia und der Polykarpbrief* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1985) 85-86; Lightfoot, 2.270-273; Koester, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 6-10; Grant, *Ignatius*, 106; S. Reinach, "Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, and the ARXEIA," pp. 339-340 in W. Buckler and W. Calder, eds., *Anatolian Studies Presented to Sir William Mitchell Ramsay* (Manchester: University Press, 1923); Ruis-Camps, 47-51; Schoedel, "Ignatius and the Archives" *HTR* 71 (1978) 97-106; and idem, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 207-209.

[10]This is Schoedel's translation of *Phld.* 8.2b. Ibid., 207.

The ambiguous syntax of the phrase ἐὰν μὴ ἐν τοῖς ἀρχείοις εὕρω ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ οὐ πιστεύω has lead to scholarly attempts at recovering Ignatius' (or his interlocutor's) point. The first difficulty here has to do with "the archives [or "original documents"] (τὰ ἀρχεῖα)."[11] Zahn, punctuates the phrase to mean "If I do not find it in the archives, [that is] in the gospel, I do not believe."[12] Thus, for Zahn, τὰ ἀρχεῖα refers to Christian gospel texts which the speaker considers to be the true εὐαγγέλιον. The consensus of scholars, however, holds that τὰ ἀρχεῖα refers to the OT (perhaps specifically the Prophets) as the archives to which Ignatius and his interlocutor are appealing. Thus, Schoedel points to the usage in Josephus *C. Apion.* 1.29 where the Jewish Scriptures are compared to the δημοσίαι ἀναγραφαί ("public records" or archives) of the Greeks; moreover, in *C. Apion.* 1.143, Josephus speaks of the archives of the Phoenicians (" . . . τοῖς ἀρχείοις τῶν Φοινίκων").[13]

---

[11]As in W. Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, trans. W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979) 111.

There is, as well, a textual problem here. In the Latin version from the Greek suggests that in the first of the three uses of τὰ ἀρχεῖα the text has ἀρχαῖοις ("ancients") instead. Since in the denouement of the conversation Ignatius would, in that case, be responding illogically to the opponents' "ancients" with "archives," the ἀρχαῖοις reading is not accepted. See Schoedel, 208, n. 7; Zahn, 374.

[12]Zahn's punctuation is as follows: "ἐὰν μὴ ἐν τοῖς ἀρχείοις εὕρω, ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ, οὐ πιστεύω." Ibid.; cf., Lighfoot, 271-272.

[13]Schoedel, "Ignatius and the Archives," 99-101; idem, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 208.

This brings to the fore another difficulty with this passage. Ignatius responds to his opponents with the statement, "it is written (γέγραπται)." Lightfoot considers it "not impossible that Ignatius might have applied γέγραπται to some Evangelical or Apostolical writings."[14] Rius-Camps is more certain: just as the speaker refers to the OT as *written* ἀρχεῖα, so in response, Ignatius refers to a *written* Christian text with γέγραπται.[15] However, elsewhere Ignatius only uses γέγραπται in the standard way to refer to the OT scriptures (*Eph.* 5.3; *Magn.* 12). This, along with the fact that there is no other indication of an authoritative Christian text for Ignatius, points to the solution that γέγραπται here refers to the OT.[16]

Hence, the exchange between Ignatius and his opponents begins with opposing interpretations of the OT scriptures. It is clear, however, that the discussion—at least for Ignatius—could go no further: each side could support its position with texts.

So, Ignatius bypasses this hermeneutic ambiguity by distancing himself from the written "archives" of the OT. In their place, he provides his own authoritative ἀρχεῖα and, by extension, the outlines of the εὐαγγέλιον itself: "But to me the archives are Jesus Christ, the sacrosanct archives

---

[14]Lightfoot, 272.
[15]Rius-Camps, 49.
[16]Schoedel, 208; Koester, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 8.

are his cross and death, his resurrection, and faith through him . . . (ἐμοὶ δὲ ἀρχεῖά ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, τὰ ἄθικτα ἀρχεῖα ὁ σταυρὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ ὁ θάνατος καὶ ἡ ἀνάστασις αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ πίστις ἡ δι' αὐτοῦ . . .)" (8.2c). For Ignatius, then, the only archives necessary, as the foundational information for the church, are not found in written documents but are the historical facts of the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus. What is more, appended to the list of events in the story of Jesus is the phrase καὶ ἡ πίστις ἡ δι' αὐτοῦ. The Ignatian archives are not texts; they exist in the present faith of the community, faith centered on Jesus and the salvation he accomplished in the past. The present faith thus has as its content the message of the εὐαγγέλιον events.

Finally, in *Phld.* 8.2 as in *Phld.* 5.1, Ignatius connects his own ultimate goal (in 8.2 to be justified, and in 5.1 the "lot in which I attain mercy") with the εὐαγγέλιον (as well as the prayer of the Philadelphian church). It is the present faith in the past events of Jesus' life, death and resurrection that is the locus of justification for Ignatius (ἐν οἷς θέλω ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ ὑμῶν δικαιωθῆναι). The εὐαγγέλιον, in the guise of the "sacrosanct archives," is therefore provided with at least an outline of content.

Hence, Ignatius makes no appeal to written Christian documents for this vital information. As we have seen, both 5.1 and 8.2 recognize the witness of the Scriptures. While those written archives—which Ignatius himself recognizes as

γέγραπται—may well point to the εὐαγγέλιον (i.e., the OT prophets' announcement in advance), the εὐαγγέλιον, past and present, is archive enough. Because of its importance for the whole of my thesis, we will have occasion to return to this intriguing pericope.

3. PHILADELPHIANS 9.2

Ignatius continues the same themes in *Phld.* 9.1-2. In 9.1 the bishop juxtaposes the priests of Israel (οἱ ἱερεῖς) with the greater high priest (ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς) who must be understood as Jesus.[17] It is Jesus alone who is entrusted with the secrets of God (τὰ κρυπτὰ τοῦ θεοῦ) and, therefore,

> αὐτὸς ὢν θύρα τοῦ πατρός, δι' ἧς εἰσέρχονται Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακὼβ καὶ οἱ προφῆται καὶ ἀπόστολοι καὶ ἡ ἐκκλησία. πάντα ταῦτα εἰς ἑνότητα θεοῦ.
>
> He is the door of the Father through which enter Abraham and Isaac and Jacob and the Prophets and the Apostles and the church: all these into the unity of God. (*Phld.* 9.1b)

Here, again, we have the Ignatian lineup of authority: an inclusive structuring of the faith lineage up to the present church. This faith structure is divided into two groups of three: the first group is composed of the classic scriptural individuals who are the authoritative supports

---

[17]This theme is a feature in Hebrews 6:20, 9:1-12. See, as well, *1 Clem.* 36.1, 61.3, 64.1; in Pol.*Phil.* 12.2 Jesus is called "sempiternus pontifex."

for the Jewish people;[18] the second group is composed of three authoritative bodies (Prophets, Apostles, the believing church) all of which, as we have seen, are directly linked with the Ignatian εὐαγγέλιον. There is no indication here of a direct appeal to the scriptures. Despite the reference to the Hebrew ancestors, Prophets, and Apostles (all, broadly speaking, scriptural figures), the final reference to the church governs the entire list in this regard: it is the figures or groups themselves and not writings by or about them that are at issue.[19] Because of Jesus, they have access to "the Father."[20] Jesus is at the center; everything is understood through him.

Having so presented this lineage of authority and its single hermeneutical center, Ignatius, in *Phld.* 9.2, turns specifically to the εὐαγγέλιον and further explains how Jesus is the referent:

> ἐξαίρετον δέ τι ἔχει τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, τὴν παρουσίαν τοῦ σωτῆρος, κυρίου ἡμοῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τὸ πάθος αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὴν ἀνάστασιν.
>
> But the gospel has something remarkable, the coming of the Savior, our lord Jesus Christ, his passion and resurrection.

---

[18]This particular three-part listing of ancestors finds its orgins in the call of Moses, Exod 3:5. It is found in the synoptic tradition (Matt 8:11, 22:32; Mark 12:26; Luke 13:28, 20:37; Acts 3:13, 7:32) but is not found in either the Johaninne or Pauline texts nor the remainder of the NT. In the Apostolic Fathers it is found in an expanded form in *1 Clem.* 31.2-4 and as a list in *Barn.* 6.8 and 8.4.

[19]Koester, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 7.

[20]The fact that the image of a door to God has a slight affinity to Ps 117:20 (Αὕτη ἡ πύλη τοῦ Κυρίου, δίκαιοι εἰσελεύσονται ἐν αὐτῇ.) plays no part here as well.

It is the salvific events of Jesus' life, death, and resurrection contained in the εὐαγγέλιον that are remarkable or set apart (ἐξαίρετος) in the history of faith. Just as Jesus is set apart as the greater high priest, so is the εὐαγγέλιον of Jesus unique in history. Hence, again, to underscore the continuity Ignatius states, "the beloved Prophets directed their announcement toward him (κατήγγειλαν εἰς αὐτόν)."[21] The salvific events of Jesus—that is, the εὐαγγέλιον—are set apart because they are "the completion of incorruption" (τὸ δὲ εὐαγγέλιον ἀπάρτισμά ἐστιν ἀφθαρσίας) and so, as in *Phld.* 5.2, are "the gospel of the common hope" not only for the Prophets but also for the present church and all the faithful in between. Therefore, in *Phld.* 9.2, it is clear that the content of the Ignatian gospel is defined at least by Jesus and his saving actions.

4. SMYRNAEANS 5.1, 7.2

The final two Ignatian usages of εὐαγγέλιον occur in the letter to the Smyrnaeans. In both of these instances Ignatius is busy countering the teachings of those he calls "beasts in human form" (*Smyrn.* 4.1) and "advocates of death

---

[21]This 'looking forward' activity is attributed specifically to Abraham in *Barn.* 9.7. Here it is the circumcision of Abraham that looks forward in the spirit to Jesus' circumcision (ἐν πνεύματι προβλέψας εἰς τὸν Ἰησοῦν περιέτεμεν). As for the Ignatian use of καταγγέλλω, further along I will consider this and other verbs of gospel witness; to anticipate that discussion, it is noteworthy that here we have κατήγγειλαν εἰς αὐτόν, and in *Phld.* 5.2 it is εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον κατηγγελκέναι. For Ignatius, the objects are the same.

(συνήγοροι τοῦ θανάτου) and not of the truth" (*Smyrn.* 5.1a).[22] So, in *Smyrn.* 5.1b Ignatius, in a polemical move, presents the authority behind his argument against his opponents:

> οὓς οὐκ ἔπεισαν αἱ προφητεῖαι οὐδὲ ὁ νόμος Μωϋσέως, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ μέχρι νῦν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, οὐδὲ τὰ ἡμέτερα τῶν κατ' ἄνδρα παθήματα.
>
> These are the ones who were not persuaded by the prophecies, nor the law of Moses, nor even the gospel until now, nor our own individual sufferings.

With respect to this sentence, there are several significant points to notice. First, we see the usual Ignatian appeal to the OT prophets, here with a suggestion of 'the Law and the Prophets.'[23]

Also, Ignatius states that the gospel "until now (μέχρι νῦν)" has not persuaded the opponents. This μέχρι νῦν first brings to mind Ignatius' exhortation in *Eph.* 11.1: "These are the last times (ἔσχατοι καιροί)." The present—that is, since the advent (παρουσία[24]) of Jesus—for Ignatius is the urgent time that the witnesses of history (especially the prophets) looked toward, the time of the gospel events of Jesus. Even this urgency has had no effect on the opponents. Indeed, we find the same usage of μέχρι νῦν in

---

[22]As we read in *Smyrn.* 5.2, these are the main opponents for Ignatius, who "do not confess him [Jesus] as bearing flesh (ὁμολογῶν αὐτὸν σαρκοφόρον)." This seems to be the same error that Ignatius calls αἵρεσις (*Eph.* 6.2; *Trall.* 6.1) and counters directly in *Trall.* 10.1, *Smyrn.* 2.1 and 4.2.

[23]This is the only Ignatian reference to Moses.

[24]See *Phld.* 9.2. Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 234. This παρουσία is one of the motifs of the Ignatian εὐαγγέλιον; it will therefore figure in the discussion in the next section.

Magn. 8.1: "For if we are living even until now according to Judaism, we confess have not received grace (εἰ γὰρ μέχρι νῦν κατὰ Ἰουδαϊσμὸν ζῶμεν, ὁμολογοῦμεν χάριν μὴ εἰληφέναι)." To live in the time characterized by the εὐαγγέλιον is to live "according to Jesus Christ (ζῆν κατὰ Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν)" (*Magn.* 8.2; *Trall.* 2.1).

What is more, Ignatius closely connects the historical witness and present εὐαγγέλιον with "our own individual sufferings (τὰ ἡμέτερα τῶν κατ' ἄνδρα παθήματα)" thus assuring that his own present sufferings, in his progress to Rome and martyrdom, are one with the righteous sufferings of history.

The final explicit mention of the εὐαγγέλιον is in *Smyrn.* 7.2. As noted before, Ignatius is here engaged in the polemic against his opponents. The advice to the Smyrnaeans is stronger: it is proper to refrain from contact with such people; one is not even to speak about them. The Smyrnaeans are told that instead of dealing with people in error, they are "to heed the Prophets, and especially the gospel, in which the passion has been made clear to us and the resurrection accomplished (προσέχειν δὲ τοῖς προφήταις, ἐξαιρέτως δὲ τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ, ἐν ᾧ τὸ πάθος ἡμῖν δεδήλωται καὶ ἡ ἀνάστασις τετελείωται)."[25] Again, here there is an immediate, present sense to the idea

---

[25]Ignatius uses both the adverb ἐξαίρετως and the adjective ἐξαίρετος. Neither word is found in the NT. We find the adverb here (as in *Trall.* 12:2) with the meaning "especially"; as we have seen, the adjective is found in *Phld.* 9.2 with reference to the εὐαγγέλιον: the gospel is something unique, distinctive or remarkable because its content is the coming, the passion, and the resurrection of Jesus.

of gospel for Ignatius: through the preaching of the gospel (already announced by the Prophets [*Phld.* 5.2]) to present believers, the saving events of Jesus have been made clear (δεδήλωται) and accomplished (τετελείωται) in the present church. The Prophets are thus held in esteem, but pride of place is reserved for the εὐαγγέλιον, for it is there that the saving events of Jesus are made present. So, this Ignatian community boundary setting is supported by the ultimate authority grounded in the history of faith: the faith of the Prophets (*Phld.* 5.2), and faith in the gospel of Jesus.[26]

Here again, we find no suggestion that the salvation events are made evident through written documents. The OT Prophets, ostensibly a set of texts, here function not as writings, but authoritative past figures. It is to their relationship with the εὐαγγέλιον (i.e., *Phld.* 5.2) that Ignatius is appealing. Thus, it is through the church's present faith in the proclaimed events of salvation that the gospel is made evident and accomplished.

---

[26]For a thorough discussion of boundary setting in the letters of Ignatius see W. Schoedel "Theological Norms and Social Perspectives in Ignatius of Antioch," pages 30-56 in E. P. Sanders, ed. *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition*, vol. 1 (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980). This prime function of Ignatius' εὐαγγέλιον will be the overarching subject in Part Two of this study.

B. THE CONTENT OF THE IGNATIAN GOSPEL

In the preceding section, I have discussed each occurrence of εὐαγγέλιον in its context. At this point it is necessary to delineate further the content and nature of Ignatius' gospel. In this section I will concentrate on the content. The procedure here has two tasks: first, in order to highlight the gospel motifs, I will briefly revisit the defining passages (*Phld.* 8.2, 9.2; *Smyrn.* 7.2); second, I will analyze those Ignatian motifs with an eye to other early Christian uses of the individual motifs (including specific traditions that parallel Ignatius'). The insights so gained will enable us, in Chapter II, to locate Ignatius' gospel within the broader world of early Christianity.

1. THE DEFINING PASSAGES

We have seen that, of the eight occurrences of εὐαγγέλιον in Ignatius, three provide some indication of the content of the εὐαγγέλιον. These pericopae, which I refer to as "defining passages," are *Phld.* 8.2, 9.2 and *Smyrn.* 7.2. In each of the three Ignatius lists events that evidently he sees as central to the εὐαγγέλιον. Thus, in my attempt to delineate the contours of Ignatius' gospel, it is to these texts and the motifs they contain that we now turn. As we will see, when brought together, these expressions of the εὐαγγέλιον bring to the surface a series of issues surrounding Ignatius' idea of the gospel content.

Therefore, we return to the exposition in *Phld.* 8.2. Here Ignatius suggests the content of the εὐαγγέλιον indirectly by identifying the ἀρχεῖα as the culminating events of Jesus' life, indeed, as Jesus himself:

> ἐμοὶ δὲ ἀρχεῖά ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, τὰ ἄθικτα ἀρχεῖα ὁ σταυρὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ ο θάνατος καὶ ἡ ἀνάστασις αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ πίστις ἡ δι' αὐτοῦ . . .
>
> But to me the archives are Jesus Christ, the sacrosanct archives are his cross and death, his resurrection, and faith through him . . . (*Phld.* 8.2c)

As we have seen, the problem that precipitates the discussion which Ignatius reports in *Phld.* 8 is centered on the authority necessary to uphold an unidentified Christian teaching. We have seen, as well, that the most viable reading here is to understand τὰ ἀρχεῖα of the opponents as the OT and not a Christian text, Gospel or otherwise. Thus, Ignatius' opponents have been appealing to the OT (the "archives") for their source of faith; that is, they want to support Christian teaching through an interpretation involving the OT. It reasonable to assume that these opponents are those to whom Ignatius refers in *Magn.* 9.1, 10.3, and especially in *Phld.* 6.1-2 as favoring judaizing interpretations and practices over the faith in the gospel.[27] For Ignatius, this judaizing activity is wrong because it looks elsewhere and not to the true source or

---

[27]Both *Magn.* 10.3 and *Phld.* 6.1-2 contain the phrase "λαλεῖν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν." As we will see further along, this phrase is important in understanding Ignatius' εὐαγγέλιον.

"archive," Jesus Christ. Therefore, Ignatius conflates the ἀρχεῖα and the εὐαγγέλιον into one entity.

Thus, Ignatius' point in *Phld.* 8.2c is that while one may find supporting texts that refer to Jesus (the scripture of 8.2b, perhaps suggestive of the Prophets [i.e., *Phld.* 9.2]), faith in Jesus centered on the gospel events needs nothing more to prove its validity.

In *Phld.* 9.2 Ignatius continues the connection between the Jesus events and the εὐαγγέλιον. With a slight variation from the gospel content in 8.2, Ignatius states that "the εὐαγγέλιον has something distinctive, the coming of the savior, our Lord Jesus Christ, his passion and resurrection (ἐξαίρετον δέ τι ἔχει τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, τὴν παρουσίαν τοῦ σωτῆρος, κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τὸ πάθος αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὴν ἀναστασιν)." Here again, in response to the judaizers, Ignatius distinguishes the εὐαγγέλιον from any other ground of faith. With the adjective ἐξαίρετος he identifies the events of the εὐαγγέλιον as something singular or unique; the gospel does not depend on any other source.

The final defining passage is *Smyrn.* 7.2. As with the Philadelphian texts above, Ignatius is countering error; here it appears to be the docetic error. In response to the failure to confess (ὁμολογέω) that the eucharist is the flesh of Jesus which suffered (7.1), Ignatius exhorts the Smyrnaeans to consider the Prophets and to concentrate especially on "the gospel in which the passion is made clear

to us and the resurrection accomplished (ἐξαιρέτως δὲ τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ, ἐν ᾧ τὸ πάθος ἡμῖν δεδήλωται καὶ ἡ ἀνάστασις τετελείωται) (7.2)." With the use of the adverb ἐξαιρέτως (cf., *Trall.* 12.2) Ignatius again distinguishes the εὐαγγέλιον, here it is more vital than the Prophets. The Prophets are mentioned because they looked forward to what was revealed and accomplished through the εὐαγγέλιον (cf., *Magn.* 8.2; *Phld.* 5.2).

Thus, in these three texts, the presentation of the εὐαγγέλιον through its specific events is in direct response to the error Ignatius is countering. As I will highlight in Part Two, this polemical matrix is a constant feature in the background of much of Ignatius' appeal to the εὐαγγέλιον. Ignatius carefully formulates the gospel with the errors in mind because, for him, the errors attack the foundational truth of the gospel message.

2. THE GOSPEL MOTIFS

Yet it is the 'events' themselves that are my present concern. In *Phld.* 8.2 we have σταυρός, θάνατος and ἀνάστασις; in *Phld.* 9.2 it is παρουσία, πάθος and ἀνάστασις; in *Smyrn.* 7.2 it is πάθος and ἀνάστασις. With respect to these three outlines of the εὐαγγέλιον, several issues come to the fore:
(a) the specific events listed vary from text to text;
(b) the resurrection (ἀνάστασις) is found in all three and therefore appears to be a primary motif;

(c) Ignatius is the first to use πάθος in reference to Jesus;

(d) Ignatius presents the παρουσία as a specific εὐαγγέλιον event;

(e) the Ignatian concept of παρουσία itself is a departure from earlier Christian usage.

In the following paragraphs I will address the above issues by treating each of the five motifs—παρουσία, σταυρός, θάνατος, πάθος and ἀνάστασις—not only within their Ignatian context, but also with some reference to other early Christian uses which shed light on Ignatius'. Yet, in regard to the other uses, these motifs (with the exception of παρουσία and πάθος) are such central features in much of early Christian expression that to treat them fully would be unmanageable and unnecessary. It is, rather, these motifs as components or expressions of the εὐαγγέλιον message (as they are for Ignatius) which are more valuable to my study. To begin with, however, it is only the specific terms themselves that are my concern; and of these, because of their particular Ignatian twist, I will concentrate my energies most on παρουσία and πάθος.

a. ΠΑΡΟΥΣΙΑ

We have observed Ignatius' statement at *Phld.* 9.2 that the εὐαγγέλιον contains the παρουσία ("advent," "coming") of Jesus. This is the only use of παρουσία by Ignatius;

moreover, this is the first time in early Christianity that we find παρουσία used to refer to Jesus' *first* coming.[28] This particular meaning is clear when we attend to the usage in its Ignatian context. Thus, for Ignatius the παρουσία of Jesus is also expressed through the use of πάρειμι (*Magn.* 9.2), φαίνω (*Magn.* 6.1) and φανερόω (*Eph.* 19.2-3; *Magn.* 8.2), as well as the γέννησις (*Magn.* 11.1; cf., *Eph.* 7.2, 18.2; *Trall.* 9.1; *Smyrn.* 1.1) of Jesus. A treatment of these is in order.

---

[28]Paulsen, *Studien*, 66-68; Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 210.

Of the twenty-four NT usages of παρουσία, eighteen (Matt 24:3, 27, 37, 39; 1 Cor 15:23; 1 Thess 2:19, 3:13, 4:15, 5:23; 2 Thess 2:1, 2:8; Jas 5:7, 8; 2 Pet 1:16, 3:4, 12; 1 John 2:28) refer specifically to Jesus' second coming (the other six, such as 1 Cor 16:17, all have to do with ordinary arrivals). It is notable that the Matthean uses are (with the exception of 24:3, the introductory question to the pericope) all part of the phrase ἡ παρουσία τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

Moreover, Bultmann points out that the Ignatian sense of Jesus' παρουσία has parallels in 2 Tim 1:10 and Titus 2:11. These texts involve the use of φανερόω and ἐπιφαίνω.

With respect to ἐπιφαίνω, Ignatius does not use either ἐπιφαίνω or ἡ ἐπιφάνεια ("appear," "appearance"). The NT uses of these terms generally refer to the second arrival of Jesus (2 Thess 2:8; 1 Tim 6:4; 2 Tim 4:1, 8; Tit 2:13); yet, 2 Tim 1:10 is a particularly 'Ignatian-sounding' pericope in which involves the ἐπιφάνεια of Jesus as his *first* appearance. We will return to this important pericope later, in the discussion on the use of τὸ εὐαγγέλιον in 2 Timothy. R. Bultmann, "Ignatius and Paul," pages 315-329 in *Existence and Faith*, S. M. Odgen, trans. (London: Collins, 1961) 322.

In the remainder of the Apostolic Fathers, we find παρουσία only three times: in *Diogen.* 7.6, 7.9 and *Herm. Sim.* 5.5.3. In all three of these cases the usage, as in the NT, refers to the "second coming" of Jesus at the end of time.

It is with Justin that we begin to see extensive use of παρουσία in the sense of Jesus' first coming. Justin, though, speaks of two comings: δύο γὰρ αὐτοῦ παρουσίας προεκήρυξαν οἱ προφῆται· μίαν μέν, τὴν ἤδη γενομένην, ὡς ἀτίμου καὶ παθητοῦ ἀνθρώπου, τὴν δὲ δευτέραν, ὅταν μετὰ δόξης ἐξ οὐρανῶν . . . (Apol. 52.3; cf., Dial. 14.8, 49.2, 7; 53.1). See A. Oepke, "παρουσί, πάρεμι," *TDNT* V, 870.

As we have seen in my initial look at *Phld.* 9.1, Ignatius supports his statement that the content of the εὐαγγέλιον (including the παρουσία) is "set apart (ἐξαίρετος)" from the scriptures by stating that "the beloved Prophets directed their announcement toward him (οἱ γὰρ ἀγαπητοὶ προφῆται κατήγγειλαν εἰς αὐτόν)" (*Phld.* 9.2b). The OT Prophets looked forward to the παρουσία of Jesus. The sequence of the events listed in 9.2a—παρουσία, πάθος, ἀνάστασις—itself indicates that, for Ignatius, this παρουσία is the first coming of Jesus into the world. Having recognized this, we also find other indications of this sense when we turn to what appear to be Ignatian synonyms for παρουσία.

Hence, in *Magn.* 9.2, we find the same complex of ideas as in *Phld.* 9.1-2: the OT Prophets look forward to the arrival of Jesus. Here, in the context of a warning concerning Jewish practices and being disciples of Jesus,[29] Ignatius asks:

> πῶς ἡμεῖς δυνησόμεθα ζῆσαι χωρὶς αὐτοῦ, οὗ καὶ οἱ προφῆται μαθηταὶ ὄντες τῷ πνεύματι ὡς διδάσκαλον αὐτὸν προσεδόκων; καὶ διὰ τοῦτο, ὃν δικαίως ἀνέμενον, παρὼν ἤγειρεν αὐτοὺς ἐκ νεκρῶν.
>
> How shall we be able to live without him of whom the Prophets were also disciples in the Spirit, to whom they looked forward as their teacher? And because of this, he, for whom they righteously waited, came and raised them from the dead.

---

[29]Immediately before, in *Magn.* 9.1, Ignatius has recourse to εὐαγγέλιον motifs: . . . μηκέτι σαββατίζοντες, ἀλλὰ κατὰ κυριακὴν ὦντες, ἐν ᾗ καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ἡμῶν ἀνέτειλεν δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ . . .

commentators have seen this passage as a reference to Jesus' descent into Hades to save the OT saints,[30] or as a reference to an ascent to an otherworldly place where the Prophets are waiting;[31] it seems best, however, to view this use of πάρειμι (παρὼν ἤγειρεν αὐτοὺς ἐκ νεκρῶν) through the lens of *Phld.* 9.2. The "coming" of Jesus refered to in *Magn.* 9.2 is the παρουσία of the εὐαγγέλιον. This means that this coming is not Jesus' descent or ascent to an extra-mundane place in order to raise the Prophets from the dead; rather, because of Jesus' παρουσία ('first arrival') *in the world*, the Prophets are included as "saints worthy of love and worthy of admiration attested to by Jesus and included in the gospel of the common hope (ἀξιαγάπητοι καὶ ἀξιοθαύμαστοι ἅγιοι, ὑπὸ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μεμαρτυρημένοι καὶ συνηριθμημένοι ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ τῆς κοινῆς ἐλπίδος)" (*Phld.* 5.2). As in *Phld.* 9.1-2 the Prophets righteously waited for Jesus' arrival. Jesus' παρουσία in the world is the inaugural salvific event of the last times (*Eph.* 11.1, *Magn.* 6.1) and is thus the inaugural event in the εὐαγγέλιον which concludes with the passion and resurrection. All of the righteous believers, past and present, share in this salvation.[32]

---

[30]J. Daniélou, *The Theology of Jewish Christianity*, J. A. Baker, trans. (Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1964) 236-237; Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 124.

[31]As in Schlier, *Untersuchugen*, 72-76.

[32]Cf., Paulsen (*Studien*, 67-69) who links Jesus' παρουσία with the Ignatian concept of hope (ἐλπίς, as in *Magn.* 9.1) as an eschatological expression. See, as well, Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch* 27.

What is more, we find this same idea as we regard two other Ignatian expressions of the παρουσία of Jesus, φανερόω ("become visible," "reveal") (*Eph.* 19.2a, 19.3; *Magn.* 8.2) and φαίνω ("manifest," "make one's appearance") (*Magn.* 6.1).[33]

Regarding φανερόω, within the same context of *Magn.* 9.2 treated in my previous paragraph, Ignatius says that the OT Prophets "lived according to Jesus Christ (κατὰ Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν ἔζησαν)" and

> διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἐδιώχθησαν, ἐνπνεόμενοι ὑπὸ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ, εἰς τὸ πληροφορηθῆναι τοὺς ἀπειθοῦντας, ὅτι εἷς θεός ἐστιν, ὁ φανερώσας ἑαυτὸν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ . . .
>
> because of this, they were also persecuted, being inspired by his grace, so that the disobedient might be persuaded that there is one God who revealed himself through Jesus Christ his son . . . (*Magn.* 8.2).

Because the Prophets lived according to Jesus Christ (as opposed to living "according to Judaism" [8.1]), even in persecution they looked toward Jesus through whom God was manifested in history. While, as we will see in Part Two, this use of φανερόω is primarily a description of Jesus' divine origin, the παρουσία of the Ignatian εὐαγγέλιον is behind this as well: Jesus came as God's son (*Magn.* 8.2; cf., *Eph.* 4.2, 20.2; *Magn.* 13.1; *Rom.* insc.; *Smyrn.* 1.1).

---

[33]We have, as well, the expression in *Pol.* 3.2 in which Jesus is described as "invisible, who for our sakes became visible (τὸν ἀόρατον, τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς ὁρατόν)."

Φανερόω is also a central feature in the star-hymn of *Eph.* 19.2-3 which follows the Christological summary of 18.2. The star-hymn is a panegyric on the incarnation.[34] Ignatius introduces the hymn (19.1) with "three mysteries of a cry which were done in the stillness of God (τρία μυστήρια κραυγῆς, ἅτινα ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ θεοῦ ἐπράχθη)" which are Mary's virginity, her giving birth and (as we have seen) the death of Jesus.[35] The bishop then asks, "How then was he revealed to the ages? (πῶς οὖν ἐφανερώθη τοῖς αἰῶσιν;)" (19.2a). The hymn follows as a symbolic description of the manifestation centered on a star as a symbol of Jesus. The manifestation is presented in contradistinction to the concealment of the mysteries from the "prince of the age" (19.1). The message is summed up with "God was revealed as human for the newness of eternal life, and that which had been prepared by God had its beginning (θεοῦ ἀνθρωπίνως φανερουμένου εἰς καινότητα ἀϊδίου ζωῆς· ἀρχὴν δὲ ἐλάμβανεν τὸ παρὰ θεῷ ἀπηρτισμένον)" (19.3).

---

[34]H. F. Stander, "The Starhymn in the Epistle of Ignatius to the Ephesians (19:2-3)," *VC* 43 (1989) 209-214, 213. Other treatments include R. Deichgräber, *Gotteshymnus und Christushymnus in der Frühen Christenheit* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987) 155-160; and Schlier, *Untersuchugen*, 5-81. Here we take a first look at *Eph.* 19.2-3; I will return to this passage as I treat the εὐαγγέλιον and the incarnation in Part II.

When considering the star-hymn here and elsewhere, I will use Schoedel's translation. Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 87.

[35]D. Daube, in a short study, has pointed to the various "cries" associated with these three events in Jesus' life in early Christianity: the cry of Elisabeth in Luke 1:42, the cry of the midwife in the Protevangelium of James 19:2, and Jesus' cry from the cross in Matt 27:46 and Mark 15:37. Daube suggests the possibility that Ignatius had these or other cries in mind. D. Daube, "Τρία μυστήρια κραυγῆς: Ignatius, *Ephesians*, XIX.1," *JTS* 16 (1965) 128-129.

In the same light, we may turn again to *Magn.* 6.1 and notice the Christological use of φαίνω by Ignatius (cf., *Rom.* 3.3). Church officials serve Jesus Christ "who before the ages was with the Father and appeared at the end (ὃς πρὸ αἰώνων παρὰ πατρὶ ἦν καὶ ἐν τέλει ἐφάνη)." The manifestation of God in Jesus occurred in the last times.[36]

Ignatius' uses of φανερόω are much like the occurrences in the NT. While Paul uses φανερόω to refer to Jesus' second coming in 1 Cor 4:5, we have the expression "[God] was revealed in flesh (ὃ ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί)" as the opening phrase of a confessional hymn in 1 Tim 3:16.[37] Ignatius' reference to Jesus' first manifestation as characteristic of the last times (*Magn.* 6.1) parallels three statements in early Christianity, all of which use φανερόω (cf., Ignatius' use of φαίνω in *Magn.* 6.1):

> προεγνωσμένου μὲν πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου φανερωθέντος δὲ ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν χρόνων δι' ὑμᾶς.
>
> He was destined before the foundation of the world, but was revealed at the end of the ages for your sake. (1 Pet 1:20)
>
> νυνὶ δὲ ἅπαξ ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰώνων εἰς ἀθέτησιν τῆς ἁμαρτίας διὰ τῆς θυσίας αὐτοῦ πεφανέρωται.

---

[36]Ignatius, in *Eph.* 11.1, has reminded his readers that "These are the last times (ἔσχατοι καιροί)." Other expressions of the 'last times' in the present include 1 Cor 10:11; 1 Pet 1:20; Heb 1:2, 9:26; Jas 5:3; *Barn,* 4.9; *2 Clem.* 14:2. As we will soon see, three of these (1 Pet 1:20; Heb 9:26; *2 Clem.* 14:2) use φανερόω to speak specifically of Jesus' first coming as characteristic of the "last times."

[37]Deichgräber, 133-137. Cf., *Eph.* 7.2, 19.3; *Magn.* 8.2; *Smyrn.* 3.3; *2 Clem* 14.3.

> But as it is, he has appeared once for all at the end of the age to remove sin by the sacrifice of himself. (Heb 9:26b)

> . . . ἐφανερώθη δὲ ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν, ἵνα ἡμᾶς σώσῃ.

> . . . but he was made manifest in the last days the he might save us. (*2 Clem.* 14.2)

These descriptions—from divergent sources—of the present time as the end time characterized by the coming of Jesus show that the concept was relatively widespread in formative Christianity.

Moreover, the Ignatian uses of φανερόω owe much to an early Christian salvation schema which expresses the message about Jesus through recourse to a contrast between what was hidden *then* but revealed through Jesus *now*.[38] Thus, (along with the 1 Pet 1:20 and 2 *Clem.* 14.2 texts cited above) we find in Rom 16:25-26:[39]

> τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ ὑμᾶς στηρίξαι κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου καὶ τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰησοῦ Χριστους, κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν μυστηρίου χρόνοις αἰωνίοις σεσιγημένου, φανερωθέντος δὲ νῦν διά τε γραφῶν προφητικῶν κατ' ἐπιταγὴν τοῦ αἰωνίου θεοῦ εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη γνωπρισθέντος. . .

---

[38]D. Lührmann, *Das Offenbarungsverständinis bei Paulus und in den paulinischen Gemeinden* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1965) 124-133.

[39]Rom 16:25-26 is recognized as a non-Pauline addition to the end of the letter. Thus, the use of τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου here is not Paul's. Since, as we will observe, the phrase occurs elsewhere in a deutero-Pauline text (2 Tim 2:8), the same phrase at Rom 2:16—itself within an awkward transition—is often seen as a gloss. See, for example, B. Byrne, *Romans*, SP6 (Collegeville: Liturgical, 1996) 94, 461; cf., E. Käsemann, *Commentary on Romans*, G. W. Romiley, trans. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980) 68, 421-428.

> Now to the One who is able to strengthen you according to my gospel and the proclamation of Jesus Christ, acording to the revelation of the mystery that was kept secret for long ages but is now disclosed, and through the prophetic writings is made known to all the Gentiles . . .

We have, as well, in Col 1:26 "the mystery that has been hidden throughout the ages and generations but has now been revealed to [God's] saints (τὸ μυστήριον τὸ ἀποκεκρυμμένον ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν γενεῶν—νῦν δὲ ἐφανερώθη τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ) ."[40]

As we have observed, the motif of the-hidden-being-revealed is central to the star-hymn of *Eph.* 19; also, the strong Ignatian theme of the faithfulness of past figures (ie., the Prophets, *Magn.* 8.2) pointing to the future revelation of the mystery is also a component (at least in the Rom 16 passage) of this *Revelationsschema*.[41]

At the same time, Ignatius' single theological use of φαίνω is a clear departure from the NT. Generally the various authors of the NT use φαίνω in a non-theological sense, to speak of something shining. Thus we have the sun in Rev 1:16, 21:32 and the star in Matt 2:7. Yet, we also find φαίνω used to describe the future appearance of "the sign of the son of man" (Matt 24:28) and the risen Jesus'

---

[40]See as well Eph 3:5, 9-10; Titus 1:2; Rev 10:7.

Also very important in this regard is 2 Tim 1:9b-10. This pericope will be treated further along in connection with this motif and the εὐαγγέλιον mentioned in 1:8, 11 and 2:8.

[41]This is Lührmann's term. Lührmann sees *Eph.* 19 as a Christian adaptation of a gnostic revealed savior myth ("Offenbarer-Erlöse-Mythos"). D. Lührmann, *Das Offenbarungsverständinis*, 129-130.

appearance to Mary of Magdala (Matt 16:9). Moreover, in Luke 9:8 Herod's thoughts about Jesus are reported indirectly: "that Elijah had appeared (φαίνω)."

But it is with the Apostolic Fathers that we find the Ignatian sense of φαίνω. In *Barn.* 14.4 Jesus "appeared that he might [redeem] our hearts already given out to death (ἵνα αὐτὸς φανείς, τὰς ἤδη δεδαπανημένας ἡμῶν καρδίας τῷ θανάτῳ) (14.5). Finally, in *Diogn.* 11.2-3 God sent the "Word" who appeared (φαίνω) to the disciples and to the world to show proper teaching.

The above discussion of Ignatius' references to Jesus as the manifestation of God leads us to consider our final expression of παρουσία in the Ignatian εὐαγγέλιον: the birth (γέννησις) of Jesus.[42] All of the references to the Jesus' birth in the letters appear to be derived from traditional Christological formulae which Ignatius is familiar with and which he utilizes for his own needs.[43] Moreover, all of the citations involve an appeal to historical figures which serve to emphasize the indisputable reality of the εὐαγγέλιον event. So, Mary is mentioned in *Eph.* 7.2, 18.2; *Magn.* 11.1;

---

[42]With respect to the birth of Jesus, the word usage is as follows: ἡ γέννησις ("birth"): *Magn.* 11; γεννητὸς ("begotten"): *Eph.* 7.2; γεννάω ("bear" in the passive sense): *Eph.* 18.2; *Trall.* 9.1, *Smyrn.* 1.1. We also see Mary's "giving birth (τοκετός)" in *Eph.* 19.1, and that Jesus was conceived (κυοφορέω) by Mary in *Eph.* 18.2.

[43]See, for example, P. Borgen, "Ignatius and Traditions on the Birth of Jesus," pages 155-163 in *Paul Preaches Circumcision and Pleases Men and Other Essays on Christian Origins* (Trondheim: Tapir, 1983) 161-162. Koester, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 60.

Trall. 9.1 (cf., *Smyrn.* 1.1: "of a virgin [ἐκ παρθένου]"). Jesus is from the lineage of David (cf., *Eph.* 20.2; *Rom.* 7.3) who is mentioned with the birth in *Eph.* 18.2; *Trall.* 9.1; *Smyrn.* 1.1. With respect to the historical placement of Jesus' birth, the references to governing figures serve a somewhat less direct function. While these figures are most clearly tied to the passion and resurrection, their function is to confirm the reality of all the events, including the birth. Thus, the "time of the rule of Pontius Pilate (ἐν καιρῷ τῆς ἡγεμονίας Ποντίου Πιλάτου)" is linked with the birth in *Magn.* 11 (cf., *Trall.* 9.1; *Smyrn.* 1.2). "Herod the Tetrarch (ἐπὶ . . . Ἡρώδου τετράρχου)" is mentioned with Pilate in *Smyrn.* 1.2.

What is more, in *Eph.* 18. 2 the birth of Jesus is placed within God's 'plan of redemption' or 'dispensation' (ἡ οἰκονομία). As we have just seen, this divine plan is further explained in the star-hymn at 19.3: God is revealed for the newness of eternal life, a divine action that had been planned from the beginning. The hymn then ends with, "hence all things were disturbed because the destruction of death was being worked out (ἔνθεν τὰ πάντα συνεκινεῖτο διὰ τὸ μελετᾶσθαι θανάτου κατάλυσιν)." Indeed, these same themes are reiterated in *Eph.* 20.1: Ignatius promises a second text (βιβλίδιον) to the Ephesians which will explain "the [divine] plan about the new human Jesus Christ, which I have begun to discuss, about his faith and his love, his passion and his

resurrection (ὃ μέλλω γράφειν ὑμῖν, προσδηλώσω ὑμῖν, ἧς ἠρξάμην οἰκονομίας εἰς τὸν καινὸν ἄνθρωπον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ πίστει καὶ ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ ἀγάπῃ, ἐν πάθει αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀναστάσει·)." Thus, we can see how for Ignatius the themes of the coming, birth, manifestation of Jesus all are part of the οἰκονομία of God which, in turn, has the passion and resurrection of the εὐαγγέλιον at its center.

With respect to expressions of the birth of Jesus in early Christianity outside of Ignatius, it is not so much the specific word usage that catches our eye;[44] rather, it is the complex of motifs which surround the birth that contain common threads with Ignatius. Thus, we have such contact points as Mary's virginity in *Eph.* 19.1 and *Smyrn.* 1.1 (Matt 1:20, 23, 25; Luke 1:34), Jesus' conception by the Holy Spirit in *Eph.* 18.2 (Matt 1:20; Luke 1:35; cf., Rom 1:4), the star in *Eph.* 19.2 (Matt 2:2, 9) and Davidic lineage in *Eph.* 18.2, 20.2; *Trall.* 9.1; *Rom.* 7.3, *Smyrn.* 1.1 (e.g. Rom 1:3; 2 Tim 2:8; Matt 1:1; Luke 1:32; Rev 22:16; *Did.* 9.2; cf., Mark 12:34-37; John 7:42; *Barn.* 12.10).

It is clear from the above citations that the birth motifs are so widespread in formative Christianity that direct dependence is difficult to point to.[45] So, to take

---

[44]We have, however, Gal 4:4-5 (ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ, γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικὸς, γενόμενον ὑπὸ νόμον . . .) as well as the βίβλος γενέσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ υἱοῦ Δαυὶδ υἱοῦ Ἀβραάμ of Matt 1:1.

[45]H. Rathke, though, holds that the κατὰ σάρκα/κατὰ πνεῦμα schema of *Eph.* 20.2; *Trall.* 9.1; *Rom.* 7.3; and *Smyrn.* 1.1 is depedent on the

an obvious example, the star of *Eph.* 19.2, which initially seems to be derived from the "star in the east" of Matt 2, does not retain its affinity with Matthew when we realize the divergent characteristics which lie just below the superficial affinity. P. Borgen has pointed to three factors that contradict the thesis that Ignatius' star is Matthew's:

> 1. There are few linguistic similarities between Ignatius and Matthew 2, apart from the word "star." 2. It is not the case in Ignatius, as it is in Matthew, that a king's star appears in the sky, but the King/the Messiah is himself described as a star. 3. The kingship motif is common to both, but its development is quite different in the two cases. In Matthew, king Herod and the Christ Child are contrasted with each other, whereas Ignatius depicts the old monarchy and the new kingdom in a mythological framework.[46]

These, combined with such possible other original sources such as Num 24:17 which promises "a star shall come out of Jacob" demonstrate that Matt 2 and *Eph.* 19 "are two different interpretations of the motif of the star of the messiah."[47]

εὐαγγέλιον summary in Rom 1:3. H. Rathke, *Ignatius von Antiochien und die Paulusbriefe*, (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1967) 48.

[46]Borgen, 160.

[47]Ibid., 161. See as well Bartsch, 151; Koester believes that the myth of the star in Ignatius is in a much more original form than in Matt 2 and is in no way dependent on Matthew. Koester, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 31-32.

For the origins of the star tradition in the Balaam story of Num 22-24, see R. Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1977) 90-196.

Overall, as I have already suggested, it seems most probable that Ignatius is working with pre-formed traditional material when speaking of the birth of Jesus. Thus, to return to the expression in *Eph.* 18.2, (which we will look at later with respect to the πάθος) Ignatius states,

> ὁ γὰρ θεὸς ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστὸς ἐκυοφορήθη ὑπὸ Μαρίας κατ' οἰκονομίαν θεοῦ ἐκ σπέρματος μὲν Δαυείδ, πνεύματος δὲ ἁγίου· ὃς ἐγεννήθη καὶ ἐβαπτίσθη . . .
>
> For our God, Jesus the Christ, was conceived by Mary according to the dispensation of God: of the seed of David and of the Holy Spirit. He was born and was baptized . . .

The unusual (for Ignatius) form of the name Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστὸς, as well as the twofold ἐκ σπέρματος μὲν Δαυείδ, πνεύματος δὲ ἁγίου mark this as traditional "quasi-credal material" of the type found in Rom 1:3-4.[48]

Therefore, we see that for Ignatius the παρουσία of Jesus, explicitly mentioned in *Phld.* 9.2, refers to the first coming of Jesus into the world. Παρουσία thus includes the bundle of manifestation themes expressed with recourse to πάρειμι, φανερόω, and φαίνω. It includes, as well, the various expressions surrounding the birth (γέννησις) of Jesus. With respect to these manifestation and birth themes, Ignatius has taken traditional material and

---

[48]Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 84. Paulsen, *Studien*, 48-54, especially, 51-52.

expressed that material through the εὐαγγέλιον motif of the παρουσία.

b. ΣΤΑΥΡΟΣ

While Ignatius makes use of the image of the cross (σταυρός) in relatively few instances, those usages indicate that Ignatius is working with a developed theology of the cross. Aside from the uses directly linked with the εὐαγγέλιον, perhaps the most striking occurence is *Eph.* 9.1: the cross is the "crane of Jesus Christ (ἡ μηχανὴ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ)" which hoists Christians as stones for the building of God. In the same letter, Ignatius states that his "spirit is a lowly servant of the cross, which is a scandal to unbelievers, but to us salvation and eternal life (περίψημα τὸ ἐμὸν πνεῦμα τοῦ σταυροῦ ὅ ἐστιν σκάνδαλον τοῖς ἀπιστοῦσιν, ἡμῖν δὲ σωτηρία καὶ ζωὴ αἰώνιος) (*Eph.* 18.1);[49] and in *Rom.* 5.3

---

[49]This is one of two Ignatian uses of τό περίψημα, the other being found in *Eph.* 8.1 where Ignatius states that he is dedicated to the Ephesians. The meaning of this word is bound up with the context in which it is used. The literal definition is "that which is removed by the process of cleansing"; thus, by extention we have "ransom" (BAGD, 563) and in *Eph.* 18.1 "lowly servant." In the NT we find περίψημα only in 1 Cor 4:13 where Paul characterizes the ministry of apostles as being "like the rubbish of the world, the dregs of all things to this very day (ὡς περικαθάρματα τοῦ κόσμου ἐγενήθημεν, πάντων περίψημα ἕως ἄρτι)."

At issue is to what degree are Paul and Ignatius using τό περίψημα as a form of humility, of self-depreciation. It seems clear Ignatius is using this word, more so than Paul, not so much as a statement of modesty or humility but as an expression of his own sense of being truly an expiation for the church (e.g. *Smyrn.* 10.2; *Pol.* 2.3; cf., *Trall.* 10, 12; *Rom.* 6). We find περίψημα also in *Barn.* 4.9 and 6.5; here in both cases the sense is much more an expression of humility. See G. Stählin "περίψημα," *TDNT* VI, 90-92.

Ignatius invites the cross as part of his expected suffering in Rome. We see as well, in *Trall.* 11.2, the cross with branches which bear incorruptible fruit in response to the "evil offshoots which bear deadly fruit (. . . τὰς κακὰς παραφυάδας τὰς γεννώσας καρπὸν θανατηφόρον)." Finally, the Smyrnaean Christians are "set in an immovable faith, as if nailed to the cross of the lord Jesus Christ . . . (ἐν ἀκινήτῳ πίστει, ὥσπερ καθηλωμένους ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ . . .)" (*Smyrn.* 1.1).

Along with his use of σταυρός itself, Ignatius suggests the cross in several other instances. In *Eph.* 16.2 he speaks of false teaching that corrupts the "faith of God for the sake of which Jesus Christ was crucified (ἐὰν πίστιν θεοῦ ἐν κακῇ διδασκαλίᾳ φθείρῃ, ὑπὲρ ἧς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ἐσταυρώθη)." The significance of the reality of Jesus' crucifixion as a necessary component of faith is also stressed in the belief statement in *Trall.* 9.1: Jesus was "truly crucified and died (ἀληθῶς ἐσταυρώθη καὶ ἀπέθανεν)" (cf., *Smyrn.* 1.1). Finally, in another, more personal, use of crucifixion Ignatius states that his "lust has been crucified (ὁ ἐμὸς ἔρως ἐσταύρωται)" (*Rom.* 7.2).

There is no indication that Ignatius is working directly with Synoptic or Johannine images of the cross. Thus, the Synoptic image of taking up one's cross and

following Jesus (Mark 8:34; Matt 16:24; Luke 9:23) is only vaguely suggested by Ignatius.[50]

Ignatius is most like Paul, however, in that the cross takes on a full theological significance; the image of the cross carries a message of salvation. For Paul, this salvation is accomplished by the obedience of Jesus to God "to the point of death, death on a cross (ὑπήκοος μέχρι θανάτου, θανάτου δὲ σταυροῦ) (Phil 2:8)." Moreover, in Paul's exposition in 1 Cor 1:17-25, the salvific message of the cross is presented in opposition to the wisdom of the world: "we proclaim Christ crucified, a stumbling block to Jews and foolishness to Gentiles . . . (ἡμεῖς δὲ κηρύσσομεν Χριστὸν ἐσταυρωμένον, Ἰουδαίοις μὲν σκάνδαλον, ἔθνεσιν δὲ μωρίαν . . .)" (1:23). We see also in Eph 2:16 that the cross is a means of reconciliation which creates a "new humanity" (ἵνα τοὺς δύο κτίσῃ ἐν αὐτῷ εἰς ἕνα καινὸν ἄνθρωπον) (2:15).

Indeed, in *Eph.* 18.1 Ignatius is making direct reference to Paul's demonstration on the cross in 1 Cor 1:19-23.[51] Ignatius thus speaks of the cross as σκάνδαλον and σωτηρία; Ignatius also imitates Paul's rhetorical questions in 1 Cor 1:20. So too, in *Smyrn.* 1.1 the faith of the Smyrnaeans has made them sharers in the crucifixion of Jesus. This suggests the Pauline theme of being crucified

---

[50]This is also true of much less immediate affinities such as the Johannine vine and branches (John 15:1-6; cf., *Trall.* 11.2).

[51]Paulsen, *Studien*, 33; Rathke, *Ignatius von Antiochien*, 30-33; Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 84.

with Christ found in Gal 2:19 and 5:24.[52] Finally, as we have seen, to share in the cross of Jesus for Ignatius takes on a personal meaning in his own situation (*Rom.* 5.3, cf., *Rom.* 7.2).

c. ΘΑΝΑΤΟΣ

Aside from the εὐαγγέλιον passage of *Phld.* 8.2, Ignatius specifically mentions the death (θάνατος) of Jesus six times, *Eph.* 7.2, 19.1; *Magn.* 9.1; *Trall.* 2.1, 9.1 and *Rom.* 6.1.[53] The most complete expression of Ignatius' theology of Jesus' death occurs in *Trall.* 2.1. Within the context of an exhortation on being subject to the bishop, Ignatius characterizes such subjection as

> οὐ κατὰ ἄνθρωπον ζῶντες, ἀλλὰ κατὰ Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς ἀποθανόντα, ἵνα πιστεύσαντες εἰς τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν ἐκφύγητε.
>
> not living according to human beings, but according to Jesus Christ, who died for us, that by believing in his death you may escape death. (*Trall.* 2.1)

Ignatius personalizes this "living according to Jesus Christ" in *Rom.* 6.1: "I seek him who died for us; I desire him who rose for us (ἐκεῖνον ζητῶ, τὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀποθανόντα)." Other references to Jesus' death include *Eph.* 19.1 where

---

[52]Ibid., 220. Ignatius' expectation of the cross as part of his own suffering in *Rom.* 8.3, while not *per se* a reference to the cross of Jesus, suggests this same Pauline theme.

[53]We also have the expression in *Eph.* 16.2: ". . . the faith of God for the sake of which Jesus Christ was crucified (ὑπὲρ ἧς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ἐσταυρώθη)."

Ignatius introduces the star-hymn with "three mysteries of a cry (τρία μυστήρια κραυγῆς)" which are Mary's virginity, her giving birth, and "the death of the lord (ὁ θάνατος τοῦ κυρίου)." We find Jesus' death referred to as a mystery in *Magn.* 9.1 as well. Here Ignatius is contrasting keeping the Sabbath with keeping the Lord's Day (ἡ κυριακός) "on which also our life rose through him and his death (which some deny), and by this mystery we received faith . . . (ἐν ᾗ καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ἡμῶν ἀνέτειλεν δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ, ὅν τινες ἀρνοῦνται, δι' οὗ μυστηρίου ἐλάβομεν τὸ πιστεύειν)." Finally, in *Eph.* 7.2, in another hymn-like passage ("There is one physician . . .") containing a series of Christological antitheses, we find the expression that Jesus is "true life in death (ἐν θανάτῳ ζωὴ ἀληθινή)."

It is obvious from the the above citations that Ignatius is working out of a theology of the death of Jesus as salvific. The statement in *Trall.* 2.1 is indeed central. Jesus died "for us (δι' ἡμᾶς)" and belief in this brings life or eternal life to the believer.[54] Thus, this belief (here externalized for Ignatius by submission to the bishop) moves the individual out of the world of humanity (κατὰ ἄνθρωπον ζῶντες) into a "new mode of existence" based on the fact of Jesus' death as redemptive.[55]

---

[54]Cf., *Eph.* 3.2, 11.1 17.1, 18.1, 20.2; *Magn.* 1.2, 5.2; *Trall.* 9.2; *Smyrn.* 4.1; *Pol.* 2.3.

[55]Ibid. 140. Ignatius in like fashion has recourse to κατὰ ἀνθρώπους ζῆν in *Rom.* 8.1 and κατὰ Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ζῶντες in *Phld.* 3.2.

Because the death of Jesus is such a central feature in early Christian belief and expression, common threads are so diffuse that they provide us little insight. Yet we have, for example, the three passion predictions in Mark 8:31-33, 9:30-32, 10:32-34.[56] Again, however, Paul is most instructive for us. So, with Ignatius in mind, we note the Pauline statements that Jesus died for our sins (1 Cor 15:3, Gal 1:4, Rom 5:6-11, cf., 1 Thess 5:10), and that Jesus died for us (Rom 5:8, Gal 3:13, cf., Eph 5:2).[57]

The role of Jesus' death as model for Christian suffering and death comes to the fore as we observe such Ignatian expressions as "I am dying willingly for God's sake (ἐγὼ ἑκὼν ὑπὲρ θεοῦ ἀποθνήσκω)" (*Rom.* 4.1) and "It is better for me to die in Christ Jesus than to be king over the ends of the earth (καλόν μοι ἀποθανεῖν εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, ἢ βασιλεύειν τῶν περάτων τῆς γῆς) (*Rom.* 6.1). These statements reveal the powerful defining function that the death of Jesus has for

---

[56]Cf., Matt 16:21-23, Luke 9:22; Matt 17:22-23, Luke 9:43b-45; Matt 20:17-19, Luke 18:31-34.

[57]Cf., Heb 10:12, 1 Pet 3:18, 1 John 3:16.

In this regard, however, Ignatius refers only once to ἡ ἁμαρτία, at *Smyrn.* 7.1 (cf., *Eph.* 14.2). We recall that "sin" is found in *Smyrn.* 7.1 where Ignatius refers to the eucharist as "the flesh of our savior Jesus Christ which suffered for our sins (σάρκα εἶναι τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τὴν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν παθοῦσαν). This Ignatian reference to sin will figure in my treatment of Jesus, the savior in Part Two.

The usual NT expression is ὑπὲρ with the genitive (ie., Rom 5:8, 14:15; 1 Cor 15:3; 2 Cor 5:14; cf., *Rom.* 6.1a; *Smyrn.* 1.2). Ignatius, as we have seen, also uses the relatively unusual διά with the accusative (δι' ἡμᾶς) in *Trall.* 2.1, *Rom.* 6.1b and *Pol.* 3.2.

Ignatius.[58] Moreover, with these expressions Ignatius echoes Paul: "For to me, living is Christ and dying is gain (ἐμοὶ γὰρ τὸ ζῆν Χριστὸς καὶ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν κέρδος)" (Phil 1:21). Particularly 'Ignatian-sounding' is a text further along in Philippians:

> . . . τοῦ γνῶναι αὐτὸν καὶ τὴν δύναμιν τῆς ἀναστάσεως αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν κοινωνίαν τῶν παθημάτων αὐτοῦ, συμμορφιζόμενος τῷ θανάῳ αὐτοῦ, εἴ πως καταντήσω εἰς τὴν ἐξανάστασιν τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν.
>
> I want to know [Christ] and the power of his resurrection and the sharing of his sufferings by becoming like him in his death, if somehow I may attain the resurrection from the dead. (Phil 3:10-11)

As we move into the final two of Ignatius' εὐαγγέλιον motifs (and the second half of this study as well), we will further see how integral the death of Jesus is to the Ignatian *Weltanschauung*.

d. ΠΑΘΟΣ

As I have already mentioned, Ignatius is the first to use the substantive τό πάθος to refer to Jesus' passion or suffering (and death).[59] In fact, Ignatius' extensive use of τό πάθος, as well as the verbal adjective παθητός ("subject

---

[58]The εὐαγγέλιον motifs as community defining symbols will be a feature in Part Two of this work. See H. O. Maier, "The Charismatic Authority of Ignatius of Antioch: A Sociological Analysis," *SR* 18 (1989) 185-199, 194 and Schoedel, "Theological Norms," 31-36.

[59]Schoedel states that τό πάθος in Ignatius refers to Jesus' death (*Ignatius of Antioch*, 15) and Jesus' suffering (Ibid., 85); as I will point out, the Ignatian τό πάθος as the 'passion' encompasses both the suffering and death of Jesus.

to suffering," "passable"[60]), sets him apart from not only the NT but also the other Apostolic Fathers. On the other hand, it is notable that with respect to the 'Christian use' (i.e., either with reference to the suffering of Jesus, or that of believers) of τό πάθημα ("suffering"), Ignatius uses the term only once (*Smyrn.* 5.1) and in this case in much the same way as in the NT (e.g. Rom 8:18, 2 Cor 1:5-7, Heb 2:9-10, 1 Pet 1:11).[61]

The passion of Jesus so permeates the thought of Ignatius that it appears within the context of epistolary greetings as part of stock phrases which praise the receivers. So we find the πάθος of Jesus refered to in the inscriptions of *Trallians* and *Philadelphians*. In *Trall.* insc., Ignatius praises the church for "having peace in

---

[60]"Passable" is the standard translation of παθητός in the Ignatian corpus; it is found in Lightfoot, Lake and Schoedel.

[61]We find τό πάθος fifteen times: *Eph.* insc., 18.2, 20.1; *Magn.* 5.2, 11.1; *Trall.* insc., 11.2; *Rom.* 6.3; *Phld.* insc., 3.3, 9.2; *Smyrn.* 1.2, 5.3, 7.2, 12.2; and παθητός twice: *Eph.* 7.2, and *Pol.* 3.2. As for the verb πάσχω, common in the NT, Ignatius uses it seven times: *Trall.* 4.2; *Rom.* 4.3, 8.3; *Smyrn.* 2.1 (bis); *Smyrn.* 7.1.

In the NT πάθος and παθητός are virtually absent. We find πάθος three times (Rom 1:26, Col 3:5, 1 Thess 4:5) all in reference to sexual passion; most notable, however is the single NT use of παθητός at Acts 26:23: in his speech to Agrippa, Paul states that the prophets and Moses foretold that the Christ must suffer (. . . παθητός ὁ χριστός).

As for the other Apostolic Fathers, πάθος is found two times in Hermas (*Sim* 6:5.5, *Man* 4:1.6) but in reference to sexual passion. In Barnabas we find the term one time: in 6.7 it refers to Jesus' suffering and death. Finally, *1 Clem.* 2.1 refers to the the sufferings (τὰ παθήματα αὐτοῦ) of Jesus. Παθητός is not found elsewhere among the Apostolic Fathers.

Scholars who propose to redate all or part of the Ignatian corpus have appealed to the use of πάθος in Ignatius as an indication of a later date. See M. P. Brown, *The Authentic Writings of Ignatius* (Durham: Duke University, 1963) 58-59; Joly, 67-68.

flesh and spirit by the passion of Jesus Christ who is our hope through resurrection in him (εἰρηνευούσῃ ἐν σαρκὶ καὶ πνεύματι τῷ πάθει Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τῆς ἐλπίδος ἡμῶν ἐν τῇ εἰς αὐτὸν ἀναστάσει)." Likewise, in *Phld.* insc., Ignatius praises that church which is "rejoicing in the passion of our lord without waivering and is fully convinced in all mercy in his resurrection (ἀγαλλιωμέῃ ἐν τῷ πάθει τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν ἀδιακρίτως καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει αὐτοῦ πεπληροφορημένῃ ἐν παντὶ ἐλέει)." Finally, in his lengthy concluding greetings to the Smyrnaeans, Ignatius salutes them "in the name of Jesus Christ, and his flesh and blood, and both his passion and resurrection . . . (ἐν ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ αἵματι, πάθει τε καὶ ἀναστάσει . .)" (*Smyrn.* 12.2).

In the above three greetings, we find Jesus' πάθος paired with his resurrection (ἀνάστασις). Indeed, we find that (except in the unusual use in *Eph.* 18.2) whenever πάθος is linked with other εὐαγγέλιον motifs in the letters, the resurrection is mentioned as well. Thus, in *Eph.* 20.1, Ignatius links Christ's faith and love with his passion and resurrection. In *Magn.* 11.1 we see both πάθος and ἀνάστασις mentioned along with Jesus' birth (ἡ γέννησις).[62] We have already observed *Smyrn.* 7.2 as one of the 'defining passsages' of the εὐαγγέλιον: here Ignatius urges believers

---

[62]Here too, as in *Phld.* insc., Ignatius uses πληροφορέω ("convince") with reference to εὐαγγέλιον events. This usage is important and will be discussed in due course.

to heed especially the gospel "in which the passion is made clear to us and the resurrection accomplished (ᾧ τὸ πάθος ἡμῖν δεδήλωται καὶ ἡ ἀνάστασις τετελείωται)." Finally, in *Smyrn.* 5.3 Ignatius shuns the docetic opponents until "they repent concerning the passion, which is our resurrection (μέχρις οὗ μετανοήσωσιν εἰς τὸ πάθος, ὅ ἐστιν ἡμῶν ἀνάστασις)." Here, of course, it is the true believer's resurrection which is mentioned; yet, because for Ignatius Jesus' passion is so often tied with his resurrection, the resurrection of Jesus is certainly suggested by this phrase.

Because of the evident nature of the error (ie., *Trall.* 10.1, *Smyrn.* 2.1), it is natural that in passages where Ignatius refers to the docetic belief we find reference to the passion of Jesus. So, in *Phld.* 3.3 Ignatius warns about anyone who creates schism (σχίζω): "if anyone walks about in strange doctrine, that one has no part in the passion (εἴ τις ἐν ἀλλοτρίᾳ γνώμῃ περιπατεῖ, οὗτος τῷ πάθει οὐ συγκατατίθεται)." This participation in the passion or suffering of Jesus is a theme to which Ignatius often appeals (e.g., *Magn.* 5.2; *Trall.* 11.2; *Smyrn.* 1.2; cf., *Rom.* 6.3).

Directly related to the polemical use of Jesus' πάθος (although without the substantive itself) is the exposition in *Smyrn.* 2.1. After the most extensive of his Christological summaries (*Smyrn.* 1.1-2), Ignatius states,

> ταῦτα γὰρ πάντα ἔπαθεν δι' ἡμᾶς, ἵνα σωθῶμεν· καὶ ἀληθῶς ἔπαθεν, ὡς καὶ ἀληθῶς ἀνέστησεν ἑαυτόν, οὐχ ὥσπερ ἄπιστοί τινες λέγουσιν, τὸ δοκεῖν αὐτὸν πεπονθέναι, αὐτοὶ τὸ δοκεῖν ὄντες· . . .
>
> For he suffered all this for us so that we might be saved; and he truly suffered just as he also truly raised himself; not as some unbelievers say: "he suffered [only] in appearance"; but it is they who are [only] in appearance . . . (*Smyrn.* 2)

Ignatius' point here is to emphasize the reality of Jesus' passion (cf., *Trall.* 10.1) against the docetists. What they think of Jesus' passion in reality describes themselves. Consequently, they will end up "without bodies and like demons (οὖσιν ἀσωμάτοις καὶ δαιμονικοῖς)." In Part Two we will return to this error and Ignatius' response with the εὐαγγέλιον as his defense.

There are also several passages in which Ignatius uses the passion of Jesus to describe Christian life. Hence, in *Magn.* 5.2 Ignatius concludes his take on the 'two ways'[63] with "unless we willingly choose to die in his passion, his life is not in us (ἐὰν μὴ αὐθαιρέτως ἔχωμεν τὸ ἀποθανεῖν εἰς τὸ αὐτοῦ πάθος, τὸ ζῆν αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν ἡμῖν)." Perhaps this expression can be seen in light of Paul's exposition on dying and rising with Christ through baptism in Rom 6:3-11.[64] Yet, more pointed is the affinity with Paul's statement in Gal

---

[63]Cf., *Did.* 1-6, *Barn.* 18-20, 1QS 3.13-4.26.

[64]Cf., Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 110-111. Schoedel also takes the opportunity to show that with respect to this particular expression of gospel themes "there is no reason to suspect a reference to the reenactment of these mysteries in eucharistic action." This is in distinction to Wetter's position that the eucharist in Ignatius is a reenactment of Jesus' passion. Ibid., 111; Wetter, 121-22.

2:19b-20a: "I have been crucified with Christ; and it is no longer I who live, but it is Christ who lives in me (Χριστῷ συνεσταύρωμαι· ζῶ δὲ οὐκέτι ἐγώ, ζῇ δὲ ἐν ἐμοὶ Χριστός·) ."

In the same vein is the use of πάθος in *Trall.* 11.2. In *Trall.* 11.1-2 Ignatius is working with the image of plants that bear either deadly or incorruptible fruit (cf., Matt 15:13).[65] This image leads the bishop to mention the cross: those who are the planting of the Father would "appear as branches of the cross . . . through which in his passion he calls you who are his members (ἐφαίνοντο ἂν κλάδοι τοῦ σταυροῦ . . . δι' οὗ ἐν τῷ πάθει αὐτοῦ προσκαλεῖται ὑμᾶς ὄντας μέλη αὐτοῦ) ."

This 'being called' by Jesus' passion brings us once again to Ignatius' own situation. Jesus' πάθος as central to Christian life becomes personal in *Rom.* 6.3. Within the context of his plea to the Romans that they allow his martyrdom (*Rom.* 1-8, passim), Ignatius makes the clearest statement about the relationship between his suffering and those of Christ: "allow me to be an imitator of the passion of my God (ἐπιτρέψατέ μοι μιμητὴν εἶναι τοῦ πάθους τοῦ θεοῦ μοῦ) ." Actually, this is only one expression among a set of expressions in which Ignatius mentions his own suffering. There is a fair amount of scholarly discussion surrounding

---

[65]Cf., Matt 3:10, 7:19; Luke 3:9; Isa 5:1-7; Ezek 19:10-14; *Gos. Phil.* 126. With respect to the symbol of the planting of God, see J. Daniélou, *Primitive Christian Symbols* (Baltimore: Helicon, 1964) 25-41.

Ignatius' imitation.[66] For my purposes, it is vital to recognize that only here does Ignatius directly speak of his own suffering as *imitating* Christ's.[67] This suggests that Ignatius' own imitation, rather than being a mystical personal experience that sets him apart from the remainder of believers, is united with the suffering of Christians. Ignatius sees his imitation of the πάθος of Jesus, therefore, as an expression of his discipleship in the church of disciples; indeed, it is in service of the unity of faith.[68] Thus, *Rom.* 6.3 is best seen in light of *Magn.* 5.2 and *Trall.* 11.2 discussed above. The εὐαγγέλιον and Jesus' passion it contains "calls" (*Trall.* 11.2) all believers.

Of all the Ignatian uses of τό παθός, however, the statement in *Eph.* 18.2 appears, at first view, to be most unusual.[69] Here—to conclude the Christological summary which follows the Pauline allusions we observed in 18.1—Ignatius says that Jesus "was born and baptized so that by his passion he might purify the water (ὃς ἐγεννήθη καὶ ἐβαπτίσθη,

---

[66]T. Preiss, "La mystique de l'imitation du Christ et de l'unité chez Ignace d'Antioche," *RHPR* 3 (1938) 199-241; Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 183-184; R. F. Stoops, "If I Suffer . . . Epistolary Authority in Ignatius of Antioch," *HTR* 80 (1987) 161-78; W. M. Swartley, "The Imitatio Christi in the Ignatian Letters," *VC* 27 (1973) 81-103.

[67]Cf., *Eph.* 1.1, 10.3; *Trall.* 1.2; *Phld.* 7.2; *Smyrn.* 12.1 where the imitation is on the part of the community of believers.

[68]Swartley, 101; cf., Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch* 183-184; Preiss, 214.

[69]Thus, the translation in by K. Lake (*The Apostolic Fathers*, [Cambridge: Harvard, 1935] 193): ". . . and was baptized, that by himself submitting he might purify the water."

ἵνα τῷ πάθει τὸ ὕδωρ καθαρίσῃ)."[70] There is no reason to suppose that πάθος here has another meaning than elsewhere in the letters.

The majority of the material in 18.1-2 is "traditional"; the concluding baptism/passion phrase appears to be as well.[71] This juxtaposition of Jesus' baptism with his passion is a combination of motifs suggested by such canonical texts as Luke 12:50 and Mark 10:38-39 in which Jesus speaks of his imminent suffering as a baptism.[72] In this same light, we may view once again Paul's statement that in baptism one is "buried with him by baptism into death (συνετάφημεν οὖν αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος εἰς τὸν θάνατον)" (Rom 6:4). The link between Jesus' suffering with his baptism is found as well in *Barn.* 11.1, and later in Justin, *Dial.* 86.[73] Hence, the juxtapostition of Jesus' passion with his

---

[70]Ignatius mentions Jesus' baptism twice: here and at *Smyrn.* 1.1. In *Smyrn.* 1.1 Jesus' baptism is a component of the Christological outline: Jesus is baptized by John "that all righteousness might be fulfilled by him (ἵνα πληρωθῇ πᾶσα δικαιοσύνη ὑπ' αὐτοῦ)." The affinity with Matt 3:15 is striking; in fact "this is the one passage in which Matthew's own redaction of synoptic materials seems clearly evident in Ignatius." Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 222. However, Schoedel in the end takes Koester's position that since there is no other clear evidence of Ignatius' direct use of Matthew, one must look elsewhere for Ignatius' source. Koester (*Synoptische Überlieferung*, 59) prefers to assume that Ignatius received this Matthean-like phrase via the Christological formula (or, in Koester's words, "kerygmatischen Formel") embedded in *Smyrn.* 1.1. Cf., Sibinga, "Ignatius and Matthew," 263-283, especially 275-277.

[71]Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 84-85.

[72]O. Cullmann, *Baptism in the New Testament*, J. K. S. Reid, trans. (London: SCM, 1961) 19.

[73]Schoedel also points to the gnostic *Gos. Phil.* 77.7-15, as well as the *Sibylline Oracles* 8.244-47. *Ignatius of Antioch*, 85-86.

baptism in Ignatius does have a discernable context in early Christianity.

Still with the Ignatian παθός of Jesus in mind, we turn to Ignatius' use of the verbal adjective παθητός (*Eph.* 7.2, *Pol.* 3.2).[74] Among the series of Christological antitheses in *Eph.* 7.2 we find that the "one physician (εἷς ἰατρός ἐστιν)" Jesus was "first passable and then impassable (πρῶτον παθητὸς καὶ τότε ἀπαθής)." In *Pol.* 3.2 the same paradox is expressed in another set of antitheses: Jesus is "impassable, for our sakes passable (τὸν ἀπαθῆ, τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς παθητὸν)." I have already noted the only usage of παθητός in the NT at Acts 26:23: while there is no antithesis in Acts 26:23, Paul states in his speech to Agrippa that Moses and the Prophets said that "the Messiah must suffer (εἰ παθητὸς ὁ Χριστός)."[75]

When brought together, *Eph.* 7.2 and *Pol.* 3.2 are remarkable in that they speak of the same qualities of Jesus, but with a difference. In *Eph.* 7.2 Jesus is "first passable"; ie., Jesus was able to suffer in his life. With the resurrection, he suffers no more, he is impassable (cf., Rom 6:9). This emphasis on the movement from the historical Jesus to Jesus who is beyond history seems to be another

---

[74]For the grammatical development of this form, see F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament*, R. W. Funk, trans. (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1961) 36.

[75]A similar series of antithetical statements may be found in the *Paschal Homily* of Melito of Sardis (died, 190 C.E.); παθητός, however, is not a feature here. A. Wifstrand, "The Homily of Melito on the Passion," *VC* 2 (1948) 201-223.

expression of the same Christology we find in *Phld.* 9.1-2 where Jesus the high priest (ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς) is the door to God for people of all times. On the other hand, in *Pol.* 3.2, the order is reversed. Jesus as impassable is mentioned first. This brings to mind the pre-existence of Jesus which Ignatius refers to in *Magn.* 6.1: the deacons of Magnesia serve Jesus "who before the ages was with the Father and appeared at the end (ὃς πρὸ αἰώνων παρὰ πατρὶ ἦν καὶ ἐν τέλει ἐφάνη)." The impassable Jesus became passable for us in the last times (cf., *Eph.* 11.1).

To conclude my discussion on Jesus' πάθος in Ignatius, it is necessary to be still more precise about to what the bishop is referring with this term. We have seen that often Ignatius links the πάθος with the resurrection (*Eph.* 20.1; *Magn.* 11.1; *Phld.* insc., 9.2; *Smyrn.* 5.3, 7.2, 12.2; cf., *Magn.* 5.2; *Trall.* insc.). Excepting the link with Jesus' baptism in *Eph.* 18.2, any time a *single event* from the life of Jesus is mentioned in conjunction with the πάθος, it is the ἀνάστασις. Together with the fact that—as I will soon underscore—the resurrection of Jesus is the defining constant in Ignatius' εὐαγγέλιον, this suggests that when the bishop refers to Jesus' πάθος, he has in mind the other two 'suffering motifs' of the εὐαγγέλιον: the σταυρός and θάνατος. So, for Ignatius, the cross and death coalesce into the passion, which in turn is closely linked with the resurrection. For Ignatius, therefore, the 'πάθος καὶ

ἀνάστασις' of Jesus is "the heart of the Christian gospel and the ground of faith."[76]

e. ΑΝΑΣΤΑΣΙΣ

Ignatius speaks of the resurrection (ἀνάστασις) of Jesus in thirteen passages (*Eph.* 20.1; *Magn.* 11.1; *Phld.* insc., 8.2 (bis); *Smyrn.* 1.2, 3.1, 7.2, 12.2; cf., *Trall.* 9.2; *Rom.* 6.1; *Smyrn.* 2.1, 7.1). The resurrection of the believer (or Ignatius' own resurrection) is a subject that is found repeatedly throughout the seven letters. This εὐαγγέλιον message of resurrection through Jesus will be addressed fully in Part Two; in the following paragraphs, I will concentrate on Jesus' ἀνάστασις itself as a component of the εὐαγγέλιον.

At this point in my study of the gospel motifs, we have already seen most of the passages in which the ἀνάστασις of Jesus is mentioned. Thus, the ἀνάστασις is tied only with πάθος in *Eph.* 20.1; *Phld.* insc.; *Smyrn.* 7.2, 12.2; (cf., *Phld.* 8.2); it is joined with γέννησις and πάθος in *Magn.* 11.1, and παρουσία and πάθος in *Phld.* 9.2. Moreover, referring to Jesus' resurrection with the participle ἀναστάς, in *Rom.* 6.1b Ignatius joins it with Jesus' death in a statement that underscores the centrality of the resurrection as the primary meaning-giving motif.[77] With

---

[76]Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 27.
[77]Ibid., 182.

these linkages before us, other more specific issues concerning Jesus' resurrection in the letters come to the surface.

The complex in *Smyrn.* 1.1-2 is instructive. As we have seen, Ignatius opens the letter with an expanded "semi-credal statement."[78] This Christological outline serves as an introduction to his warnings about the docetic error that forms the backbone of the letter (2.1-7.2); indeed, it is structured with the error in mind.[79] The bishop concludes this statement by referring to the passion (see above). He then leads into the phrase,

> ἵνα ἄρῃ σύσσημον εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας διὰ τῆς ἀναστάσεως εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους καὶ πιστοὺς αὐτοῦ, εἴτε ἐν Ἰουδαίοις εἴτε ἐν ἔθνεσιν, ἐν ἑνὶ σώματι τῆς ἐκκλησίας αὐτοῦ.
>
> so that he might raise a sign for the ages, through the resurrection, to his saints and believers, whether among the Jews or among the Gentiles, in the one body of his church. (*Smyrn.* 1.2b)

Ignatius is working with the image of the σύσσημον ("sign") found in Isa 5:26, 49:22, and 62:10.[80] Moreover, it has been plausably suggested that here the ἀνάστασις is Ignatius' own addition to a formula which had originally ended with

---

[78]Ibid., 220.

[79]The anti-docetic "truly (ἀληθῶς)" (cf., *Trall.* 9.1) is the clearest indication of this. Ibid., 153, 220.

[80]E.g. Isa 5:26: "[The Lord] will raise a signal for a nation far away, and whistle for a people at the ends of the earth (LXX: Τοιγαροῦν ἀρεῖ σύσσημον ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι τοῖς μακρὰν, καὶ συριεῖ αὐτοὺς ἀπ' ἄκρου τῆς γῆς)." Schoedel (Ibid., 223) also points to Eph 2:16 as suggesting the same idea of the cross as gathering Jews and Gentiles into one body.

the cross.[81] In the Ignatian schema, it is through the resurrection that the cross of Jesus becomes this universal sign of salvation for believers in the church.[82] Therefore, the ἀνάστασις is for Ignatius the controlling feature which gives meaning to the cross (and, thus, the πάθος as well).

Another Ignatian passage concerning Jesus' resurrection that has attracted attention is found in *Smyrn.* 3.1-3:

> ἐγὼ γὰρ καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἐν σαρκὶ αὐτὸν οἶδα καὶ πιστεύω ὄντα. καὶ ὅτε πρὸς τοὺς περὶ Πέτρον ἦλθεν, ἔφη αὐτοῖς· Λάβετε, ψηλαφήσατέ με καὶ ἴδετε, ὅτι οὐκ εἰμὶ δαιμόνιον ἀσώματον. καὶ εὐθὺς αὐτοῦ ἥψαντο καὶ ἐπίστευσαν, κραθέντες τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ πνεύματι. διὰ τοῦτο καὶ θανάτου κατεφρόνησαν, ηὑρέθησαν δὲ ὑπὲρ θάνατον. μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἀνάστασιν συνέφαγεν αὐτοῖς καὶ συνέπιεν ὡς σαρκικός, καίπερ πνευματικῶς ἡνωμένος τῷ πατρί.
>
> For I know and believe that he was in the flesh even after the resurrection. And when he came to those about Peter, he said to them: "Take, handle me, and see that I am not a bodiless demon." And immediately they touched him and believed, being intermingled with his flesh and spirit. Therefore they despised even death and were found to be above death. And after the resurrection he ate and drank with them as a being of flesh, although spiritually united with the Father.[83]

---

[81]M. Elze holds that the phrase "διὰ τῆς ἀναστάσεως" is the Ignatian addition. M. Elze, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zur Christologie der Ignatiusbriefe* (Tübingen: Univ. Bib., 1963) 19.

Also, while there is no possessive genitive with respect to the ἀνάστασις in this text (the closest being just before in 1.2a: ἀπὸ τοῦ θεομακαρίστου αὐτοῦ πάθους), it is clear from the context that *Jesus'* resurrection is meant here.

[82]Even though it is not mentioned in the pericope after 1.1a, the cross is suggested by "truly nailed for us in the flesh under Pontius Pilate and Herod the tetrarch (ἀληθῶς ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου καὶ Ἡρῴδου τετράρχου καθηλωμένον ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐν σαρκί)" (1.2a).

[83]Translation, Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 225. In my future references to this passage, I will use Schoedel's translation.

This pericope is still within the context of Ignatius' refutation of the docetic error that the Christological outline of *Smyrn.* 1 introduced. Countering the error, Ignatius strongly emphasizes Jesus' physical nature *after* the resurrection by beginning with the phrase "I know and believe . . ."[84] The affinity here with Luke 24:36-43 is notable. In the Lukan text, the resurrected Jesus apears to the disciples and,

> εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Τί τεταραγμένοι ἐστὲ καὶ διὰ τί διαλογισμοὶ ἀναβαίνουσιν ἐν τῇ καρδιᾳ ὑμῶν; ἴδετε τὰς χεῖράς μου καὶ τοὺς πόδας μου ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι αὐτὸς· ψηλαφήσατέ με καὶ ἴδετε, ὅτι πνεῦμα σάρκα καὶ ὀστέα οὐκ ἔχει καθὼς ἐμὲ θεωρεῖτε ἔχοντα. καὶ τοῦτο εἰπὼν ἔδειξεν αὐτοῖς τὰς χειρας καὶ τοὺς ποδας. ἔτι δὲ ἀπιστούντων αὐτῶν ἀπὸ τῆς χαρᾶς καὶ θαυμαζόντων εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Ἔχετέ τι βρώσιμον ἐνθάδε; οἱ δὲ ἐπέδωκαν αὐτῷ ἰχθύος ὀπτοῦ μέρος· καὶ λαβὼν ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν ἔφαγεν.
>
> He said to them, "Why are you frightened, and why do doubts arise in your hearts? Look at my hands and my feet; see that it is I myself. Touch me and see; for a ghost does not have flesh and bones as you see that I have." And when he had said this, he showed them his hands and his feet.[85] While in their joy they were disbelieving and still wondering, he said to them, "Have you anything to eat?" They gave him a piece of

---

[84]J. Ruis-Camps has suggested unconvincingly the possibility that "οἶδα καὶ πιστεύω" idicates Ignatius was himself an eyewitness to the passion and resurrection of Jesus. J. Ruis-Camps, "Ignacio de Antioquia, ¿testigo ocular de la muerte y resurrección de Jesús?" *Bib* 70 (1989) 449-473.

[85]This verse, v. 40 ("And when he had said . . . feet."), is missing from certain Western texts. Metzger includes it with a "D" probability. B. M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1971) 187. Koester (*Synoptische Überlieferung*, 46) sees v. 40 as a later interpolation based on John 20:20. Fitzmyer, on the other hand, reasonably considers v. 40 as original to the text. J. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, AB 28A (New York: Doubleday, 1985) 1573, 1576.

broiled fish, and he took it and ate in their presence. (Luke 24:38-43)

What is the relationship between these two passages? In both pericopae we find the phrase ψηλαφήσατέ με καὶ ἴδετε; and in both, this phrase is followed by Jesus' denial that he is a "demon" (Ignatius) or "spirit" (Luke). In both pericopae, the denial is followed by a demonstration of Jesus' physical presence, albeit expressed differently in each text. Finally, the conclusion of both pericopae involves Jesus eating with the disciples.[86] Based on these ties, various degrees of direct dependence on the Lukan text have been asserted.[87] However, many hold that here Ignatius is working with another, parallel tradition, perhaps even older than the Lukan expression.[88]

If it were simply a case of Ignatius and Luke, perhaps the issue would be less controversial. There are, however, indications of a tradition line alongside of Luke. Origen refers to a Jesus-logion from what seems to be the *Kerygma Petrou*: "I am not a bodiless demon (Non sum daemonium incorporeum)" (*De princ.* 1, preface 8). Moreover, Eusebius

---

[86]A feature that certainly serves Ignatius' purpose in countering docetic error (cf., *Trall.* 9.1); as for Luke (cf., Acts 1:4, 10:4), there is no indication that any sort of docetic ideas figure in his purpose for telling the story as he did. Ibid. 1575.

[87]Thus, P. Vielhauer and G. Strecker, "Jewish-Christian Gospels," *NTA* I 143-145. R. M. Grant ("Scripture and Tradition," 327) suggests that Ignatius is "paraphrasing" Luke 24:39. Paulsen (*Studien*, 41), while supporting the opinion that Ignatius received this material from elsewhere, admits that a direct link with Luke cannot be discounted.

[88]Koester *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 46-50; Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers*, II.2, 296; Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 227.

quotes *Smyrn.* 3.1-2a and says he does not know the source of Ignatius' information (*Hist. ecc.* 3.36.11). Finally, Jerome in *De vir. inl.* 16 also quotes Ignatius and says Ignatius got the story from the *Gospel of the Hebrews*.[89] These citations alone suggest that this resurrection story has an history which is not necessarily connected with Luke. This suggestion, as well as the fact that there is no other indication in the Ignatian corpus of direct contact with the Lukan documents, leads to the conclusion that Ignatius in *Smyrn.* 3.1-3 is working with a resurrection tradition that found expression in various documents, Luke and Ignatius among them. Therefore, it is "perhaps most likely that Luke and Ignatius rely on common tradition."[90]

Before concluding my discussion on Ignatius and the ἀνάστασις of Jesus, there is a final point that must be addressed. In three instances Ignatius writes of the resurrection of Jesus using either the verb ἐγείρω (*Trall.* 9.2; *Smyrn.* 7.1) or ἀνίστημι (*Smyrn.* 2.1). The issue here is that Ignatius uses ἐγείρω in the passive voice and ἀνίστημι in the active (with a reflexive pronoun referring to Jesus).

---

[89]Jerome mistakenly attributes the story to Ignatius' letter to Polycarp. It is generally held that Jerome is dependent on Eusebius. Vielhauer and Strecker, 144.

[90]Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 227. See also Koester *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 50 (Koester [Ibid., 50-56] has a full excursus devoted to the tradition history of this story).

In another twist, Vielhauer and Strecker ("Gospels" 145) hold that the *Kerygma Petrou* is dependent on Ignatius; Joly (*Le Dossier*, 54) presents most plausably the opposite opinion.

So, in *Trall.* 9.2, in the Christological outline Jesus "was also truly raised from the dead, his Father having raised him (καὶ ἀληθῶς ἠγέρθη ἀπὸ νεκρῶν, ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ)"; and in *Smyrn.* 7.1, the docetists "do not confess that the eucharist is the flesh of our savior Jesus Christ which suffered for our sins, [flesh] which the father raised up by his goodness (μὴ ὁμολογεῖν τὴν εὐχαριστίαν σάρκα εἶναι τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τὴν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν παθοῦσαν, ἣν τῇ χρηστότητι ὁ πατὴρ ἤγειρεν)." On the other hand, as Ignatius moves into the resurrecton story in *Smyrn.* 3.1-3, the bishop writes that Jesus "truly suffered just as he truly raised himself (καὶ ἀληθῶς ἔπαθεν, ὡς καὶ ἀληθῶς ἀνέστησεν ἑαυτόν)" (*Smyrn.* 2.1).

Turning to the NT, we usually find that Jesus *was raised* or, God raised Jesus.[91] However, there are Johannine statements—albeit, somewhat elliptical—of Jesus raising himself (2:19, 10:18). With Ignatius, the passive expressions of Jesus' resurrection are found in contexts where, in response to the docetic error, Ignatius seems to have recourse to traditional expressions. Thus in *Trall.* 9.1-2, we have before ὃς καὶ ἀληθῶς ἠγέρθη (who was also truly raised), the phrases ὃς ἀληθῶς ἐγεννήθη (who was truly born), ἀληθῶς ἐδιώχθη (was truly persecuted), and ἀληθῶς ἐσταυρώθη (was truly crucified). The traditional confessional material is

---

[91]I.e., ἐγείρω: Matt 16:21, 17:23, 26:32, 27:64, 28:7; Mark 14:28; Luke 9:22, 24:6; John 2:22, 21:14; Acts 4:10, 10:40; Rom 6:4, 9:8, 34; 1 Cor 15:4, 12, 20. We find ἀνίστημι used the same way in Acts: 2:24, 32, 3:26, 13:33, 17:31.

structured in parallel passive relative clauses.[92] So too, in *Smyrn.* 7.1 the declaration appears to be within the guise of a confessional statement based on a traditional expression. Therefore, the opening ὁμολογέω (here negated) introduces a short faith statement from the tradition which Ignatius adapted to his present needs.[93]

By pointing to this particular passive/active tension in Ignatius, I want to suggest that the expression in *Smyrn.* 2.1 (Jesus truly raised himself) is entirely Ignatius' own. Here, we may point to the presence of the Ignatian ἀληθῶς to support this suggestion. Moreover, when we consider the phrase διὰ τῆς ἀναστάσεως in *Smyrn.* 1.2 as an Ignatian addition (where Jesus is the one acting, raising a sign through the resurrection), it seems reasonable to consider the *Smyrn.* 2.1 expression of Jesus' action in raising himself to be Ignatian as well. Thus, with *Smyrn.* 2.1 Ignatius provides a short statement that serves as an emphatic recapitulation of the traditional material he has structured into *Smyrn.* 1, all of which addresses the docetic error.

---

[92]This in particular is an identifying characteristic of pre-formed "creedal formulae" in the NT as proposed in E. Stauffer, *New Testament Theology*' J. Marsh, trans. (London: SCM, 1963) 339. Having recognized this, Ignatius' hand is nevertheless clearly present with the anti-docetic ἀληθῶς.

[93]Cf., I John 4:2,3; 2 John 7; Pol. *Phil.* 7.1. The mention of the eucharist is from Ignatius' hand for this particular situation; the confessional statement is centered on the person of Christ. For the characteristics of such statements see V. H. Neufeld, *The Earlest Christian Confessions* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1963) 13-33. I will return to ὁμολογέω and other commitment verbs with respect to the εὐαγγέλιον motifs further along.

So far in this study I have introduced the gospel of Ignatius, its components and their meanings. It is necessary at this point that—with respect to the εὐαγγέλιον—we recognize Ignatius' place within early Christianity. The next chapter, then, will attempt to locate Ignatius' gospel within early Christianity's efforts to articulate the gospel message.

CHAPTER II

THE EARLY CHRISTIAN GOSPEL ENVIRONMENT

So far in Part One of this study, I have presented the Ignatian use of τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, and established the key motifs of Ignatius' idea of the εὐαγγέλιον. Part One is concerned as well with the environment of Ignatius' gospel. By *environment* I refer not only to the situation of Ignatius' Christianity as reflected in his letters, but also to the broader world of early Christianity up to the time of Ignatius.

Therefore, before continuing with Ignatius' gospel *per se*, it is necessary to address other expressions of the gospel in early Christianity. My goal here is to understand more clearly the place of Ignatius' εὐαγγέλιον within early Christianity's efforts to articulate its central message. This, in turn, will provide a context through which we may view Ignatius' gospel in its own environment.

As we proceed through the following survey, Ignatius will be the limiting factor. Not only is Ignatius the *terminus ad quem* in this survey, but also the Ignatian gospel motifs we have highlighted will be the lens through which we will view the various gospels.

So, my concern is the use of the term τὸ εὐαγγέλιον in early Christianity. Paul naturally takes center stage here. This is not only because of his central role in the earliest Christian use of εὐαγγέλιον, but also because of his evident influence on Ignatius (i.e., *Eph.* 12.2).[1] At the same time, with the past scholarship surrounding Ignatius and the NT in mind, it is vital to examine other articulations of the gospel from the NT, especially the Synoptic Gospels. The final section of this survey will treat τὸ εὐαγγέλιον in the Apostolic Fathers, outside of Ignatius.

A. PAUL

While there are indeed occurrences of τὸ εὐαγγέλιον and its cognates in Greek literature (and inscriptions) before Paul, it is only with the first Christian assemblies that we find its usage in the specific theological sense of a salvific "good news," a gospel.[2]

---

[1]Thus, for example, R. Bultmann, "Ignatius and Paul," H. Rathke, *Ignatius von Antiochien und die Paulusbrief*, Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 9-10.

When treating Paul's letters in the following survey, I will consider Romans, 1-2 Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians, 1 Thessalonians, and Philemon as authentic. Ephesians, Colossians, 2 Thessalonians and 1 and 2 Timothy will be addressed further along.

[2]Bultmann emphasizes that by the time of the LXX (which uses only the verb) and Philo "the entymological meaning '*good* news' or 'to proclaim *good* news' had already worn off." He points, for example, to the addition of ἀγαθά in 1 Kings 1:42 and Is. 52:7 to support this. R. Bultmann *Theology of the New Testament*, trans. K. Groebel (Scribner's: New York, 1951, 1955) 87. An exposition of the pre-Christian usage in both Jewish (LXX) and gentile contexts can be found in H. Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, 2-4.

Paul uses the substantive εὐαγγέλιον forty-eight times in the seven genuine letters.[3] The εὐαγγέλιον no doubt is at the heart of Paul's theology.[4] Of the forty-eight times, twenty-five are absolute, that is, without a genitive of object or subject.[5] Linked with a genitive or not, by the time of Paul, the noun εὐαγγέλιον—as well as the verb εὐαγγελίζεσθαι—"are already well-established technical terms for the Christian message and its proclamation."[6]

It is clear that for Paul the εὐαγγέλιον is preached; it is a message to be proclaimed or declared (εὐαγγελίζεσθαι: 1 Cor 15:1; 2 Cor 11:7; Gal 1:11; καταγγέλλειν: 1 Cor 9:14; κηρύσσειν: Gal 2:2; 1 Thess 2:9; λαλεῖν: 1 Thess 2:2). It is made known or revealed (γνωρίζειν: 1 Cor 15:1), taught (διδάσκειν: Gal 1:12), and presented for discussion (ἀνατίθεσθαι: Gal 2:2). Moreover, the εὐαγγέλιον is taken on or

---

In all of the NT, the substantive εὐαγγέλιον is used almost exclusively with the article (*τὸ εὐαγγέλιον*); the only exceptions are two instances in the Pauline corpus (Rom 1:1 and Gal. 1:6, both with the preposition εἰς) and one time in Rev 14:6 (which, from the context, is indefinite: "a gospel" or "a message"). Three occurrences in such a large and disparate body of works as the NT have little to tell us; it is best to see the Pauline occurrences as examples of the relative ease with which the article drops out in the NT when there is a preposition involved. See BDF, §255, 133. Thus, in the NT, εὐαγγέλιον is virtually always an entity that is *sui generis*, it is *the* gospel.

[3]This includes the doubted usages at Rom 2:16 and 16:25, the latter being universally recognized as part of a non-Pauline addition to the letter.

[4]See J. Fitzmyer, "The Gospel in the Theology of Paul," *Int.* 33 (1979) 341, 348.

[5]For a full examination of the occurrences in Paul see P. Stuhlmacher, *Das paulinische Evangelium* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1968) 56-60.

[6]H. Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, 4.

received (παραλαμβάνειν: 1 Cor 15:1; Gal 1:12; δέχεσθαι: 2 Cor 11:4).[7]

This preached message that Paul calls "εὐαγγέλιον" concerns what God has done in the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus. It is "the message about God's new mode of salvific activity on behalf of human beings made present in Jesus Christ, his Son."[8]

In the paragraphs to follow, my goal is to show how Paul uses the term εὐαγγέλιον to refer to the Christian message. I will approach Paul's gospel from two directions. First, I will treat the two primary expressions that outline the content of the Pauline gospel, Rom 1:1-3 and 1 Cor 15:1-4. Second, I will discuss how Paul often uses τὸ εὐαγγέλιον as an "intramural abbreviation" for the message. This two-part discussion will provide a foundation not only for my treatment of the relationship between Paul's gospel and various other early uses of τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, but it will also have direct bearing on my continued examination of the gospel of Ignatius.

---

[7]All of these have τὸ εὐαγγέλιον as their object. Outside of the seven genuine letters of Paul, we have some of the same usages: κηρύσσειν (Col 1:23), γνωρίζειν (Eph 6:19), as well as ἀκούειν (Col 1:23) and προακούειν (Col 1:5). See G. Friedrich, "εὐαγγελίζομαι, κ.τ.λ.," *TDNT* II, 730.

[8]Fitzmyer, "Theology of Paul," 340.

1. THE CONTENT OF PAUL'S GOSPEL

In the Pauline corpus the most extensive statements which express the εὐαγγέλιον are Rom 1:2-4 and 1 Cor 15:1-5. These passages are explicitly presented by Paul as τὸ εὐαγγέλιον (Rom 1:1, 3; 1 Cor 15:1). Moreover, they are often held to be pre-Pauline compositions which express the "kerygmatic traditions of the church before him and of his own day."[9] There is a formulaic quality to them that is clearly present whether Paul wrote them or not.[10] A brief look at these pericopae is in order.

a. ROMANS 1:1-4

Paul opens his letter to the Romans with a description of his ministry: "Paul, a slave of Jesus Christ, called to

---

[9]G. Bornkamm, *Paul*, D. M. G. Stalker, trans. (New York: Harper & Row, 1971) 113.

[10]Bornkamm considers Rom 1:3f a "pre-Pauline credo" and provides four reasons for this assumption: "(a) the use of participles, characteristic of propositions in primitive Christian confessions, and the (synthetic) parallelism; (b) the Christological scheme: according to the flesh—according to the Spirit . . .; (c) the motif of Jesus as son of David, found nowhere else in Paul; (d) un-Pauline turns of phrase ('designated as . . '; 'Son of God in power'; 'Spirit of holiness'; 'since [his] resurrection from the dead')." Ibid. 248. These (most especially 'c') remain convincing reasons. R. Jewett has a listing of twelve reasons in "The Redaction and Use of an Early Christian Confession in Romans 1:3-4," pages 99-122 in D. Groh, R. Jewett, eds., *The Living Text* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1985) 100-102. See also J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds* (London: Longman, 1972) 16-17. Less willing to see this as a pre-Pauline credal statement are, for example, K. Snodgrass "The Gospel in Romans: A Theology of Revelation," pages 288-314 in L. A. Jervis and P. Richardson, eds. *Gospel in Paul: Studies on Corinthians, Galatians and Romans for Richard N. Longenecker* (Sheffield: J.S.N.T., Supplement Series 108, 1994) 300; and S. Mason, "'For I am not Ashamed of the Gospel' (*Rom.* 1.16): The Gospel and the First Readers of Romans," Ibid., 281, n 100.

be an apostle, set apart for the gospel of God (Παῦλος δοῦλος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, κλητὸς ἀπόστολος ἀφωρισμένος εἰς εὐαγγέλιον θεοῦ)" (Rom 1:1). He then presents the εὐαγγέλιον θεοῦ as "promised in advance through his prophets in the holy scriptures (προεπηγγείλατο διὰ τῶν προφητῶν αὐτοῦ ἐν γραφαῖς ἁγίαις)" (v. 2). The εὐαγγέλιον θεοῦ is

> . . . περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ
> τοῦ γενομένου ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυὶδ
> κατὰ σάρκα,
> τοῦ ὁρισθέντος υἱοῦ θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει
> κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης
> ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν,
> Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν.
>
> . . . concerning his Son,
> who was descended from David
> according to flesh,
> and was declared to be Son of God with power
> according to the spirit of holiness,
> by resurrection from the dead,
> Jesus Christ our lord.
> (vv. 3-4)

There are several points to notice here. The parallel formulaic structure between "according to the flesh" and "according to the spirit of holiness" strikes one immediately. These are the hinges of the confessional outline (and, perhaps its earliest shape[11]); it is here that we find the core of the εὐαγγέλιον which in turn is the center of Paul's ministry. The link between the past work of God in history (the lineage of David), and the resurrection from

---

[11]A plausible redaction analysis is presented in R. Jewett, "Redaction," 113-122.

the dead accomplished by Jesus through the spirit is the message of salvation.

Jesus was "declared to be son of God . . . by resurrection from the dead." The reading of this phrase is largely governed by the passive use of ὁρίζω ("declare," "appoint") and the preposition ἐξ. It seems clear not only that the resurrection of Jesus is seen as intimately tied with his divine sonship (ὁρισθέντος υἱοῦ θεοῦ . . .), but also that there is no sense of a pre-existent sonship in the formula. Moreover, ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν suggests both the resurrection of Jesus as well as the final resurrection of believers.[12] Thus, the divine sonship of Jesus, cast in an eschatological context, "*begins from the resurrection.*"[13]

Therefore, the message of salvation is centered on Jesus, who, because of the power shown in his resurrection, is exalted as son of God. The content of the εὐαγγέλιον is Jesus Christ the son of God.[14] For Paul, therefore, to "preach Christ" (1 Cor 1:23, 15:12) is to preach the gospel (1 Cor 1:17, 15:1; Gal 1:8).

---

[12]J. D. G. Dunn, *Christology in the Making* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996) 34-35.

[13]Ibid., 35. The emphasis is Dunn's.

Futher along, as I turn to Ignatius' Christological formulations, we will observe Ignatius' particular shift in the categories of this formula.

[14]J. Fitzmyer, *Romans: a New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* AB 33 (New York: Doubleday, 1993) 229.

b. 1 CORINTHIANS 15:1-5

The above references to 1 Corinthians bring us to another, more extensive, statement outlining the content of the gospel: 1 Cor 15:1-5. As a prologue to that expression, Paul reminds the Corinthians that it was through him that they heard "that word," the gospel:

> . . .τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὃ εὐηγγελισάμην ὑμῖν, ὃ καὶ παρελάβετε, ἐν ᾧ καὶ ἑστήκατε, δι' οὗ καὶ σῴζεσθε, τίνι λόγῳ εὐηγγελισάμην ὑμῖν εἰ κατέχετε . . .
>
> . . . the gospel that I preached to you, which you received and in which you stand, and through which you are saved if you hold fast to that word I preached to you . . . (15:1-2).

Paul then makes his own relationship to that gospel clear: "For I passed on to you in the first place what I also received . . . (παρέδωκα γὰρ ὑμῖν ἐν πρώτοις, ὃ καὶ παρέλαβον . . .)" (15:3a). Paul received and handed on the gospel:

> ὅτι Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν
> κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς
> καὶ ὅτι ἐτάφη
> καὶ ὅτι ἐγήγερται τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ
> κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς
> καὶ ὅτι ὤφθη Κηφᾷ εἶτα τοῖς δώδεκα
>
> that Christ died for our sins
> according to the scriptures,
> and that he was buried,
> and that he was raised on the third day
> according to the scriptures
> and that he appeared to Cephas and then to the twelve (15:3b-5).

Here, again, we have a formulaic outline of the gospel message.[15] This is more detailed; again, it is structured around two hinge phrases. Whereas Rom 1:3-4 does not explicitly mention the death of Jesus (although, as we have seen, it is suggested), Jesus' death as salvation from sin (ὅτι Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν) is the first of the two hinges in this formula. The second is Jesus' resurrection (ὅτι ἐγήγερται τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ). Each of these statements is punctuated with κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς and then expanded with an event that confirms the reality of the 'hinge' event.

2. PAUL'S GOSPEL ABBREVIATED

Thus, in Rom 1:1-3 and 1 Cor 15:1-4 we have Paul's fullest presentations of the content of the gospel. Yet, as I have pointed out, the noun τὸ εὐαγγέλιον is a technical term in Pauline Christianity. Therefore, with the absolute use

---

[15]So, J. Kloppenborg, "An Analysis of the Pre-Pauline Formula 1 Cor 15:3b-5 In Light of Some Recent Literature," *CBQ* 40 (1978) 351-36; J. Lambrecht, "Line of Thought in 1 Cor 15,1-11," *Greg* 72 (1991) 655-670; and J. Murphy-O'Connor, "Tradition and Redaction in 1 Cor 15:3-7," *CBQ* 43 (1981) 582-589. Koester, referring to the passage, states, "the phrases used here seem to suggest a fixed formulation of the content of the gospel that was formally handed down like a piece of tradition." Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, 6.

It is generally held that the traditional material extends to the end of v. 5; thus, vv. 6-7 constitute a "free composition of Paul who supplements the quotation in vv. 3b-5 by information drawn form his own personal knowledge." Murphy-O'Connor, 585. Also H. Conzelmann, *I Corinthians* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975) 257.

of τὸ εὐαγγέλιον (e.g. Rom 1:16, 1 Cor 9:18, Gal 2:2),[16] Paul assumes that his readers know the content of the gospel message. This usage of τὸ εὐαγγέλιον thus functions as an intramural abbreviation which connotes the full message for those within the boundaries of Paul's Christianity.[17]

Likewise, in cases where a genitive construction modifies εὐαγγέλιον, the phrases stand in for the entire content of the gospel and are directed to those who are within Paul's circle of influence. Examples of the Pauline use of εὐαγγέλιον with a modifying genitive include τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ/εὐαγγέλιον θεοῦ (Rom 1:1, 2 Cor 11:7, 1 Thess 2:2), and τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ (Rom 15:19; 1 Cor 9:12; 2 Cor 2:12, 9:13, 10:14; Gal 1:7; etc.). The first two types of genitive phrases, which can be either subjective or objective, emphasize at once both the source and the content of the message to which Paul is alluding.[18]

---

[16]W. Marxsen notes the "striking" fact that Mark (except only 1:1 and 1:14) and Paul (half of the time) use the noun τὸ εὐαγγέλιον in the absolute, while Matthew never does in the absolute, and Luke avoids the term altogether (only two times in Acts). W. Marxsen, *Mark the Evangelist*, J. Boyce, D. Juel, W. Poehlmann, and R. Harrisville, trans. (Nashville: Abingdon, 1969) 118, 129, 142.

[17]"The gospel of the NT is the witness of those who know to those who know." E. Stauffer, *New Testament Theology*, J. Marsh, trans. (London: SCM, 1963) 158.

[18]The distiction between objective and subjective genitive is not strong in the Pauline use of the phrases τὸ ευαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστου and τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ. Jesus (or God) is both the content and the source of the εὐαγγέλιον in these. See G. Friedrich, "εὐαγγελίζομαι, κ.τ.λ.," 731; and Marxsen, *Mark*, 118.

Also, as we have see, τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου occurs at Rom 2:16 and 16:25 (cf., 2 Tim 2:8). The latter is recognized as part of a non-Pauline addition (16:25-27); as for 2:16 the non-Pauline character is not as widely recognized. See Käsemann, *Commentary*, 67-68, 421-428.

There is also a series of other types of phrases in the Pauline letters which function in the same way as abbreviations for the content of the gospel.[19] Among these is Paul's use of the verb εὐαγγελίζεσθαι.[20] Three times Paul uses εὐαγγελίζεσθαι with εὐαγγέλιον itself as the object and content of the action (1 Cor 15:1, 2 Cor 11:7, Gal 11:1). We find, as well, "proclaim him as the gospel (εὐαγγελίζεσθαι αὐτόν)" in Gal 1:8.[21] Galatians also contains "proclaims the gospel faith (εὐαγγελίζεται τὴν πίστιν)" in 1:23. All of these are examples of Paul's use of εὐαγγελίζεσθαι in the context of preaching or proclaiming a specific message. The gospel referred to in the verbal forms of these passages designates a specific content alluded to by descriptive phrases to suggest further that content. Thus, again, they function as abbreviations of the entire message intended for the in-group.

While I am concentrating on Paul's use of εὐαγγέλιον and εὐαγγελίζεσθαι, it is necessary to recognize that there are as well other short phrases and terms which function in the

---

In any case, for Paul it is always the same gospel: the gospel for which he was set apart by God (Rom 1:1, cf., Gal 1:1). Thus, the source of the gospel is always the same.

[19]Betz calls attention to several of these. H. D. Betz, *Galatians* Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979) 72.

[20]The usage in early Christianity is virtually always in the middle/passive voice. The only exceptions to this are the active voice usages in Rev 10:7, 14:6; I will turn to these in due course.

[21]Betz (*Galatians*, 72) suggests this translation. We find the same phrase in Gal. 1:16. This sort of usage has direct bearing on the gospel expressions in the Ignatian corpus.

same way, as abbreviations of the gospel message for Paul and his communities. The most obvious of these involve some form of the name of Jesus Christ (or a pronoun with "Jesus" the antecedent) as the direct object of a proclaiming verb.[22] This particular type of phrase will figure in my discussion of Ignatius' εὐαγγέλιον. With Paul, we are reminded of the above citation from Gal 1:8 εὐαγγελίζεσθαι αὐτόν; the same phrase is a feature of Gal 1:16. This construction—with the name of Jesus stated—is found, for example, in 1 Cor 1:23 where Paul writes "we proclaim Christ crucified (κηρύσσομεν Χριστὸν ἐσταυρωμένον)." And, in 2 Cor 4:5, as part of a defence of the "gospel of the glory of Christ (εὐαγγέλιον τῆς δόξης τοῦ Χριστοῦ)" (4:4) Paul states, "For we do not proclaim ourselves; we proclaim Jesus Christ the Lord (οὐ γὰρ ἑαυτοὺς κηρύσσομεν ἀλλὰ Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν κύριον)." Moreover, Paul complains to the Corinthians in 2 Cor 11:4,

> εἰ μὲν γὰρ ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἄλλον Ἰσοῦν κηρύσσει ὃν οὐκ ἐκηρύξαμεν, ἢ πνεῦμα ἕτερον λαμβάνετε ὃ οὐκ ἐλάβετε, ἢ εὐαγγέλιον ἕτερον ὃ οὐκ ἐδέξασθε, καλῶς ἀνέχεσθε.
>
> For if someone comes and proclaims another Jesus that the one we proclaimed, or if you receive a different spirit from the one you received, or a different gospel from the one you accepted, you submit to it readily enough.

Despite his negative description here—and the parallel mention of receiving the spirit—, it is clear that for Paul

---

[22]There is, as well, τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰησοῦ Χριστους in the non-Pauline doxology of Rom 16:25.

the act of "proclaiming Jesus" brings about accepting the gospel in response.[23]

3. SUMMARY ON PAUL'S GOSPEL

At this point, the Pauline corpus merits a few preliminary conclusions. Rom 1:3-4 amd 1 Cor 15:3b-5 are the pericopae most often cited from the Pauline corpus as pre-Pauline confessional outlines. They are at the same time declarations in outline form of the gospel message at the center of Paul's ministry. Most striking is the fact that the details of the outlines vary. The content of that εὐαγγέλιον, centered on Jesus and the salvation he accomplished, is encompassed by both statements despite their variations. These confessional statements, as we will see, share motifs and structural characteristics with several passages which express the εὐαγγέλιον in the letters of Ignatius.

---

[23]"If we were to sum up the content of the gospel in a single word, it would be Jesus the Christ." Friedrich, "εὐαγγελίζομαι, κ.τ.λ.," 731. This type of phrase—a proclaiming verb with an "accusative of a person"—will be important to my discussion of Ignatius' εὐαγγέλιον.

Also very important in this same light is Paul's exposition in Phil 1:15-18. Here, 'proclaiming Christ' and 'proclaiming the gospel' (1:12) are interchangable. This pericope will become central to my argument further along when I turn to expressions of the gospel in Ignatius.

Finally, we cannot overlook Phlm 9 where Paul speaks of himself as "a prisoner of Christ Jesus (δέσμοις Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ)" and see this at least as a parallel statement to Phlm 13 where he states that Onesimus, if he were to remain, would minister to him in his "imprisonment of the gospel (ἐν τοῖς δεσμοῖς τοῦ εὐαγγελίου)."

In this discussion of Paul I have also highlighted several abbreviations for the message of the gospel. As we have seen, these terms and phrases function as shorthand which refers to the entire message about Jesus that Paul preached when founding or later visiting the various communities within his circle of influence. For Paul these abbreviations are intramural: they serve to define the boundaries of faith in Jesus. Again, we will observe the same sort of shorthand phrases as we return to Ignatius and his gospel.

Without doubt, then, the Pauline εὐαγγέλιον is centered on a preached message and not a fixed text. The content of that message is: *Jesus, both the son of God and of human lineage, died for human salvation, and was raised from the dead.* The intramural abbreviations (τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ) and the confession outlines (Rom 1:1-3, 1 Cor 15:1-5) of the gospel all function as portrayals of the one message.

B. THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS

With the above conclusions regarding the Pauline gospel before us, we now turn to the problem of τὸ εὐαγγέλιον in the Synoptic Gospels of the NT.[24] To begin with, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον is

---

[24]Especially striking is the fact that neither the noun εὐαγγέλιον nor the verb εὐαγγελίζεσθαι are found in the Johannine literature (i.e., both Gospel and Epistles). This intriguing Johannine characteristic,

not found in the reconstructed Q source; as for εὐαγγελίζεσθαι, the verb is found once, at Q 7:22.[25] This is the logion in which Jesus, with recourse to Second Isaiah, provides his credentials.[26] The most we can say about this occurrence of the verb in Q is that it indicates an early link between this action and the ministry of Jesus.

Turning to the Synoptic Gospels themselves, we find the noun seven times but never the verb in Mark; in Matthew the noun occurs four times, and the verb once. As for Luke-Acts, the verb occurs in both volumes (ten times in Luke, fifteen in Acts), but the substantive only in Acts (two times). As we will observe, the above list alone provides an entry into the particular vision each of the three authors has with respect to the εὐαγγέλιον.

Therefore, in what follows I will treat each of the Synoptic Gospels by paying attention to contextual indications that suggest the idea of "gospel" for each author. This discussion will be centered primarily on the

---

while engaging, will not detain us here; my task is better served by concentrating on the usage of these terms in the synoptic tradition.

[25]In the following paragraphs, I am presuming the validity of the two-source hypothesis with respect to the relationship among the synoptic Gospels.

Concerning Q, a reconstruction of the Greek text may be found in J. Kloppenborg, *Q Parallels: Synopsis, Critical Notes & Concordance* (Sonoma: Polebridge, 1988). For a discussion of the various positions on Q and its relationship to "gospel" as a genre and as a message see idem, *The Formation of Q* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987) 8-39.

[26]Cf., Isaiah 26:19; 29:18-19; 35:5-6; 42:6-7; 61:1. As for the "good news to the poor," both Matt 11:5 and Luke 7:22 have πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται. Isaiah 61:1 is as follows: πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐπ' ἐμὲ, οὗ εἵνεκεν ἔχρισέ με, εὐαγγελίσασθαι πτωχοῖς ἀπέσταλκέ με . . .

uses of εὐαγγέλιον. Concerning εὐαγγελίζεσθαι, except for Luke-Acts, the usage outside of Paul will become less important for our purposes.[27]

1. THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MARK

Aside from the opening reference to "the beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ (Ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ) (1:1)" and τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ (1:14), all of the occurrences of εὐαγγέλιον in Mark are absolute (1:15, 8:35, 10:29, 13:10, 14:9). Thus, "εὐαγγέλιον" functions as an abbreviation within the Markan community just as we have seen in Paul.[28]

The use of εὐαγγέλιον at 8:35 and 10:29 (ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ καὶ [ἕνεκεν] τοῦ εὐαγγελίου) attracts our attention for several reasons. First, neither are found in the parallel texts of Matthew (16:26, 19:29) and Luke (9:25, 18:29[29]); also, they are located within the narrative context of the three suffering/death/resurrection predictions (8:31, 9:31, 10:33-34). These facts reveal not only Mark's particular idea of τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, but also that that εὐαγγέλιον appears intimately linked in Mark with the death and resurrection of Jesus. Indeed, it is significant that both 8:35 and 10:29 are

---

[27]Also, as I have noted, εὐαγγελίζεσθαι does not exist in the Ignatian corpus.

[28]Marxsen (*Mark*, 136) notes "great similarity with Paul's use of the term."

[29]Luke has changed the phrase entirely here: in the place of ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ καὶ ἕνεκεν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου of Mark 10:29, Luke 18:29 has ἕνεκεν τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ.

located within pericopae which speak of discipleship as imitation of the suffering of Jesus: "for my sake and the gospel" is the single (they are the same) impetus for discipleship in Mark.

Hence, in the phrase ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ καὶ [ἕνεκεν] τοῦ εὐαγγελίου of 8:35 and 10:29, the καὶ is epexegtical.[30] Just as Jesus was for his disciples in the past, the εὐαγγέλιον is the reason for discipleship in Mark's community: the εὐαγγέλιον is the "form in which Jesus is made present" to the Markan Christians. In short, Jesus in Mark is the content of the εὐαγγέλιον.[31]

This same connection between Jesus and the εὐαγγέλιον also undergirds the expression in Mark 13:9-10. Here, Jesus tells Peter, James, John and Andrew that they will be arrested and suffer "because of me, as a testimony to them [i.e., their persecutors] (ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς)" (v. 9). This prediction is broadened in v. 10: "And the gospel must first be proclaimed to all nations (καὶ εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη

---

[30]The second ἕνεκεν of 10:29 is not found in 8:35.

It is generally held that the last half of this phrase ([ἕνεκεν] τοῦ εὐαγγελίου) is Mark's addition to the tradition. See E. Best, *Disciples and Discipleship* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1986) 9; E. Lohmeyer, *Das Evangelium des Markus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967) 216; Marxsen, *Mark*, 120.

[31]M. Hengel, *Studies in the Gospel of Mark*, J. Bowden, trans. (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985) 53; Marxsen, 129. Marxsen goes on to say, "the (proclaimed) gospel is Jesus' representative. It thus reflects a feature which all but eliminates historical distance, but by emphasizing and retaining the historical reference. Not only in Jesus' lifetime could a person undertake something for his sake. He can do so today as well, and in fact when he undertakes it for the gospel's sake." Ibid.

πρῶτον δεῖ κηρυχθῆναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον)."[32] Again, the testimony ἕνεκεν ἐμου is reiterated as τὸ εὐαγγέλιον that is proclaimed. Jesus is proclaimed as gospel.

Moreover, in Mark 14:8, Jesus directly links the woman's action of anointing his head to his passion ("she has anointed my body beforehand for its burial"). Jesus then carries the link further, to the εὐαγγέλιον: "wherever the gospel is proclaimed in the whole world, what she has done will be told in remembrance of her (ὅπου ἐὰν κηρυχθῇ εἰς ὅλον τὸν κόσμον, καὶ ὃ ἐποίησεν αὕτη λαληθήσεται εἰς μνημόσυνον αὐτῆς)" (v. 9).[33] It is not the woman herself or her action that is the message; it is, rather, what her action signifies that is the message. "What she has done will be told in remembrance of her" because her action proclaims the εὐαγγέλιον of the death (and by implication) the resurrection of Jesus.[34]

There has been much scholarly discussion on the word εὐαγγέλιον in Mark because, unlike Paul, we get no Markan expression that states, "the gospel is this . . ." The closest we have is Mark 1:1 (Ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ). The εὐαγγέλιον in 1:1 refers to the narrative in which Mark has embedded the Christian message (the woman's action in

---

[32]The NRSV has "And the good news must first be proclaimed . . ." Marxsen (Ibid., 129) calls v. 10 a "parallel" to v. 9; it "interprets" v. 9.

[33]NRSV: ". . . wherever the good news is proclaimed . . ."

[34]Cf., Marxsen, 130.

14:8 is part of that narrative which contains the εὐαγγέλιον).[35] Hence, 1:1 refers to how the saving events of the εὐαγγέλιον began.

We can therefore see τὸ εὐαγγέλιον in Mark as signifying the message of salvation both by (1:14-15) and about Jesus (1:1). That message is embedded within a narrative which conveys the import of the message for believers. The heart of Mark's narrative presentation of τὸ εὐαγγέλιον—as in Paul's εὐαγγέλιον—is the culminating events of the passion and resurrection in the history of Jesus. At the same time, by presenting it as a narrative, the idea of εὐαγγέλιον has been broadened by Mark; the Markan εὐαγγέλιον refers as well to the many events that make up the narrative and relate the message. In this way, therefore, the discipleship motif presents the εὐαγγέλιον as it exists in the faith of the Markan community. The "content of the Gospel is Jesus, and admittedly paradoxically, the earthly Jesus as the Risen One."[36]

---

[35]Hengel, 53; R. H. Gundry, "ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ," 321; cf., K. Kertelge, "The Epiphany of Jesus in the Gospel (Mark)" pages 78-94 in W. Telford, ed., *The Interpretation of Mark* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985) 79; Marxen, 132.

[36]Kertelge, "Epiphany," 92.

2. THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MATTHEW

Matthew uses the noun εὐαγγέλιον four times (4:23, 9:35, 24:14, 26:13). All of these are in the context of preaching (all with the verb κηρύσσω): preaching by Jesus in the summary statements about his ministry (4:23 and 9:35); and, in a passive sense, in logia concerning future preaching by disciples (24:14, 26:13). Moreover, in the first three occurrences (all with an objective genitive), Matthew provides an abbreviation for the content of the gospel; it is "the gospel of the kingdom (τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας)."[37] Thus, the εὐαγγέλιον for Matthew is intimately linked with the pervasive Matthean motif, the "kingdom of heaven."[38] The εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας is uniquely Matthean; as we have seen, it does not exist in Matthew's known sources, Mark and Q. It is evident that Matthew created the gospel abbreviation, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας for his own purposes.[39]

---

[37]J. D. Kingsbury speaks of the phrase "gospel of the kingdom" as "Mathew's capsule-summary of his document." It is thus an abbreviation for the message of both the earthly and risen Jesus in Matthew's narrative. J. D. Kingsbury, *Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989) 129. In the same way we may point to the expression ὁ λόγος τῆς βασιλείας in Matt 13:19 (which replaces simply ὁ λόγος in Mark 4:13). This is another way of expressing τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας. Ibid., 131.

[38]The phrase ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν occurs twenty-seven times throughout Matthew. Variants to this phrase are ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ (6:33, 12:28, 19:24, 21:31, 21:43), ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ πατρός μου (26:29).

[39]Stuhlmacher (*Das paulinische Evangelium,* 238-243), however, unconvincingly sees this phrase as an indication of a particularily Jewish-Christian Palestinian background, perhaps even of Jesus himself. With respect to the striking differences between the Markan and Matthean usages, see the chart in Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, 11.

Thus, the εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας is the message which Jesus himself, in continuity with the Baptist (3:1-2), is preaching: the kingdom of heaven is "near" (ἐγγίζω) (3:2, 4:17, 10:7). This kingdom is the direct salvific involvement of God in human affairs. So, the kingdom is "gospel" or good news for the world (10:7). Moreover, it is signified by Jesus' actions (12:28).

Therefore, because of the link between the εὐαγγέλιον and the βασιλεία, the salvation brought by Jesus is the dominant component of the Matthean εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας. Early on, in 1:21, Matthew calls attention to the name of Jesus as an indication of Jesus' role in salvation. More to the point, though, within the commonly called Eschatological Discourse of 24:13-14, Jesus describes the trials of the end time and says,

> ὁ δὲ ὑπομείνας εἰς τέλος οὗτος σωθήσεται. καὶ κηρυχθήσεται τοῦτο τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ οἰκουμένῃ εἰς μαρτύριον πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, καὶ τότε ἥξει τὸ τέλος.
>
> But the one who endures to the end will be saved. And this gospel of the kingdom will be proclaimed throughout the world, as a testimony to all the nations; and then the end will come.

It is difficult to read *τοῦτο* τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας as referring to anything but the salvation achieved through endurance.[40]

---

[40]Matthew has thus taken Mark's version of the same logion and made it his own: instead of τὸ εὐαγγέλιον of Mark, Matthew has τοῦτο τὸ

In the fourth occurrence of εὐαγγέλιον (26:13), it is simply "this gospel" (τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦτο). This is Matthew's telling of the anointing scene in Mark 14:3-9.[41] It is difficult to be as certain about the meaning "*this* gospel" as we were above with 24:14 (not to mention "*the* gospel" in the parallel Mark 14:9). It seems, though, that the antecedent of τοῦτο still refers in some way to Jesus' death: "she has prepared me for burial (πρὸς τὸ ἐνταφιάσαι με ἐποίησεν)" (26:12).[42] However, it goes beyond that. It is most accurate to say that Matthew's τὸ εὐαγγέλιον *τοῦτο* encompasses the entire message taught by Jesus; it refers to the message of τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας that is at the heart of Matthew's book. Therefore, "this" εὐαγγέλιον in 26:13 is the salvation brought by God in the actions and especially the teachings of Jesus.[43]

εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας; moreover Matthew expands the Markan "must first be proclaimed" into "and then the end will come (καὶ τότε ἥξει τὸ τέλος)."

The motif of endurance in persecution is found in 10:22 which is verbatim from Mark 13:13. Here, the disciples suffer διὰ τὸ ὄνομά μου; "the one who endures this suffering to the end will be saved (ὁ δὲ ὑπομείνας εἰς τέλος οὗτος σωθήσεται)."

[41]This story is not found in Luke.

[42]Those with this position include Marxsen, *Mark*, 124; L. Morris, *The Gospel According to Matthew* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992) 651; J. Schniewind, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1936) 258; Stuhlmacher, *Das paulinische Evangelium*, 242.

[43]In this regard, Kingsbury (*Matthew*, 130-131) states, "in 26:13 we have evidence that in Matthew's community the term "gospel" embraces not merely traditions of logia of Jesus but traditions of narratives about him as well."

So, it is primarily the words—the teachings—of Jesus that Matthew presents as the gospel.[44] This is clear when we observe the εὐαγγέλιον passages at 4:23 and 9:35. These two are are virtually identical summary statements:

> καὶ περιῆγεν ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ διδάσκων ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν καὶ κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας καὶ θεραπεύων πᾶσαν νόσον καὶ πᾶσαν μαλακίαν ἐν τῷ λαῷ.
>
> Then Jesus went about all the cities and villages, teaching in their synagogues, and proclaiming the gospel of the kingdom, and curing every disease and every sickness. (4:23)[45]

These summary statements function as transitions in the narrative that set up the scene for the next episode. They encapsulate what is to follow. Thus, Jesus is presented as teacher, herald and healer, all attributes of Jesus in Matthew's presentation. Yet, with the first two attributes, the point is not so much to emphasize two separate actions; rather, the emphasis is on locale: it is "in *their* synagogues (ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν)." This is the place that, for Matthew's community, stands for rejection and persecution (ie. 10:17, 23:34; cf., 5:10, 12, 44; 13:21).

---

[44]**As we shall see, Ignatius speaks of Jesus as "our only teacher"** (ἵνα εὑρεθῶμεν μαθηταὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ μόνου διδασκάλου ἡμῶν) **in *Magn.* 9.1 (cf., Matt 23:8). It is striking that Ignatius never presents any teachings as those of Jesus.**

[45]**Cf., 9:35:** καὶ περιῆγεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὰς πόλεις πάσας καὶ τὰς κώμας διδάσκων ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν καὶ κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας καὶ θεραπεύων πᾶσαν νόσον καὶ πᾶσαν μαλακίαν. **Matthew 4:23 and 9:35 are related to Mark 1:14 where** τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας **replaces the Markan** τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ. **Related too is Mark 1:39; here Mark simply refers to unspecified preaching by Jesus. A related summary is found at Matt 11:1.**

Jesus' teaching in their synagogues has been rejected.[46] So, to return to these summary statements in general, both 4:23 and 9:35 introduce major blocks of teaching material. This material includes as well proclaiming the εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας.

Hence, 4:23 introduces the sermon on the mount (5:1-7:28). This is presented as Jesus' teaching about the kingdom of heaven (5:3, 10, 19 [bis], 20; 6:10, 33; 7:21). It is, therefore, proclaiming the εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας. Likewise, 9:35 introduces Jesus' teaching on discipleship and mission.[47] The mission is centered on the εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας: "And as you go, preach, saying, 'The kingdom of heaven has come near' (πορευόμενοι δὲ κηρύσσετε λέγοντες ὅτι ἤγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν)" (10:7).[48] The εὐαγγέλιον is not mentioned; but the kingdom is intimately connected with the εὐαγγέλιον. It is the εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας that is preached by the disciples.[49]

To conclude with Matthew, we have seen that Paul and Mark (and Ignatius as well) make Jesus—especially his suffering, death and resurrection—the content of the εὐαγγέλιον, while placing little emphasis on the content of Jesus' teachings. Matthew, on the other hand, provides us

---

[46]Kingsbury, 154.

[47]9:35 is preceded by a series of healings, and other works of authority by Jesus 8:1-9:34. Matthew, by the way, never has Jesus actually teaching in a synagogue.

[48]The NRSV has, "As you go, proclaim the good news . . ."

[49]Kingsbury, 129.

with discourses that present the εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας through its implications for Jesus' followers. In this way, Matthew emphasizes that Jesus' teachings are included in the content of the εὐαγγέλιον.

This uniquely Matthean perspective explains why Matthew omits "τὸ εὐαγγέλιον" from and adds it to his Markan source. In Matt 4:17 (cf., Mark 1:14-15) Matthew emphasizes the all important kingdom as the content of Jesus' preaching and thus drops Mark's εὐαγγέλιον. Yet, in the first use of εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας (Matt 4:23), Matthew *adds* εὐαγγέλιον to Mark's summary of Jesus' ministry (Mark 1:39); this is because, as we have seen, Matthew is leading into the first major block of Jesus' teachings, the sermon on the mount (5:1-7:28).[50]

Therefore, the defining nexus between the kingdom of heaven and the Matthean εὐαγγέλιον distinguishes it from the εὐαγγέλιον of Paul and of Mark. The Pauline and Markan (and Ignatian) priority of the cross and resurrection is not denied. Yet the content of the Matthew's εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας is centered on the salvation *taught* by Jesus, and eventually enacted on the cross by Jesus. It is the message of the Immanuel ("God-is-with-us") of 1:23 who is named savior from sins (1:21).[51] This is the message that Jesus'

---

[50]Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, 12.

[51]O. Betz, "Jesus' Gospel of the Kingdom" pages 53-74 in P. Stuhlmacher, *The Gospel and the Gospels* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991) 63-67.

disciples are to spread to "all nations" (27:18-20; cf., 10:7).

3. THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO LUKE AND THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES

With respect to Luke-Acts, we are immediately confronted with the relative absence of the noun εὐαγγέλιον. Τὸ εὐαγγέλιον is not used at all in the Gospel of Luke; it is, however, found twice in Acts (15:7, 20:24). Actually, the occurrences in Acts—both in the context of speeches—provide few clues about what exactly is being proclaimed to the Gentiles in 15:7, and to "both Jews and Greeks" in 20:21.

When we observe how, in the Gospel, Luke has worked with his Markan source, it becomes clear that he has made a point of avoiding τὸ εὐαγγέλιον.[52] Thus, for example, we find in Luke's version of Mark 8:35, he does not use the Markan ἕνεκεν . . . *τοῦ εὐαγγέλιου* (Luke 9:25); and in the place of the same phrase in Mark 10:29, Luke 18:29 has "for the sake of the kingdom of God (ἕνεκεν τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ)." As we have seen, Matthew has avoided both these usages of τὸ εὐαγγέλιον as well; but, again,—unlike Matthew—Luke does not use the term in any other way in his Gospel.

Missing too are the Markan usages at 1:1 and 1:14-15. In the prologue, Luke refers to his work as "an orderly

---

[52]H. Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke*, G. Buswell, trans. (New York: Harper & Row, 1961) 221; J. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, AB 28 (Garden City: Doubleday, 1981) 148.

account" based on his own investigation into the beginnings (παρηλολουθηκότι ἄνωθεν πᾶσιν ἀκριβῶς καθεξῆς) (1:3). So, Mark's ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστου (Mark 1:1) is transformed into Luke's concern with presenting an accurate account based on what was handed on (παραδίδωμι) by those who were there at the beginning (οἱ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται) (1:2). Moreover, in his telling of the start of Jesus' ministry, Luke presents Jesus as teaching in synagogues (4:15, 31) but does not give the content of that teaching until 4:43 where it is identified within a logion: "I must proclaim the kingdom of God . . . (εὐαγγελίσασθαί με δεῖ τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ . . .)."[53]

This use of εὐαγγελίζεσθαι brings to the fore the question of Luke's sense of this verb. The verb occurs frequently in Luke-Acts.[54] Taking into account the evident avoidance of the noun in the light of Luke's overall theology, Fitzmyer suggests that—except for the references to Isaiah (4:16-21 and 7:22)—Luke does not mean for the verb to be understood "in the etymological sense of announcing/preaching *good* news" in either document.[55] So,

---

[53]The NRSV has "the good news of the kingdom of God." This is the reading in the JB and NAB as well. This common translation is striking; as we shall see in my next step, the commentators generally refrain from reading εὐαγγελίσασθαί here and elsewhere as suggesting the specific meaning of "good" news.

[54]Ten times in the Gospel (1:19, 2:10, 3:18, 4:18, 43, 7:22, 8:1, 9:6, 16:16, 20:1) and fifteen times in Acts (5:42, 8:4, 12, 25, 35, 40, 10:36, 11:20, 13:32, 14:7, 15; 14:21, 15:35, 16:10, 17:18). As we have seen, it occurs only once in Matthew (11:5 [the Q 7:22 logion]) and not at all in Mark.

[55]Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 148. The emphasis is mine. See Bultmann, *New Testament*, 87; Conzelmann (*Theology*, 222), in treating this issue,

the Lukan meaning of εὐαγγελίζεσθαι becomes simply "to preach" or "proclaim."

Therefore, it is not until Acts that we have the Christian message ostensibly referred to as "good news" or "gospel." Because the εὐαγγέλιον is the message of salvation proclaimed by the Church, "Luke cannot use the term εὐαγγέλιον in the first part of his dual work, though indeed in the second."[56] Thus, in Acts 15:7 Peter is speaking in Jerusalem and states it was God's choice that through him "the Gentiles would hear the message of the gospel and become believers (διὰ τοῦ στόματός μου ἀκοῦσαι τὰ ἔθνη τὸν λόγον τοῦ εὐαγγελίου καὶ πιστεῦσαι)." Also, in 20:24 Paul, speaking at Miletus, describes his ministry received from Jesus Christ as, "to testify to the gospel of God's grace (διαμαρτύρασθαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ)."[57] As we have seen especially with Paul and Matthew, these uses of εὐαγγέλιον in Acts, especially 20:24, are abbreviations of the message intended for the Lukan community.

Moreover, εὐαγγέλιον with the genitive phrase in 20:24 (τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ) provides clues to Luke's idea

---

speaks of John's preaching in 3:18 as simply a message and not 'gospel.' Friedrich (*TDNT* II, 718) suggests the same understanding; however, Friedrich is speaking of the historical ministry of Jesus in general and relates it to Luke's accuracy in reporting that ministry as preaching the kingdom of God. Friedrich concludes his remarks in this regard by stating, "the presence of the kingdom of God means joy." Marxsen (*Mark*, 143) has the same general position with respect to εὐαγγελίζεσθαι in Luke.

[56]Marxsen, *Mark*, 143.

[57]In both 15:7 and 20:24 the NRSV has "good news" for τὸ εὐαγγέλιον.

of gospel. This phrase is clearly paralleled by the phrase ὁ λόγος τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ in 14:3, 20:32 (cf., 13:42). Hence, as we have seen with Matthew's εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας, the Lukan εὐαγγέλιον τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ is a message that is announced and preached (it certainly does not refer to either of the documents Luke has written). This means that the speeches woven through Acts are the natural loci for the content of the εὐαγγέλιον message. Thus, for example, Peter's Pentecost sermon contains in 2:22-24 an outline of the salvation events of Jesus' life:

> Ἰησοῦν τὸν Ναζωραῖον, ἄνδρα ἀποδεδειγμένον ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς ὑμᾶς δυνάμεσι καὶ τέρασι καὶ σημείοις οἷς ἐποίησεν δι' αὐτοῦ ὁ θεὸς ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν καθὼς αὐτοὶ οἴδατε, τοῦτον τῇ ὡρισμένῃ βουλῇ καὶ προγνώσει τοῦ θεοῦ ἔκδοτον διὰ χειρὸς ἀνόμων προσπήξαντες ἀνείλατε, ὃν ὁ θεὸς ἀνέστησεν λύσας τὰς ὠδῖνας τοῦ θανάτου, καθότι οὐκ ἦν δυνατὸν κρατεῖσθαι αὐτὸν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ.
>
> Jesus of Nazareth, a man attested to you by God with deeds of power, wonders, and signs that God did through him among you, as you yourselves know—this man, handed over to you according to the definite plan and foreknowledge of God, you crucified and killed by the hands of those outside the law. But God raised him up, having freed him from death, because it was impossible for him to be held in its power.

This type of statement about the salvific events centered on Jesus is a common feature in the six main mission speeches in Acts.[58] With variations in details, these confessional

---

[58]Acts 2:22-24, 3:13-15, 4:10, 5:30-31, 10:39-41, 13:27-31. Schweizer notes that the two later speeches of Paul to Gentiles (14:15-17, 17:22-31) do not contain the Christ statement; they are replaced by statements about God. E. Schweizer, "Concerning the Speeches in Acts," pages 208-216 in L. E. Keck and J. L. Martyn, eds., *Studies in Luke-Acts*

statements all present Jesus' suffering, death and resurrection as events in which God was intimately involved —despite the actions of humanity in killing Jesus—for human salvation. This salvation is the core of Luke's εὐαγγέλιον τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ.

Indeed, the Lukan use of διαμαρτύρομαι ("testify," "bear witness to") and ὁ μάρτυς ("witness") ties the salvation message with the εὐαγγέλιον τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεου.[59] We have already noted the usage in Acts 20:24 in which Paul identifies his ministry as "to testify to the gospel of God's grace (διαμαρτύρασθαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ)." We see, as well, in 23:11 Jesus appears to Paul and says, "just as you have testified for me in Jerusalem, so you must bear witness also in Rome (ὡς γὰρ διεμαρτύρω τὰ περὶ ἐμοῦ εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ, οὕτω σε δεῖ καὶ εἰς Ῥώμην μαρτυρῆσαι)."[60] Other uses of διαμαρτύρομαι

(Nashville: Abingdon, 1966) 213. For a recent full treatment of the speeches see M. L. Soards, *The Speeches in Acts: Their Content, Context, and Concerns* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1994).

[59]Because of their multiple use in Acts, I am concentrating my energies here on διαμαρτύρομαι and ὁ μάρτυς. Other related terms are μαρτύριον (Luke 5:14, 9:5, 21:13, Acts 4:33, 7:44), μαρτυρία (Luke 22:71, Acts 22:18); both terms refer to the testimony given by a witness or witnesses. For μαρτυρέω see below, n. 58. On these usages, see Ibid, 198.

[60]This use of μαρτυρέω is one of the few Lukan uses of this verb in reference to the ministry; except for two instances, all of the other uses (Luke 4:22; Acts 6:3, 10:22, 13:22, 16:2, 22:5, 12, 26:5) refer to various individuals (including Jesus in Luke 4:22) simply being well spoken of by others. In 14:3 and 15:8, however, it is the Lord or God who testifies to the divine activity; significantly, in 14:3 the Lord "testified to the word of his grace by granting signs and wonders to be done through them (μαρτυροῦντι ἐπὶ τῷ λόγῳ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ, διδόντι σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα γίνεσθαι διὶ τῶν χειρῶν αὐτῶν)." This seems a pointed reference to Luke's τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ. See F. F. Bruce, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990) 318.

(8:25, 10:42, 18:5, 20:21; cf., 2:40), within narrative transition summaries, are all linked directly with the ministry of proclaiming the message.

Turning to ὁ μάρτυς in Luke-Acts, we see how it further provides us a context for this ministry. At the end of the Gospel, in Luke 24:48, the risen Jesus gives the Apostles their commission: "You are witnesses of these things (ὑμεῖς μάρτυρες τούτων)." The antecedent of "these things" is the salvific dying and rising of the Christ (24:46). This commission is carried forward in the opening scene in Acts with Jesus' final words before being taken up: "you will be my witnesses in Jerusalem, in all Judea and Samaria, and to the ends of the earth (ἔσεσθέ μου μάρτυρες ἔν τε Ἰερουσαλὴμ καὶ πάσῃ Ἰουδαίᾳ καὶ Σαμαρείᾳ καὶ ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς)" (1:8). In his turn, during his conversion experience, Paul receives the same commission from Jesus (26:16).[61]

With these texts in mind, most telling for my purposes are the obvious links between ὁ μάρτυς and five of the six summaries of the εὐαγγέλιον within the speeches discussed above. Thus, in 3:13, 5:32, 10:39, 41, and 13:31 the

---

[61]Soards points out the vague identity of the witnesses in Luke-Acts. As the Gospel ends, the Apostles are present, but we find others present as well. Acts begins with the Apostles clearly referred as the witnesses; as the narrative progresses, "witness" takes on a meaning that included others besides the twelve. Soards, *Speeches*, 197-198.

Apostles, in their proclamation, are witnesses to the Jesus-events of the εὐαγγέλιον τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεου.[62]

Before leaving διαμαρτύρομαι and ὁ μάρτυς it is vital to point out that for Luke these terms—when referring to the ministry—carry a twofold connotation.[63] On the one hand, these terms refer to activity and people centered on the historical facts of Jesus' life, death and resurrection. This involves the Jesus-events having been "seen and heard" in history (Acts 22:15). Hence, for example, it is important that the one to replace Judas among the twelve be someone who had been with Jesus and the Apostles from the beginning: "one of these must become a witness with us to his resurrection (μάρτυρα τῆς ἀναστάσεως αὐτοῦ σὺν ὑμῖν γενέσθαι ἕνα τούτων)" (Acts 1:22b). The role of the testimony of an eye-witness to the historical events is at issue. On the other hand, there is at the same time a 'confessional' connotation to Luke's uses of διαμαρτύρομαι and ὁ μάρτυς. Thus, in the case of 1:22b, the testimony of the eye-witness to the historical facts of Jesus also involves acceptance and proclamation in faith the historical facts of the εὐαγγέλιον.

---

[62]Peter's speech in 2:14-36 is the only one of the six speeches that does not link ὁ μάρτυς directly to the summary of the εὐαγγέλιον message (2:22-24).

Moreover, in 10:41 we find a fragment of Luke 24:36-43 (cf., *Trall.* 9.1, *Smyrn.* 3.1-3): those who are witnesses are those who "ate and drank with him after he rose from the dead."

[63]See H. Strathman, "μάρτυς, κ.τ.λ.," *TDNT* IV, 492-494.

The Lukan εὐαγγέλιον τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεου, therefore, is the message of salvation proclaimed by the Church as it fulfills Jesus' last words before leaving them (Luke 24:47, Acts 1:8). This message of salvation is both confirmed by and proclaimed by the testimony of the witnesses.

C. THE REMAINDER OF THE NEW TESTATMENT

We find τὸ εὐαγγέλιον fourteen additional times in the remainder of the NT.[64] A brief look at each of these is necessary to complete this survey.

1. EPHESIANS

In his own letter to Ephesus, Ignatius tells the Ephesians that "in every letter [Paul] makes mention of you in Christ Jesus (ἐν πάσῃ ἐπιστολῇ μνημονεύει ὑμῶν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ)" (12.2; cf., Eph 1:16). While, based on this reference, we cannot say for certain that Ignatius knew the NT letter, it is at least an indication that Ignatius was aware of the Pauline tradition at Ephesus.[65]

The author of the NT Ephesians uses τὸ εὐαγγέλιον four times (1:13, 3:6, 6:15, 6:19).[66] For my purposes, the usage

---

[64]Eph 1:13, 3:6, 6:15, 6:19; Col 1:5, 1:23; 2 Thess 1:8, 2:14; 1 Tim 1:11; 2 Tim 1:8, 1:10, 2:8; 1 Pet 4:17; Rev 14:6.

[65]Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 73. Cf., R. Schnackenburg, *Ephesians*, H. Heron, trans. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1991) 33.

[66]With respect to 6:19, the textual support is somewhat uncertain for the genitive phrase τοῦ εὐαγγελίου. Metzger (*Textual Commentary*, 610), however, assigns it a "B" probability.

at 3:6 is the most significant; I will turn to it last. In 1:13 the "gospel of your salvation (εὐαγγέλιον τῆς σωτηρίας ὑμῶν)" has been heard proclaimed as "the word of truth (ἀκούσαντες τὸν λόγον τῆς ἀληθείας)." Then, while continuing a military equipment metaphor begun in 6:11, the author alludes to Isa 52:7 and thus is able to refer to the "gospel of peace (ἐν ἑτοιμασίᾳ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τῆς εἰρήνης)" in 6:15.[67] It is Christ who is at the center of this gospel of peace (2:14, 17).

Elsewhere, we have already observed in passing the 'revelation of the mystery' schema expressed in 3:5-6.[68] Here, the author employs the schema specifically to present Paul's mission to the Gentiles: the "mystery of Christ (μυστήριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ)" has been made known, "that is, the Gentiles have become fellow heirs, members of the same body, and sharers in the promise in Christ Jesus through the gospel (εἶναι τὰ ἔθνη συγκληρονόμα καὶ σύσσωμα καὶ συμμέτοχα τῆς ἐπαγγελίας ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου)." The schema functions theologically. Through the εὐαγγέλιον, "the plan of

---

We also find εὐαγγελίζεσθαι in Eph 3:8: the author writes that he went to the gentiles "to proclaim the unsearchable riches of Christ (εὐαγγελίσασθαι τὸ ἀνεξιχνίαστον πλοῦτος τοῦ Χριστοῦ)." There is also a participial usage at Eph 2:17: Jesus "came proclaiming peace (ἐλθὼν εὐηγγελίσατο εἰρήνην)." (my translation).

[67]Cf., Rom 10:15; Isa 52:7: "How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of the messenger who announces peace, who brings good news . . . (πάρειμι ὡς ὥρα ἐπὶ τῶν ὀρέων, ὡς πόδες εὐαγγελιζομένου ἀκοὴν εἰρήνης, ὡς εὐαγγελιζόμενος ἀγαθὰ . . .)."

[68]Here, as Lührmann points out, we find the verb ἀποκαλύπτω ("reveal," v. 5); the νῦν of v. 5 represents the present time as end time. Lührmann, 124.

the mystery hidden for ages in God (ἡ οἰκονομία τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ ἀποκεκρυμμένου ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων ἐν τῷ θεῷ)" is made available to the Gentiles (3:9).[69]

2. COLOSSIANS

In the letter to the Colossians, the εὐαγγέλιον (1:5, 1:23) is a message of hope. Thus, in 1:5 it is "the hope reserved for you in heaven, about which you have already heard in the word of truth: the gospel that has come to you (διὰ τὴν ἐλπίδα τὴν ἀποκειμένην ὑμῖν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, ἣν προηκούσατε ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τῆς ἀληθείας τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τοῦ παρόντος εἰς ὑμᾶς)."[70] Then, in 1:23, the author encourages the Christians to persevere in the faith, "without shifting from the hope promised by the gospel that you heard (μὴ μετακινούμενοι ἀπὸ τῆς ἐλπίδος τοῦ εὐαγγελίου οὗ ἠκούσατε)." This hope (ἐλπίς) is the content of the εὐαγγέλιον: Christ is the "hope of glory (ἐλπὶς τῆς δόξης)" (1:27) for those who have faith.[71] It is obvious that this

---

[69]R. Schnackenburg, *Ephesians, A Commentary*. H. Heron, trans. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1991.

The theme of the plan (ἡ οἰκονομία) of God is an Ignatian theme as well. We find it at *Eph.* 18.1, 20.1; it is also found under the guise of the "will" of God (τό θέλμα: *Rom.* insc., *Trall.* 1.1, *Pol.* 8.1) and the "purpose" of God (ἡ γνώμη: *Eph.* 3.2, *Smyrn.* 6.2, *Pol.* 8.1).

[70]The translation is mine. This is a clear parallel to Eph 1:13.

[71]E. Lohse, *Colossians and Philemon*, W. R. Poehlmann and R. J. Karris, trans. (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971) 66.

While there are gospel themes in the Christ-hymn of 1:15-20 such as redemption through the cross (vv. 14, 20) the uses of εὐαγγέλιον do not seem to be directly linked with this hymn.

With respect to Ignatius, "the gospel of the common hope (ἐν τῳ εὐαγγελίῳ τῆς κοινῆς ἐλπίδος)" (*Phld.* 5.2) is a favorite Ignatian theme. This hope is centered on Jesus (*Eph.* 21.2; *Magn.* 11.1; *Trall.* insc.; *Phld.* 11.2).

is a preached εὐαγγέλιον: in both uses, it is "the gospel you heard."

3. 2 THESSALONIANS

Turning to 2 Thess, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον occurs twice, 1:8 and 2:14. In 1:8 the author is speaking of the vengeance God will inflict "on those who do not obey the gospel of our Lord Jesus (τοῖς μὴ ὑπακούουσιν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ)."[72] This use of ὑπακούω ("obey") with the dative suggests a total surrender to the εὐαγγέλιον.[73] Then, in 2:14, the author refers to his ministry as the way in which God chose the Thessalonians for salvation and sanctification "to which he called you through our gospel (εἰς ὃ ἐκάλεσεν ὑμᾶς διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἡμῶν)."[74]

We can safely assume that this εὐαγγέλιον is the preached message of salvation through Jesus. Because the passion and resurrection of Jesus are never mentioned in this letter, the salvation message presumably rests on the gospel that Paul originally preached in Thessalonica (1 Thess 1:5, 2:2-

---

[72]R. Collins contrasts this τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ with Paul's phrase τὸ εναγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ and points out that it is a new phrase that represents a conscious shift on the part of the author from the more personal rememberences of the past by Paul in 1 Thess to an emphasis on the furture coming of Jesus. It is, as well, an hapax legomenon in the NT. R. F. Collins, "'The Gospel of Our Lord Jesus' (2 Thess 1,8) A Symbolic Shift of Paradigm," pages 426-440 in R. R. Collins, ed., *The Thessalonian Correspondence* (Leuven: University Press, 1990) 439-440.

[73]BAGD, 837.

[74]The translation is mine.

9). Moreover, it appears that in 2:15 the εὐαγγέλιον is referred to as at least part of "the traditions (ἡ παράδοσις)" that the writer (as Paul) preached (cf., 3:6). Yet, it is not the past that is important; rather, the message of the εὐαγγέλιον directs the Thessalonians to the future coming of Jesus and the ultimate salvation he brings (2:1-17).

4. 1 & 2 TIMOTHY

With 2 Timothy we have the most unambiguous presentation of the content of the εὐαγγέλιον outside of Paul and Ignatius in early Christianity. We may regard first, however, the single use of εὐαγγέλιον in 1 Timothy 1:11. Here the writer lists lawless actions, those "contrary to the sound teaching that conforms to the glorious gospel of the blessed God, which he entrusted to me (. . . τῇ ὑγιαινούσῃ διδασκαλίᾳ ἀντίκειται κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς δόξης τοῦ μακαρίου θεοῦ, ὃ ἐπιστεύθην ἐγώ)" (1:10-11). The gospel sets the boundaries of correct teaching. Again, the author is referring to the gospel originally preached by Paul.

That gospel comes to the fore in 2 Timothy. The exhortation of 1:8-11 merits a closer look:

> μὴ οὖν ἐπαισχυνθῇς τὸ μαρτύριον τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν μηδὲ ἐμὲ τὸν δέσμιον αὐτοῦ, ἀλλὰ συγκακοπάθησον τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ κατὰ δύναμιν θεοῦ, τοῦ σώσαντος ἡμᾶς καὶ καλέσαντος κλήσει ἁγίᾳ, οὐ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα ἡμῶν ἀλλὰ κατὰ ἰδίαν πρόθεσιν καὶ χάριν, τὴν δοθεῖσαν ἡμῖν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων, φανερωθεῖσαν δὲ νῦν διὰ τῆς ἐπιφανείας τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, καταργήσαντος μὲν τὸν θάνατον φωτίσαντος δὲ ζωὴν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου εἰς ὃ ἐτέθην ἐγὼ κῆρυξ καὶ ἀπόστολος καὶ διδάσκαλος . . .

> Do not be ashamed, then, of the testimony about our Lord or of me his prisoner, but join with me in suffering for the gospel, relying on the power of God who saved us and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works but according to his own purpose and grace. This grace was given to us in Christ Jesus before the ages began, but it has now been revealed through the appearing of our Savior Christ Jesus, who abolished death and brought life and immortality to light through the gospel. For this gospel I was appointed a herald and an apostle and a teacher . . .

The complex of themes which surrounds this use of τὸ εὐαγγέλιον calls for our attention. The author is imprisoned, "suffering for the gospel" and depends on the grace that was given in the past and revealed in the present, both through the "savior Christ Jesus." This suffering in conjunction with the εὐαγγέλιον is an important contact point between the the Pastoral letters and Ignatius.[75] It is significant, however, that the suffering—much less, the cross—of Jesus is not mentioned in the Pastoral Epistles (the closest being the reference to Jesus before Pilate in 1 Tim 6:13 and the "saying" in 2 Tim 2:11). Thus, it seems that Christian suffering is not so much grounded in the suffering of Jesus as it is a result of being a herald of the gospel.[76]

---

[75]A. T. Hanson, "The Theology of Suffering in the Pastoral Epistles and Ignatius of Antioch," pages 694-696 in E. A. Livingstone, ed., *Studia Patristica* XVII.2. (Oxford: Pergamon, 1982).

[76]Cf., 1 Tim 1:19, 6:12; 2 Tim 2:3, 3:12, 4:5.

This last citation brings to the fore the use of ὁ εὐαγγελιστής ("preacher of the gospel") in 2 Tim 4:5. We find this word three times in the NT: 2 Tim 4:5; in Acts 21:8 where the Apostles enter the house of "Philip, the evangelist (εἰσελθόντες εἰς τὸν οἶκον Φιλίππου τοῦ εὐαγγελιστοῦ)"; and in Eph 4:11 where ὁ εὐαγγελιστής is one of the ministries listed. D. Y.

Also, as I have already underscored with respect to the use of φανερόω in Ignatius, 2 Tim 1:9-10 ("This grace . . . through the gospel") depends on a confessional schema which presents a contrast between "then" and "now" of salvation: *then* it was hidden, *now* it is revealed in Jesus.[77] It is "through the gospel (διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου)" that the grace which was hidden in the past and revealed in Jesus abolishes death and brings "life and immortality to light (καταργήσαντος μὲν τὸν θάνατον φωτίσαντος δὲ ζωὴν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν)." This particular gospel theme centered on the abolishment of death is a feature in the Ignatian star-hymn of *Eph.* 19.3.

The εὐαγγέλιον, then, is centered on the salvation (expressed by the end-of-death/life/immortality theme) accomplished by Jesus by his appearing in the world. This is further confirmed by the confessional statement in 2 Tim 2:8-9a:

> μνημόνευε Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐγηγερμένον ἐκ νεκρῶν, ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυίδ, κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου, ἐν ᾧ κακοπαθῶ μέχρι δεσμῶν ὡς κακοῦργος ἀλλὰ ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ οὐ δέδεται·

Hadidian has suggested unconvincingly that at least in Eph 4:11, ὁ εὐαγγελιστής refers to a specific ministry of gospel *writer*. D. Y. Hadidian "tous de euangelistas in Eph 4,11," *CBQ* 28 (1966) 317-321. It seems best to see this as a ministry of preaching subordinate to that of apostles; however, the activity of the two ministries overlap. G. Friedrich, "εὐαγγελιστής," *TDNT* II, 736-737.

[77]Cf., Rom 16:25-26; Eph 3:5, 9-11; Col 1:26; Titus 1:2; and Rev 10:7 (see below). We have seen elsewhere that Lührmann speaks of this as a "Revelationsschema." Lührmann, *Das Offenbarungsverständinis*, 124-133.

With respect to our 2 Tim text, see M. Dibelius, H. Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles*, P. Buttolph, A. Yarbro, trans. (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1972) 99.

> Remember Jesus Christ, raised from the dead, a descendant of David—that is my gospel, for which I suffer hardship, even to the point of being chained like a criminal. But the word of God is not chained.

This formula is based on the same sort of twofold statement that we have seen with Rom 1:3-4.[78] We know, as well, that the theme of the lineage of David is a feature in Ignatius' uses of Christological formulae.[79] Like Rom 1, the 2 Tim 2:8 passage sets up a contrast between the earthly existence of Jesus and his exultation, here suggested by "raised from the dead." With respect to Ignatius, excepting the 'David formula' in *Trall.* 9.1 (which is obviously a fragment), all of the Ignatian passages which mention David have the same function.

As we have seen in the inauthentic doxology of Rom 16:25-27 (cf., Rom 2:16), the author calls this message to be remembered "my gospel (τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου)"; it is the reason for his suffering and chains (v. 9a).[80] Finally, the author refers to the εὐαγγέλιον as "the word of God (ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ)" that cannot be chained (v. 9b).

---

[78]Ibid., 108; E. Norden, *Agnostos Theos*, (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1956) 381; O. Cullmann, *Les Premières Confessions de foi Chrétiennes* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1948) 45.

[79]*Eph.* 18.2, 20.2; *Rom.* 7.3; *Trall.* 9.1; *Smyrn.* 1.1. Cf., *Did.* 9.2, which is a prayer over the eucharistic cup: "We give thanks to you, our Father, for the holy vine of David your child, which you have made known to us through Jesus your child (εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι, πάπερ ἡμῶν, ὑπὲρ τῆς ἁγίας ἀμπέλου Δαυεὶδ τοῦ παιδός σου, ἧς ἐγνώρισας ἡμῖν διὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ παιδός σου).

[80]For this same theme see again 2 Tim 1:8, as well as Phil 1:12-14; Eph 3:1 and, in Ignatius, *Smyrn.* 5.1.

5. 1 PETER

While the use of τὸ εὐαγγέλιον at 1 Pet 4:17 seems linked with several themes we have already encountered, the exact nature of that gospel, much less its content, is difficult to determine. Within a lengthy exhortation on the suffering of Christians (chaps. 4-5) the author states that the time of God's judgement has come; the "elder" then asks, "if it [i.e., judgement] begins with us, what will be the end for those who do not obey the gospel of God? (τί τὸ τέλος τῶν ἀπειθούντων τῷ τοῦ θεοῦ εὐαγγελίῳ;)" (4:17b). The disobedient are those who are ostensibly within the "household of God" (v. 17a) yet have in actuality placed themselves outside the household by rejecting the gospel.[81]

In 2 Thess 1:8 we have already seen the theme of disobedience toward the gospel and the divine response to this disobedience. Yet, this is not a complete correspondence with 1 Pet 4:17; for, in 2 Thess 1:8 there is a sense that God's judgement is righting the injustice of the persecution perpetrated by those who "do not know God and do not obey the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ." God's

---

[81]L. Goppelt, *A Commentary on I Peter*, F. Hahn, ed., J. E. Alsup, trans. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993) 332.

Indeed, the correspondence between the gospel and judgement figures also in the use of εὐαγγελίζεσθαι in 4:5. Here, judgement of both living and the dead is placed whithin the context of the good news having been preached to the dead. Presumably, this end-time judgement thus includes both those who are living and those who have already died. Ibid., 287.

judgement in 1 Pet 4:17, on the other hand, functions simply to "induce fear before God's exercise of judgement" upon the church members who disobey the Gospel.[82]

What is more, the use of ἀπειθέω ("disobey") is not so much a reference to ethical demands linked with the gospel; rather, to disobey the gospel is the opposite of to believe in the gospel.[83] It is significant that, as we have already noted in passing, Ignatius uses ἀπειθέω at *Magn.* 8.2 within the context of his statement on the OT Prophets who, despite being persecuted, are inspired "to convince the disobedient that there is one God who manifested himself through Jesus Christ, his son (εἰς τὸ πληροφορηθῆναι τοὺς ἀπειθοῦντας, ὅτι εἷς θεός ἐστιν, ὁ φανερώσας ἑαυτὸν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ)." This belief statement has direct ties with εὐαγγέλιον motifs; the "disobedient" for Ignatius, as for 1 Peter, are those who refuse to believe in the εὐαγγέλιον.

6. THE BOOK OF REVELATION

We cannot leave the NT without pausing to consider the Revelation of John. Written in 95 or 96 C.E., Revelation is

---

[82]Ibid., 332.

[83]BAGD, 82; R. Bultmann, "ἀπειθέω" *TDNT* VI 10-11. Thus, the usage in Isa 65:2, which is taken up by Paul in Rom 10:21 and in *Barn.* 12.4. See also 1 Pet 3:1 and John 3:36; Acts 14:2, 19:9; Rom 15:31. In 2 Thess 1:8, discussed above, we find μὴ ὑπακούω instead of ἀπειθέω. The meaning is essentially the same.

thus proximate in time to Ignatius.[84] As for place, the messages to the seven churches of Asia in Rev 2:1-3:22 suggest the same general sphere of influence as that of Ignatius.[85] The substantive εὐαγγέλιον occurs once in Revelation, in 14:6; and the verb εὐαγγελίζω (i.e., in the active voice) twice, in 10:7 and in 14:6 as well.[86]

It seems clear that the two uses of the verb εὐαγγελίζω refer to the proclamation of a message with ultimate import. So, in 10:7 when the seventh angel blows his trumpet "the mystery of God will be fulfilled, as he announced to his servants the prophets (καὶ ἐτελέσθη τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ θεοῦ, ὡς εὐηγγέλισεν τοὺς ἑαυτοῦ δούλους τοὺς προφήτας)."[87]

In Rev 14:6 we have both the verb and the substantive. After the visions of the dragon and the woman, and the two beasts in chapters 12 and 13, the seer recounts the vision of the lamb on Zion with the 144,000 redeemed. Then the seer describes "another angel flying in midheaven, with an eternal gospel to proclaim to those who live on the earth .

---

[84]On the dating of Revelation, see the discussion in A. Yarbro Collins, *Crisis and Catharsis: The Power of the Apocalypse*, (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1984) 54-83.

[85]D. Aune holds that the author is writing from Ephesus. D. Aune, "The Social Matrix of the Apocalypse of John," *BR* 26 (1981) 27-28.

[86]These are the only occurrences in early Christianity of this verb in the active voice. Cf., BAGD, 317.

[87]This is yet another example of the revelation schema we have spoken of before (as in Lührmann, *Das Offenbarungsverständinis*, 124-133); here, the schema involves the "mystery" and the witness of the prophets in advance. For these themes in various configurations see Rom 16:25-26; Col 1:26; *Barn.* 5.6. Cf., 1 Pet 1:20; Heb 9:26b; 2 Clem 14:2; and, in Ignatius, *Magn.* 8.2, 9.3; *Phld.* 5.2; *Smyrn.* 7.2.

. . (ἄλλον ἄγγελον πετόμενον ἐν μεσουρανήματι, ἔχοντα εὐαγγέλιον αἰώνιον εὐαγγελίσαι ἐπὶ τοὺς καθημένους ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς . . .)" (14:6). Then there follows the warning to fear God's judgement (v. 7).

This "eternal gospel" is to be distinguished from the gospel of the Pauline and Synoptic traditions. It is clearly not centered on the person of Jesus and his deeds; rather, the εὐαγγέλιον in Revelation refers to the message about the end of the world with its concomitant, the fulfillment of God's justice. This justice means good news to the faithful and punishment to the nations. Thus, the εὐαγγέλιον in Rev 14:6 (as well as in 10:7) is the message of the ultimate triumph of the authority of God.[88]

Despite the proximity of time and locale to Ignatius, there seems to be little in common between Ignatius and Revelation with respect to the idea of the εὐαγγέλιον.

D. THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS

We now turn outside the NT and regard the final group of witnesses to the idea of an εὐαγγέλιον before Ignatius. In these final paragraphs I will consider several documents from the Apostolic Fathers.[89] As with the above discussion

---

[88]J. M. Ford, *Revelation* AB 38 (Garden City: Doubleday, 1975) 236; and L. Cerfaux, "'L'Évangile éternel' (Apoc., XIV,6)." *ETL* 39 (1963) 672-681, 680.

[89]In this discussion I will treat the following documents: *1 Clement*, the *Epistle of Barnabas*, and the *Didache*. I have excluded *Hermas* simply because the terms εὐαγγέλιον and εὐαγγελίζεσθαι are not used in that document. This is also true of Polycarp's letter to the Philippians, which, in any case, is much later than Ignatius: P. N.

of the NT, I will concentrate my energies on the use of τὸ εὐαγγέλιον in these documents.

1. 1 CLEMENT

Generally accepted as the earliest document among the Apostolic Fathers is *1 Clement*, written ca. 96 C.E.[90] In this lengthy epistle, the word εὐαγγέλιον is used once, referring to Paul's message: Clement tells the Corinthians to pick up Paul's epistle (47.1) and then asks them, "What did he first write to you in the early days of [preaching] the gospel? (τί πρῶτον ὑμῖν ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἔγραψεν;)" (47.2). This phrase can only refer to the beginning of Paul's preaching ministry in Corinth.[91] We find the same usage in Paul's own epistles: in Phil 4:15 Paul speaks about leaving Macedonia "in the early days of the gospel (ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου)." Therefore, in his epistle Clement is asking the

---

Harrison has shown it to be two letters combined, the larger portion being a letter written by Polycarp just before his death in the 150's. P. N. Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles to the Philippians* (Cambridge: University Press, 1936) 16. As for the *Martyrdom of Polycarp*, not only is it late, but also the usages in 1.1, 4.4, 19.1, 22.1 are all seen as still later interpolations (see Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, 20). *2 Clement* and *Diognetus* are generally held to be later, well into the period when the authority of the NT gospels comes to the fore. [Yet, in the case of *2 Clement*, there is a dissenting voice in K. P. Donfried who holds that *2 Clement* was written between 98-100 C.E. K. P. Donfried, *The Setting of Second Clement in Early Christianity* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1974) 1. This position is not generally accepted.]

[90]Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, 15.

[91]See G. D. Fee, *Paul's Letter to the Philippians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995) 439-441.

As for *1 Clem* 47.2, Lightfoot (*Apostolic Fathers*, I.2, 143) suggests " . . . in the first days of the Gospel, soon after your conversion."

Corinthians to return to the origins of their faith as found in the preaching by Paul.

The use of the verb εὐαγγελίζεσθαι in 1 *Clem.* 42.1 and 3 provides us with little more information: Jesus preached to the Apostles who, in turn, "went out with the assurance of the holy Spirit proclaiming that the kingdom of God is coming (. . . μετὰ πληροφορίας πνεύματος ἁγίου ἐξῆλθον εὐαγγελιζόμενοι, τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ μέλλειν ἔρχεσθαι)" (42.3). Thus, as in the Synoptic tradition, especially Luke (8:1; cf., Matt 9:35; Mark 6:6), the kingdom of God is part of the message preached. Yet, the emphasis in 1 Clement is on the chain of preaching from Jesus through the Apostles "for us (ἡμῖν)" (42.1) and not on the message or its content.

Moreover, there is no connection between the reference to Paul's ministry in 47.2—or the reference to the kingdom in 42.3—with what ostensibly are Synoptic Jesus-sayings earlier in 1 *Clem.* 13.2 and 46.8. Even if it were certain that Clement used written documents (i.e., the Synoptic Gospels) as a source for these sayings, there is no indication that he thinks of them as, in any way, "gospel." Those "words of the Lord Jesus" (μνήσθητε τῶν λόγων τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ [46.7; cf., 13.1]) are commandment (ἐντολή) and precepts (παράγγελμα) (13.3).[92] Clement gives us no other clues with respect to his concept of gospel.

---

[92]Koester gives two reasons for considering these sayings to be from "the oral tradition": (a) the fact that there is no redactional

2. THE EPISTLE OF BARNABAS

Another epistle from approximately the same time, that of Barnabas,[93] refers to the εὐαγγέλιον twice (*Barn.* 5.9, 8.3).[94] Both εὐαγγέλιον passages concern a message to be proclaimed (κηρύσσειν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον αὐτοῦ [5.9]). It is significant that the reference to the εὐαγγέλιον in 5.9 is part of an extended discourse on the passion of Jesus which encompasses the whole of chapter five. The passion of Jesus is one of atonement: ὁ κύριος παραδοῦναι τὴν σάρκα εἰς καταφθοράν, ἵνα τῇ ἀφέσει τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἁγνισθῶμεν, ὅ ἐστιν ἐν τῷ αἵματι τοῦ ῥαντίσματος αὐτοῦ (5.1; cf., 6.7, 7.2, 14.4-5). What is more, embedded in chapter five, we have at least the echoes of a confessional formula.[95] After posing a rhetorical question as to how Jesus came to suffer at the hands of humanity, the

---

evidence to link these sayings with the NT gospels, and (b) the quotation formula (εἶπεν) occurs in the past tense. Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, 15.

[93]L. W. Barnard, for example, dates *Barnabas* between 117-138 C.E. L. W. Barnard, "Is the Epistle of Barnabas a Paschal Homily?" pages 73-85 in L. W. Barnard, *Studies in the Apostolic Fathers and Their Background* (New York: Schocken, 1966) 74; R. A. Kraft holds that it is not possible to fix a date more precise than between 70 C.E. and 135. The problem is the generally recognized composite nature of the text. R. A. Kraft, "Barnabas and the Didache" vol 3 in R. M. Grant, ed. *The Apostolic Fathers: A New Translation and Commentary* (New York: Thomas Nelson, 1965) 42.

[94]*Barnabas* uses the verb εὐαγγελίεσθαι in 14.9 in what is virtually a direct quote from Is. 61:1-2; there is, as well, a use of the participle ὁ εὐαγγελιζόμενος in 8.3. Both refer to preaching; the 8.3 usage is tied with the use of εὐαγγέλιον in 8.3.

[95]Barnard (*Studies*, 82) states that "traces of credal formulae are perhaps to be found in the Epistle; cf., v. 6-7, vii.2 and xv.9." In my opinion, the strongest case can be made for 5.6-7.

author responds with an imperative "Learn: (μάθετε)."[96] Then follows the content of what is to be learned:

> οἱ προφῆται, ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἔχοντες τὴν χάριν, εἰς αὐτὸν ἐπροφήτευσαν· αὐτος δέ, ἵνα καταργήσῃ τὸν θάνατον καὶ τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν δείξῃ, ὅτι ἐν σαρκὶ ἔδει αὐτὸν φανερωθῆναι, ὑπέμεινεν, ἵνα τοῖς πατράσιν τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν ἀποδῷ, καὶ αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ τὸν λαὸν τὸν καινὸν ἑτοιμάζων ἐπιδείξῃ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ὤν, ὅτι τὴν ἀνάστασιν αὐτὸς ποιήσας κρινεῖ.
>
> The prophets, after they had received special insight [χάρις] from him, prophesied concerning him. And he submitted so that he might break the power of Death and demonstrate the resurrection from the dead—thus it was necessary for him to be manifested in flesh. Also (he submitted) so that he might fulfill the promise to the fathers and, while he was preparing the new people for himself and while he was still on earth, to prove that after he has brought about the resurrection he will judge. (5.6-7)[97]

This fascinating pericope cannot be discussed in detail here. What is necessary for my present purposes, however, is to regard the apparent close proximity of themes in this confessional summary to gospel motifs that we have already seen.

The motifs of Jesus' coming in the flesh, salvific suffering (ὑπομένω), and resurrection are indeed common

---

[96]*Barnabas* is a witness to a thread of early Christianity that was centered on conveying perfect knowledge (. . . ἵνα μετὰ τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν τελείαν ἔχητε τὴν γνῶσιν [1.5]). This is to be distinguished from later, more fully formed gnosticisms with which the developing structure of Christianity eventually clashed. This use of μανθάνω is characteristic of the author's rhetoric (e.g. 5.5, 6.9, 9.7, 14.4, 16.2, 16.7) which serves to call attention to a particular bit of knowledge or insight into God's will. R. Kraft lists twenty-six such terms which he calls "Gnostic-Parenetic Terminology." R. Kraft, "Barnabas and the Didache" 24-26.

[97]Translation, Ibid. 94.

threads. We also have another take on the revelation schema that we have encountered elsewhere; here the Prophets receive the grace to prophesy about Jesus in advance and Jesus demonstrates (δείκνυμι) the resurrection through being "manifested in the flesh (ἐν σαρκὶ . . . φανερωθῆναι)."

With these gospel motifs before us, there is a slight link with the εὐαγγέλιον: immediately after this summary, the author speaks of Jesus as teaching and preaching to Israel (5.8) and then choosing "his own apostles to preach his gospel (ὅτε δὲ τοὺς ἰδίους ἀποστόλους τοὺς μέλλοντας κηρύσσειν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον αὐτοῦ ἐξελέξατο)" and manifesting himself as God's son (ἐφανέρωσεν ἑαυτὸν εἶναι υἱὸν θεοῦ) (5.9). This allows the author to speak of Jesus' coming in the flesh and suffering (vv. 10-14).

Moreover, within this same context there appears to be a quotation of a Jesus-saying from the Synoptic tradition: Jesus chose the apostles who were sinners to demonstrate "that he came not to call the righteous but sinners (ὅτι οὐκ ἦλθεν καλέσαι δικαίους, ἀλλὰ ἁμαρτωλούς)" (5.9; cf., Matt 9:13, Mark 2:17, Luke 5:32, 2 *Clem.* 2.4).[98] While clearly presented as coming from Jesus, this logion in Barnabas is not presented as a quotation from a written text, gospel or otherwise. As

---

[98]Except for the first person singular in the opening verb, the logion is identical in Matthew and Mark. Luke has a variant: οὐκ ἐλήλυθα καλέσαι δικαίοῦ ἀλλὰ ἁμαρτωλοὺς εἰς μετάνοιαν. Koester, recognizing the wide usage of this logion (with another variant in 1 Tim 1:15) states that it is from the oral free tradtion of the community. Koester, *Synoptische Überleiferung*, 144-145.

a saying of Jesus, however, it does seem to be included in Barnabas' idea of gospel. This is probable when we observe this saying in its setting of the teaching and preaching of Jesus and the apostles.

So, with respect to the epistle of Barnabas, we can be certain that Jesus' "gospel" refers to a preached message;[99] and we can be reasonably certain that that message contains not only the salvific suffering/death/resurrection sequence, but also the motif of Jesus' manifestation. It seems, as well, that we must include teachings of Jesus in Barnabas' idea of gospel. Overall, though, we have no indication that the author of Barnabas knows the gospels of the NT (or any other written text) as εὐαγγέλιον.

3. THE DIDACHE

Even more than Barnabas, the Didache or "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles" is a complex document. It is generally recognized to be a composite of several sources, some dating

---

[99]It is clearly a preached message in 8.3 as well (οἳ ἔδωκεν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τὴν ἐξουσίαν . . . εἰς τὸ κηρύσσειν). This use of εὐαγγέλιον tells us little more; it is also within an exposition on the passion of Jesus, this time how Num. 19 "typifies" the passion of Jesus.

to before or near the time of Ignatius.[100] The dating of its final redaction, however, is still not agreed upon.[101]

The Didache has four references to εὐαγγέλιον (8.2, 11.3, 15.3, 15.4). The first of these (8.2) has attracted the most attention because it introduces a version of the Lord's prayer. After the instruction on baptism in chapter seven, the author, in chapter eight, provides an exhortation on fasting (v. 1) and prayer (vv. 2-3). On prayer the author states, "Neither pray like the hypocrites, but as the Lord commanded in his gospel (μηδὲ προσεύχεσθε ὡς οἱ ὑποκριταί, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐκέλευσεν ὁ κύριος ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ αὐτοῦ)" (v. 2a). Then, introduced with "pray like this: (οὕτω προσεύχεσθε)," the author provides a version of the Lord's prayer that is much the same as in Matt 6:9-13.

The second use of τὸ εὐαγγέλιον occurs in 11.3. In this section on church order, the author states, "and concerning apostles and prophets do the following according to the rule of the gospel (περὶ δὲ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ προφητῶν, κατὰ τὸ δόγμα τοῦ εὐαγγελίου οὕτω ποιήσατε)." Immediately after we find a two-part instruction, first on apostles (vv. 4-6), followed by a more lengthy section on prophets (vv. 7-12). The

---

[100]In a recent essay C. N. Jefford has suggested that Ignatius used "traditions which have been preserved in the text of the *Didache*." C. N. Jefford, "Did Ignatius of Antioch know the Didache?" pp 330-351 in C. N. Jefford, ed. *The Didache in Context* (New York: E. J. Brill, 1995) 349. Jefford's conclusions are reasonable.

[101]As we shall see, the dates one assigns the Didache and its redactions are the crux of the problem in its relationship to the gospel traditions.

instruction on apostles opens with a phrase that can be understood in light of Matt 10:40 (ὁ δεχόμενος ὑμᾶς ἐμὲ δέχεται . . .):[102] "Let every apostle who comes to you be received as the Lord (πᾶς δὲ ἀπόστολος ἐρχόμενος πρὸς ὑμᾶς δεχθήτω ὡς κύριος)" (11.4). The instruction on prophets opens with another Matthean-sounding phrase: "Do not test or judge any prophet speaking in a spirit, for every sin will be forgiven but this sin will not be forgiven (καὶ πάντα προφήτην λαλοῦντα ἐν πνεύματι οὐ πειράσετε οὐδὲ διακρινεῖτε· πᾶσα γὰρ ἁμαρτία ἀφεθήσεται, αὕτη δὲ ἡ ἁμαρτία οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται) (11.7).[103]

The final two occurrences of τὸ εὐαγγέλιον in the Didache are found within an exhortation on community rules:

> ἐλέγχετε δὲ ἀλλήλους μὴ ἐν ὀργῇ, ἀλλ' ἐν εἰρήνῃ ὡς ἔχετε ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ· καὶ παντὶ ἀστοχοῦντι κατὰ τοῦ ἑτέρου μηδεὶς λαλείτω μηδὲ παρ' ὑμῶν ἀκουέτω, ἕως οὗ μετανοήσῃ. τὰς δὲ εὐχὰς ὑμῶν καὶ τὰς ἐλεημοσύνας καὶ πάσας τὰς πράξεις οὕτω ποιήσατε, ὡς ἔχετε ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν.
>
> And admonish one another not in anger but in peace as you have it in the gospel; and let no one speak who has done wrong against another, nor let that one hear from you until he repents. And your prayers and alms and all your acts do them as you have it in the gospel of our Lord. (15.3)

What are we to make of all of this? The problem becomes more complex when we consider the string of teaching-sayings in 1.3-6, most of which are elsewhere (i.e., in Matthew or Luke) attributed to Jesus. So, we have

---

[102]Cf., Luke 10:16, John 13:20.
[103]Cf., Matt 12:31.

our usual two-edged question before us: is the author of the Didache referring to a written document—a gospel—when speaking of the εὐαγγέλιον? and, whether the author is or is not referring to a written text of a gospel, what is the content of that εὐαγγέλιον?

With respect to the first edge of the question, one is confronted with the perennial difficulty of dating the various redactions of the Didache. A fully argued answer to that question is not possible here. It seems reasonable, however, that the usages of τὸ εὐαγγέλιον are from the final author of the Didache.[104] This means that at least the *idea* of a gospel as an authoritative text was added to a document which originally witnessed to oral traditions. Thus, the final redactor wished to support the oral traditions in the Didache with the authority carried by a (by then recognized) gospel text.

Hence, the usage in 8.2 that introduces the Lord's prayer need not refer to a gospel text. Indeed, as Koester points out, the past tense of the verb (ὡς ἐκέλευσεν ὁ κύριος) makes it highly unlikely that this refers to a written gospel (not to mention the fact that this prayer would

---

[104]See K. Niederwimmer, *Die Didache* (KEK, KAV 1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1988) 168-69. Koester states that "there is no external evidence which would force a date of the final composition of the *Didache* before the end of the 2nd century . . ." H. Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, 17, n. 2.

certainly be commonly memorized among Christians of the time).[105]

What is more, the rather distant affinity between the exhortations (on the treatment of apostles and prophets) and Matthean sayings after the 11.3 εὐαγγέλιον passage (11.3-12) presents a strong case for early contact with oral traditions which were later incorporated into written gospel texts (and given their authority by the later redactor: "do the following according to the rule of the gospel" [κατὰ τὸ δόγμα τοῦ εὐαγγελίου οὕτω ποιήσατε] 11.3). Likewise, it seems most probable that the references to τὸ εὐαγγέλιον in chapter 15 stem from the late redaction.[106] Lastly, all of this is further confirmed by presence of the disparate collection of teachings in 1.3-6.

As for the content of this εὐαγγέλιον in the Didache, the above approach makes this question less crucial for my present study. What is clear, however, is the fact that the passion and resurrection of Jesus are never mentioned in the Didache. Thus, no matter the origin of the usage of the word in the Didache, the content the εὐαγγέλιον as presented

---

[105]Ibid., 16. Jefford states that because of the prayer's stylized and relatively fixed form, "one can hardly determine the source behind the Didache's versions of the 'Lord's Prayer.'" C. N. Jefford, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* (Leiden: Brill, 1989) 138.

[106]For Jefford the last redaction of the Didache occured as early as soon after the final version of Matthew. Ibid., 145. It seems a date after 150, however, would best fit the idea of a gospel as an authoritative text.

there is composed of teachings of "the Lord." This fact alone argues strongly for the use of εὐαγγέλιον in the Didache as a later addition; for, even in the foregoing survey, we have seen the close connection between the passion and resurrection of Jesus with the earliest articulations of the gospel message.

E. SUMMARY: THE GOSPEL OF IGNATIUS AMONG THE GOSPELS

Having highlighted the content of Ignatius' gospel and surveyed the idea of τὸ εὐαγγέλιον in the broader world of early Christianity, it is now valuable to draw conclusions with respect to Ignatius' gospel within its early Christian matrix. At this point in this study these conclusions are meant not only to collate information gained so far, but they also serve to introduce a closer treatment of many of the same issues in the following chapters. In this sense, therefore, these conclusions are preliminary.

In general, the most obvious common ground in virtually all of the documents we have considered is the preached nature of the εὐαγγέλιον. This quality is most dominant in the Pauline corpus. We find the same quality (albeit in various contexts) in the Synoptic Gospels, especially strong in Acts, and the remainder of the NT. Finally, in the Apostolic Fathers, the oral nature is also dominant: it is not until the later redactions in the Apostolic Fathers (ie., the Didache) that we begin to see the idea of a gospel

text. Ignatius' gospel is no exception in this emphasis on oral, preached message.

This oral, preached characteristic means that expressions of the gospel message encompasses various nuances with particular motifs and themes being emphasized or not depending on the author's purpose. The clearest example of this is seen in the variations of the two Pauline statements of Rom 1:2-4 and 1 Cor 15:1-5.

Yet, the presumably formulaic nature of those Pauline texts—not to mention formulae and schemata we have seen elsewhere—at the same time strongly suggests a tendency to fix the message. This tendency is evident in Ignatius. Even through our initial approach to the Ignatian εὐαγγέλιον, we have observed that while for the bishop the εὐαγγέλιον appears to be an oral message, the specific motifs that make up that message seem to be more invariable than in Paul: Ignatius' εὐαγγέλιον is specifically defined by the salvific παθός and ἀνάστασις of Jesus. For Ignatius, Jesus is the content of the εὐαγγέλιον: Jesus' salvific passion and resurrection (along with his coming/manifestation) are the furthest outlines of that content. Hence, what I have referred to as "traditional" or "pre-formed" material in the Ignatian letters appears to have been more directly subordinated to Ignatius' central message of the παθός and ἀνάστασις. As we will observe more fully in the following chapters, Ignatius structures the material he has received

to serve his often polemical purpose, as well as to serve his idea of the εὐαγγέλιον.

Thus, we can say that in general Ignatius' idea of the gospel is most like Paul in that the εὐαγγέλιον is preached. Paul's basic message of the salvation through the events of Jesus' life is the same as well; but for Ignatius those events are more starkly distinct. We will continue to observe, however, that Ignatius' strongest affinity (linked to the εὐαγγέλιον or not) with Paul is rhetorical. By rhetorical I refer to Pauline expressions and occasional all-but-direct quotations which are a feature in the Ignatian corpus (e.g., *Eph.* 18.1 [cf., 1 Cor 1:19-23]).

With respect to the idea of τὸ εὐαγγέλιον in the Synoptic tradition, we are confronted with the uniqueness of each of the three (or four, to include Acts) documents. We have seen how, even though Mark is in clear continuity with Paul's concept of the εὐαγγέλιον as centered on Jesus and the salvific events of his death and resurrection, Mark's idea of the εὐαγγέλιον is broadened to include the events of the narrative that encompasses the message by and about Jesus.

The situation with Matthew is more pressing because of the often discussed Matthean-sounding passages in Ignatius (e.g., *Eph.* 14.2 [Matt 12:33], *Smyrn.* 1.1 [Matt 3:15], *Pol.* 2.2 [Matt 10:16]). While it is probable that Ignatius is dependent on written (or oral) Matthean traditions (especially with respect to the Matthew-like Jesus logia),

it is just as clear that Ignatius does not consider this presumed source as, in any way, gospel. Moreover, while the salvific suffering, death and resurrection of Jesus are portrayed in Matthew's Gospel, the idea of the Matthean εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας more specifically includes the teachings of Jesus. In this, Matthew's idea of the εὐαγγέλιον is in clear distinction from that of Ignatius. Indeed, as we will observe, even though Ignatius presents Jesus as the "only teacher" (*Magn.* 9.1; cf., Matt 23:8) he does not provide any teachings that are linked with Jesus (much less the εὐαγγέλιον). Again, the strongest connection between the Matthean and Ignatian ideas of gospel is that both see it as a preached message of salvation.

Turning to Luke-Acts, we find the same preached characteristic, especially in Acts. There are as well links with Ignatian motifs and themes in the kerygmatic outlines embedded in the the speeches of Acts; these, however, are primarily the death/resurrection motifs that are common in most of our documents. More than this, we cannot draw other clear affinities between the Lukan and Ignatian concepts of the εὐαγγέλιον.

In the deutero-Pauline letters (Ephesians, Colossians, 2 Thessalonians, 1 and 2 Timothy), perhaps because of their ultimate connection with Paul, we begin once more to find Ignatian εὐαγγέλιον themes. While the salvific suffering/ death/resurrection sequence of motifs is often not

explicitly present in these letters, the complex of surrounding themes at least suggest these motifs. So, for example, in Colossians we find such Ignatian themes as hope centered on the εὐαγγέλιον (1:5, 1:23; cf., *Eph.* 21.2, *Magn.* 11.1, *Phld.* 5.2, etc.); we see as well the attending themes of obedience to the εὐαγγέλιον (2 Thess 1.8; cf., 1 Pet 4:17, *Magn.* 8.2), suffering for the gospel (2 Tim 1:9, 2:8-9; cf., Mark 8:35, 10:29, *Eph.* insc, *Magn.* 5.2, 9.2, *Smyrn.* 5.1). Again, to reiterate, in all of these documents, we have noted the oral, preached nature of the εὐαγγέλιον.

With the Apostolic Fathers we have encountered further shifts in the idea of τὸ εὐαγγέλιον. Aside from observing the presence of a preached gospel, we gained little additional insight from considering *1 Clement*. *Barnabas*, on the other hand, presents a more nuanced idea of the preached εὐαγγέλιον. That gospel encompasses not only the salvific suffering/death/resurrection sequence, but it also includes —like Matthew—the teachings of Jesus (not to mention the manifestation schema which I will highlight below). Finally, the *Didache*, in its present state, exhibits the first indications we have encountered of a gospel *text* invested with normative authority. It is notable, as well, that the Didache does not mention the suffering/death/resurrection of Jesus.

Taking into consideration all the documents we have discussed, there are several other contact points with

Ignatius which need to be recapitulated here. First, we have occasionally noticed the theme of the lineage of David linked with the εὐαγγέλιον (Rom 1:3, 2 Tim 2:8; cf., *Eph.* 18.2, 20.2, *Trall.* 9.1, *Rom.* 7.3, *Smyrn.* 1.1). Not only is this a Christological theme, but the mention of David, as well as other historical personages (Mary: *Eph.* 7.2, 18.2, *Magn.* 11.1, *Trall.* 9.1; Pilate: *Magn.* 11; and Herod: *Smyrn.* 1.2), serves to confirm the reality of the salvation events. It is clear that for Ignatius the figures of the OT Prophets serve the same function (*Magn.* 8.2, 9.3, *Phld.* 5.2, 9.1-2, *Smyrn.* 7.2; cf., *Barn.* 5.6-7).

A second and more important contact point is the often expressed complex of themes that surround the motif of Jesus' manifestation in the world. We have seen that the παρουσία is a motif of the Ignatian εὐαγγέλιον (*Phld.* 9.2) and how this motif has different facets for Ignatius (πάρειμι: *Magn.* 9.2; φαίνω: *Magn.* 6.1; φανερόω: *Eph.* 19.2-3; γέννησις: *Magn.* 11.1). We have found this revelation schema with various nuances often connected with the εὐαγγέλιον, or at least with its motifs (Rom 16:25-26; Eph 3:5, 9-10; 2 Tim 1:9b-10; Col 1:26; 1 Pet 1:20; *2 Clem.* 14.2, *Barn.* 5.6-7).

Third, I have highlighted various terms and phrases which serve as "intramural abbreviations." We have seen how Paul's uses of τὸ εὐαγγέλιον itself, along with τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ and τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ, are abbreviations of the full message for those within the circle of Paul's influence. So

too, we have Matthew's τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας and Luke's τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ, both of which function in the same manner. As we move into a closer examination of the Ignatian gospel environment, we will observe the same sort of in-house language to refer to the gospel.

As I have stated, these concluding paragraphs introduce the following chapters. We are now equiped to return specifically to Ignatius' εὐαγγέλιον and examine its internal environment and, eventually, its function in Ignatius' theological world view.

CHAPTER III

THE ENVIRONMENT OF THE IGNATIAN GOSPEL

We have established the lineaments of the gospel of Ignatius and have placed it within its historical context. Even with the relatively few occurrences of the word in the seven letters, it is evident that the εὐαγγέλιον for Ignatius is not identified with written texts. Hence, as we have seen, it appears to be a preached gospel.[1] With this statement before us, it is now necessary to push a bit further and explore the broader environment that frames the Ignatian idea of gospel and its transmission within the seven letter corpus.

Thus, in the pages to follow, I will treat the Ignatian preached gospel by paying particular attention to the situation or environment within which the gospel is expressed in Ignatius' letters. First I will examine the Ignatian verbs of gospel transmission as well as acceptance; next, I will turn to specific phrases and expressions which

---

[1]As we have seen, this is Koester's position; Koester indeed holds that while Ignatius knew of synoptic material through an older "free tradition," the Ignatian gospel is entirely oral. As I suggested in the preceding conclusions, it seems reasonable that Ignatius does know Matthean traditions, but does not give them the authority he gives the preached tradition; in short, he does not call them "τὸ εὐαγγέλιον." Koester, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 6-12, 60; Idem, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, 7-8; cf., most recently, Gundry, "ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ," 324-325.

give evidence as to how Ignatius presumes the history and teachings of Jesus are disseminated. My goal is to gain a clearer sense of the environment in which the Ignatian gospel is transmitted. This environment will tell us much about the contours of the Jesus traditions Ignatius is invoking as τὸ εὐαγγέλιον.

A. VERBS OF TRANSMISSION AND ACCEPTANCE

One of the consistent characteristics that emerges from the Ignatian passages centered on εὐαγγέλιον is the orality—implied or expressed—of the gospel message. It is a preached gospel. In recognizing this, what is immediately striking is the fact that, while Ignatius appears to distance himself from written texts (thus suggesting an oral context), he never uses one of the verbs of oral proclamation, εὐαγγελίζεσθαι, that is such a strong feature in the earliest expressions of gospel activity, i.e., the Pauline tradition.[2] It is appropriate at this point,

---

[2]Thus far in this study we have observed the close affinity that Ignatius has with Paul. In the genuine letters, Paul uses the verb εὐαγγελίζεσθαι some nineteen times. While often having a more generic sense of "to inform," or to pass on information (as in 1 Thess 3:6), εὐαγγελίζεσθαι is also used by Paul in the precise sense of preaching the gospel (as in *Rom.* 1:15, 15:20; 1 Cor 1:17; 2 Cor 10:16; Gal. 1:8-9). What is more, in two instances, for emphasis, Paul links the action with the content in the phrase εὐαγγελίζεσθαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον (1 Cor 15:1; 2 Cor 11:7). See H. Friedrich, "εὐαγγελίζομαι, κ.τ.λ." *TDNT* II (1964) 707-737; on εὐαγγελίζεσθαι specifically, ibid. 720.

therefore, to pay attention to Ignatian verbs of proclamation, commitment, or preaching.[3]

As we have seen, the εὐαγγέλιον is for Ignatius intimately linked with the Prophets of the OT. In all of the eight instances treated above, only the engaging passage in *Phld.* 8.2 does not explicitly mention the Prophets.[4] Moreover, in two of these instances, our eye is drawn to the verb which describes the prophetic action in relation to the gospel of Jesus. We have already seen as well that in *Phld.* 5.2 Ignatius states that the Prophets are held in esteem because they announced (καταγγέλλω) and hoped in the gospel of Jesus. Then, in *Phld.* 9.2., the Prophets made an announcement (καταγγέλλω) with Jesus in view. Καταγγέλλω for Ignatius thus refers to both a thing (the εὐαγγέλιον in 5.2) and a person (Jesus in 9.2); both referents are ultimately the same.

We see the same sort of usage in 1 Cor 2:1 in which Paul speaks about the way he came among the Corinthians

---

[3]Again, it is striking that Ignatius uses a NT term for preaching, κηρύσσω, only once, in *Phld.* 7.2. Referring to the action of the Spirit in his own ministry Ignatius states, "but the spirit was preaching and saying this . . . (τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ἐκήρυσσεν λέγον τάδε)." This passage will be important to my discussion of Ignatius' own ministry to the gospel.

Moreover, Ignatius' use of μαρτυρέω (*Eph.* 12.2; *Trall.* 12.3; *Phld.* 5.2, 6.3, 7.2, 11.1) has certainly not yet modulated into "martyr." See H. F. von Campenhausen, *Die Idee des Martyriums in der alten Kirche* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964) 68, 74; Strathmann, "μάρτυς κ.τ.λ." *TDNT*, IV 504-508.

[4]This is clear when one considers *Phld.* 5.1-2 and *Phld.* 9.2a-b as sense units. As for *Phld.* 8.2, the prophets are included in the written archives, the scripture.

"announcing to you the mystery of God (καταγγέλλων ὑμῖν τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ θεοῦ);" this mystery is "Jesus Christ, and him crucified" (2:2). We see as well the usage in 1 Cor 9:14: Paul is referring to a Jesus logion about those who proclaim (καταγγέλλω) the gospel should make their living by the gospel. Yet in 9:16, Paul speaks of himself as preaching the gospel by using εὐαγγελίζωμαι rather than καταγγέλλω. It seems safe to say that for Paul—whose Corinthian correspondence has greatly influenced Ignatius—the two words overlap.

Thus, for Ignatius, the OT Prophets announced the εὐαγγέλιον in the past. But, as I have suggested, Ignatius' view of the εὐαγγέλιον includes the present church. My next step, then, is to examine the transmission of the εὐαγγέλιον in the Ignatian corpus. In short, my question is: how does Ignatius speak of gospel announcing and commitment by Christians within his circle of influence?

At first glance, it seems that paying attention to the use of πιστεύω ("believe") would provide insight into Ignatius' gospel.[5] Yet, one quickly discovers that the Ignatian use of πιστεύω is so diffuse that few specifics can be observed with respect to its object and the εὐαγγέλιον. We have, though, the formula in *Trall.* 2.1b, "that by believing in his death, you might escape death (ἵνα πιστεύσαντες εἰς τὸν

---

[5]*Magn.* 6.1, 10.3; *Trall.* 2.1, 9.2; *Rom.* 8.2, 10.2; *Phld.* 5.2, 8.1-2, 9.1-2; *Smyrn.* 3.1-2, 6.1; *Pol.* 7.3.

θάνατον αὐτοῦ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν ἐκφύγητε)." This statement—which describes the passion of Jesus as salvific (as in *Rom.* 6.1, *Smyrn.* 2, *Pol.* 3.2)—is presented as the consequence of "living not according to humanity but according to Jesus Christ, who died for our sake (οὐ κατὰ ἄνθρωπον ζῶντες, ἀλλὰ κατὰ Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς ἀποθανόντα)" (*Trall.* 2.1a).[6] Aside from *Trall.* 2.1, Ignatius states, "I believe in the grace of Jesus Christ (πιστεύω τῇ χάριτι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ)" (*Phld.* 8.1).[7] Finally, we have two uses of πιστεύω in the vicinity of important expressions of gospel content, *Trall.* 9.2 and *Phld.* 9.2. These, however, are generalized comments on faith with no specific content.

Somewhat more valuable for our purposes is the exhortation found in *Eph.* 14.2:

> οὐδεὶς πίστιν ἐπαγγελλόμενος ἁμαρτάνει, οὐδὲ ἀγάπην κεκτημένος μισεῖ. φανερὸν τὸ δένδρον ἀπὸ τοῦ καρποῦ αὐτοῦ. οὕτως οἱ ἐπαγγελλόμενοι Χριστοῦ εἶναι δι' ὧν πράσσουσιν ὀφθήσονται. οὐ γὰρ νῦν ἐπαγγελίας τὸ ἔργον, ἀλλ' ἐν δυνάμει πίστεως ἐάν τις εὑρεθῇ εἰς τέλος.
>
> No one who professes faith, sins; nor does the one who has obtained love, hate. The tree is known by its fruits; so, those who profess to be of Christ will be seen through their deeds. For the deed is not in

---

[6]These descriptions of the salvation brought by Jesus' suffering δι' ἡμᾶς will be treated further along, in Part Two.

Another feature in Ignatius' gospel rehtoric is "ζάω κατὰ . . . " phrases. These will figure in my discussion of the εὐαγγέλιον and its opponents.

[7]As we have already seen, πιστεύω in *Phld.* 8.1 does not have the εὐαγγέλιον as its object; rather, it is the *inclusion* in the archives or gospel of the unnamed subject of controversy that is the object of πιστεύω.

> professing only now, but being found in the power of faith to the end.

This passage is centered on the word ἐπαγγέλλομαι ("profess") and is a continuation of 14.1 in which Ignatius is exhorting the Ephesians to have "perfect faith towards Jesus Christ (ἐὰν τελείως εἰς Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἔχητε τὴν πίστιν)." With the object of ἐπαγγέλλομαι as "faith" or "being of Christ", the point of the argument here is to link an oral faith commitment with actions which are the fruit of that profession. The faith profession is only genuine if it lasts "to the end." Yet, this is not announcing or preaching *per se*; it is, rather, a personal faith commitment. We see only a suggestion of specifically gospel commitment in this profession.[8]

The most we may say here is to point out that the faith profession is clearly not simply a statement of belief; rather it involves a perservering way of life that has faith in the salvation by Jesus as its center. In this sense, the profession is centered on the gospel; the gospel is announced through the actions of believers.

While there is only a suggestion of gospel commitment connected with πιστεύω and ἐπαγγέλλομαι, gospel motifs are

---

[8]Still, in *Phld.* 5.2 the OT Prophets, who announced the εὐαγγέλιον in advance, are hoping and waiting for Christ "in whom by faith they also obtain salvation, being in union with Jesus Christ (ἐν ᾧ καὶ πιστεύσαντες ἐσώθησαν, ἐν ἑνότητι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ὄντες)." Thus, we see the same themes of "faith" and "being of Christ" at work. On an other level, it is noteworthy that the only other use of ἐπαγγέλλομαι in the sense of "to profess" in early Christianity occurs in 1 Tim 2.10 in which women who profess reverence for God (ἐπαγγελλομέναις θεοσέβειαν) are to put that reverence into good deeds (δι' ἔργων ἀγαθῶν).

clearly connected with the Ignatian use of πληροφορέω ("fully convince").[9] In *Magn.* 8.2 we see a lesser connection: the prophets are inspired by Jesus' grace "that the disobedient might be fully convinced that there is one God who manifested himself through Jesus Christ, his son (εἰς τὸ πληροφορηθῆναι τοὺς ἀπειθοῦντας, ὅτι εἷς θεός ἐστιν, ὁ φανερώσας ἑαυτὸν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ)." As we have observed above, this statement is a repetition not only of the particular term found in *Eph.* 19.3 ("God was manifested as human [...θεοῦ ἀνθρωπίνως φανερουμένου...]"), but it also is a different formulation of a gospel motif, the παρουσία of Jesus which we saw the prophets announcing in *Phld.* 9.2. It follows, as well, that Ignatius has in mind the same prophetic announcing of the εὐαγγέλιον in *Phld.* 5.2.

In *Magn.* 11.1, however, the link between πληροφορέω and the εὐαγγέλιον is clear. Using the perfect passive infinitive, Ignatius exhorts the Magnesians "to be fully convinced of the birth and passion and resurrection which took place at the time of the procuratorship of Pontius Pilate (πεπληροφορῆσθαι ἐν τῇ γεννήσει καὶ τῷ πάθει καὶ τῇ ἀναστάσει τῇ γενομένῃ ἐν καιρῷ τῆς ἡγεμονίας Ποντίου Πιλάτου)." Here we have, with little elaboration, the three events that are a summary of the Ignatian εὐαγγέλιον. The motif of the παρουσία is presented under the guise of the γέννησις of Jesus. Ignatius

---

[9]*Magn.* 8.2, 11.1; *Phld.* insc.; *Smyrn.* 1.1.

is thus presenting the gospel in response to what he calls "vain teaching (κενοδοξία)"; and to strengthen his argument, he presents an historical figure as the context for the gospel events. So, in the following phrase he—using typical Ignatian terminology[10]—is able to name the events as "truly and certainly done by Jesus Christ, our hope (πραχθέντα ἀληθῶς καὶ βεβαίως ὑπὸ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τῆς ἐλπίδος ἡμῶν)."

Πληροφορέω functions in the same way in *Smyrn.* 1.1. Here it is used to introduce another, more elaborate Christological summary of faith that has gospel motifs at its core. In a vivid phrase, Ignatius recognizes that the Smyrnaeans have an "immovable faith as if nailed on the cross of the lord Jesus Christ (ἐν ἀκινήτῳ πίστει, ὥσπερ καθηλωμένους ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ)"; they are fully "convinced as to our Lord (that he is) truly of the family of David according to the flesh. . . (πεπληροφορημένους εἰς τὸν κυριον ἡμῶν, ἀληθῶς ὄντα ἐκ γένους Δαυεὶδ κατὰ σάρκα . . .)."[11] Then follows the belief summary, punctuated throughout with the adverb ἀληθῶς, in which Ignatius develops the core gospel motifs of advent, passion, resurrection into a full faith statement. We will have occasion to return to this important text (as well as to those above); here I simply

---

[10]As we have seen Ignatius consistently emphasizes the reality of the Jesus events with the word ἀληθῶς (*Eph.* 17.2; *Trall.* 9.1 [three times], 9.2; *Rom.* 8.2; *Smyrn.* 1.1 [bis], 1.2, 2.1 [bis]).

[11]Translation, Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 220.

wish to highlight the commitment to the εὐαγγέλιον that is signified by Ignatius' use of πληροφορέω in these passages.

There is one remaining Ignatian use of πληροφορέω to consider. In the inscription of the Philadelphian letter, Ignatius addresses the church as

> . . . ἡδρασμένῃ ἐν ὁμονοίᾳ θεοῦ καὶ ἀγαλλιωμένῃ ἐν τῷ πάθει τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν ἀδιακρίτως καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει αὐτοῦ πεπληροφορημένῃ ἐν παντὶ ἐλέει.
>
> . . . established in harmony of God, and rejoicing in the passion of our lord without wavering, and is fully convinced in the resurrection in all mercy.

Again, we see the familiar pivotal gospel events of passion and resurrection (here without the παρουσία). Especially noteworthy, however, is the affinity between this statement and *1 Clem.* 42.3, a passage which presents the Apostles as foundation for church organization. *1 Clement* 42 begins with a reference to the Apostles having received the gospel message from Jesus for the church (42.1); they were "fully convinced through the resurrection of our lord Jesus Christ (πληροφορηθέντες διὰ τῆς ἀναστάσεως τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ)" and went forth preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God (42.3). The conviction arising from witnessing the resurrection of Jesus is the impetus for the apostles' preaching. This affinity is not grammatically exact, and there is no direct link between Ignatius and Clement; yet, on the strength of these two citations it seems valid to suggest that 'being convinced' of the Jesus events,

especially the resurrection, is a formula that expresses a foundational experience in the faith commitment of Christians at the turn of the second century.[12]

We may return, as well, to Ignatius' use of ὁμολογέω ("confess"). Of the three Ignatian usages of ὁμολογέω (*Magn.* 8.1; *Smyrn.* 5.2, 7.1) two have as their object some reference to the content of faith and appear "to have a more technical significance."[13] In *Smyrn.* 5.2 Ignatius states that his opponents are praising him while they "blaspheme my Lord by not confessing him as bearing flesh (τὸν δὲ κύριόν μου βλασφημεῖ, μὴ ὁμολογῶν αὐτὸν σαρκοφόρον) .[14] What is especially noteworthy here is the close proximity of this ὁμολογέω passage with the εὐαγγέλιον in 5.1: the schismatics are not persuaded by the gospel. Moreover, in *Smyrn.* 5.3 the denial of Jesus as bearing flesh is only remedied through

---

[12]There is, however, limited NT use of πληροφορέω in the sense of 'fully convince.' Out of the NT occurrences (Luke 1:1; Rom 4:21, 14:5; Col 4:12; 2 Tim 4:5, 4:17) the clearest example is found in Rom 4:21 where Paul presents Abraham's faith as a model. Abraham is "fully convinced that God was able to do what he had promised (πληροφορηθεὶς ὅτι ὃ ἐπήγγελται δυνατός ἐστιν καὶ ποιῆσαι)." Otherwise, the use in Col 4:12 ("that you may stand mature and fully assured in everything that God wills [καὶ πεπληροφορημένοι ἐν παντὶ θελήματι τοῦ θεοῦ]") is the only NT usage close in meaning to Ignatius. G. Delling "πλήρη κ.τ.λ." *TDNT* IV, 309-311.

[13]Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 240, n 8. Neufeld, *Earliest Christian Confessions*, 32, 84, 144.

[14]Here one is reminded of 1 John 4:2-3 : πᾶν πνεῦμα ὃ ὁμολογεῖ Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθότα ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστιν, καὶ πᾶν πνεῦμα ὃ μὴ ὁμολογεῖ τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐκ ἔστιν. There is, however, no other indication that Ignatius is working from 1 John. The affinity is evidence, rather, of a relatively widespread docetic tendency in many early Christologies. See O. Cullmann, *Christ and Time*, F. Filson, trans. (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1964) 125-130 and J. G. Davies, "The Origins of Docetism," pages 13-35 in *Studia Patristica VI* (TU 81; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1962).

repentance "concerning the passion, which is our resurrection." So, bracketing and informing the confessing passage of *Smyrn.* 5.2 we have not only an explicit mention of the εὐαγγέλιον, but also fragments of what Ignatius elsewhere names as the content of the εὐαγγέλιον. By not confessing Jesus bearing flesh, the schismatics fail in confessing the gospel.

In *Smyrn.* 7.1 both the opponents and the object are the same as they are in *Smyrn.* 5.2:

> Εὐχαριστίας καὶ προσευχῆς ἀπέχονται, διὰ τὸ μὴ ὁμολογεῖν τὴν εὐχαριστίαν σάρκα εἶναι τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησους Χριστοῦ τὴν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν παθοῦσαν, ἣν τῇ χρηστότητι ὁ πατὴρ ἤγειρεν.
>
> They avoid the eucharist and prayer, because they do not confess that the eucharist is the flesh of our savior Jesus Christ which suffered for our sins, [flesh] which the Father raised by his goodness.

As we have seen in *Phld.* 5.1-2, the eucharistic flesh of Jesus is linked with the saving events of the gospel. The schismatics who deny flesh to the historical Jesus (in 5.2) fail to confess as well the flesh of Jesus in the present. Thus, they are failing to confess the gospel past and present.

Therefore, while we are unable to state that καταγγέλλω, ἐπαγγέλλομαι, ὁμολογέω and πληροφορέω each have a single theologically precise sense for Ignatius,[15] we may safely conclude that these verbs refer in general to behavior

---

[15]The possible exception is ὁμολογέω. See Neufeld, 13-33.

directly related to the εὐαγγέλιον and the motifs surrounding it. This conclusion is obvious. However, the fact that these three verbs refer to activity that is by nature oral has much to do with the environment of the Ignatian gospel witness that I am highlighting.

Also, at this point it should be clear from this study that the εὐαγγέλιον is a central feature of Ignatius' understanding of the Jesus traditions as a whole. This being said, as I continue this study, it is well to keep in mind that a large percentage of the Jesus traditions in the letters of Ignatius lies outside of the lineaments so far presented as the center of the εὐαγγέλιον.[16] The interplay in the letters between the specific Ignatian gospel motifs we have so far discussed, and the broader complex of themes which appeal to traditions about Jesus will become increasingly important as I proceed.

B. ΛΑΛΕΙΝ ΙΗΣΟΥΝ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΝ

Still, while it is evident that Ignatius' use of καταγγέλλω, ἐπαγγέλλομαι, ὁμολογέω and πληροφορέω has the εὐαγγέλιον as its reference (albeit, at times, general), there is yet another verbal clue in the seven letters. This construction is a specific Ignatian use of λαλέω: λαλεῖν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν.

---

[16]V. Corwin lists some sixty instances in which Ignatius seems to be having recourse to traditions about the historical Jesus (*St. Ignatius and Christianity in Antioch* [New Haven: Yale University, 1960] 94-95).

Because of its centrality to this study, it is necessary to pause here and ground my analysis within the extra-Ignatian usages of this word. Λαλέω is, after all, a very common word in Greek literature. In what follows, I will pay attention to several examples of uses of the word and its equivalents in earliest Christianity that mirror the usage in Ignatius. My purpose is simply to highlight similar usages that, taken as a whole, suggest a connotative meaning for the Ignatian texts.

The basic denotation of λαλέω in classical Greek ranges from the neutral "talk" or "speak" to the more frivolous "chatter." There is no indication of a more formal or technical usage.[17]

Yet, as I have suggested, it is not so much the meaning of the word that first draws our attention; we are drawn, rather, to the structure of the λαλέω phrase. The most striking Ignatian usage is the verb λαλέω with what may be referred to as an accusative of a person (i.e., a person, often named, is the direct object of the action). In the case of speaking or proclaiming verbs with the accusative of a person, the individual referred to is the object (the *content*) of the speaking or proclaiming. This construction is found in two of the five Ignatian occurrences of λαλέω

---

[17]H. G. Liddell, R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1968) 1025-1026. Cf., BAGD, 463-464; G. W. H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1961) 790-791.

that refer to Jesus (*Magn.* 10.3, *Rom.* 7.1). Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν is the object.

Elsewhere in formative Christian documents, we find the accusative of a person as the object of various verbs having meanings similar or equivalent to λαλέω. In Gal 1:16, for example, Paul speaks of God's revelation of the Son to him "so that I might preach him among the Gentiles" (ἵνα εὐαγγελίζωμαι αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν). Continuing with Paul, we read in Phil 1:14-18 that there are some who preach Christ out of goodwill (δι' εὐδοκίαν τὸν Χριστὸν κηρύσσουσιν), while others do so out of rivalry (ἐξ ἐριθείας τὸν Χριστὸν καταγγέλλουσιν).[18] Finally, in 2 Cor 4:5, Paul states, "we do not preach ourselves but Jesus Christ the lord (οὐ γὰρ ἑαυτοὺς κηρύσσομεν ἀλλὰ Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν κύριον)."

This construction, a proclamation verb with accusative of a person, is a feature in Acts as well, usually involving the verb εὐαγγελίζεσθαι. In Acts 5:42, within one of the summary statements describing the ministry of the Apostles, we read they were found in the temple and in homes "teaching and preaching Christ Jesus without cease (οὐκ ἐπαύοντο διδάσκοντες καὶ εὐαγγελιζόμενοι τὸν Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν)." In Acts 11:20,

---

[18]I will soon return to this Philippians pericope; it is clear, even from these two citations (where we find both καταγγέλλω and κηρύσσω), that Paul is using various words to describe essentially the same action. As we shall see, included in this complex of preaching terminology is λαλέω (τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ λαλεῖν Phil 1:14). Phil 1:17, by the way, is the only NT usage of καταγγέλλω with an accusative of a person.

we have the same action, this time "preaching the lord Jesus (εὐαγγελιζόμενοι τὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν)" to the Greeks.

We also find κηρύσσω with our construction in Acts: after the Damascus experience Paul "preached Jesus in the synagogues (ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς ἐκήρυσσεν τὸν Ἰησοῦν)" (Acts 9:20); in Acts 15:21 it is Moses who has been preached in the synagogues (Μωϋσῆς γὰρ ἐκ γενεῶν ἀρχαίων κατὰ πόλιν τοὺς κηρύσσοντας αὐτὸν ἔχει ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς κατὰ πᾶν σάββατον ἀναγινωσκόμενος).[19]

Therefore, with these several examples, we have convincing indication of the connotation attached to the proclaiming verb with accusative of a person construction in early Christianity. The verb varies, as does the form of the object, but the meaning remains "preach" or "proclaim Jesus Christ."

Having so considered the structure of our phrase, it is now necessary to focus on the meaning of λαλέω itself. Once again Phil 1:14-18 is instructive. Paul has been speaking in 1:12 of his trials and how they have helped him "spread the gospel (εἰς προκοπὴν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου)." He then describes how his imprisonment made others "dare to proclaim the word with greater boldness and without fear (περισσοτέρως τολμᾶν ἀφόβως τὸν λόγον λαλεῖν)" (1:14).[20] He goes on:

---

[19]Contrary to my general position with respect to Ignatius and the oral gospel, it is important to point out that this proclaiming Moses is clearly the result of *reading* (ἀναγινώσκω) the Hebrew scriptures out loud. Hence, here we have a strong link between a text and a proclamation.

[20]The NRSV has "dare to speak the word . . ."

> τινὲς μὲν καὶ διὰ φθόνον καὶ ἔριν, τινὲς δὲ καὶ δι' εὐδοκίαν τὸν Χριστὸν κηρύσσουσιν· οἱ μὲν ἐξ ἀγάπης, εἰδότες ὅτι εἰς ἀπολογίαν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου κεῖμαι, οἱ δὲ ἐξ ἐριθείας τὸν Χριστὸν καταγγέλλουσιν, οὐχ ἁγνῶς, οἰόμενοι θλῖψιν ἐγείρειν τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου. τί γάρ; πλὴν ὅτι παντὶ τρόπῳ, εἴτε προφάσει εἴτε ἀληθείᾳ, Χριστὸς καταγγέλλεται, καὶ ἐν τούτῳ χαίρω.
>
> Some proclaim Christ from envy and rivalry, but others from goodwill. These proclaim Christ out of love, knowing that I have been put here for the defense of the gospel; the others proclaim Christ out of selfish ambition, not sincerely but intending to increase my suffering in my imprisonment. What does it matter? Just this, that Christ is proclaimed in every way, whether out of false motives or true; and in that I rejoice. (1:15-18)

In the space of these four verses, Paul uses three different verbs to designate the action in question. We have already seen his use of κηρύσσω (v. 15) and καταγγέλλω (v. 17, and, in a passive construction in v. 18). The other verb is λαλέω (v. 14).[21] It is safe to say that the ministry referred to in Phil 1:14-18 is governed by the first reference in v. 14: people have been enboldened by Paul's chains to preach the word without fear (ἀφόβως τὸν λόγον λαλεῖν[22]). The remaining references to preaching are descriptions, positive and negative, of motives behind the preaching. So, λαλεῖν τὸν

---

[21]A selection of recent English translations reveals the different ways translators have approached this situation: the NRSV has "speak" for λαλέω and "proclaim" for the other two verbs; the NAB (revised NT) has "proclaim" for all three verbs; and the NJB has "announce" for λαλέω, "preach" for κηρύσσω, and "proclaim" for καταγγέλλω.

[22]Important texts (for example, ℵ, A, B, P, Ψ) have added to τὸν λόγον, the genitive modifier τοῦ θεοῦ. While opting for the text without modifier, Metzger (*Textual Commentary*, 611-612) assigns this option a "D" degree of certainty.

λόγον is the same outward action as κηρύσσειν τὸν Χριστὸν and καταγγέλλειν τὸν Χριστὸν.

Paul's use of λαλέω thus ultimately refers to the ministry of proclaiming the gospel. This being said, it is also clear that often Paul uses λαλέω to refer to a specific sort of proclamation, a charismatic ministry. In this regard, we find his exposition in 1 Cor 14:1-40 on two types of spirit proclamation—to speak in tongues and to prophesy—and the role of each type within the Christian community. Both are from the Spirit of God (thus, 12:6-11); both are described with recourse to λαλέω:

> ὁ γὰρ λαλῶν γλώσσῃ οὐκ ἀνθρώποις λαλεῖ ἀλλὰ θεῷ· οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἀκούει, πνεύματι δὲ λαλεῖ μυστήρια· ὁ δὲ προφητεύων ἀνθρώποις λαλεῖ οἰκοδομὴν καὶ παράκλησιν καὶ παραμυθίαν. ὁ λαλῶν γλώσσῃ ἑαυτὸν οἰκοδομεῖ· ὁ δὲ προφητεύων ἐκκλησίαν οἰκοδομεῖ. θέλω δὲ πάντας ὑμᾶς λαλεῖν γλώσσαις, μᾶλλον δὲ ἵνα προφητεύητε·
>
> For those who speak in a tongue do not speak to other people but to God; for nobody understands them, since they are speaking mysteries in the Spirit. On the other hand, those who prophesy speak to other people for their upbuilding and encouragement and consolation. Those who speak in a tongue build up themselves, but those who prophesy build up the church. Now I would like all of you to speak in tongues, but even more to prophesy. (14:2-5a)

Thus, the speaking in tongues is not inarticulate babbling (as in the classical Greek sense of λαλέω); rather it is a specific gift of the Spirit to be interpreted for the church (12:10). It seems probable that Paul was the first to distinguish this phenomenon from other charismatic

occurrences.[23] Prophecy, on the other hand, is the greater gift because it builds up (οἰκοδομέω) the church (14:3).[24] Yet, both, as manifestations of the Spirit, are gifts from God for the common good (12:7).

Therefore, with these Philippians and Corinthians texts before us, we see that Paul's use of λαλέω involves not only the proclamation of the εὐαγγέλιον, but also the charismatic ministry that is among the gifts for the common good.

Paul is not alone in this particularly Christian use of λαλέω. We often find the same sort of charismatic or prophetic sense for λαλέω in Luke-Acts as well.[25] This is clearest in Acts. Thus, at Pentecost, "all of them were filled with the Holy Spirit and began to speak in other languages, as the Spirit gave them ability (καὶ ἐπλήσθησαν πάντες πνεύματος ἁγίου, καὶ ἤρξαντο λαλεῖν ἑτέραις γλώσσαις καθὼς τὸ πνεῦμα ἐδίδου ἀποφθέγγεσθαι αὐτοῖς)" (2:4). Peter's speech explains these astonishing events with a lengthly passage from the

---

[23]Aune, *Prophecy in Early Christianity*, 199; T. W. Gillespie, *The First Theologians: A Study in Early Christian Prophecy* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994) 139.

[24]For this 'building up the church' and its connection with the ministy of the εὐαγγέλιον in Paul see J. H. Schütz, *Paul and the Anatomy of Apostolic Authority* (London/New York: Cambridge University, 1975) 224-225.

[25]For a presentation of this Lukan use of λαλέω see H. Jaschke, "«λαλεῖν» bei Lukas: Ein Beitrag zur lukanischen Theologie," *BZ* 15 (1971) 109-114.

Before going any further, we must recognize (with Jaschke) the opening verses of Hebrews: "Long ago God spoke to our ancestors in many and various ways by the prophets, but in these last days he has spoken to us by the Son (πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως πάλαι ὁ θεὸς λαλήσας τοῖς πατράσιν ἐν τοῖς προφήταις ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων ἐλάλησεν ἡμῖν ἐν υἱῷ)" (Heb 1:1-2).

prophet Joel (2:17-21; cf., Joel 3:1-5): God says through the Prophet, " . . . I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh and your sons your daughters shall prophesy . . ." (2:17). This passage from Joel not only sets the context for the ministry of the Apostles throughout Acts, but it also introduces Peter's kerygmatic outline concerning Jesus' deeds, crucifixion and resurrection that immediately follows (2:22-24). The kerygma, in turn, is further confirmed by David ("since he was a prophet . . ." [2:30]), who foretold and "spoke of the resurrection of the Christ (ἐλάλησεν περὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως τοῦ Χριστοῦ)" (2:31). Just as God spoke in the Prophets (2:31, 3:21, 3:22, 28:25), the message is continued in the church by the Apostles through the Spirit (ie., 4:8, 18:9).[26]

We see this unfolded throughout Acts 4-16 where the ministry of the Apostles is described as λαλεῖν τὸν λόγον.[27] This phrase is technical language which refers to the ministry of preaching the Christian message.[28] What is more, in chapter 4 we find λαλεῖν τὸν λόγον to be clearly a charismatic ministry of preaching. In their united prayer (4:24-30), the Apostles refer of the guidance of the Holy Spirit in the past (v. 25) and ask for the same guidance (v.

---

[26]Ibid., 113.

[27]Acts 4:29, 31, 11:19, 13:46, 14:25, 16:32. Hence, Λαλεῖν τὸν λόγον functions as a Lukan abbreviation for preaching the message.

[28]H. Conzelmann, *Acts of the Apostles* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987) 35; Jaschke, 113; G. Kittle, "λέγω κ.τ.λ." *TDNT* IV, 114-119.

29). Verse 31b gives the answer to their prayer: "and they were all filled with the Holy Spirit and spoke the word with boldness (καὶ ἐπλήσθησαν ἅπαντες τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος καὶ ἐλάλουν τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ μετὰ παρρησίας)."[29]

I have emphasized both the 'proclaiming' as well as the charismatic character of λαλέω in the above discussion for a reason. As we shall soon see, not only does the phrase λαλεῖν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν in Ignatius refer to the proclamation of the εὐαγγέλιον, but it also suggests that Ignatius' own sense of the ministry to the εὐαγγέλιον has a definite charismatic character. While this usage is not the only indication of a charismatic ministry in Ignatius' letters, the above discussion of λαλέω provides a foundation for my eventual treatment of that Ignatian ministry.

With more confidence, therefore, we may now return to Ignatius. Of the fourteen times Ignatius uses λαλέω,[30] five of those refer directly to Jesus, in some form of λαλεῖν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν (*Eph.* 6.2, *Magn.* 10.3, *Trall.* 9.1, *Rom.* 7.1, *Phld.* 6.1).[31] This phrase carries a specific sense for

---

[29]The παρρησία ("boldness") of 4:29 and 4:31 puts one in mind of Paul's ἀφόβως τὸν λόγον λαλεῖν in Phil 1:14 that we noted above.

What is more, as in Ignatius (*Smyrn.* 1.2; cf., *Magn.* 11.1; *Trall.* 9.1), this prayer contains an historical reference to Herod and Pontius Pilate which locates the death of Jesus in time and place (v. 27).

[30]*Eph.* 6.2, 15.1, 15.2; *Magn.* 10.3; *Trall.* 9.1; *Rom.* 7.1, 7.2, 8.2; *Phld.* 1.1, 6.1, 6.3, 7.1; *Smyrn.* 7.2; *Pol.* 1.3. We also find the related προσλαλέω in *Eph.* 3.1; *Magn.* 1.3; and *Pol.* 5.1.

[31]Actually, as we have seen, the accusative Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν is found in two of the instances (*Magn.* 10.3, *Rom.* 7.1); the genitive Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is used with the preposition περὶ in *Eph.* 6.2 and *Phld.* 6.1, and with the adverb χωρίς as an improper preposition in *Trall.* 9.1. Thus we have

Ignatius: it is best translated in an Ignatian context as "to preach [or, "to proclaim"] Jesus Christ." As we have already seen, throughout the seven letters Ignatius is concerned with presenting the correct way to believe in Jesus. It is no surprise, then, to find that these λαλέω passages concerning Jesus have as their contexts polemical arguments against—what is for Ignatius—improper belief or action. In the following paragraphs I will highlight these passages and give particular attention to indications of an oral environment for Ignatius' ministry, as well as how this usage relates to the Ignatian εὐαγγέλιον.

1. EPHESIANS 6.2

Ironically, our first λαλέω passage opens with Ignatius addressing the *silence* of the bishop of the Ephesians: "And as much as anyone sees the bishop silent, all the more let that one fear him" (*Eph.* 6.1). The taciturn bishop Onesimus however has spoken to Ignatius (see *Eph.* 5.1) in praise of the Ephesians because, as Ignatius states,

> ὅτι πάντες κατὰ ἀλήθειαν ζῆτε καὶ ὅτι ἐν ὑμῖν οὐδεμία αἵρεσις κατοικεῖ· ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἀκούετέ τινος πλέον, ἢ περὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ λαλοῦντος ἐν ἀληθείᾳ.
>
> all of you [Ephesians] live according to truth and no error resides among you; for you do not listen to

---

"preach Jesus Christ," "preach about Jesus Christ," and "preach apart from Jesus Christ." I consider these to refer to essentially the same action (with the χωρίς phrase its negation).

> anyone except one who proclaims in truth about Jesus Christ. (*Eph.* 6.2)

From the context it is clear that there had actually been preaching of error (αἵρεσις) at Ephesus. Ignatius praises the Ephesians' "good orderliness in God (ἡ ἐν θεῷ εὐταξία)" which they have preserved by listening only to proper preaching. So, the ones "who are accustomed to carry around the name with wicked cunning (εἰώθασιν γάρ τινες δόλῳ πονηρῷ τὸ ὄνομα περιφέρειν)" (*Eph.* 7.1) are outside the boundaries of the orderly church and are ignored by the Ephesians.

Ultimately, this is a clash of proclamations. Ignatius is recognizing the validity only of those who preach the true facts concerning Jesus and is commending the Ephesians for doing the same. We may presume that by this speaking "in truth about Jesus Christ" Ignatius is referring to the content of the preached εὐαγγέλιον we have seen him express elsewhere. The other preaching may well be seductive in its cunning and even claim to be of Christ (i.e., "carry around the name"), but the Ephesians have not been taken in.

Still within the context of *Eph.* 6.2, in *Eph.* 7 2 Ignatius provides the response to carrying around the name falsely. Ignatius begins 7.2 with an epithet referring to Jesus: "There is one physician (εἷς ἰατρός ἐστιν)" and then presents a series of antithetical attributes of Jesus, earthly and risen, which summarize Ignatius' Christology:

> εἷς ἰατρός ἐστιν,
> σαρκικός τε καὶ πνευματικός,

γεννητὸς καὶ ἀγέννητος,
ἐν σαρκὶ γενόμενος θεός,
ἐν θανάτῳ ζωὴ ἀληθινή,
καὶ ἐκ Μαρίας καὶ ἐκ θεοῦ,
πρῶτον παθητὸς καὶ τότε ἀπαθής,
Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν.[32]

There is one physician,
both fleshly and spiritual
begotten and unbegotten,
come in flesh, God,
in death, true life,
both of Mary and of God,
first passible and then impassible,
Jesus Christ our lord.[33]

This passage is obviously part of the complex of Jesus traditions Ignatius has at hand. Moreover, it has been reasonably suggested that this is a hymn.[34]

Having recognized this, one is again confronted with the question behind my analysis thus far: how do the various expressions of Jesus traditions relate to the Ignatian εὐαγγέλιον? We can certainly view the series of epithets in *Eph.* 7.2 as an expanded version of the central gospel motifs we have already seen; indeed, those same motifs are invoked within the context of our next two λαλεῖν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν passages (*Magn.* 10.3-11.1, *Trall.* 9.1). Hence,

---

[32]There is a textual question with the third antithesis (ἐν σαρκὶ γενόμενος θεός) with some texts having ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ θεός in its stead. Lightfoot (*Apostolic Fathers*, 2.2, 49) accepts the ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ reading, while the ἐν σαρκὶ reading is commonly held now. For the textual background see A. Lindemann and H. Paulsen, eds., *Die Apostolischen Väter* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1992) 182, n. 84. Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 61.

[33]Translation, Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 59.

[34]Deichgräber, 155-156. Schoedel (Ibid., 61) suggests 1 Tim 3:16 has having "some formal and substantive similarity" to *Eph.* 7.2.

I suggest that this chain of epithets has at its heart the gospel of Ignatius.

2. MAGNESIANS 10.3

Turning, then, to the next usage of λαλέω, in *Magn.* 10.3 Ignatius states, "It is absurd to preach Jesus Christ and to judaize (ἄτοπόν ἐστιν, Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν λαλεῖν καὶ ἰουδαΐζειν)." Again, here with the opposing infinitives λαλεῖν καὶ ἰουδαΐζειν, we have the juxtaposition of proper preaching with improper belief (or, perhaps, preaching). Ignatius clinches his exposition on the relationship between Christianity and Judaism by stating that "every tongue believing in God was brought together (ᾧ πᾶσα γλῶσσα πιστεύσασα εἰς θεὸν συνήχθη)" in Christianity. This brings to mind the ἐυαγγέλιον passage in *Phld.* 9.1-2 which we have already examined: Jesus is the door to the father through which the universal gospel is accomplished.

Next, in *Magn.* 11, Ignatius continues these same themes and gives content to the above suggestion of oral profession: "be convinced of the birth and passion and resurrection which took place in the time of the leadership of Pontius Pilate (ἀλλὰ πεπληροφορῆσθαι ἐν τῇ γεννήσει καὶ τῷ πάθει καὶ τῇ ἀναστάσει τῇ γενομένῃ ἐν καιρῷ τῆς ἡγεμονίας Ποντίου Πιλάτου)" (11.1b). As noted before, this outline centered on Jesus presents at least the basic content of the gospel for Ignatius. It functions here in the same way we have already

seen the traditional material *Eph.* 7.2 function: it serves as a response to those who preach Jesus while judaizing and thus are "caught on the fishooks of vain opinion (κενοδοξία)." What is more, the invoking of particular Jesus events, the reference to the historical rule of Pilate, as well as Ignatius' emphatic "truly and certainly (ἀληθῶς καὶ βεβαίως)" (11.1c) all link this passage with other Christological outlines such as *Trall.* 9.1-2. As I have already suggested, these belief statements are evidence that Ignatius has access to a particular type of traditional material. It is necessary to recognize the direct link between the λαλεῖν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν statements, these Christological outlines or summaries, and the motifs and themes which we know constitute the εὐαγγέλιον.

3. TRALLIANS 9.1

In fact, the next Ignatian usage of λαλέω occurs in *Trall.* 9.1. Here Ignatius counters the "unbelievers (ἄπιστοι)" who say Jesus' "suffering was only in appearance (τὸ δοκεῖν πεπονθέναι αὐτόν)" (*Trall.* 10). Trallians 9 begins with an exhortation: "Be deaf then when anyone preaches to you apart from Jesus Christ (κωφώθητε οὖν, ὅταν ὑμῖν χωρὶς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ λαλῇ τις)." It seems someone has; for Ignatius immediately provides one of his fullest Christological statements. Just as we have seen in *Magn.* 11, this belief statement is presented in answer to improper preaching, it

appeals to people of history (here: David, Mary, Pilate), and is composed of traditional material redacted (again, "ἀληθῶς") by Ignatius for the specific purpose at hand.[35] This, too, is a conflict of preaching. Ignatius makes sure we know his side of the discussion. In response to that which is "apart from Jesus Christ," Ignatius provides its opposite, the retelling in outline credal form of the historical events of Jesus' life, the εὐαγγέλιον.

4. ROMANS 7.1-3

In *Rom.* 7.1-2 we have two different uses of λαλέω. First, we find the familiar λαλεῖν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν construction within the context of an intensely personal exhortation directed to the Romans, asking them not to assist the "ruler of this age (ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ αἰῶνος)" in corrupting his mind about God. To this end he tells them, "do not preach Jesus Christ and desire the world (μὴ λαλεῖτε Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, κόσμον δὲ ἐπιθυμεῖτε)."[36] As we have already seen (e.g., *Magn.* 10.3), Ignatius is concerned here with the relationship between words and action. The things of the world only corrupt the

---

[35]Ibid., 152-153. Schoedel (153) follows von Campenhausen in his discussion of *Trall.* 9.1-2: "traditional materials from a variety of sources come and go within the framework Moreover the framework itself seems directly determined by the use to which Ignatius put these themes." See H. von Campenhausen, "Das Bekenntnis im Urchristentum," *ZNW* 63 (1972) 234-253.

[36]It is notable that H. O. Maier translates this as "Do not *profess* Jesus Christ, and desire the world" [emphasis mine]. Maier, "Charismatic Authority," 197.

proper knowledge of God and thus are not compatible with preaching Jesus. Based on what we have observed so far, we may presume that 'preaching Jesus' includes the historical events of the εὐαγγέλιον embodied in the church of Ignatius' time.

While the second use of λαλέω, in *Rom.* 7.2, is not a "λαλεῖν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν" passage and thus does not refer to preaching Jesus *per se*, this particular usage is central to our understanding Ignatius' intention in *Rom.* 7 as a whole. In *Rom.* 7.2 mistrust of the world is further expressed; this time, Ignatius refers to his own experience: "my craving has been crucified and there is no matter-loving fire in me; but there is only water, living and speaking within me (ὕδωρ δὲ ζῶν καὶ λαλοῦν ἐν ἐμοί), saying to me from within, 'Come to the Father.'"[37] Later on, this intriguing text will be

---

[37]This use of λαλέω is contested. Lightfoot states that the text here "has been much tumbled about in very early times" and somewhat cautiously considers ἀλλόμενον to be the correct reading in the place of καὶ λαλοῦν. This would link the Ignatian text with John 4:14 (πηγὴ ὕδατος ἁλλομένου εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον). Ἀλλόμενον is the reading from the long rescension of *Romans* which, while it has a separate pre-history from the other letters in that rescension, is heavily interpolated. Lightfoot is alone in his decision. Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2.2, 224-225. Bauer/Paulsen (*Briefe des Ignatius*, 76), Grant (*Apostolic Fathers*, vol. 4, 94), Lindemann/Paulsen (*Die Apostolischen Väter*, 214), Schoedel (who makes no mention of the problem: *Ignatius of Antioch*, 184-185) and Zahn (*Ignatius von Antiochien*, 563) all accept καὶ λαλοῦν as the correct reading.

Aside from the textual considerations, it seems valid to stay with the καὶ λαλοῦν reading for several reasons: (a) the water in the next phrase is indeed speaking; (b) there is little indication of Ignatius having contact with Johannine traditions; and, (c) as I will soon point out, there seems to be a stronger link with the living and speaking water in the *Odes of Solomon*.

important for my discussion of Ignatius' ministry to the tradition; at this point, we may briefly anticipate that treatment as well as elucidate our present concerns with a brief excursus concerning this "living and speaking water."

While we may immediately think of John 4:14 or 7:38 for assistance in understanding this Ignatian pericope, perhaps closest in time and place to Ignatius is the usage in the *Odes of Solomon*.[38] Ode XI begins with the author declaring his heart circumcised by the Most High with the Holy Spirit (ὁ ὕψιστος περιέτεμέν με τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ) (XI.2); in verses 5-9, the author continues:

> ἐστηρίχθην ἀπὸ στερεᾶς πέτρας
> ὅπου με συγκεκάθικεν
> καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ τὸ λαλοῦν ἤγγισε πρὸς τὰ χείλη μου
> ἀπὸ πηγῆς ζωῆς κυρίου ἐν ἀφθονίᾳ αὐτοῦ
> ἔπιον καὶ ἐμεθύσθην ὕδωρ τὸ ἀθάνατον
> καὶ ἡ μέθη μου οὐκ ἐγένετο εἰς ἀλογιστίαν
> ἀλλ' ἐξετράπην τῶν ματαίων
> ἐπὶ τὸν ὕψιστον θεόν μου . . .
>
> And I was established on the firm rock,
> Where he set me;
> And speaking waters touched my lips
> From the Lord's spring [of life] without grudging;
> And I drank, and was intoxicated
> By the {living,} immortal, waters;
> And my intoxication was not without knowledge,

---

[38]The *Odes of Solomon* are usually dated around the year 100 C.E. J. H. Charlesworth, ed. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* vol. 2 (Garden City: Doubleday, 1985) 727. Ignatius' literary dependence on the Odes has been suggested. R. M. Grant points to the probability that Ignatius knew one or another of the *Odes* and concludes: "In any event his letters and the Odes come from the same spiritual environment." R. M. Grant, "The Odes of Solomon and the Church of Antioch," *JBL* 63 (1944) 372; V. Corwin states that "the most probable conclusion is that he knew at least some of the *Odes*." V. Corwin, *St. Ignatius*, 72.

But I turned from vanities
Towards the Most High, my God . . .[39]

Clearly the living and speaking waters of Ode XI are directly linked with the Holy Spirit, they provide knowledge of truth, and lead to the abandonment of worldly vanities. Of course, these are all Ignatian themes as well.[40]

For Ignatius, the Spirit-living water in *Rom.* 7.2 has not only quenched the fire of his worldly longings, but through this quenching it has also exhorted the bishop to "Come to the Father." While at first glance it may not seem that the speaking water is announcing the εὐαγγέλιον, in the next verse (*Rom.* 7.3) Ignatius—this time using food as metaphor—sets up a chain of linked statements which end with the themes surrounding the εὐαγγέλιον. First, he provides a parallel to 7.2 by stating he has no desire for the food of corruption (οὐχ ἥδομαι προφῇ φθορᾶς) but rather desires the bread of God (ἄρτον θεοῦ θέλω). So, we have again the longings for this world contrasted with the longings for God. Next, Ignatius tells us that the bread of God is "the

---

[39]I have added to the translation material found only in Greek, in brackets ([]), and only in Syriac, in braces ({}). For both Greek and Syriac texts see M. Lattke, *Die Oden Salomos in ihrer Bedeutung für Neues Testament und Gnosis* OBO 25/1 (Fribourg [Suisse]: Editions Universitaires; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1979) 106-113.

[40]While Ignatius in *Rom.* 7.2 does not explicitly link the living and speaking water with the Spirit, as I will soon point out, the action of the Spirit is suggested. In fact, the living and speaking water in Ignatius can be associated with both the baptismal waters as well as the Spirit. It seems best, however, to regard the two together: "Both baptism and the Spirit are so intertwined in the thought of Ignatius . . . that the two conceptions should probably not be separated." D. E. Aune, *Prophecy in Early Christianity*, 294.

flesh of Jesus Christ who was of the seed of David (ὅ ἐστιν σὰρξ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τοῦ ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυείδ)." Then, he tells us that for drink he desires the blood of Christ which "is incorruptible love (ὅ ἐστιν ἀγάπη ἄφθαρτος)." As we have seen in *Phld.* 5.1 and *Phld.* 9.2, the reference to the historical flesh of Jesus (that from David), as well as the reference to incorruption, suggest the εὐαγγέλιον and its content.

So here is my point: in *Rom.* 7.1-3 Ignatius is working within a general ambiance centered on what he has referred to as the εὐαγγέλιον. The spirit-proclamation of the quenching and living water exhorts Ignatius to "Come to the Father." The εὐαγγέλιον in *Phld.* 9.1-2 comes to mind: Jesus is entrusted with the secrets of God and is thus the door to the Father; Jesus' coming, passion and resurrection (i.e., the content of the εὐαγγέλιον) are the completion of incorruption. All of this, coupled with the gospel themes of the historical flesh of Jesus (*Phld.* 5.1, 9.2, *Rom.* 7.3), place us squarely within the pervasive context of the Ignatian εὐαγγέλιον. The Spirit exhortation of the water within is calling Ignatius to a denial of worldly things and a faithfulness to the gospel. Here, of course, we are brought full circle back to Ignatius' own exhortation to gospel faithfulness which first attracted us to this pericope: μὴ λαλεῖτε Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, κόσμον δὲ ἐπιθυμεῖτε (*Rom.* 7.1). This is a reference to the oral gospel preached with authority.

Thus, these usages of λαλέω in the context of *Rom.* 7.1-3 are central for our consideration not only of the oral gospel environment of Ignatius' situation, but it will also become just as pivotal when we examine Ignatius' own position of authority vis-à-vis the Jesus traditions.

5. PHILADELPHIANS 6.1-7.2

We have seen the reference to the εὐαγγέλιον τῆς κοινῆς ἐλπίδος at the end of *Phld.* 5. Philadelphians 6 opens by combining ἐὰν δέ with an aorist subjunctive in the protasis of a conditional sentence: "But if anyone intreprets Judaism to you . . . (Ἐὰν δέ τις ἰουδαϊσμὸν ἑρμηνεύῃ ὑμῖν . . .)." The apodosis of the conditional sentence contains the verb ἀκούω in the present tense, thus setting up a present general condition: " . . .do not listen to him (. . . μὴ ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ)."[41]

This use of the adversative conjunction with a present general condition expresses a contrast with what has been stated immediately before. The contrast is between proclaiming the εὐαγγέλιον (*Phld.* 5) and proclaiming an interpretation (ἑρμηνεύω) of Judaism.[42] After declaring this opposition to the εὐαγγέλιον, Ignatius continues with the somewhat puzzling phrase, "for it is better to hear

---

[41]Ἀκούετε is either indicative or imperative; it seems within the context that the imperative sense is meant here.

[42]See BAGD, 310.

Christianity from a man who is circumcised than Judaism from one who is uncircumcised (ἄμεινον γάρ ἐστιν παρὰ ἀνδρὸς περιτομὴν ἔχοντος χριστιανισμὸν ἀκούειν, ἢ παρὰ ἀκροβύστου ἰουδαϊσμόν) " (*Phld.* 6.1a). This obvious reference to oral exposition is centered on the same issues present in *Magn.* 10.3: Ignatius is concerned with the boundaries between the church of Christ and Judaism, specifically, judaizing activity in Philadelphia.[43]

This being said, my present interest lies not with the polemic of this passage (fascinating as it is), but with the oral nature of the environment presumed by Ignatius. That oral environment is clearly present not only in the *Phld.* 6.1a passages cited above, but is further confirmed as Ignatius continues in *Phld.* 6. First, in *Phld.* 6.1b, Ignatius employs an echo of a Jesus logion (cf., Matt 23:27) to describe the preachers in error:

> ἐὰν δὲ ἀμφότεροι περὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μὴ λαλῶσιν, οὗτοι ἐμοὶ στῆλαί εἰσιν καὶ τάφοι νεκρῶν, ἐφ' οἷς γέγραπται μόνον ὀνόματα ἀνθρώπων.
>
> But if either of them [circumcised or not] do not preach about Jesus Christ, they are to me tombstones and sepulchres of the dead on which are written only the names of people.

Here, with a negative version of the λαλεῖν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν (infinitive with περί and genitive) construction, Ignatius is again setting the boundaries that define the true

---

[43]I will fully treat this sentence, *Phld.* 6.1a, and the boundary-setting function of the εὐαγγέλιον in Part Two.

tradition. Referring to a judaizing interpretation of (presumably) the gospel, he makes it clear that such interpretation is not the way to approach Christianity. Thus, the oppositional nature of the text is extended from ἑρμηνεύω ἰουδαϊσμόν (*Phld.* 6.1a)—which has the εὐαγγέλιον in *Phld.* 5 as its opposite—through to λαλέω Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν (*Phld.* 6.1b).

That is not all. Ignatius continues in *Phld.* 6.2 by exhorting the Philadelphians to gain church unity by fleeing from the evil arts, snares and purpose (ἡ γνώμη) of the "prince of this age (ἄρχοντος του αἰῶνος τούτου)."[44] This evil divisive activity, it seems, is expressed through the erroneous interpretations—alluded to in 6.1—that are not of Jesus Christ. Ignatius next, in Pauline fashion,[45] claims not to have been a burden for those to whom he has ministered (*Phld.* 6.3a).

Most telling for my present concerns, however, is that in 6.3b Ignatius provides a clue to the nature of his ministry: "And I pray for all among whom I spoke, so that it may not be a witness against them (καὶ πᾶσι δέ, ἐν οἷς ἐλάλησα, εὔχομαι, ἵνα μὴ εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτὸ κτήσωνται)." Ignatius is recalling his preaching among the Philadelphians; it is a witness (μαρτύριον) that he prays does not convict them of

---

[44]This appears to be in deliberate contrast to the γνώμη of God in, for example, *Eph.* 3.2 and *Smyrn.* 6.2. Thus, we have a contrast to the saving events of the εὐαγγέλιον suggested here.

[45]Cf., 1 Thess 2:7, 9; 2 Cor 11:9, 12:16.

disunity. So, we may safely assume that the content of Ignatius' preaching to the Philadelphians is the εὐαγγέλιον of *Phld.* 5.2: in contrast to those mentioned in 6.1, Ignatius has truly preached Jesus Christ. His preaching is a witness to unity in the "gospel of the common hope."

This unity focused on the gospel comes to the fore in *Phld.* 7.1-2 as Ignatius further describes his preaching among the Philadelphians. He begins by locating the source of his true preaching in the Spirit which is from God (ἀλλὰ τὸ πνεῦμα οὐ πλανᾶται ἀπὸ θεοῦ ὄν) (7.1a). Then, in an arresting passage (7.1b), Ignatius describes his preaching : "I cried out among you, preaching in a great voice, the voice of God (ἐκραύγασα μεταξὺ ὤν, ἐλάλουν μεγάλῃ φωνῇ, θεοῦ φωνῇ)." A bit later, in 7.2b, Ignatius gives another description of the same event: "but the Spirit was preaching, saying . . . (τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ἐκήρυσσεν λέγον τάδε· . . .)."[46]

So, Ignatius describes this event three times: first, in passing, in 6.3b ("that it not be a witness against them"); then in the two above citations of 7.1b and 7.2b. I have already suggested that in 6.3b, while he gives us no clear indication, unity in the common gospel seems to have been the content of Ignatius' preaching to the

---

[46]There is a clear prophetic quality to this event. The prophetic nature of Ignatius' leadership and ministry to the εὐαγγέλιον is a subject I will treat further along.

Phld. 7.2b, by the way, is the only use of κηρύσσω in the letters of Ignatius. In this context, it carrys the same meaning as the Ignatian λαλέω of *Phld.* 6.3b which is the first mention of the event.

Philadelphians. With regard to 7.1b and 7.2b, Ignatius provides us with details of his preaching to the Philadelphians: "Pay attention to the bishop, the presbytery and deacons (τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ προσέχετε καὶ τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ καὶ διακόνοις)" (7.1b) and,

> χωρὶς τοῦ ἐπισκόπου μηδὲν ποιεῖτε, τὴν σάρκα ὑμῶν ὡς ναὸν θεοῦ τηρεῖτε, τὴν ἕνωσιν ἀγαπᾶτε, τοὺς μερισμοὺς φεύγετε, μιμηταὶ γίνεσθε Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὡς καὶ αὐτὸς τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ.
>
> Apart from the bishop do nothing, guard your flesh as the temple of God, love unity, flee divisions, be imitators of Jesus Christ as he was of his father (7.2b).

In these fragments from his preaching, Ignatius provides us with some idea of the practical results arising from his preaching Jesus Christ, his preaching of the gospel. So, with ultimate authority (τὸ πνεῦμα in 7.1a and 7.2b; and ἐλάλουν μεγάλῃ φωνῇ, θεοῦ φωνῇ in 7.1b) Ignatius preaches unity in the gospel.

C. OTHER INDICATIONS OF AN ORAL ENVIRONMENT

In the above pages, I have highlighted the Ignatian gospel and its oral evironment by concentrating on a series of words and phrases that are clearly linked with the εὐαγγέλιον. In this section my aim is to discover what further can be said about that environment. First, I will continue where we ended the previous section by addressing Ignatius' own concept of the ministry to the εὐαγγέλιον as

having a prophetic or charismatic quality. Following that discussion, I will examine the single use of ἡ ὁμιλία, in *Pol.* 5.1. Finally, I will consider the setting of *Eph.* 9, as well as the theme of silence in *Eph.* 15 and *Phld.* 1.

1. PREACHING IN THE SPIRIT

So far in this study, I have occasionally touched on Ignatius' own concept of his ministry and have suggested a prophetic or charismatic character for that ministry. At this point, it is valuable to focus on this topic as a means not only of bringing those insights together, but also of further elucidating the environment of Ignatius' gospel that we have been examining.

Much has been made of the types of Christian ministry in the Ignatian corpus. Because of its evident importance for Ignatius (not to mention, more modern, inter-confessional reasons), the threefold schema of deacon, presbyter, and bishop has been a major flashpoint in Ignatian studies.[47] The apparent existence of such a fully developed structure of church order as early as Ignatius has

---

[47]See, for example, A. Brent, "The Ignatian Epistles and the Threefold Ecclesiastical Order, " *JRH* 17 (1972) 18-32; P. Burke, "The Monarchical Episcopate at the End of the First Century," *JES* 7 (1970) 499-518; E. Jay, "From Presbyter-Bishops to Bishops and Presbyters: Christian Ministry in the Second Century: A Survey," *SecCent* 1 (1981) 125-162; E. Lohse, "Die Entstehung des Bischofsamtes in der frühen Christenheit," *ZNW* 71 (1980) 58-73; G. Schölligen, "Monepiskopat und monarchischer Episkopat. Eine Bemerkung zur Terminologie," *ZNW* 77 (1986) 146-151.

engaged many scholars. While this is indeed a vital question, my present concern largely bypasses the main question of the definition of διάκονος, πρεσβύτερος, and ἐπίσκοπος in Ignatius. It centers, rather, on the authority with which Ignatius exercises his ministry to the εὐαγγέλιον. It is clear that Ignatius sees himself as a proclaimer inspired by the Spirit of God.[48]

Ignatius' charismatic ministry has attracted attention at least since B. H. Streeter's recognition of the prophetic quality in Ignatius' ministry. More recently we have the studies of P. Meinhold, D. Aune and H. O. Maier, all of which propose various approaches to the question.[49] Meinhold speaks of Ignatius' "pneumatic" character as one component of his (Meinhold's) own tripartite schema that describes Ignatius as bishop, pneumatic, and martyr.[50] Aune holds that Ignatius' letters preserve several prophetic oracles in *Phld.* 7.1-2, as well as other "indications of

---

[48]In this section I will use the terms "charismatic" and "prophetic" with respect to this aspect of Ignatius' ministry. The term "prophetic," however, more specifically refers to activity in which speaking or proclamation through the Spirit (or God) is at issue.

[49]Aune, *Prophecy in Early Christianity*, 291-299; H. O. Maier, *The Social Setting of the Ministry as Reflected in the Writings of Hermas, Clement and Ignatius* (Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University, 1991) 147-187; idem, "Charismatic Authority"; P. Meinhold, *Studien zu Ignatius von Antiochien* (Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1979) 2-18; B. H. Streeter, *The Primitive Church* (London: Macmillan, 1930) 228-29. See, as well, Paulsen, 122-129 and H. Schlier, *Untersuchungen*, 140-152.

[50]Meinhold, 8-10.

prophetic speech" and some nineteen examples of "pronouncements of sacral law."[51]

Perhaps most valuable, however, is H. O. Maier's approach to Ignatius as charismatic leader. Maier appeals to the classic description of charismatic leadership by the early twentieth century sociologist Max Weber.[52] Weber describes the charismatic leader as one having exceptional qualities and powers to which the ordinary person has no access; moreover,

> charisma is self-determined and sets its own limits. Its bearer seizes the task for which he is destined and demands that others obey and follow him by virtue of his mission.[53]

Weber's concern is not the origin of the charisma; yet he points out that charismatic leadership is "regarded [by those under its authority] as of divine origin or as exemplary."[54]

---

[51]Prophetic speech: *Eph.* 20; *Trall.* 4.1-5.2; *Rom.* 7.2; Pronouncements of Sacral Law: *Eph.* 2.1, 2.2, 21.2; *Trall.* 5.2; *Rom.* 8.1; *Phld.* 10.1-2, 11.1; 11.2; *Smyrn.* 2.1, 5.1, 6.1, 9.1, 9.2, 10.2, 12.1; *Pol.* 1.2, 3.1, 6.1, 6.2. Thus, for example, *Rom.* 7.2 exhibits a three-part structure of prophetic speech: narrative: "My lust has ben crucified, and there is in me no fire of love for material things;" revelation formula: "but only water living and speaking in me, and saying to me from within," admonition: "'Come to the Father.'" As for 'pronouncements of sacral law' we have, for example, *Trall.* 5.2: "Much is lacking to us, that we might not lack God" and *Pol.* 6.1: "Give heed to the bishop, that God may do the same to you." Aune, *Prophecy in Early Christianity*, 293-296.

[52]Maier, *Social Setting*, 158-160, 163; Idem, "Charismatic Authority," 188-192.

[53]M. Weber, *Economy and Society*, G. Roth, C. Wittich, et al., trans. (New York: Bedminster, 1968) 1112. See also idem, *The Sociology of Religion*, E. Fischoff, trans. (Boston: Beacon, 1964) 46-59.

[54]Weber, *Economy and Society*, 241.

So, to return in this light to Ignatius, we have already examined not only the specific meaning as well as the probable prophetic nature of the bishop's use of λαλέω. This charismatic quality is found not only with the phrase λαλεῖν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν itself, but we have also seen the suggestion—via the Odes of Solomon—of prophetic activity in *Rom.* 7.2 ("water, living and speaking in me [ὕδωρ δὲ ζῶν καὶ λαλοῦν ἐν ἐμοι]"). Moreover, we have observed the evidently prophetic event that Ignatius describes three times in *Phld.* 6.1-7.2, in which the bishop appeals directly to the Spirit. Ignatius describes this event the second time by stating that the Spirit from God "exposes secret things (τὰ κρυπτὰ ἐλέγχει)" (*Phld.* 7.1).[55] Finally, it is necessary for our purposes to recognize that, as we have seen, ultimately these prophetic proclamations are centered on the εὐαγγέλιον.

Further indications of Ignatius' prophetic ministry include the remark in *Eph.* 20 where Ignatius promises another letter about the divine plan (ἡ οἰκονομία) about Jesus, regarding "faith in him and love of him, his passion and his resurrection; especially if the Lord reveals anything to me (αὐτοῦ πίστει καὶ ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ ἀγάπῃ, ἐν πάθει αὐτοῦ καὶ

---

[55]Ignatius speaks of "secret things" two other times: in *Eph.* 15:3 secret things of people are near God; and in *Phld.* 9.1 Jesus the high priest is entrusted with the secret things of God.

As for *Phld.* 7.1, this action of the Spirit is akin to the Spirit's action through the prophet in 1 Cor 14:25. Aune, *Prophecy*, 293.

ἀναστάσει· μάλιστα ἐὰν ὁ κύριός μοι ἀποκαλύψῃ τι)" (20.1-2a).[56] It is noteworthy here that not only is this remark made in the context of the two primary εὐαγγέλιον motifs (πάθος, ἀνάστασις), but also that Ignatius continues in 20.2 by encouraging unity "in one faith and in one Jesus Christ who was of the family of David according to the flesh, the son of man and the son of God (ἐν μιᾷ πίστει καὶ ἐν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τῷ κατὰ σάρκα ἐκ γένους Δαυείδ, τῷ υἱῷ ἀνθρώπου καὶ υἱῷ θεοῦ)," [57] thereby further underscoring the link between the εὐαγγέλιον and the plan of God in history. It is this message that Ignatius refers to as a possible revelation at the beginning of *Eph.* 20.2.

Not only does Ignatius suggest that his ministry is directed by the Spirit, but in *Trall.* 4-5 he also claims to have knowledge that sets him apart as one who can speak of the supernatural. Thus Ignatius begins *Trall.* 4 with a Paul-like refusal to boast about his "many thoughts in God (πολλὰ φρονῶ ἐν θεῷ)."[58] He then continues by pointing out that in the face of this unique knowledge, he must strive for humility (πραότης) so that the "ruler of this age (ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου)" will be destroyed. These "many thoughts in

---

[56]Here Schoedel follows both Lightfoot and Zahn in reading here ὁ κύριός μοι ἀποκαλύψῃ *τι* instead of ὁ κύριός μοι ἀποκαλύψῃ *ὅτι οἱ κατ' ἄνδρα κοινῇ* . . . of the important Greek and Latin witnesses. Thus, this phrase is a concluding statement tied with the mention of Jesus in 20.1 rather than an introductory statement leading into 20.2. For the details of the convincing argument see Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 96, n. 6; Lightfoot, 86, n. 3; Zahn, 586.

[57]Cf., Rom 1:3-4.

[58]Cf., 2 Cor 10:12-18.

God" become more specific in *Trall.* 5. Here—beginning with a rhetorical question that, again, takes its cue from Paul (cf., 1 Cor 3:1-2)—Ignatius again claims to have access to special knowledge that is too much for ordinary mortals:

> Μὴ οὐ δύναμαι ὑμῖν τὰ ἐπουράνια γράψαι; ἀλλὰ φόβοῦμαι, μὴ νηπίοις οὖσιν ὑμῖν βλάβην παραθῶ· καὶ συγγνωμονεῖτέ μοι, μήποτε οὐ δυνηθέντες χωρῆσαι στραγγαλωθῆτε. καὶ γὰρ ἐγώ, οὐ καθότι δέδεμαι καὶ δύναμαι νοεῖν τὰ ἐπουράνια καὶ τὰς τοποθεσίας τὰς ἀγγελικὰς καὶ τὰς συστάσεις τὰς ἀρχοντικάς, ὁρατά τε καὶ ἀόρατα, παρὰ τοῦτο ἤδη καὶ μαθητής εἰμι. πολλὰ γὰρ ἡμῖν λείπει, ἵνα θεοῦ μὴ λειπώμεθα.
>
> Surely I am not unable to write you of heavenly things? No, but I fear inflicting harm on you who are infants, Bear with me, then, lest you be choked by what you cannot take in. Even in my case, not because I am in bonds and am able to know heavenly things, both the angelic locations and the archontic formations, things both visible and invisible—not because of this am I already a disciple; for we need many things that we may not lack God.[59]

We are immediately reminded of the language found in the star-hymn of *Eph.* 19.1-3, as well as the exposition in *Smyrn.* 6.1 (cf., Col 1:16). While the Spirit is not mentioned in either *Trall.* 4 or 5, Ignatius is making it clear that he has access to extraordinary knowledge that can only have divine origin (thus, "many thoughts in God [πολλὰ φρονῶ ἐν θεῷ]).

It is also noteworthy in this regard that Ignatius concerns himself with charismatic ministry in others. This is most clearly seen in the bishop's exhortation to his

---

[59]Translation, Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 143.

colleague Polycarp: "pray that the invisible things may be revealed to you so that you might lack nothing and overflow in every gift (τὰ δὲ ἀόρατα αἴτει ἵνα σοι φανερωθῇ, ὅπως μηδενὸς λείπῃ καὶ παντὸς χαρίσματος περισσεύῃς)" (*Pol.* 2.2). Only a little less clear in this respect is Ignatius' recognition that the bishop of Philadelphia's authority for the common good comes "neither from himself nor through human beings, nor for vainglory, but in the love of God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ . . . (οὐκ ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ οὐδὲ δι' ἀνθρώπων . . . οὐδὲ κατὰ κενοδοξίαν, ἀλλ' ἐν ἀγάπῃ θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ·)" (*Phld.* 1.1).[60] Not only do these passages suggest that Ignatius recognizes that his own gift is from a divine source, but they also tell us that Ignatius recognizes and encourages charismatic ministry (and authority) on the part of others.[61]

So, what are we to make of all this? There are two issues that rise from this material. First, we must realize that whatever the exact nature of Ignatius' charismatic ministry, it seems to be a source of authority for the bishop. Second, Ignatius *is* a bishop (*Rom.* 2.2; cf., *Magn.* 2.1). In this regard, Maier notes "it is not as a bishop or holder of some other official position that [Ignatius]

---

[60]Cf., Gal 1:1, 1 Cor 14:2-5.

[61]With respect to Ignatius' own gift, see Maier, "The Charismatic Authority," 190. Cf., Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 263.

Phld. 1.1, according to Schoedel, is an indication of the "essentially charismatic" authority of the Philadelphian bishop. Ibid., 196.

exhorts the Asia Minor communities to avoid schisms and unite with their bishops."[62] However, Maier is making an unwarranted distinction between Ignatius' office as ἐπίσκοπος and his authority as a charismatic leader. It appears most accurate to see them as one. This means that no matter how one defines ἐπίσκοπος in the letters of Ignatius, one must include a prophetic or charismatic character when we speak about Ignatius' *own* episcopal ministry. These issues easily take us beyond our immediate concerns; yet, as we have seen, Ignatius' ministry to the εὐαγγέλιον clearly involves the action of the Spirit. This is a preached, oral ministry based in the authority of the Spirit. Ignatius "takes it for granted that the Spirit speaks through and on behalf of estabished authority."[63]

2. POLYCARP 5.1

In the brief letter to Polycarp, Ignatius provides the bishop of Smyrna an exhortation on Christian leadership ("παρακαλῶ σε . . ." [*Pol.* 1.2]). We have already considered the charismatic nature (at least from Ignatius' perspective) of Polycarp's ministry. The fifth chapter of that letter begins with Ignatius' only use of what appears to be a technical word for church preaching, ἡ ὁμιλία. There is little Christian usage of this word before Justin, none in

---

[62]Maier, *Social Setting*, 157.
[63]Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 206.

the NT; its classical sense includes "association," "assembly" and "instruction."[64] Ignatius exhorts Polycarp to "flee not only from evil arts, but also preach against them (τὰς κακοτεχνίας φεῦγε, μᾶλλον δὲ περὶ τούτων ὁμιλίαν ποιοῦ)" (*Pol.* 5.1a). He then continues—with the verbs προσλαλέω ("address") and παραγγέλλω ("instruct")—by giving specific content of the message. It is intended for married couples.[65] There is no reference to the Ignatian gospel or gospel themes linked with this preaching.[66] With respect to the content of the preaching, the most we can point to is that the women should be instructed to "love the Lord," and the men to "love their wives as the Lord loved the church." I call attention to this single use of ἡ ὁμιλία (along with προσλαλέω and παραγγέλλω) to point out that this usage is indicative of an official ministry of preaching by a church

---

[64]Liddell and Scott, 1222.

As for Justin, we read in Dia. 28.2, Ἐπειδὴ ἀπό τε τῶν γραφῶν καὶ τῶν πραγμάτων, τάς τε ἀποδείξεις καὶ τὰς ὁμιλίας ποιοῦμαι . . .

The verb, ὁμιλέω ("speak," "address'), occurs rather more often in formative Christianity. It occurs in the letter of Diognetus two times (11.1, 7), the second of which refers to the Word itself speaking through chosen agents. In the Martyrdom of Polycarp it occurs once: (2.2): Christ stands by and speaks to the martyrs in their agony. The NT occurences, all in the Lukan documents (Luke 24:14, 15; Acts 20:11), are in the context of conversations.

[65]The link between "evil arts" and marriage practices is uncertain. Schoedel, however, sees it in the other direction, the "evil arts" are linked with the teaching on slavery immediately preceeding. Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 271. Either way, the "evil arts" are an enigma.

[66]The εὐαγγέλιον is not explicitly mentioned in the letter. Only general references to gospel motifs can be discerned. For example, in this same passage Ignatius suggests celibacy for those who are able "in honor of the flesh of the Lord (εἰς τιμὴν τῆς σαρκὸς τοῦ κυρίου)" (*Pol.* 5.2a).

official which does not necessarily have the εὐαγγέλιον as its content. What is more, there is no indication here of any charismatic sense to this preaching; it appears to be simply instruction on Christian living.

3. PASSAGES ABOUT ORAL EXPOSITION

There is also a series of Ignatian passages in which some sort of oral exposition is presumed. Beginning with *Eph.* 9, a brief look at the more noticeable of these is in order.

a. EPHESIANS 9

We have already encountered the taciturn bishop of the Ephesians, Onesimus, and the Ephesians' "good orderliness in God" (*Eph.* 6.1, 2) arising from their refusal to "listen to anyone except one who preaches in truth about Jesus Christ (ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἀκούετέ τινος πλέον, ἢ περὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ λαλοῦντος ἐν ἀληθείᾳ)" (*Eph.* 6.2). A bit later, in *Eph.* 9, Ignatius refers again to the preaching of error in Ephesus; outsiders have been there broadcasting an "evil teaching" (ἔχοντας κακὴν διδαχήν). Then, launching into a chain of mixed metaphors, Ignatius tells the Ephesians: "but you did not allow them to sow it among you, stopping your ears, so as not to receive what they sow (οἷς οὐκ εἰάσατε σπεῖραι εἰς ὑμᾶς, βύσαντες τὰ ὦτα, εἰς τὸ μὴ παραδέξασθαι τὰ σπειρόμενα ὑπ' αὐτῶν)" (*Eph.* 9.1). Ignatius, for his part, is making his case against the nefarious teaching;

he is joyful because, as he writes, "I was made worthy to address you through what I write to you (ἀγαλλιώμενος ἠξιώθην δι' ὧν γράφω προσομιλῆσαι ὑμῖν)" (*Eph.* 9.2). The use of προσομιλέω at least suggests an oral connotation (cf., *Pol.* 5.2). The letter is his preaching.[67]

b. EPHESIANS 15

Later in the same letter (*Eph.* 15), in response to this proselytizing by outsiders,[68] Ignatius furthers his position by apparently returning to the situation with the quiet bishop Onesimus.[69] Building on his defence of episcopal silence in 6.1 (καὶ ὅσον βλέπει τις σιγῶντα ἐπίσκοπον, πλειόνως αὐτὸν φοβείσθω), Ignatius sets up an oppositional sequence between silence accompanied by righteous deeds, and speech that is not fulfilled with deeds: Ἄμεινόν ἐστιν σιωπᾶν καὶ εἶναι, ἢ λαλοῦντα μὴ εἶναι. Elsewhere we have already examined the 'professing/deeds' passage in *Eph.* 14 that leads into this passage ("οὐδεὶς πίστιν ἐπαγγελλόμενος ἁμαρτάνει"). To provide ultimate support for Onesimus and what he stands for,

---

[67]Cf., 2 Cor 10:9-11.

[68]Schoedel calls them "itinerant teachers." Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 65.

[69]There is scholarly discussion concerning this episcopal silence. Chadwick connects it with the silence of God in *Eph.* 19.1 and *Magn.* 8.2: since the bishop corresponds to God in *Eph.* 5.3, *Magn.* 6.1, *Trall.* 3.1, and *Smyrn.* 8.1-2, the bishop's silence corresponds to God's silence. Moreover, Chadwick points to the silence of God as a theme in gnostic texts. H. Chadwick, "The Silence of the Bishops in Ignatius," *HTR* 43 (1950) 169-72. It seems, however, that Schoedel is correct in seeing this silence simply as referring to an "inarticulate bishop." Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 56-57.

Ignatius turns to Jesus who not only is the "one teacher who spoke and it came to pass, but also what he did in silence is worthy of the Father (εἷς οὖν διδάσκαλος, ὃς εἶπεν, καὶ ἐγένετο· δὲ πεποίηκεν ἄξια τοῦ πατρός ἐστιν) (*Eph.* 15.1b)."[70] In the next sentence, Ignatius clinches his argument:

> ὁ λόγον Ἰησοῦ κεκτημένος ἀληθῶς δύναται καὶ τῆς ἡσυχίας αὐτοῦ ἀκούειν, ἵνα τέλειος ᾖ, ἵνα δι' ὧν λαλεῖ πράσσῃ καὶ δι' ὧ σιγᾷ γινώσκηται.
>
> The one who truly possesses the word of Jesus is also able to hear his [Jesus'] silence, so that he may be perfect, so that through that which he says he may act, and through his silence he may understand. (*Eph.* 15.2)

The point of all of this, therefore, is twofold: to uphold the authority of the local bishop who, it seems, is not much of a preacher, and to counter improper teaching by preachers from the outside. At the center is the "word of Jesus."

c. PHILADELPHIANS 1

Thus, in the Ephesian passages treated above the silence motif plays a specific role with respect to the local situation. That same motif plays a part as well in

---

[70]While one may point, for example, to Jesus' silence before Pilate (Herod in Luke) (Matt 27:14, Mark 15:5, Luke 23:9, John 19:9), that here Ignatius has some specific episode or episodes of the life of Jesus in mind is improbable; Ignatius is more concerned with his present task than reporting the life of Jesus. The figure of Jesus, then, serves simply to support Ignatius' view of the ministry of Onesimus. Cf., Schoedel, "Ignatius and the Reception of Matthew," 160-161.

Ignatius' dealings with another bishop who apparently is a man of few words.

The unnamed gentle bishop in Philadelphia is praised early in Ignatius' Philadelphian letter because he is able to "do more in silence than those proclaiming vain words (ὃς σιγῶν πλείονα δύναται τῶν μάταια λαλούντων)" (*Phld.* 1.1b).[71] Ignatius recognizes that the bishop's ministry for the common good is from God (κεκτῆσθαι τὴν διακονίαν τὴν εἰς τὸ κοινὸν . . . ἐν ἀγάπῃ θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ) (*Phld.* 1.1a) and is therefore of unquestionable authority.[72] Here again, as with Onesimus of Ephesus, Ignatius is highlighting a bishop's silence and righteous actions by contrasting them with those who preach error. As Ignatius has told the Ephesians, "it is better to be silent and to be, than speaking and not to be (ἄμεινόν ἐστιν σιωπᾶν καὶ εἶναι, ἢ λαλοῦντα μὴ εἶναι)."[73]

---

[71]Again, here we may point to the figure of Jesus in *Eph.* 15.1b: "what he did in silence is worthy of the Father (δὲ πεποίηκεν ἄξια τοῦ πατρός ἐστιν)."

[72]As I have suggested this authority is "essentially charismatic." Ibid., 196.

[73]Schoedel suggests *Magn.* 4 (πρέπον οὖν ἐστιν μὴ μόνον καλεῖσθαι Χριστιανούς, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἶναι) as a way of filling in the eliptical objects to the two uses of εἶναι. In this light, we may understand the *Eph.* 15.1 text as "It is better to be silent and to be in reality Christians, than to speak and only be called Christian." W. Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 77.

CONCLUSIONS TO PART ONE

THE GOSPEL OF IGNATIUS

The constant task throughout Part One has been to isolate the gospel of Ignatius—its particular motifs and themes—and to examine Ignatius' idea of τὸ εὐαγγέλιον through the lens of its environment not only within the specific Ignatian context, but also its place among the gospels of early Christianity.

Principally, we have established that for Ignatius the gospel is an oral, preached message which is centered on the salvific πάθος and ἀνάστασις of Jesus. Therefore, the εὐαγγέλιον to which Ignatius appeals is not a written, authoritative text. Documents referred to as γέγραπται (i.e., *Phld.* 8.2), presumably the OT Prophets (and the Law of Moses [*Smyrn.* 5.1]), may well witness to the gospel in advance but there is no indication that Ignatius is appealing to a written text that he refers to as τὸ εὐαγγέλιον.

Therefore, it is vital to recognize how the γέγραπται relates to Ignatius' εὐαγγέλιον. The OT Prophets function in the Ignatian corpus as authoritative figures and not as texts (*Magn.* 8.2, 9.2; *Phld.* 5.2, 9.1-2; *Smyrn.* 5.1, 7.2), figures which announce the gospel in advance. This

witnessing function extends also to the Apostles (e.g., *Eph.* 11.2; *Magn.* 6.1, 13.1; *Trall.* 2.2, 3.1, 3.3). Moreover, Ignatius occasionally appeals to other historical figures (David: Rom 1:3, 2 Tim 2:8; Mary: *Eph.* 7.2, 18.2, *Magn.* 11.1, *Trall.* 9.1; Pilate: *Magn.* 11; Herod: *Smyrn.* 1.2); all serve a related purpose: to underscore the reality of the εὐαγγέλιον events.

Also with respect to the written/oral question, we have noted that apparently there are expressions in Ignatius which can be related to various passages in the Gospels of the NT, most especially in Matthew. However, it is clear that, while we may presume that Ignatius knows Matthean material, there is no indication that he considers this material to be τὸ εὐαγγέλιον.

Moreover, the instances in which Ignatius appears to be working with pre-formed traditional confessional formulae (e.g., *Trall.* 9.1-2, *Smyrn.* 1.1-2) or hymns (e.g., *Eph.* 19) show that the bishop is concerned with presenting the message rather than authoritative formulae; those presumed formulae are redacted to serve Ignatius' particular purposes. He employs them to articulate the preached εὐαγγέλιον.

The oral nature of Ignatius' gospel is supported not only by specific uses of the word εὐαγγέλιον, but also by the overall matrix within which Ignatius presents his position. Indeed, the oral gospel environment is so pervasive that

Ignatius often simply assumes its existence. Thus, the verbs of transmission and acceptance (καταγέλλω: *Phld.* 9.2, ἐπαγγέλλομαι: *Eph.* 14:2, πληροφορέω: *Magn.* 11.1, ὁμολογέω: *Smyrn.* 5.2) strongly suggest a preached gospel message.

Most telling in this regard, however, is Ignatius' use of the phrase λαλεῖν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν (*Eph.* 6.2, *Magn.* 10.3, *Trall.* 9.1, *Rom.* 7.1, *Phld.* 6.1). In the Ignatian context this phrase is best translated as "to preach Jesus Christ"; it refers to preaching the εὐαγγέλιον. This Ignatian usage is supported by such texts as Paul's exposition in Phil 1:14-18. What is more, Ignatius' use of λαλεῖν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν also suggests a charismatic context linked with proclaiming the gospel. This charismatic quality, in turn, is supported by various similar usages in Paul (1 Cor 14:2-5) and Luke (e.g., Acts 4:24-31).

Hence, within Ignatius' view of ministry to the gospel, a charismatic or prophetic quality is an integral component of the Ignatian architecture of authority. We see this "preaching in the Spirit" present in such passages as *Eph.* 20, *Trall.* 4-5, *Rom.* 7.2, and *Phld.* 6.1-7.2. Ignatius, as well, recognizes that this authority from the Sprit is not his alone. So, in *Phld.* 1.1 and *Pol.* 2.2 he encourages a charismatic ministry (and authority) for other leaders also. Ignatius is a bishop (*Rom.* 2.2; cf., *Magn.* 2.1); yet, the ministry of ἐπίσκοπος, at least for Ignatius, appears to include preaching with the authority of the Spirit.

This ministry of preaching is still further suggested by Ignatius' single use of ἡ ὁμιλία in *Pol.* 1.2. While the εὐαγγέλιον is not specifically present in this passage, the usage at least indicates an official, authoritative ministry of preaching. Preaching ministry is also suggested by the Ignatian theme of silence/speaking (e.g., *Eph.* 15, *Phld.* 1.1). This theme, along with the concomitant theme of deeds from words (*Eph.* 14), ultimately refers to the proclamation of the message about Jesus.

With respect to the motifs that make up the Ignatian εὐαγγέλιον, we have seen that the passion and resurrection of Jesus, as salvific events, are the central facts of Ignatius' preached gospel. Early in Part One we observed that these salvation events are the core of the εὐαγγέλιον in much the same way that we find them in Paul. However, for Ignatius, the πάθος and ἀνάστασις of Jesus appear to be somewhat more invariable and distinct εὐαγγέλιον motifs than in Paul.

Finally, the gospel of Ignatius serves to set the perimeters of proper belief and practice in the life of the church. In Part One I specifically highlighted this boundary-setting function in early Christianity through the use of terms and phrases which are in-house abbreviations for the whole of the gospel message. They are intended for those within the boundaries. Along with the common simple use of the substantive τὸ εὐαγγέλιον in many of our documents,

prime examples of these sorts of intramural phrases are Paul's τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ, ὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ, λαλεῖν τὸν λόγον and κηρύσσειν τὸν Χριστὸν; we have as well Matthew's τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας, and Luke's τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ and λαλεῖν τὸν λόγον. With respect to Ignatius we have seen a similar function in his use of the substantive τὸ εὐαγγέλιον; however the boundary-setting function is clearest with λαλεῖν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν in which "Jesus Christ" stands for the gospel message. Another Ignatian intramural phrase for the gospel message is "the gospel of the common hope (τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς κοινῆς ἐλπίδος)" (*Phld.* 5.2; cf., *Eph.* 21.2, *Magn.* 11.1, *Trall.* insc, *Phld.* 11.2). This particular phrase will come to the fore as we proceed through Part Two.

Therefore, it is from the preached gospel that Ignatius' Christianity gains its identity. This Christian identity results from being united not only with correct belief in Jesus' passion and resurrection and but also with correct practice founded on that belief.

Indeed, as we have occasionally seen in Part One, the boundary-setting function of the Ignatian εὐαγγέλιον extends far beyond the use of these intramural abbreviations. Thus, the goal in Part Two is to examine this function through a treatment of two facets of Ignatius' theology: Christology and opposition to the εὐαγγέλιον.

PART TWO

THE FUNCTION OF THE IGNATIAN GOSPEL

INTRODUCTION TO PART TWO

In Part One, my goals were to establish the content and to examine the environment of Ignatius' gospel. Having accomplished these tasks, we may now utilize the insights so gained to consider more specifically how the εὐαγγέλιον functions within Ignatius' theological world.

Among the general conclusions suggested—and occasionally highlighted—in Part One is that Ignatius presents the εὐαγγέλιον motifs and themes in order to delineate what are for him the acceptable boundaries of belief and practice. Hence, it is no surprise to observe this function most clearly as Ignatius confronts those who are outside the acceptable boundaries.[1] Indeed, I have noted in passing how the bishop often pointedly structures expressions of the gospel motifs and themes in response to the error he is countering.

This boundary-setting function, therefore, is the overarching issue for consideration in Part Two. Part Two is divided into two chapters. In Chapter IV, I will consider what is for Ignatius the faith which delineates the

---

[1]With respect to this boundary-setting function see especially Maier, "Charismatic Authority," 194; Ibid, *Social Setting*, 175-181; Schoedel, "Theological Norms," 31-36.

true boundaries of Christianity. Because this faith is centered on correct belief about Jesus, I will approach it through an examination of Ignatius' Christology as it is expressed through the εὐαγγέλιον. Here I will treat a series of Ignatian Christological themes and especially titles in order to highlight their relationship to Ignatius' gospel.

With Ignatius' Christology as the starting point, Chapter V then will be a treatment of how Ignatius' gospel functions in response to error in the various communities. Thus, Chapter V will involve not only delineating the nature and identity of the error evident in the letters, but it will also involve more importantly an examination of the way in which Ignatius expresses the εὐαγγέλιον in his polemics against the error.

As is already evident from the conclusions of Part One, Ignatius' εὐαγγέλιον is the source of Christian identity; Chapters IV and V, therefore, will show how the gospel message is the unifying principle in Ignatius' world view.

CHAPTER IV

WITHIN THE BOUNDARIES: THE GOSPEL OF IGNATIUS AND CHRISTOLOGY

In the following pages I will consider Ignatius' Christology by paying attention primarily to the titles or epithets which are used by Ignatius to refer to Jesus, and which have direct linkages with Ignatius' εὐαγγέλιον. These include Jesus as: "son of God" (e.g., *Eph.* 20.2, *Smyrn.* 1.1), "the savior" (*Eph.* 1.1, *Magn.* insc., *Phld.* 9.2, *Smyrn.* 7.1), "the common hope" (*Eph.* 21.2, *Magn.* 11.1, *Trall.* insc., *Phld.* 11.2), "the only teacher" (*Magn.* 9.1; cf., *Phld.* 8.2), and "the one physician" (*Eph.* 7.2). However, before turning to these particular titles, it is necessary to ground this examination with a more general treatment of Ignatius' expressions of the incarnation—as always, through the lens of Ignatius' εὐαγγέλιον.[1]

Finally, as we proceed through this chapter, it is vital to notice that, along with the boundary-setting function of Ignatius' Christology, there are particular Ignatian shifts with respect to various NT Christological

---

[1]Helpful in this entire treatment of Ignatius' Christology is a list compiled by D. Aune. D. Aune, "Divine Names and Epithets in Ignatius," (Unpublished Paper, n.d.).

categories. As we will observe, these shifts arise not only from Ignatius' 'boundary-setting' or polemical activity, but also from his own world-view and that of the churches he addresses.

A. THE INCARNATION

The most simple of Ignatius' expressions of the incarnation is the reference to Jesus as "our [or "my" in *Rom.* 6.3] God" (*Eph.* insc., 15.3, 18.2, *Rom.* insc., 3.3, 6.3, *Pol.* 8.3; cf., *Eph.* 7.2, *Smyrn.* 1.1).[2] It is clear that, while he distinguishes between the Father and the Son (and the Spirit) (e.g, *Eph.* 9.1, *Magn.* 13.1), Ignatius speaks of Jesus as divine. On a more immediate level, it is also significant that Jesus is "our" God. This suggests that Ignatius is appealing to a common faith experience of Christians within his circle of influence. Jesus is God, "*our* God," for those with correct belief.[3]

---

[2]In *Trall.* 7.1 there is in some texts (e.g., the Latin witness to the Greek) a reference to those who are "inseparable from God, Jesus Christ (οὗσιν ἀχωρίστοις θεοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ)." "Θεοῦ," however, is not found in an important witness, the Armenian version from the Greek. This, together with the fact of the awkwardness of the phrase, as well as the absence of any qualifying modifiers (such as the usual Ignatian μοῦ or ἡμῶν in such statements) leads Lightfoot to conclude reasonably that the θεοῦ is not original. Lightfoot, 168-169.

[3]We will see as we proceed through this chapter that this same sort of appeal to a common faith experience to delineate the "in" group is operative with "Jesus, the common hope" (*Eph.* 21.2; *Phld.* 11.2),"the gospel of the common hope" (*Phld.* 5.2), not to mention "the only teacher" (*Magn.* 9.1; cf., *Phld.* 8.2) and the "one physician (*Eph.* 7.2).

This being said, it is necessary to recognize that Ignatius is still early in Christological debates: "the use of technical language to describe Ignatius' theology runs the risk of falsifying the picture."[4] This refers to Ignatian passages which at first glance may suggest subordinationist (e.g., *Eph.* 3.2) or adoptionist (e.g., *Magn.* 8.2) tendencies. However, these technical terms (which do not necessarily exclude one another) are inappropriate in an Ignatian context. The Ignatian passages which ostensibly suggest these categories must be read in light of the unambiguous references which refer to Jesus as "our [or "my"] God." These references are further supported by "the blood of God (ἐν αἵματι θεοῦ)" in *Eph.* 1.1, as well as the phrase we have seen with respect to the πάθος: "allow me to be an imitator of the passion of my God (ἐπιτρέψατέ μοι μιμητὴν εἶναι τοῦ πάθους τοῦ θεοῦ μοῦ)" (*Rom.* 6.3).[5]

In his frequent and unambiguous references to Jesus as God, Ignatius clearly moves beyond the NT. We may find references to Jesus' identification as God in the NT designation of Christ as ὁ κυριός, thus suggesting the attributes which the OT applies to God.[6] In this regard one

---

[4]Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 20. Schoedel, however, states that "from the view of later trinitarian developments, Ignatius tends to a 'monarchian' position." Cf., Corwin, *St. Ignatius*, 140-141; Elze, *Untersuchungen*, 23-26.

[5]Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 39.

[6]Dunn, 180. Also, O. Cullmann, *The Christology of the New Testament*, S. C. Guthrie, C. A. M. Hall, trans. (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963) 234-237, 307-308.

thinks immediately, for example, of Thomas' confession in John 20:28: "My Lord and my God (ὁ κύριός μου καὶ ὁ θεός μου)."[7] We may look as well to Phil 2:6-11 where Jesus "was in the form of God (ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ)" and is exalted as κυριός. However, in general, the NT is far from direct in assigning divine qualities to Jesus.[8]

Ignatius, on the other hand, is clear in his expressions of Jesus' divinity. As we will see, the contrast between Ignatius' unambiguous Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ θεός (i.e., *Smyrn.* 1.1) and the NT expressions largely arises from Ignatius' own polemical activity in addressing error. Indeed, rather than looking back to the NT, Ignatius' expressions of Jesus' divinity point to the later Christological debates.[9] Ignatius is a witness to an early stage in the controversies.

Yet, our present task has Ignatius' εὐαγγέλιον as its controlling constant. There are two areas in which the εὐαγγέλιον and expressions of the incarnation are especially intertwined in the Ignatian corpus: the Christological polarity "flesh and spirit" (e.g., *Eph.* 7.2: σαρκικός τε καὶ

Ignatius often uses the title ὁ κυριός to refer to Jesus (but never to God): *Eph.* 7.2; *Magn.* 7.1, 13.1; *Trall.* 8.1; *Phld.* 3.1, 4.1, 9.2, 11.2; *Smyrn.* insc., 1.1, 4.2, 5.2; *Pol.* 8.3.

[7]R. Brown points out that this phrase is a "cross between a vocative and a proclamation of faith ("you are my Lord and my God")." He states that no modern scholarship considers this as an exclamation in honor of the Father. R. Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, AB 29-29A (Garden City: Doubleday, 1970) 1026-1027.

[8]See Dunn, 60-64.

[9]Cullmann, *Christology*, 314.

πνευματικός), and the motifs and themes which surround the coming, or manifestation, of Jesus.

Out of the several polarities in Ignatius' rhetoric, "flesh and spirit" is a particular theme that describes the incarnation and, at the same time, points to the εὐαγγέλιον.[10] This polarity for Ignatius is both Christological (*Eph.* 7.2; *Smyrn.* 3.2) and anthropological (*Trall.* 12.1; *Pol.* 1.2, 2.2, 5.1); the former is my primary concern.

Ephesians 7.2 is the presumed hymn we have seen in Part One. The first of the seven antitheses which describe the "one physician (εἷς ἰατρός ἐστιν)" is the phrase "both fleshly and spiritual (σαρκικός τε καὶ πνευματικός)." This theme is reiterated in the third antithesis: "born in flesh, God (ἐν σαρκὶ γενόμενος θεός)."[11] Moreover, in the resurrection appearance story related in *Smyrn.* 3.1-3 the disciples touched Jesus and believed, "being intermingled with his flesh and spirit (κραθέντες τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ πνεύματι)" (3.2); and, in 3.1, Ignatius concludes the scene with "And after the resurrection he ate and drank with them as a being of flesh, although spiritually united with the Father (μετὰ δὲ

---

[10]"Polarities" is Schoedel's term (*Ignatius of Antioch*, 23).

[11]These are references to the παρουσία, which is the primary εὐαγγέλιον motif in the hymn.

Most likely because of later Christological controversies, this third antithesis has been altered in some texts to read ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ θεός. Citing patristic quotations, Lightfoot (49) accepts ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ θεός as the correct reading, while more recent authors agree that ἐν σαρκὶ γενόμενος θεός of the best Greek texts is the proper reading. Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 61; A. Lindemann, H. Paulsen, eds., *Die Apostolischen Väter* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck, 1992) 182.

τὴν ἀνάστασιν συνέφαγεν αὐτοῖς καὶ συνέπιεν ὡς σαρκικός, καίπερ πνευματικῶς ἡνωμένος τῷ πατρί)." Thus, it is clear that Ignatius presents Jesus as God (ie., 'spiritual') in flesh both before and after the resurrection: he links both the birth (*Eph.* 7.2: ἐν σαρκὶ γενόμενος θεός) and the resurrection (*Smyrn.* 3.1-3) with this theme to underscore the reality of the entirety of Jesus' earthly existence as God in human flesh.

This 'flesh and spirit' description of Jesus as God-human has its origins in the two-step movement from "born . . . according to flesh," to "recognized as son of God . . . according to the spirit of holiness from the resurrection" that we have highlighted as Paul's εὐαγγέλιον in Rom 1:3-4.[12] Yet, when we turn to Ignatius' more direct uses of the formula behind Rom 1:3-4 (i.e., *Eph.* 20.2; *Trall.* 9.1; *Smyrn.* 1.1), we will see that, consistently, Ignatius' idea of the incarnation has one step: Ignatius describes Jesus, the God-human, as from the start a union of flesh and spirit (cf., *Eph.* 18.2).

The union is vital for Ignatius; for, not only does this expression of the incarnation counter the docetic error (and, thus, argues for church unity; i.e., *Smyrn.* 2), but Jesus' unity of flesh and spirit in the incarnation also defines the individual Christian's union with Jesus (or

---

[12]With respect to this two-stage Christological movement in Rom 1:3-4, see Dunn, 33-35. Cf., Rathke, 48; Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 20.

God). Hence, just after responding to the docetists with the incarnation sequence in *Eph.* 7.2, Ignatius writes the Ephesians that they are "completely of God (ὅλοι ὄντες θεοῦ)" and then tells them "what you do according to the flesh is spiritual, for you do everything in Jesus Christ (ἃ δὲ καὶ κατὰ σάρκα πράσσετε, ταῦτα πνευματικά ἐστιν· ἐν Ἰησοῦ γὰρ Χριστῷ πάντα πράσσετε)" (*Eph.* 8.1-2).[13]

What is more, we have seen that in *Phld.* 5.1 the flesh of Jesus is compared to the εὐαγγέλιον: Ignatius speaks about "taking refuge in the gospel as in the flesh of Jesus (προσφυγὼν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ ὡς σαρκὶ Ἰησοῦ)." This refers to the reality of the flesh of Jesus "which suffered for our sins, [flesh] which the Father raised in his goodness (. . . τὴν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν παθοῦσαν, ἣν τῇ χρηστότητι ὁ πατὴρ ἤγειρεν)" (*Smyrn.* 7.1).[14] Thus, through the physical flesh of the God-human Jesus, the Father accomplished his purpose (e.g., *Eph.* 3.2, *Smyrn.* 6.2) in the events of the εὐαγγέλιον. Ignatius, therefore, takes refuge in the εὐαγγέλιον because in it he finds the events of salvation accomplished by Jesus, "our God" in the flesh.[15]

---

[13]Cf., *Rom.* insc.: "to those who are united in flesh and spirit in every one of [Jesus'] commandments, filled with the grace of God . . . (κατὰ σάρκα καὶ πνεῦμα ἡνωμένοις πάσῃ ἐντολῇ αὐτοῦ, πεπληρωμένοις χάριτος θεοῦ . . .)."

[14]Here Ignatius is referring to the eucharist as the flesh of Jesus in the church (cf., *Phld.* 4.1).

[15]H. E. Lona, "Der Sprachgebrauch von σάρξ, σάρκικός bei Ignatius von Antiochien," *ZKT* 108 (1986) 395-396.

We may now turn to the 'coming' or 'manifestation' of Jesus, another εὐαγγέλιον motif which functions as a defining feature in Ignatius' idea of the incarnation. We have seen in Part One how the παρουσία motif—as contained in the εὐαγγέλιον (*Phld.* 9.2)—is expressed through recourse to several themes: πάρειμι (*Magn.* 9.2), φαίνω (*Magn.* 6.1) and φανερόω (*Eph.* 19.2-3; *Magn.* 8.2), and γέννησις (*Magn.* 11.1; cf., *Eph.* 7.2, 18.2; *Trall.* 9.1; *Smyrn.* 1.1). Having recognized this nexus with the εὐαγγέλιον, we may review the 'coming/manifestation' motif specifically as an expression of Ignatius' concept of the incarnation.

Ignatius' letter to the Magnesians contains several passages which merit consideration in this regard. In *Magn.* 6.1 Ignatius sets up a chain of church authority which is in service to Jesus "who before the ages was with the Father and appeared at the end (ὃς πρὸ αἰώνων παρὰ πατρὶ ἦν καὶ ἐν τέλει ἐφάνη)." This use of φαίνω, as we have seen, refers to the παρουσία of Jesus in the εὐαγγέλιον. Moreover, this passage clearly speaks of Jesus' pre-existence with the Father. Thus, while Jesus' divinity is described somewhat indirectly as being "with the Father" (cf., John 1:2, 17:5, 24), we have in one sentence a summary of the existence of Jesus with his appearance (presumably, *from* the Father) as the pivotal end-time event.

We find the same juxtaposition of Jesus' pre-existence with the incarnation more clearly expressed in *Magn.* 7.2 where Ignatius exhorts the Magnesians:

> πάντες ὡς εἰς ἕνα ναὸν συντρέχετε θεοῦ, ὡς ἐπὶ ἓν θυσιαστήριον, ἐπὶ ἕνα Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, τὸν ἀφ' ἑνὸς πατρὸς προελθόντα καὶ εἰς ἕνα ὄντα καὶ χωρήσαντα.
>
> All of you together run as to one temple of God, as to one altar, to one Jesus Christ who came forth from the one Father, was with the one, and returned.

In this passage—which has a typical multi-layered Ignatian emphasis on unity (cf., *Magn.* 1.2, *Phld.* 8.1)—Ignatius uses the verb προέρχομαι to describe not only Jesus' origins with the Father, but also his manifestation in the world. Jesus' own unity ("one Jesus Christ": of flesh and spirit [e.g., *Eph.* 7.2]), along with his being united with the Father (as in *Magn.* 6.1) are unities which serve as models for the church unity which Ignatius is encouraging for the Magnesians. Therefore, in *Magn.* 7.2 we have an expression of the incarnation which is grounded in the manifestation motif, and which, in turn, itself functions as an image and exhortation to church unity.

In another Magnesian text, 8.2, the OT Prophets "lived according to Jesus Christ (οἱ . . . προφῆται κατὰ Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν ἔζησαν)." They were persecuted because of their living in this way. In their persecution they were "inspired by [Christ's] grace to convince the disobedient (ἐνπνεόμενοι ὑπὸ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ, εἰς τὸ πληροφορηθῆναι τοὺς απειθοῦντας)":

> ὅτι εἷς θεός ἐστιν, ὁ φανερώσας ἑαυτὸν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, ὅς ἐστιν αὐτοῦ λόγος ἀπὸ σιγῆς προελθών, ὅς κατὰ πάντα εὐηρέστησεν τῷ πέμψαντι αὐτόν.[16]
>
> that there is one God who revealed himself through Jesus Christ his son who is his word proceeding from silence, who in all things pleased the one who sent him.

Elsewhere we have considered this use of πληροφορέω and its relation to the εὐαγγέλιον; moreover, we have also noted that the sense of ἀπειθέω—rather than referring primarily to a failure in ethical demands—is the opposite of correct belief (e.g., Rom 10:21; 1 Pet 4:17; *Barn.* 12.4; cf., 2 Thess 1:8).

Hence, through their lives "according to Jesus Christ," their persecution, and their being inspired by Jesus, the Prophets convince the unbelievers of the truth of the incarnation (and, by implication, the truth of the salvation through the εὐαγγέλιον events). In the incarnation, Jesus is not only the revelation of God but he is also God's son.[17]

---

[16]There is a textual question here. The Greek of the middle recension (with its Latin translation) has "who is his eternal word which did not proceed from silence (λόγος ἀΐδιος οὐκ ἀπὸ σιγῆς προελθών). Lightfoot (126-128), Lindemann/Paulsen (196) and Schoedel (*Ignatius of Antioch*, 5, 120, n. 12) all most reasonably see ἀΐδιος οὐκ as from the hand of a later editor to counter Valentinian gnosticism.

Joly (*Le Dossier*, 71-73) uses the ἀΐδιος οὐκ reading to support his position that the Ignatian letters are to be dated later, ca. 165.

[17]Jesus as "the son of God" (e.g., *Eph.* 20.2; *Smyrn.* 1.1) will be the first Christological expression for consideration in the next section. As we will see, here the title "son" serves to underscore the separateness of the 'one God' and 'Jesus, our God.'

Again we find the use of προέρχομαι (cf., *Magn.* 7.2) to describe Jesus' coming as God.

However, here, with the reference to "silence" as Jesus' origin, the situation seems more complex. There is a fair amount of scholarship which sees behind this phrase various gnostic formulations about a silent supreme deity revealed through divine speech (λόγος) in the world.[18]

Yet, to attribute to this silence of God a fully gnostic background places an unwarranted template on Ignatius' expression. We have seen how the silence/words/deeds theme functions for Ignatius with respect to the εὐαγγέλιον. More telling, however, is the fact that elsewhere Ignatius never clearly identifies God with silence. There is no such identification, for example, with the "three mysteries of a cry which were done in the stillness of God (τρία μυστήρια κραυγῆς, ἅτινα ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ θεοῦ ἐπράχθη)" of the star-hymn (*Eph.* 19.1).[19] Moreover, *Rom.* 8.2 (Jesus is the "unlying mouth through which the Father spoke truly [τὸ ἀψευδὲς στόμα, ἐν ᾧ ὁ πατὴρ ἐλάλησεν ἀληθῶς]") is best seen within the context of Jesus' silence/speaking/deeds of

---

[18]See, for example, L. W. Barnard, "The Background of St. Ignatius of Antioch," *VC* 17 (1963) 193-206; H.-W. Bartsch, *Gnostisches Gut*, 57-61; Paulsen, *Studien*, 110-114.

[19]Schoedel sees this stillness (ἡσυχία) as describing God's silence while the divine plan is revealed in the historical events of the birth and passion of Jesus. In other words, God did not openly intervene in these events. Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 91.

Eph. 15.1-2 in which Jesus is the "one teacher" who is "worthy of the Father."

Therefore, it seems most accurate to see these silence and/or speaking passages—including *Magn.* 8.2—in light of the revelation-schema which we highlighted with respect to the εὐαγγέλιον in Part One.[20] The *hidden mystery that is now revealed as part of the plan of God* is the operative theme here.[21] While there may well be a gnostic mythological quality to these expressions, that quality is hardly recognizable as dominant for Ignatius. Ignatius, rather, is working with the relatively common early Christian theme of God's plan being revealed in Jesus at the intended time.[22]

The same context is operative with respect to *Eph.* 19, the star-hymn. The hymn is presented as an answer to the question, "How then was he revealed to the aeons? (πῶς οὖν ἐφανερώθη τοῖς αἰῶσιν;)." In *Eph.* 19.3b the answer is summarized with,

> . . . θεοῦ ἀνθρωπίνως φανερουμένου εἰς καινότητα ἀϊδίου ζωῆς· ἀρχὴν δὲ ἐλάμβανεν τὸ παρὰ θεῷ ἀπηρτισμένον. ἔνθεν τὰ πάντα συνεκινεῖτο διὰ τὸ μελετᾶσθαι θανάτου κατάλυσιν.
>
> . . . God being revealed as human to bring newness of eternal life, and what had been prepared by God had its beginning; hence all things were disturbed because the destruction of death was being worked out.

---

[20]Cf., Lührmann, 129-130.
[21]E.g., Rom 16:25-26; Col 1:26; 1 Pet 1:20; *2 Clem.* 14:2.
[22]Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 120-121.

Again, we find the plan of God in conjunction with Jesus as the manifestation of God. Here, as well, the ultimate purpose of God is to bring the "newness of eternal life." Therefore, Jesus as the God-human, through his birth (manifestation), passion (19.1: "the death of the Lord') and resurrection completes the plan of God in history.[23]

To conclude this discussion of the incarnation in the Ignatian letters we turn to two Ignatian titles which refer to Jesus as God in human flesh: "the new human (καινὸς ἄνθρωπος)" (*Eph.* 20.1), "the perfect human (τέλειος ἄνθρωπος)" (*Smyrn.* 4.2). These titles are closely related and appear to be versions of similar titles in the NT, specifically in the Pauline tradition. Thus, we find "perfect [or "complete"] man (ἀνὴρ τέλειος)" at Eph 4:13, and "new human (καινὸς ἄνθρωπος)" at Eph 2:15 and 4:24.[24] These NT usages, however, do not refer to Christ himself; rather they are used to describe the person who accepts Christ and thus becomes "new" or "perfect" ("complete").[25]

In *Eph.* 20, Ignatius is concluding his letter and promises another "little book (βιβλίδιον)" in which he will present the "plan concerning the new human Jesus Christ,

---

[23]Ibid., 94.

[24]See, as well, νέος ἄνθρωπος at Col 3:10.

[25]So, for example, in Eph 4:24, the "new human" is in contrast to the "old human (παλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος)" of lust and corruption of 4:22. The new human is the result of God's new creation; thus the new human lives "according to the likeness of God in true righteousness and holiness (καὶ ἐνδύσασθαι τὸν καινὸν ἄνθρωπον τὸν κατὰ θεὸν κτισθέντα ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ ιαὶ ὁσιότητι τῆς ἀληθείας)." Schnackenburg, ***Ephesians***, 201.

faith in him and love of him, in his passion and resurrection (οἰκονομίας εἰς τὸν καινὸν ἄνθρωπον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ πίστει καὶ ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ ἀγάπῃ, ἐν πάθει αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀναστάσει)" (*Eph.* 20.1). As we have seen, by "plan (ἡ οἰκονομία)," Ignatius is speaking of God's intentions for the history of the world (cf., *Eph.* 18.2, etc.).[26] Because of his identity with God as well as with humanity (i.e., "the son of humanity and the son of God": *Eph.* 20.2), Jesus' role in this οἰκονομία—especially through the εὐαγγέλιον events of the passion and resurrection—is to become a human being who is God, a *new* human being in the course of human history.[27] As the new human being Jesus fulfills God's plan of salvation through his passion and resurrection. This salvation is the "newness of eternal life (. . . εἰς καινότητα ἀϊδίου ζωῆς)" of *Eph.* 19.3.

We may view the title "the perfect human (τέλειος ἄνθρωπος)" of *Smyrn.* 4.2 in the same light . Ignatius, after speaking dramatically of his own sufferings in defense of proper belief in Christ, states,

---

[26]In the above paragraphs we have recognized the "plan of God" theme in relation to the manifestation motif. Other Ignatian expressions of this οἰκονομία are: God's "will" (τό θέλημα: *Rom.* insc.; *Smyrn.* 6.2), and "purpose" (ἡ γνώμη: *Eph.* 3.2; *Smyrn.* 6.2; *Pol.* 8.1).

[27]Cf., Schlier, *Untersuchungen*, 88-89, n. 2 who sees the καινὸς ἄνθρωπος in a gnostic context, as the redeemer from the light who gathers his scattered members and thus becomes *new*. Schoedel, however, demonstrates that this image has "a variety of possible roots." *Ignatius of Antioch*, 96.

> μόνον ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς τὸ συμπαθεῖν αὐτῷ πάντα ὑπομένω, αὐτοῦ με ἐνδυναμοῦντος τοῦ τελείου ἀνθρώπου.
>
> only in the name of Jesus Christ am I enduring all things to suffer with him: he, the perfect human, empowers me.

W. Schoedel sees both this title and καινὸς ἄνθρωπος as expressions of an idea that makes Christ a "Representive Human Being" who, as the ultimate type, is the object of unity for Christians in the one body of Christ, the church (see *Smyrn.* 1.2). Thus, the Ignatian τέλειος ἄνθρωπος

> marks the transcendent nature of the Representative Human Being, yet finds its actualization only in Christ as a historical figure—perhaps especially in Christ as the crucified one . . .[28]

This means that for Ignatius only Jesus, "our God" in human flesh, through his historical passion and resurrection, can bring human beings to their proper identity: "newness of eternal life," or salvation.[29] Christians are to be united through their "faith in him and love of him in his passion and resurrection" (*Eph.* 20.1).

B. IGNATIAN TITLES FOR JESUS

With the above general discussion concerning Ignatian expressions of the incarnation before us, a more specific discussion of Ignatius' Christology is in order. In the following pages, I will consider several other Ignatian

---

[28]Ibid., 232-233.
[29]Cf., Ibid., 233.

titles or descriptions for Jesus. These include "Son of God," "Savior," "the common hope," "the only teacher," and "the one physician." My primary concern here centers on how these titles serve as expressions of εὐαγγέλιον motifs and themes.

1. THE SON OF GOD

Ignatius refers to Jesus as God's son six times (*Eph.* 4.2, 20.2; *Magn.* 8.2, 13.1; *Rom.* insc.; *Smyrn.* 1.1); however, only once, at *Eph.* 20.2, do we find the apparently more formal title ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ.[30]

In *Eph.* 4.2, within a metaphorical passage centered once again on church unity, Ignatius speaks of Jesus as God's son in conjunction with the fatherhood of God toward Christians in general. The Ephesians are urged to join together as in a choir to "sing with one voice through Jesus Christ to the Father (ᾄδητε ἐν φωνῇ μιᾷ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τῷ πατρί)." This, so that God may recognize them as being "members of his son (. . . μέλη ὄντας τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ)." There are no εὐαγγέλιον motifs or images here. The most we can point to is the centrality of Jesus, the son, as the way to Father.

---

[30]At the same time, of the forty-four times Ignatius refers to God as "Father," Ignatius directly calls God the Father of Jesus six times (*Eph.* 2.1; *Magn.* 3.1; *Trall.* insc, 9.2; *Rom.* insc; *Phld.* 7.2). The other references to God as Father involve either God as Father of Christians (ie., *Eph.* insc; *Magn.* 3.1; *Trall.* 11.1; *Rom.* 7.2; *Phld.* 3.1; *Smyrn.* 13.1) or God's fatherhood with some mention of Jesus (ie., *Magn.* insc, 5.2; *Trall.* 13.3; *Rom.* 2.2).

Hence, we may think of *Phld.* 9.1—another 'unity' text—where Jesus, through the events of the εὐαγγέλιον (in *Phld.* 9.2), is the way to the Father:

> αὐτὸς ὢν θύρα τοῦ πατρός, δι' ἧς εἰσέρχονται Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακὼβ καὶ οἱ προφῆται καὶ ἀπόστολοι καὶ ἡ ἐκκλησία. πάντα ταῦτα εἰς ἑνότητα θεοῦ.
>
> He is the door of the Father through which enter Abraham and Isaac and Jacob and the Prophets and the Apostles and the church: all these into the unity of God.

Thus viewing *Eph.* 4.2 in light of *Phld.* 9.1-2, we find ourselves not far from Ignatius' εὐαγγέλιον. Jesus, God's son, through his coming, passion and resurrection, is the way to the Father.[31]

In *Eph.* 20.2 we find a stronger tie between Jesus as God's son and the εὐαγγέλιον. After promising to write more about the "new human Jesus Christ . . . in his passion and resurrection (οἰκονομίας εἰς τὸν καινὸν ἄνθρωπον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν . . . ἐν πάθει αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀναστάσει) (20.1)," Ignatius speaks of Jesus as "according to the flesh of the family of David, son of a human and son of God (κατὰ σάρκα ἐκ γένους Δαυείδ, τῷ υἱῷ ανθρώπου καὶ υἱῷ θεοῦ)" (20.2).

Here again Ignatius is working with the formulation of Paul's εὐαγγέλιον in Rom 1:1-3 (cf., *Trall.* 9.1; *Smyrn.* 1.1).[32] Yet, in place of Paul's reference to Jesus being

---

[31]Cf., the only "archives" of *Phld.* 8.2.

[32]Rathke, 48; Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 97.

recognized as "the son of God in power according to the spirit of holiness" (the second step in the formula), Ignatius has "son of a human and son of God," thus, as we have seen, emphasizing Jesus' divinity from the time of his human origins.

Only here does Ignatius refer to Jesus as υἱὸς [τοῦ] ἀνθρώπου. This phrase in the Ignatian context is not a title; it functions, rather as a statement of Jesus' humanity in contrast to his divinity. Hence, for Ignatius we see that υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, when paired with υἱὸς [τοῦ] θεοῦ becomes an expression of the incàrnation.[33] The bishop, then, is not using υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου in the general NT senses, which are titular and tend to be more eschatological.[34] This means that Ignatius has shifted the meaning of the NT title—which clearly has its origins in Dan 7:13-14—presumably to fit an environment which does not have direct contact with the Jewish background of much of the "Son of Man" material in the NT.

---

[33]Ibid.

This same sort of use is found in *Barn.* 12.10: "See again Jesus, not as son of humanity, but as son of God, and manifested in a type of the flesh (ἴδε πάλιν Ἰησοῦς, οὐχὶ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου, ἀλλὰ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, τύπῳ δὲ ἐν σαρκὶ φανερωθείς)."

[34]Dunn, 96-97. Actually, in the NT the title ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου is a feature only in the Gospels, Acts and in Revelation (along with one quotation of Ps 8:4 in Heb 2:6). With respect to Paul, Cullmann points to three passages, 1 Cor 15:45-49; Rom 5:12-21; Phil 2:5-11, and highlights the Adam/Christ typology as Paul's take on the υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. Cullmann, *Christology*, 137-188; on Paul, 166-181. Cf., Dunn, 107-113.

Jesus as υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ is ultimately a reference to the God-human arriving in the world that we have observed elsewhere. Therefore, this formulation in *Eph.* 20.2 has affinities with *Eph.* 7.2 (e.g., "born in flesh, God [ἐν σαρκὶ γενόμενος θεός]") and *Eph.* 18.2:

> ὁ γὰρ θεὸς ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστὸς ἐκυοφορήθη ὑπὸ Μαρίας κατ' οἰκονομίαν θεοῦ ἐκ σπέρματος μὲν Δαυείδ, πνεύματος δὲ ἁγίου·
>
> for our God, Jesus the Christ, was conceived by Mary according to God's plan, of the seed of David and the Holy Spirit.

In this same vein, in *Magn.* 8.2—treated above with respect to the incarnation—Ignatius states that "there is one God who revealed himself through Jesus Christ his son (εἷς θεός ἐστιν, ὁ φανερώσας ἑαυτὸν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ,)" (cf., *Eph.* 19.3). Here we find the manifestation motif of the εὐαγγέλιον in conjunction with Jesus as "the son" not only to describe the incarnation, but also to distinguish the existence of the "one God" from that of Jesus, God's manifestation.[35]

Continuing with *Magnesians*, in 13.1 we find a reference to God's son within the only full triadic formula in the letters of Ignatius (cf., *Eph.* 9.1). Ignatius exhorts the Christians to be "confirmed in the ordinances of the Lord and the Apostles (. . . βεβαιωθῆναι ἐν τοῖς δόγμασιν τοῦ κυρίου καὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων)" so that they might be united "in flesh and

---

[35]Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 120.

spirit, faith and love, in the Son and the Father and in the Spirit, in the beginning and in the end (κατευοδωθῆτε σαρκὶ καὶ πνεύματι, πίστει καὶ ἀγάπῃ, ἐν υἱῷ καὶ πατρὶ καὶ ἐν πνεύματι, ἐν ἀρχῇ καὶ ἐν τέλει)." The order of divine beings here appears important.[36] It suggests a theme we have seen already which is linked with the εὐαγγέλιον: the Son is the way to the Father (*Eph.* 4.2; *Phld.* 9.1). Here the way to the Father through the son is "in the Spirit."[37]

There are two references to Jesus as God's son in *Rom.* insc. These, however, have only general contact with the εὐαγγέλιον motifs and themes. Thus, at the beginning of the greeting, Ignatius refers to "the most high Father and Jesus Christ his only son (πατρὸς ὑψίστου καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ μόνου υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ)"; and toward the end of the greeting we find "I greet in the name of Jesus Christ, the son of the Father (ἀσπάζομαι ἐν ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, υἱοῦ πατρός)." Interspersed with these statements are two references to "Jesus Christ, our God." We find, as well, a suggestions of the plan of God ("in the will of him who willed all things [ἐν θελήματι τοῦ θελήσαντος τὰ πάντα]"), and church unity ("to those who are united in

---

[36]We find this particular order (Jesus, God, Spirit) only in the triadic formula of 2 Cor 13:13.

[37]Lightfoot, 138. Schoedel, therefore, suggests that "trinitarian thinking" is not Ignatius' concern here; rather, it is the unity (ie., "in flesh and spirit") in the way to God that is primary. Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 130-131.

Schoedel also suggests, with little textual support, the possibility that καὶ ἐν πνεύματι is an addition to the original. Ibid., 131. The καὶ ἐν πνεύματι, however, is accepted as original by most other scholars (eg., Lake, 208, Lightfoot, 137-138, Lindemann/Paulsen, 198).

flesh and spirit in all his commandments [κατὰ σάρκα καὶ πνεῦμα ἡνωμένοις πάσῃ ἐντολῇ]"). These are the closest links to the εὐαγγέλιον in *Rom.* insc.

In *Smyrn.* 1.1, however, the title 'Son of God" is an integral component of Ignatius' fullest εὐαγγέλιον statement (1.1-2). The bishop states that Jesus is

> ἀληθῶς ὄντα ἐκ γένους Δαυεὶδ κατὰ σάρκα, υἱὸν θεοῦ κατὰ θέλημα καὶ δύναμιν θεοῦ, γεγεννημένον ἀληθῶς ἐκ παρθένου . . .
>
> truly of the family of David according to the flesh, son of God according to the will and power of God, truly born of a virgin . . .

Once more, as we have seen with *Eph.* 20.2 (and with our discussion of the flesh/spirit polarity), this is a version of the formula in the Pauline εὐαγγέλιον statement of Rom 1:3-4 (. . . τοῦ γενομένου ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυὶδ κατὰ σάρκα, τοῦ ὁρισθέντος υἱοῦ θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν).[38] Here the affinity is closer.

Yet, again, there is a major difference. In the Pauline passage Jesus is recognized as son of God through the resurrection. Ignatius, on the other hand, places Jesus' sonship with the birth.[39] As we have seen in Part

---

[38]See Rathke, 48. Another closely related text is *Trall.* 9.1-2.

[39]Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 221. This is in contrast with M. Elze's position that here Ignatius is linking Jesus' sonship with his baptism (which is the next event listed after the birth in *Smyrn.* 1.1: "truly born of a virgin, baptized by John [γεγεννημένον ἀληθῶς ἐκ παρθένου, βεβαπτισμένον ὑπὸ Ἰωάννου . . .]). Elze thus holds that Ignatius' Christology is adoptionist. Elze, *Untersuchungen*, 14-15, 23-26.

On the other hand, it must be recognized that Jesus' pre-existence does not come into play in either Rom 1:3-4 or *Smyrn.* 1.1.

One, the birth of Jesus itself is a statement of the παρουσία in the εὐαγγέλιον (ie., *Phld.* 9.1). Thus, again, the title 'Son of God' for Ignatius is an assertion of the παρουσία, which is the beginning of the gospel events.

Moreover, the incarnation took place through the "will and power of God." This is a different emphasis from the Pauline "in power according to the spirit of holiness." Ignatius is emphasizing a favorite theme we have highlighted often: the purpose or will of God in history fulfilled in the person of Jesus (e.g., *Eph.* 3.2, 18.1; *Rom.* insc.). Also, it is notable that both Ignatius and Paul refer to God's δύναμις. Jesus, born in the flesh as God's son, is the manifestation of God's power so that God's will may be fulfilled.[40] The phrase "according to the spirit of holiness" of the Pauline formula does not appear to interest Ignatius (cf., *Eph.* 7.2, 18.2; *Smyrn.* 3.2).

Therefore, to conclude this discussion of the title 'Son of God' in Ignatius' letters, it is most clear that this is an expression of the incarnation, the earthly life of the God-human from his birth in the world and continuing in his union with his Father. This identity as God—primarily expressed through conjunction with ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (*Eph.* 20.2), and often through the flesh/spririt polarity—

---

[40]W. Grundmann, "δύναμαι, κ.τ.λ.," *TDNT* II, 306.

Ignatius uses δύναμις in this way three other times: In *Magn.* 3.1 and *Smyrn.* 13.1 it is the "power of God"; in *Eph.* 11.2, it is the "power of Jesus Christ."

is the foundation for the εὐαγγέλιον: God's plan is begun in the birth (the παρουσία) of God's son Jesus, and is fulfilled through the salvific events of the εὐαγγέλιον, the passion and resurrection.

Ignatius' emphasis on the incarnation in all of this is a departure from the NT. Most clearly in this respect, we have observed that Ignatius has taken the tradition found in Rom 1:3-4 and expressed Paul's formula for the needs of his own situation.

2. THE SAVIOR

In the following pages, I will examine not only the specific Ignatian references to Jesus as Savior, but I will also broaden my treatment to consider the theme of salvation in general and how this theme is played out with reference to the εὐαγγέλιον (i.e., *Rom.* 6.1; *Phld.* 9.2; *Smyrn.* 5.3). First, then, I will begin with the four Ignatian references to Jesus as "Savior (ὁ σωτήρ)." Second, I will consider the way the bishop speaks of salvation (ἡ σωτηρία) through the phrase "for us (δι' ἡμᾶς/ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν)," and through the more general themes centered on "life" and "resurrection." As always, Ignatius' εὐαγγέλιον is our watchword.

As in the NT, with respect to Jesus as "Savior," one is immediately struck by the relatively few instances in which Ignatius directly refers to Jesus with this title (i.e.,

Eph. 1.1; *Magn.* insc.; *Phld.* 9.2; *Smyrn.* 7.1).[41] Of these, two have a formulaic quality: blessings are received "in Christ Jesus, our Savior (ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ σωτῆρι ἡμῶν)" (*Eph.* 1.1; *Magn.* insc.). Aside from being part of opening greetings, this usage tells us little else.

Other references to Jesus the Savior, though, tell us more. In one of our εὐαγγέλιον-defining passages, *Phld.* 9.2, Ignatius states

> ἐξαίρετον δέ τι ἔχει τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, τὴν παρουσίαν τοῦ σωτῆρος, κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τὸ πάθος αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὴν ἀνάστασιν. οἱ γὰρ ἀγαπητοὶ προφῆται κατήγγειλαν εἰς αὐτόν· τὸ δὲ εὐαγγέλιον ἀπάρτισμά ἐστιν ἀφθαρσίας.
>
> But the gospel has something remarkable, the coming of the Savior, our lord Jesus Christ, his passion and resurrection. For the beloved Prophets directed their announcement toward him; but the gospel is the completion of immortality.

In this passage—centered on the advent, passion and resurrection of the σωτήρ—Ignatius defines the εὐαγγέλιον as

---

[41]Regarding the NT, Cullmann explains the relative absence of the title σωτήρ for Jesus by appealing to the much greater importance of the designation κύριος as the central name in all early expressions of faith in Jesus. Cullmann, *Christology*, 238. It is not until the Pastoral Epistles (Titus 1:3,4, 2:10, 13, 3:4,6; 1 Tim 1:1, 2:3, 4:10; 2 Tim 1:10) and 2 Peter (1:1, 11, 2:20, 3:2,18) that the title σωτήρ comes into more common usage. In the Pastorals it is used in reference to God (e.g., Titus 1:1; 1 Tim 2:3) as well as to Jesus; in 2 Peter it always refers to Jesus. Thus, by the period of 2 Peter, the title was established as a common title for Jesus. W. Foerster, "σώζω, κ.τ.λ.," *TDNT* VII, 1018.

Ignatius is no different. He refers to Jesus as κύριος some thirty-two times. In the εὐαγγέλιον passage of *Phld.* 9.2 we find both titles juxtaposed as if in explanation: "the coming of the savior, our lord Jesus Christ (. . . τὴν παρουσίαν τοῦ σωτῆρος, κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ . . .).

"the completion of immortality." Thus, the announcement given in advance by the OT Prophets is completed through the events of the Savior's life. The completed announcement is the εὐαγγέλιον message of immortality (ἀφθαρσία). Ignatius mentions ἀφθαρσία several times (*Eph.* 17.1; *Magn.* 6.2.; *Trall.* 11.2; *Rom.* 7.3; *Pol.* 2.3). We will soon observe that this immortality is the key to Ignatius' concept of the salvation accomplished by Christ. Most significant at this point, though, is the expression at *Pol.* 2.3. Ignatius admonishes Polycarp to remember that in everything "the prize is immortality and eternal life about which you also are persuaded (τὸ θέμα ἀφθαρσία καὶ ζωὴ αἰώνιος, περὶ ἧς καὶ σὺ πέπεισαι)."

However, there is another less apparent facet to Ignatius' idea of salvation. In the 'confessing' passage of *Smyrn.* 7.1, Ignatius complains that the schismatics

> εὐχαριστίας καὶ προσευχῆς ἀπέχονται, διὰ τὸ μὴ ὁμολογεῖν τὴν εὐχαριστίαν σάρκα εἶναι τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησους Χριστοῦ τὴν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν παθοῦσαν, ἣν τῇ χρηστότητι ὁ πατὴρ ἤγειρεν.
>
> avoid the eucharist and prayer, because they do not confess that the eucharist is the flesh of our Savior Jesus Christ [flesh] which suffered for our sins, which the Father raised by his goodness.

The flesh of Jesus the Savior "suffered for our sins" and was raised by God. This is one of only two direct references to sin (ἡ ἁμαρτία) in the Ignatian letters (cf.,

Eph. 14.2).[42] Ignatius, it seems, is dependent here on the traditional formulation represented by Paul's εὐαγγέλιον statement in 1 Cor 15:3: "that Christ died for our sins . . . (ὅτι Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν . . .)."

The apparent emphasis on atonement for human sin is the issue here. Ignatius, in his own use of this formula, suggests that the suffering of the Savior was indeed to atone for human sin. Yet, with only this single reference, it seems evident that atonement for sin is not at all a significant feature in Ignatius' concept of the salvation accomplished by Jesus.[43] Ignatius' idea of salvation through Jesus appears to be more broadly governed by the theme of immortality.[44] Therefore, it is not as if atonement for sin is absent from Ignatius' Christological world; rather, this concept seems to be folded into—as a secondary component of—the more broadly expressed 'salvation as immortality.'

In this regard, one notices that in lieu of ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν Ignatius most frequently employs two related expressions for Jesus' work of salvation (the first of which is found in the NT): Jesus suffered "for us" (ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν:

---

[42]There is also an indirect reference to sin in *Phld.* 8.1: "The Lord then forgives all who repent, if their repentance leads to the unity of God (πᾶσιν οὖν μετανοοῦσιν ἀφίει ὁ κύριος, ἐὰν μετανοήσωσιν εἰς ἑνότητα θεοῦ)." This, however is more specifically a reference to the activity of the schismatics.

[43]Cf., Cullmann, *Christology*, 243.

[44]Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 182, n. 3.

Rom. 6.1a; *Smyrn.* 1.2)[45] or "for our sake" (δι' ἡμᾶς: *Trall.* 2.1; *Rom.* 6.1b; *Pol.* 3.2). The fullest example of this usage is found in *Rom.* 6.1. In his plea to the Roman Christians to be allowed to suffer and undergo martyrdom, Ignatius states: "I seek him who died for us; I desire him who rose for our sake (ἐκεῖνον ζητῶ, τὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀποθανόντα· ἐκεῖνον θέλω, τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς ἀναστάντα)."[46] Ignatius next states that the result of his seeking will be a birth to new life: "the pains of birth are upon me (ὁ δὲ τοκετός μοι ἐπίκειται)" (*Rom.* 6.1). The Ignatian salvation "for us," therefore, is not concentrated on atonement from sin; rather, it involves the gaining of "immortality" (e.g. *Eph.* 17.1; *Smyrn.* 2.3) or "eternal life" (e.g. *Eph.* 18.1, 19.3; *Magn.* 1.1; *Pol.* 2.3) through the salvific deeds of the Savior in the εὐαγγέλιον.

In *Trall.* 2.1, another "for our sake" passage, this salvation to eternal life comes to the fore: Ignatius tells the Trallians,

> φαίνεσθέ μοι οὐ κατὰ ἄνθρωπον ζῶντες, ἀλλὰ κατὰ Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς ἀποθανόντα, ἵνα πιστεύσαντες εἰς τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν ἐκφύγητε.
>
> it is clear to me that you are living not according to humanity but according to Jesus Christ who died for our

---

[45]Cf., Rom 5:8, 14:15; 2 Cor 5:14; 1 Cor 15:3.

Ignatius speaks of the resurection "for our sake (δι' ἡμᾶς)" only once, in *Rom.* 6.1b. The other citations (*Trall.* 2.1; *Rom.* 6.1a; *Smyrn.* 1.2; *Pol.* 3.2) refer only to Jesus' suffering or death.

[46]Cf., Pol. *Phil.* 9.2: "For [the Apostles] did not love this world but him who died for us and who was raised by God for our sake (οὐ γὰρ τὸν νῦν ἠγάπησαν αἰῶνα, ἀλλὰ τὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀποθανόντα καὶ δι' ἡμᾶς ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀναστάντα)."

> sake, that by believing in his death you may escape death.

Here, within the context of an exhortation to subjection to the bishop, the salvific death of Jesus is presented as the source of eternal life. Belief in Jesus' death "for our sake" indicates one is "living according to Jesus Christ" and thus escaping death.

The "for our sake" passages in *Smyrn.* 1.2 and 2.1 are, therefore, best seen as statements of Jesus' salvific passion which leads to eternal life for the believer. So, within the expanded faith statement of *Smyrn.* 1.2, Ignatius says that Jesus was "truly nailed in the flesh [to the cross] for our sake (ἀληθῶς . . . καθηλωμένον ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐν σαρκί)"; and *Smyrn.* 2.1 sums up the entire message with, "for he suffered all these things for us so that we might be saved (ταῦτα γὰρ πάντα ἔπαθεν δι' ἡμᾶς, ἵνα σωθῶμεν·)." In his suffering Jesus is "true life (τὸ ἀληθινὸν ἡμῶν ζῆν)" (*Smyrn.* 4.1) for believers.

Finally, in *Pol.* 3.2, within an exhortation to perseverance in correct belief, Ignatius provides a series of Christological antitheses with "for our sake" as the central feature:

> τοὺς καιροὺς καταμάνθανε.
> τὸν ὑπὲρ καιρὸν προσδόκα,
> τὸν ἄχρονον,
> τὸν ἀόρατον,
> τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς ὁρατόν
> τὸν ἀψηλάφητον,
> τὸν ἀπαθῆ,

τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς παθητόν,
τὸν κατὰ πάντα τρόπον δι' ἡμᾶς ὑπομείναντα.

Observe the times.
Look for him who is above time—
non-temporal,
invisible,
for our sakes visible,
intangible,
impassable,
for our sakes passible,
one who endured in every way for our sakes.[47]

Jesus, who has the supernatural attributes of God, endured incarnation in the world "for our sake." Ignatius presents Jesus' endurance of the incarnation events to Polycarp as the model of perseverance. Indeed, we are not far from the παρουσία ("invisible, for our sakes visible") and παθός (impassable, for our sakes passible") motifs of the εὐαγγέλιον. Jesus' coming into the world and his passion were for the salvation of those who believe. While neither atonement nor immortality themes are immediately evident here, we have already observed the phrase in the passage just preceding 3.1-2: in endurance "the prize is immortality and eternal life about which you also are persuaded (τὸ θέμα ἀφθαρσία καὶ ζωὴ αἰώνιος, περὶ ἧς καὶ σὺ πέπεισαι)" (*Pol.* 2.3).

To conclude this discussion of the Ignatian themes surrounding the title "Christ Jesus, our Savior," we may briefly highlight other Ignatian expressions of the

---

[47]Translation, Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 266.

salvation gained through the events of the εὐαγγέλιον, but in which "savior" or "salvation" are not directly mentioned.[48] So, turning again to the star-hymn, we find the salvation accomplished by Jesus suggested by the summary passage (*Eph.* 19.3):

> . . . θεοῦ ἀνθρωπίνως φανερουμένου εἰς καινότητα ἀϊδίου ζωῆς· ἀρχὴν δὲ ἐλάμβανεν τὸ παρὰ θεῷ ἀπηρτισμένον. ἔνθεν τὰ πάντα συνεκινεῖτο διὰ τὸ μελετᾶσθαι θανάτου κατάλυσιν.
>
> . . . God being revealed as human to bring newness of eternal life, and what had been prepared by God had its beginning; hence all things were disturbed because the destruction of death was being worked out.

The destruction of death (cf., 1 Cor 15:26) through the παρουσία of God in Jesus brings about the "newness of eternal life" in the plan of God.

Lesser references to the eternal life gained through Jesus the Savior are found in such expressions as *Magn.* 1.1 where Ignatius prays that in the churches "there might be a union of the flesh and spirit of Jesus Christ, our everlasting life . . . (ἐν αἷς ἕνωσιν εὔχομαι σαρκὸς καὶ πνεύματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τοῦ διὰ παντὸς ἡμῶν ζῆν . . .)." Likewise, Ignatius, referring to the repentence of schismatics, states in *Smyrn.* 4.1: "Jesus Christ, our true life, has power over this (τούτου δὲ ἔχει ἐξουσίαν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, τὸ ἀληθινὸν ἡμῶν ζῆν)." Finally, we find in *Smyrn.* 5.3 that the schismatics are to

---

[48]Related to the complex of 'salvation' language is Ignatius' fairly extensive use of ἐπιτύχανω, most often in the phrase "to attain God" (e.g., *Eph.* 12.2; *Magn.* 14; *Rom.* 1.2; *Smyrn.* 11.1).

be shunned "until they repent concerning the passion, which is our resurrection (μέχρις οὗ μετανοήσωσιν εἰς τὸ πάθος, ὅ ἐστιν ἡμῶν ἀνάστασις)."[49]

Also directly related to Ignatius' theology of salvation is the complex of themes which refer to the resurrection of Christ as the image of the resurrection of the believer. A prime example of this is the conclusion of the credal summary in *Trall.* 9.2:

> . . . ὃς καὶ ἀληθῶς ἠγέρθη ἀπὸ νεκρῶν, ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ, κατὰ τὸ ὁμοίωμα ὃς καὶ ἡμᾶς τοὺς πιστεύοντας αὐτῷ οὕτως ἐγερεῖ ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, οὗ χωρὶς τὸ ἀληθινὸν ζῆν οὐκ ἔχομεν.
>
> . . . [Jesus] who was also truly raised from the dead, his Father having raised him, in whose likeness his Father will also so raise us up who believe in him through Jesus Christ, apart from whom we do not have true life.[50]

Here Ignatius is working with the Pauline fundamental that through the resurrection of Jesus, God has provided those who believe in Jesus resurrection to new life. Thus, we find in 1 Cor 6:14 the succinct statement, "and God raised the Lord and will also raise us by his power (ὁ δὲ θεὸς καὶ τὸν κύριον ἤγειρεν καὶ ἡμᾶς ἐξεγερεῖ διὰ τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ)." This is a short allusion to what occurs in much fuller form later, in 1 Cor 15:12-22.[51] For Ignatius, as for Paul, the

---

[49]There are, as well, medical expressions which refer to eternal life (*Eph.* 7.2, 20.2). These will be treated further along when I turn to the Christology of the "one physician" (*Eph.* 7.2).

[50]Translation, Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 152.

[51]See also 2 Cor 4:14, 1 Thess 4:14; cf., Pol. *Phil.* 2.2.

resurrection of Jesus is the image of the resurrection of the believer (*Trall.* 9.2: κατὰ τὸ ὁμοίωμα . . .); through that resurrection, the believer receives "true life."

Finally, we have *Magn.* 5.2 where, in response to unbelievers, Ignatius sets up an opposition between the "imprint (ἡ χαρακτήρ)" of this world and the "imprint of God the Father (οἱ δὲ πιστοὶ ἐν ἀγάπῃ χαρακτῆρα θεοῦ πατρὸς διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ)." To clinch his point he states, "unless we freely choose to die in [Jesus'] passion, his life is not in us (δι' ου ἐὰν μὴ αὐθαιρέτως ἔχωμεν τὸ ἀποθανεῖν εἰς τὸ αὐτοῦ πάθος, τὸ ζῆν αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν ἡμῖν)." Paul, who obviously influences Ignatius here, fully develops this theme in Rom 6:5-11. While Ignatius' concern is not baptism—as is Paul's in Romans—but Christian life in the world, the message is the same: being united with Jesus in his death assures union with his resurrection.

Therefore, for Ignatius, the salvation accomplished by Jesus through the historical events of the εὐαγγέλιον is a salvation which brings "eternal life," "immortality," "resurrection." While 'salvation by Jesus' as atonement for human sin is not entirely absent from Ignatius' concept of this salvation (i.e., *Smyrn.* 7.1), it is clear that such atonement is not the dominant feature. Ignatius, rather, emphasizes immortality and includes atonement within the larger theme. This salvation as eternal life is the ultimate message of the εὐαγγέλιον.

3. THE COMMON HOPE

Another Ignatian title for Jesus is "the common hope" (*Eph.* 21.2; *Phld.* 11.2). This title, as well as other theological uses of "hope," are centered on the salvation we discussed in the previous section.

Ignatius speaks of "hope (ἐλπίς)" in a theological sense nine times (*Eph.* 1.2, 5.2, 21.2; *Magn.* 7.1; *Trall.* insc., 2.2; *Phld.* 5.2, 11.2; *Smyrn.* 10.2). As we will see in discussing these citations, this concept for Ignatius is often in line with much of early Christian expression. Thus, for example, we have Paul's assertion in Rom 8:24:

> τῇ γὰρ ἐλπίδι ἐσώθημεν· ἐλπὶς δὲ βλεπομένη οὐκ ἔστιν ἐλπίς· ὃ γὰρ βλέπει τίς ἐλπίζει; εἰ δὲ ὃ οὐ βλέπομεν ἐλπίζομεν, δι' ὑπομονῆς ἀπεκδεχόμεθα.
>
> For in hope we were saved. Now hope that is seen in not hope. For who hopes for what is seen? But if we hope for what we do not see, we wait for it with patience.

Along with Col 1:5, 23, which I will review further along, we have as well in 1 Pet 1:3, "[God] has given us a new birth into a living hope through the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead ([ὁ θεὸς] ὁ ἀναγεννήσας ἡμᾶς εἰς ἐλπίδα ζῶσαν δι' ἀναστάσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκ νεκρῶν)." Christian hope is

centered on the salvation accomplished by Jesus in the events encompassed by the gospel.[52]

In this regard, we may turn to Ignatius. The exposition in *Phld.* 5.2 bears repeating:

> καὶ τοὺς προφήτας δὲ ἀγαπῶμεν, διὰ τὸ καὶ αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον κατηγγελκέναι καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν ἐλπίζειν καὶ αὐτὸν ἀναμένειν, ἐν ᾧ καὶ πιστεύσαντες ἐσώθησαν, ἐν ἑνότητι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ὄντες ἀξιαγάπητοι καὶ ἀξιοθαύμαστοι ἅγιοι, ὑπὸ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μεμαρτυρημένοι καὶ συνηριθμημένοι ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ τῆς κοινῆς ἐλπίδος.
>
> And we also love the prophets because they also made their proclamation with the gospel in view and set their hope on him and waited for him, in whom by believing they were also saved, being in the unity of Jesus Christ saints worthy of love and worthy of admiration, attested by Jesus Christ and numbered together in the gospel of the common hope.[53]

Ignatius is presenting the OT Prophets as the model of Christian hope. We have seen in *Magn.* 8.2 that the Prophets "lived according to Jesus Christ (οἱ γὰρ θειότατοι προφῆται κατὰ Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν ἔζησαν)." In *Magn.* 9.1, the Prophets "who lived in ancient ways came to a new hope (οἱ ἐν παλαιοῖς πράγμασιν ἀναστραφέντες εἰς καινότητα ἐλπίδος ἦλθον)." Also, they were disciples of Jesus "to whom they looked forward as their teacher (ὡς διδάσκαλον αὐτὸν προσεδόκων)" and Jesus, upon his παρουσία in the world, raised them from the dead (*Magn.* 9.2). The Prophets' proclamation, therefore, pointed in advance to the salvific message of the εὐαγγέλιον. Their hopeful waiting

---

[52]R. Bultmann, "ἐλπίς, κ.τ.λ.," *TDNT* II, 532.

[53]Translation, Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 200.

—expressed through their proclamation—was fulfilled only in the coming of Jesus and the salvation he brought: "by believing [in Jesus] they were also saved" (*Phld.* 5.2).[54]

The Prophets are "numbered together in the gospel of the common hope." This means that the εὐαγγέλιον message of salvation unites the Prophets, as believers before Christ,[55] with believers of Ignatius' Christianity. As I pointed out in Part One, when Ignatius refers to the Prophets, it is not as prophetic sacred texts; rather, the Prophets are figures of faith united with believers in history:[56]

> αὐτος ὢν θύρα τοῦ πατρός, δι' ἧς εἰσέρχονται Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακὼβ καὶ οἱ προφῆται καὶ ἀπόστολοι καὶ ἡ ἐκκλησίᾳ. πάντα τοῦτα εἰς ἑνότητα θεοῦ.
>
> [Jesus] is the door of the Father, through which enter Abraham and Isaac and Jacob and the Prophets and the Apostles and the Church, all these into the unity of God. (*Phld.* 9.1b)

The hope for salvation through Jesus in the εὐαγγέλιον events unites believers past and present. It is, thus, a common (κοινός) hope.

"Εὐαγγέλιον τῆς κοινῆς ἐλπίδος," therefore, serves as an Ignatian intramural phrase to refer to the salvation gained through the events of the gospel. Thus, it is no surprise to find the term "εὐαγγέλιον" in this phrase replaced by

---

[54]This waiting in hope, as we have seen, is a feature in Col 1:23. See, as well, Heb 6:18-20, 10:23; *2 Clem.* 11.5.

[55]Again, *Phld.* 5.2: ἐν ἑνότητι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ὄντες ἀξιαγάπητοι καὶ ἀξιοθαύμαστοι ἅγιοι, ὑπὸ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μεμαρτυρημένοι . . .

[56]Koester, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 7.

"Ἰησοῦς Χριστός." Two of the Ignatian letters conclude with what is obviously a catch-phrase which refers to the central message of the εὐαγγέλιον: "Farewell {in God our Father and} in Jesus Christ, our common hope (ἔρρωσθε {ἐν θεῷ πατρὶ καὶ} ἐν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ, τῇ κοινῇ ἐλπίδι ἡμῶν.) (*Eph.* 21.2; *Phld.* 11.2).[57]

Jesus, who accomplished the salvific events of the εὐαγγέλιον, is understood as the common hope. Hence, in his lengthy concluding remarks to the Magnesians, Ignatius exhorts the Christians to avoid "the fishhooks of vain doctrine (μὴ ἐμπεσεῖν εἰς τὰ ἄγκιστρα τῆς κενοδοξίας)," but

> ἀλλὰ πεπληροφορῆσθαι ἐν τῇ γεννήσει καὶ τῷ πάθει καὶ τῇ ἀναστάσει τῇ γενομένῃ ἐν καιρῷ τῆς ἡγεμονίας Ποντίου Πιλάτου· πραχθέντα ἀληθῶς καὶ βεβαίως ὑπὸ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τῆς ἐλπίδος ἡμῶν, ἧς ἐκτραπῆναι μηδενὶ ὑμῶν γένοιτο.
>
> but be convinced of the birth and passion and resurrection which took place in the time of the leadership of Pontius Pilate: things truly and certainly done by Jesus Christ, our hope, from which may none of you be led. (*Magn.* 11)[58]

Here, the εὐαγγέλιον motifs take center stage as the boundary of proper belief (cf., *Trall.* 9; *Smyrn.* 1). The events of those motifs, "truly and certainly done," are encapsulated

---

[57]The material in braces in found only in the *Phld.* 11.2 version. In 1 Tim 1:1 "Jesus our hope" is found in the opening greeting: "Paul, an apostle of Christ Jesus by the command of God our Savior and of Christ Jesus our hope (Παῦλος ἀπόστολος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ κατ' ἐπιταγὴν θεοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν καὶ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ τῆς ἐλπίδος ἡμῶν)."

[58]We are reminded here of the Ignatian use of πληροφορέω in conjuction with the εὐαγγέλιον motifs in *Magn.* 8.2; *Phld.* insc; *Smyrn.* 1.1 (cf., Rom 4:21; Col 4:12; *1 Clem.* 42:3).

We have noted, as well, the close proximity—textual and rhetorical—of this passage to the λαλεῖν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν passage of *Magn.* 10.3.

by the epithet "Jesus Christ, our hope." It is the hope gained through the εὐαγγέλιον which Ignatius reminds the Magnesians not to be led from by the preachers of vain doctrine.[59] Instead, they are to be convinced (πληροφορέω) of the εὐαγγέλιον message enacted by Jesus. This hope in Christ, therefore, defines proper belief.

Likewise, in *Trall.* insc., Ignatius presents the εὐαγγέλιον motifs as the reason for the peace that the Church of Tralles enjoys: ". . . having peace in flesh and spirit by the passion of Jesus Christ, our hope, in resurrection through him (. . . εἰρηνευούσῃ ἐν σαρκὶ καὶ πνεύματι τῷ πάθει Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τῆς ἐλπίδος ἡμῶν ἐν τῇ εἰς αὐτὸν ἀναστάσει)." The εὐαγγέλιον motif of the πάθος is the foundation for the Trallians' peace.[60] Jesus is hope through the resurrection. This suggests not only Jesus' own rising from the dead but also the salvation or "eternal life" (ie., *Eph.* 19.3) gained through his resurrection. Unity in this hope has brought peace to the church and thereby makes it "elect and worthy of God (ἐκλεκτῇ καὶ ἀξιοθέῳ)" (*Trall.* insc.).

The theme of hope surfaces again shortly into *Trallians*. In *Trall.* 2.1 Ignatius makes the statement we have considered elsewhere: ". . . Jesus Christ who died for

---

[59]I.e., *Magn.* 10.3: "It is absurd to preach Jesus Christ and to Judaize (ἄτοπόν ἐστιν, Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν λαλεῖν καὶ ἰουδαΐζειν)."

[60]Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 137. The use of the εὐαγγέλιον motifs with respect to church identity will be treated in the next chapter.

our sake, that by believing in his death you may escape death." This statement is reiterated in *Trall.* 2.2 with a reference to the "Apostles of Jesus Christ, our hope, in whom we will be found if we live in him (ἀποστόλοις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τῆς ἐλπίδος ἡμῶν, ἐν ᾧ διάγοντες εὑρεθησομεθα)."[61] As we have seen, the hope centered on Jesus is based on the salvific passion of the εὐαγγέλιον.

What is more, *Trall.* 2.2 is one of the few Ignatian references to hope that directly places an emphasis on its future realization (cf., *Smyrn.* 10.2). Spending one's life (διάγοντες) as a believer assures future life with Jesus.

This eschatological hope recalls the εὐαγγέλιον message we underscored in Colossians. Thus, in Col 1:5 it is "the hope reserved for you in heaven, about which you have already heard in the word of truth: the gospel that has come to you (διὰ τὴν ἐλπίδα τὴν ἀποκειμένην ὑμῖν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, ἣν προηκούσατε ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τῆς ἀληθείας τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τοῦ παρόντος εἰς ὑμᾶς)"; and in 1:23 it is "the hope promised by the gospel that you heard (. . . ἀπὸ τῆς ἐλπίδος τοῦ εὐαγγελίου οὗ ἠκούσατε)."[62]

While we recognize these similar expressions of future realization in Colossians and Ignatius, it must be pointed

---

[61]Both of these statments are in the context of being subject to church authorities: in 2.1 it is being "subject to the bishop as to Jesus Christ (ἐπισκόπῳ ὑποτάσσησθε ὡς Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ)"; in 2.2 it is doing nothing without the bishop and being "subject to the presbytery as to the Apostles of Jesus Christ, our hope . . . (ὑποτάσσεσθαι καὶ τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ ὡς τοῖς ἀποστόλοις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τῆς ἐλπίδος. . .)."

[62]Cf., Col 1:17.

out that in his theology of hope Ignatius does not emphasize the future realization. The bishop, rather, is primarily concerned with the present faith of Christians as it is lived in unity. Ignatius is interested in the present results of that hope: a unity of faith among believers (thus, *Trall.* insc.). Ignatius' first concern is the present situation of believers. So, this faith in "Jesus, our common hope" is centered on not only hope for salvation, but it also—through the link with the εὐαγγέλιον motifs—serves a more immediate purpose, to delineate the acceptable opinions about Jesus to be held in common in the church.

This twofold purpose is further expressed in *Eph.* 1.2 in which Ignatius speaks of his own predicament as being "in bonds from Syria for the sake of the common name and hope (ἀκούσαντες γὰρ δεδεμένον ἀπὸ Συρίας ὑπὲρ τοῦ κοινοῦ ὀνόματος καὶ ἐλπίδος)." The reference to "the name (τό ὄνομα)" is to Jesus.[63] Ignatius uses τό ὄνομα in this way four times: in *Eph.* 3.1 he again says that he is "chained in the name (δέδεμαι ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι)"; in *Eph.* 7.1 schismatics "carry around the name with wicked cunning (εἰώθασιν γάρ τινες δόλῳ πονηρῷ τὸ ὄνομα περιφέρειν)"; and in *Phld.* 10.1 the church gathers "to

---

[63]Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 43.

We find these same themes in *Barn.* 16.8: "When we received pardon of sins and put our hope on the Name, we became new, being created from the beginning again (λαβόντες τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ ἐλπίσαντες ἐπὶ τὸ ὄνομα ἐγενόμεθα καινοί, πάλιν ἐξ ἀρχῆς κτιζόμενοι·)."

glorify the name (. . . δοξάσαι τὸ ὄνομα)."[64] Thus, when he refers to "the common name and hope" in *Eph.* 1.2, Ignatius is placing his own suffering not only within the context of Jesus' suffering but also with the trials of the present church (*Smyrn.* 9.2; *Pol.* 6.1).

The context and meaning are the same in *Smyrn.* 10.2; yet, this time Ignatius suggests the future realization of the hope. He tells the Smyrnaeans that

> ἀντίψυχον ὑμῶν τὸ πνεῦμά μου καὶ τὰ δεσμά μου, ἃ οὐχ ὑπερηφανήσατε οὐδὲ ἐπῃσχύνθητε, οὐδὲ ὑμᾶς ἐπαισχυνθήσεται ἡ τελεία ἐλπίς, Ἰησοῦς Χριστός
>
> My spirit and my bonds are your expiation, which you did not despise or feel ashamed of. Neither will the perfect hope, Jesus Christ, be ashamed of you.[65]

Jesus as the "perfect hope" recalls our discussion of the Ignatian expression of the incarnation, "the perfect human

---

[64]Cf., Acts 5:41; 3 John 7; 2 *Clem.* 13.1,4. Hermas, as well, often employs τό ὄνομα in this way (*Vis.* 3:2.1; *Sim.* 8:10.3).

Of the twenty-four times Ignatius uses τό ὄνομα, fourteen refer to Jesus or God (*Eph.* 1.2, 1.2, 3.1, 7.1; *Magn.* 1.2, 10.1; *Rom.* insc, 9.3; *Phld.* 10.1, 10.2; *Smyrn.* 4.2, 12.2; *Pol.* 5.1). Twice it is "the name of God" (*Eph.* 1.3; *Phld.* 10.2) and four times it is "in the name of Jesus Christ" (*Rom.* 9.3; *Smyrn.* 4.2, 12.2; *Pol.* 5.1). In *Smyrn.* 12.2 this is connected with the εὐαγγέλιον motifs. Moreover, twice "the name" refers to "Christian" (*Magn.* 10.1; *Rom.* insc).

[65]Translation, Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 247.

There is a textual question with this use of ἐλπίς. Major texts (the Greek and the Latin from it) have πίστις in its place. Schoedel demonstrates how by homoeoteleuton either reading could have resulted from scribal error. Based on the Ignatian identification of Jesus with hope, Schoedel most reasonably stays with ἐλπίς. Ibid, 248-249, n. 6. Cf., Lighfoot (317) who opts for πίστις, pointing out that the Ignatian usage of ἐλπίς with respect to Jesus would lead a scribe to use it by mistake.

Ignatius' reference to his own suffering as "your expiation (ἀντίψυχον)" will be treated in the next chapter.

(τέλειος ἄνθρωπος)" of *Smyrn.* 4.2. Jesus, the manifestation of God, is the perfect human; by his passion and resurrection, he is the perfect hope. Ignatius thus suggests the salvation accomplished by Jesus within the context of unity in trials.

Our final reference to hope is found in *Magn.* 7.1. Within an extended exposition in which "one (μία)" appears repeatedly (7.1-2), Ignatius again bases church unity on Jesus:

> ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ μία προσευχή, μία δέησις, εἷς νοῦς, μία ἐλπὶς ἐν ἀγάπῃ, ἐν τῇ χαρᾷ τῇ ἀμώμῳ, ὅ ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, οὗ ἄμεινον οὐδέν ἐστιν.
>
> but [may there be] one prayer in common, one supplication, one mind, one hope in love, in blameless joy, which is Jesus Christ, than whom nothing is better.

There is little new for us here. Within the context of a plea for unity, Ignatius places Jesus at the center of church life. The phrase οὗ ἄμεινον οὐδέν ἐστιν is typically Ignatian: we find it in *Magn.* 1.2 in reference to a union of "faith and love (ἐν αἷς ἕνωσιν εὔχομαι . . . πίστεώς τε καὶ ἀγάπης)" in Jesus; and in *Pol.* 1.2 Ignatius exhorts Polycarp to "be intent on unity, than which nothing is better (τῆς ἑνώσεως φρόντιζε, ἧς οὐδὲν ἄμεινον)." Both of these expressions of unity ultimately refer to Jesus. Thus, among the Christ-unities "than which nothing is better" in *Magn.* 7.1, is "one hope in love."

For Ignatius, therefore, 'hope' is a prime expression of the salvation brought by Jesus. It is the indication, throughout history, of the εὐαγγέλιον message (e.g., *Phld.* 5.2). The theme of hope thus becomes not only an epithet for Jesus (*Eph.* 21.2; *Phld.* 11.2), but it also surfaces as an Ignatian intramural phrase which refers to the message held in common: it is the εὐαγγέλιον τῆς κοινῆς ἐλπίδος.

4. THE ONLY TEACHER

Ignatius calls Jesus "teacher (διδάσκαλος)" in three passages: *Eph.* 15.1, *Magn.* 9.1, and *Magn.* 9.2. In the first two of these citations, Jesus is presented as the only true teacher for Christians (*Eph.* 15.1: εἷς οὖν διδάσκαλος, *Magn.* 9.1: . . . Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ μόνου διδασκάλου ἡμῶν). Ignatius' emphasis on Jesus as the sole acceptable teacher is paralleled by the logion in Matt 23:8 in which Jesus states "But you are not to be called rabbi, for you have one teacher, and you are all students (ὑμεῖς δὲ μὴ κληθῆτε, Ῥαββί· εἷς γάρ ἐστιν ὑμῶν ὁ διδάσκαλος, πάντες δὲ ὑμεῖς ἀδελφοί ἐστε)."[66] Matthew 23:8 is in the context of Jesus' criticism of the scribes and Pharisees for not practicing what they teach (thus, 23:2). The same general theme centered on deeds and teaching is the context with Ignatius in *Eph.* 15.1; yet, for

---

[66]Cf., Matt 23:10 in which, in the place of ὁ διδάσκαλος we find a synonym, ὁ καθηγητῆς: μηδὲ κληθῆτε καθηγηταί, ὅτι καθηγητὴς ὑμῶν ἐστιν εἷς ὁ Χριστός. Matt 23:6-10 contains material found only in Matthew.

Ignatius, it is Jesus whose silent actions are "worthy of the Father (δὲ πεποίηκεν ἄξια τοῦ πατρός ἐστιν)."

This parallel raises once again the question of Ignatius' knowledge of Matthew. I have recognized that Ignatius may well have had contact with Matthean material. This being said, no matter the contact, it seems most probable that both Matthew and Ignatius are using a standard type of argument by church leaders against teaching that is outside the boundaries of acceptable belief. Thus, for the Matthean and Ignatian communities, in response to teachers from the outside, Jesus is the only teacher one must follow.[67]

Turning our attention directly to *Eph.* 15.1, therefore, we find that the title ὁ διδάσκαλος is applied to Jesus within the context of Ignatius' own take on the theme of silence and speech in Christian life:

> ἄμεινόν ἐστιν σιωπᾶν καὶ εἶναι, ἢ λαλοῦντα μὴ εἶναι. καλὸν τὸ διδάσκειν, ἐὰν ὁ λέγων ποιῇ. εἷς οὖν διδάσκαλος, ὃς εἶπεν, καὶ ἐγένετο· καὶ ἃ σιγῶν δὲ πεποίηκεν ἄξια τοῦ πατρός ἐστιν.
>
> It is better to be silent and to be, than speaking and not to be.[68] To teach is good if the speaker acts.

---

[67]Schoedel, "Ignatius and the Reception of Matthew," 171-172; idem, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 77, n. 12. For Matthew, teachers who are unacceptable are represented by the "scribes and Pharisees" of 23:2; these presumably would be members of "the Jewish magisterium which regrouped and led Judaism after A. D. 70." J. P. Meier, *The Vision of Matthew: Christ, Church and Morality in the First Gospel* (New York: Paulist, 1979) 162-163, n. 176. As for Ignatius *Eph.* 16.2 and *Magn.* 10.3, 11.1 are indications of unacceptable teaching.

[68]We have already seen that Schoedel links this statement with *Magn.* 4, thus suggesting as the meaning, "It is better to be silent and

> There is, then, one teacher who spoke and it came to pass, and what he has done in silence is worthy of the Father.

This passage opens with a λαλέω phrase, perhaps suggesting that the teaching in question involves the proclamation of the εὐαγγέλιον and its fulfillment in action.[69] Then, using an allusion to Psalm 33:9,[70] Ignatius presents Jesus as the one teacher who put his teachings into practice.[71] The actions which flow from Jesus' teaching—"what he has done in silence"—appear to be the saving events of the εὐαγγέλιον. Hence, the teaching and saving actions of Jesus are the only answer to outsiders bringing an "evil teaching (ἔχοντας κακὴν διδαχήν)" (*Eph.* 9.1) and corrupting "the faith of God by evil teaching (ἐὰν πίστιν θεοῦ ἐν κακῇ διδασκαλίᾳ φθείρῃ)" (*Eph.* 16.2). As Ignatius remarks still earlier, the Ephesians have rightly refused to "listen to anyone except one who preaches in truth about Jesus Christ (ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἀκούετέ τινος πλέον, ἢ περὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ λαλοῦντος ἐν ἀληθείᾳ)" (*Eph.* 6.2).

---

to be in reality Christians, than to speak and only be called Christian." Ibid.

[69]Cf., *Phld.* 1.1b: the Philadelphian bishop can "do more in silence than those proclaiming vain words (ὃς σιγῶν πλείονα δύναται τῶν μάταια λαλούντων)."

[70]"For he spoke, and it came to be; he commanded, and it stood firm (ὅτι αὐτὸς εἶπε καὶ ἐγενήθησαν, αὐτὸς ἐνετείλατο καὶ ἐκτίσθησαν)."

Cf., Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch,* 77-78 who looks rather to the first chapter of Genesis as the allusion here: Jesus is "regarded as speaking the creative words."

[71]While Jesus is not named until the next sentence, there is little chance that this "one teacher" refers to God the Father; the connection between σιγῶν in 15.1 and σιγᾷ in 15.2 makes it clear that Jesus is intended.

Therefore, in *Eph.* 15.2 Ignatius continues building on the image of Jesus, the one teacher:

> ὁ λόγον Ἰησοῦ κεκτημένος ἀληθῶς δύναται καὶ τῆς ἡσυχίας αὐτοῦ ἀκούειν, ἵνα τέλειος ᾖ, ἵνα δι' ὧν λαλεῖ πράσσῃ καὶ δι' ὧν σιγᾷ γινώσκηται.
>
> The one who truly possesses the word of Jesus is also able to hear his [Jesus'] silence, so that he may be perfect, so that through that which he says he may act, and through his silence he may understand. (*Eph.* 15.2)

Anyone who has the word (or teaching, ὁ λογός) of Jesus also "hears his silence." This can only refer to "what [Jesus] has done in silence" of 15.1. Therefore, "hearing" the silence of Jesus means to have faith in ("possess") the salvific deeds of Jesus that are linked with his words. So, in turn, the believer who professes to be "of Christ" with words will be identifiable by his or her deeds (οἱ ἐπαγγελλόμενοι Χριστοῦ εἶναι δι' ὧν πράσσουσιν ἀφθήσονται [*Eph.* 14.2]). Uniting words with action makes one perfect (ἵνα τέλειος ᾖ) like Jesus, the "perfect human (τέλειος ἄνθρωπος)" of *Smyrn.* 4.2.

The two references to Jesus as διδάσκαλος in Mag. 9 are part of Ignatius' polemic activity against what appears to be judiazing practices. Therefore, the OT Prophets take center stage in 9.1:[72]

---

[72]Cf., Ibid., 123. Schoedel sees the people referred to in *Magn.* 9.1 as "the early Christians who abandoned their allegiance to Judaism." For this same opinion, see Lightfoot, 128 and Zahn, 354. However, it appears that 9.1 continues Ignatius' train of thought begun in 8.2 where "the divine prophets lived according to Christ Jesus (οἱ γὰρ θειότατοι

> εἰ οὖν οἱ ἐν παλαιοῖς πράγμασιν ἀναστραφέντες εἰς καινότητα ἐλπίδος ἦλθον, μηκέτι σαββτίζοντες, ἀλλὰ κατὰ κυριακὴν ζῶντες, ἐν ᾗ καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ἡμῶν ἀνέτειλεν δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ, ὅν τινες ἀρνοῦνται, δι' οὗ μυστηρίου ἐλάβομεν τὸ πιστεύειν, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ὑπομένομεν, ἵνα εὑρεθῶμεν μαθηταὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ μόνου διδασκάλου ἡμῶν . . .
>
> So, if they who lived in ancient ways came to a new hope, no longer [living according to] the Sabbath, but living according to the Lord's day, on which also our life rose through him and his death—which some deny—through which mystery we receive faith and through which we endure so that we might be found disciples of Jesus Christ, our only teacher . . .

As we have seen, the Prophets are the models of Christian hope. Through their announcement with the εὐαγγέλιον in view (ie., *Phld.* 5.2) they came to a new hope. In Ignatius' schema, the Sabbath of Judaism was no longer the center of their lives (i.e., the "ancient ways" in 9.1; cf., "old fables [μυθεύμασιν τοῖς παλαιοῖς]" of 8.1); they lived, rather, according to the εὐαγγέλιον to which they looked forward in their proclamation. Thus, for Ignatian Christians, observing the Lord's day (κατά κυριακὴν ζῆν) is the answer to the "keeping of the sabbath (σαββτίζοντες)" of the judiazers. This means that living according to the death and resurrection of Jesus—celebrated on the Lord's day—is the response to the judiazing error.

προφῆται κατὰ Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν ἔζησαν)." Thus, the "no longer living according to the Sabbath but living according to the Lord's day" of 9.1 is a reiteration of "living acording to Christ Jesus." Moreover, this reading is supported by the connecting particle οὖν in the opening of 9.1. E. Molland, "The Heretics Combatted by Ignatius of Antioch," *JEH* 5 (1954) 3.

It is in this context that Ignatius says Christians become disciples (ὁ μαθητής) of Jesus "our only teacher." So, in the next passage, *Magn.* 9.2, the bishop continues with an appeal to the Prophets as disciples in advance:

> . . . πῶς ἡμεῖς δυνησόμεθα ζῆσαι χωρὶς αὐτοῦ, οὗ καὶ οἱ προφῆται μαθηταὶ ὄντες τῷ πνεύματι ὡς διδάσκαλον αὐτὸν προσεδόκων; καὶ διὰ τοῦτο, ὃν δικαίως ἀνέμενον, παρὼν ἤγειρεν αὐτοὺς ἐκ νεκρῶν.
>
> . . . how shall we be able to live without him of whom the Prophets were also disciples in the spirit, to whom they looked forward as their teacher? And because of this, he, for whom they righteously waited, came and raised them from the dead.

We have already examined this passage with respect to the use of πάρειμι: the Prophets righteously waited for the παρουσία of Jesus as his disciples. This description of the Prophets as disciples of Jesus the teacher allows Ignatius to speak again of Christian life in the present. So, in *Magn.* 10.1 he states, "Hence, let us become his disciples and learn to live according to Christianity (διὰ τοῦτο, μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ γενόμενοι, μάθωμεν κατὰ Χριστιανισμὸν ζῆν)."[73] The Prophets were raised from the dead because in advance they were disciples of Jesus the teacher. In the same way Ignatian believers, through their discipleship to the one teacher, learn to live as Christians and thereby gain resurrection.

---

[73]This is the first use of "Christianity (ὁ Χριστιανισμός)" in Christian literature (see *Magn.* 10.3; *Rom.* 3.3; *Phld.* 6.1; cf., *Mart. Pol.* 10.1). BAGD, 886.

This Ignatian bundle of themes involving the OT prophets, discipleship, the εὐαγγέλιον motifs, and salvation brings to mind once again the exhortation to "learn (μάθετε)" in *Barn.* 5. While discipleship is not explicitly mentioned, it is implied by the reference to Jesus as teacher (5.8). The lesson is that:

> οἱ προφῆται, ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἔχοντες τὴν χάριν, εἰς αὐτὸν ἐπροφήτευσαν· αὐτὸς δέ, ἵνα καταργήσῃ τὸν θάνατον καὶ τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν δείξῃ, ὅτι ἐν σαρκὶ ἔδει αὐτὸν φανερωθῆναι . . .
>
> the Prophets, after they had received special insight from him, prophesied concerning him. And he submitted so that he might break the power of death and demonstrate the resurrection from the dead—thus it was necessary for him to be manifested in flesh . . . (5.6)[74]

Ignatius and Barnabas are working with very similar Christological themes and motifs.

Returning to Ignatius, it is necessary to pause here and consider more closely this theme of discipleship in conjunction with Jesus as teacher. For Ignatius, Jesus the teacher has followers whose discipleship involves suffering and endurance. Of the eleven times Ignatius mentions discipleship,[75] six times he mentions his own discipleship; and in these, discipleship involves his suffering and expected death (*Eph.* 1.2, 3.1; *Trall.* 5.2; *Rom.* 4.2, 5.1, 5.3). We have seen in *Magn.* 9.1, as well, that through the

---

[74]Translation, Kraft, "Barnabas," 94.

[75]*Eph.* 1.2, 3.1, 10.1; *Magn.* 9.1, 9.2, 10.1; *Trall.* 5.2; *Rom.* 4.2, 5.1, 5.3; *Pol.* 2.1).

εὐαγγέλιον motifs of Jesus' suffering and death "we endure so that we might be found disciples of Jesus Christ, our only teacher . . . (ὑπομένομεν, ἵνα εὑρεθῶμεν μαθηταὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ μόνου διδασκάλου ἡμῶν . . .).

Moreover, especially with Ignatius' own discipleship, there is always a sense of 'becoming a disciple' through his ordeals.[76] Thus, in *Rom.* 4.2, Ignatius states that only after he is eaten by the wild beasts "then I will truly be a disciple of Jesus Christ when the world will not even see my body (τότε ἔσομαι μαθητὴς ἀληθῶς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅτε οὐδὲ τὸ σῶμά μου ὁ κόσμος ὄψεται)." Only after his righteous death will he be a disciple.

So, for Ignatius a true disciple looks to Jesus the only teacher as the ultimate model for Christian living, and, specifically, suffering.[77] As I have highlighted elsewhere, Ignatius speaks of this discipleship as an imitation of Jesus' παθός in one instance: "allow me to be an imitator of the passion of my God (ἐπιτρέψατέ μοι μιμητὴν εἶναι τοῦ πάθους τοῦ θεοῦ μοῦ)" (*Rom.* 6.3). All Christians are to be disciples in this way: "in his [Jesus'] passion he calls you who are his members (ἐν τῷ πάθει αὐτοῦ προσκαλεῖται ὑμᾶς ὄντας μέλη αὐτοῦ)" (*Trall.* 11.2). This imitation is therefore not

---

[76]M. J. Wilkins calls this "developmental discipleship." See M. J. Wilkins, "The Interplay of Ministry, Martyrdom and Discipleship in Ignatius of Antioch," pages 294-315 in *Worship, Theology and Ministry in the Eary Church*, M. J. Wilkins and T. Paige, eds. (Sheffield: JSOT, 1992) 304. Cf., Schoedel, "Ignatius and the Reception of Matthew," 165.

[77]Cf., 1 Pet 2:21.

only for a few; rather, it is "the calling of Christians in general."[78] Through his endurance in suffering, Ignatius is becoming a disciple in a church of disciples.

With Ignatius' concept of discipleship before us, therefore, we may once more return specifically to Jesus as teacher in the letters. It is necessary to recognize that there are passages in which Ignatius assigns Jesus a teaching role without explicitly calling him ὁ διδάσκαλος. As we have seen elsewhere, Ignatius presents Jesus as teaching a specific way of life based on the will of God (e.g., *Eph.* 3.2 [τοῦ πατρὸς ἡ γνώμη]). So, for example, we find passages which refer to Jesus' commandments (ἐντολή) (*Eph.* 9.2, *Magn.* 4.1, *Rom.* insc., *Phld.* 1.2),[79] Jesus' law (νόμος) (*Magn.* 2),[80] Jesus' ordinances (δόγμα) (*Magn.* 13.1), and—an hapax legomenon in early Christianity—"instructions of Christ" (χριστομαθία) (*Phld.* 8.2).

It is significant that, with the exception of νόμος in *Magn.* 2 and δόγμα in *Magn.* 13.1 (both of which refer to proper church order), in each of the above citations Jesus'

---

[78]Wilkins, 308; Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 30, 183-184.

[79]In Mag. 4.1 and Phd. 1.2, however, there is no possessive genitive; so, it is unclear to whose ἐντολή Ignatius is referring. Both passages concern church order; at the very least, we may presume that Ignatius is speaking of divine commandments in general. It seems accurate, however, in the context of Ignatius' view of church life, as well as his Christology, to consider these Jesus' ἐντολή.

[80]With respect to νόμος, there is also a variant reading in the inscription of Romans: Ignatius, in a chain of epithets, refers to the Roman Christians as either "χριστώνυμος" ("named for Christ") or "χριστόνομος" ("following the law of Christ"). Lightfoot accepts the latter. See Lightfoot, 193.

teaching is presented in direct opposition to some form of wrong teaching or action. Thus, in *Eph.* 9.2 the ἐντολή of Jesus is in answer to those having evil teaching (ἔχοντας κακὴν διδαχήν); in *Magn.* 4.1 it is the difference between proper and inproper meetings (τὸ μὴ βεβαίως κατ' ἐντολὴν συναθροίζεσθαι); in *Rom.* insc. the ἐντολή opposes the "foreign stain (ἀλλότριος χρῶματος)"; in *Phld.* 1.2 it describes the bishop of Philadelphia who represents the opposite of the division (μερισμός) and evil teaching (κακοδιδασκαλία) described in *Phld.* 2.1; and, finally, in *Phld.* 8.2 the teaching of Christ (χριστομαθία) is the answer to actions of self-serving ambition (ἐριθεία).

Of these, *Phld.* 8.2—the "archives" passage—is the most significant for our purposes. Elsewhere, we have viewed *Phld.* 8.2 as one of the defining passages for Ignatius' εὐαγγέλιον; at this point, the introductory phrase demands attention. Ignatius has been encouraging unity among the Christians, placing his faith in "the grace of Jesus Christ (πιστεύω τῇ χάριτι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ)" (8.1b). He then introduces the discussion about the archives and the εὐαγγέλιον with, "But I exhort you to do nothing from selfish ambition but according to the teaching of Christ (παρακαλῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς μηδὲν κατ' ἐριθείαν πράσσειν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ χριστομαθίαν)" (8.2a). Ἡ χριστομαθία—a particular Ignatian term—is the counterpoint to the divisive teaching (or preaching) of some within the community (i.e., *Phld.* 7.2) who are acting out of ἐριθεία.

Both the divisive teaching and the teaching of Christ are exemplified in the ἀρχεῖα/εὐαγγέλιον sequence which follows.

So, the ἐριθεία of the trouble-makers is expressed through their dependence on the wrong archives, the OT. The χριστομαθία is expressed through the εὐαγγέλιον. Thus, the preached εὐαγγέλιον as the true archives is tied with the teaching of Christ:

> ἐμοὶ δὲ ἀρχεῖά ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, τὰ ἄθικτα ἀρχεῖα ὁ σταυρὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ ὁ θάνατος καὶ ἡ ἀνάστασις αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ πίστις ἡ δι' αὐτοῦ . . .
>
> But to me the archives are Jesus Christ, the sacrosanct archives are his cross and death, his resurrection, and faith through him . . . (*Phld.* 8.2c).

This brings to the fore a significant fact: in all of Ignatius' presentations of Jesus as teacher, the bishop never explicitly presents any specific teachings as those of Jesus. As we have noted in passing early on, there are indeed Ignatian passages which contain material we know from elsewhere as logia from Jesus' teachings. These, however, have no indication of a connection to Jesus in their Ignatian context. Thus, for example, in *Pol.* 2.2 Ignatius exhorts Polycarp to "Be prudent as the serpent in all things and pure as the dove for ever (φρόνιμος γίνου ὡς ὁ ὄφις ἐν ἅπασιν καὶ ἀκέραιος εἰς ἀεὶ ὡς ἡ περιστερά)" (cf., Matt 10:16; *Gos. Thom.* 39:2).[81] Ignatius treats this saying like an ordinary

---

[81]See also, for example, *Pol.* 2:1a (cf., Matt 5:46; Luke 6:32; *2 Clem,* 13.4; *Did.* 1.3b).

maxim, without the persuasive authority it would carry if it were a specific teaching from Jesus.[82]

All of this suggests that 'Jesus the only teacher' exists in the world of Ignatius' letters to serve a specific purpose: to counter erroneous teachers. To serve this purpose, specific teachings of Jesus are not necessary; rather, Jesus as a teacher with ultimate authority (i.e., the only one needed) is sufficient to counter the erroneous teachers and their teachings. So—as I have suggested with respect to the OT Prophets—it is the *figure* of Jesus the teacher and not the content of his teaching that Ignatius is primarily interested in. Ignatius aligns his position with the figure of the only true teacher from God, thereby gaining ultimate validity.

However, at the same time it must be recognized that the closest we get to the content of Jesus' teaching is the εὐαγγέλιον message itself. Here we are reminded of the Ignatian concept of discipleship as imitation of the παθός of Jesus. We are also reminded once again of *Phld.* 8.2c. Because the particular error Ignatius is countering in Philadelphia has to do with the historical supports for Christian belief, Ignatius states that the only support (or "archive") needed for Christian faith is Jesus himself: the salvation he accomplished through the εὐαγγέλιον events.

---

[82]See Koester, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 43; Schoedel, "Ignatius and the Reception of Matthew," 168; cf., Köhler, 86.

Therefore, in Ignatius' world view, 'Jesus the one teacher' does not function as a source for specific guidelines for Christian living; rather, 'Jesus the one teacher' serves as an unimpeachable figure of authority supporting Ignatius' position vis-à-vis the error he wishes to counter in the various communities. In Ignatius' concern for unity through right belief, the events of the εὐαγγέλιον message themselves are the only teaching necessary.

5. THE ONE PHYSICIAN

Our final Ignatian Christological title, the "one physician (εἷς ἰατρός)," occurs a single time within the context of the hymn in *Eph.* 7.2:[83]

> εἷς ἰατρός ἐστιν,
> σαρκικός τε καὶ πνευματικός,
> γεννητὸς καὶ ἀγέννητος,
> ἐν σαρκὶ γενόμενος θεός,
> ἐν θανάτῳ ζωὴ ἀληθινή,
> καὶ ἐκ Μαρίας καὶ ἐκ θεοῦ,
> πρῶτον παθητὸς καὶ τότε ἀπαθής,
> Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν.
>
> There is one physician,
> both fleshly and spiritual
> begotten and unbegotten,

---

[83]For *Eph.* 7.2 as a hymn, see Deichgräber, 155-156; Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 61; G. Dumeige calls it "un début de confession de foi." G. Dumeige, "Le Christ médecin dans la littérature chrétienne des premiers siècles," *Rivista di archeologia cristiana* 48 (1972) 118.

With respect to the word ἰατρός Deichgräber states it is possible that ἰατρός was added to the hymn to replace the orginal κύριος. However, he concludes: "Aber genausogut möglich ist es, daß ἰατρός zum ursprünglichen Text gehört und das Stichwort für die Zitierung des Hymnus abgab." Deichgräber, 155.

come in flesh, God,
in death, true life,
both of Mary and of God,
first passible and then impassible,
Jesus Christ our lord.[84]

We saw in Part One how this passage is within the context of the λαλεῖν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν expression in 6.2. The Ephesians refuse to listen to the wrong preaching about Jesus. In *Eph.* 7.1 Ignatius continues with a strongly worded warning to the Ephesians about the unacceptable individuals who are "difficult to cure (δυσθεράπευτος)." This reference to curing allows Ignatius to launch into the 'one physician' hymn as a response to the wrong opinions.

As we have seen elsewhere, all but two of the antithetical statements in the hymn ultimately refer to the εὐαγγέλιον motif of the παρουσία. The two exceptions speak of the salvific παθός and ἀνάστασις ("in death, true life," "first passible and then impassible"). Thus, Jesus the one physician, through his coming, death and resurrection is the answer to human mortality, as well as to the illness of disunity caused by wrong preaching.

Ignatius is the first to use the title "physician" for Christ.[85] Such NT expressions as Matt 9:12 (cf., Mark 2:17; Luke 5:31) and Luke 4:23 come to mind here; yet, it is difficult to think that Ignatius has these in mind. What is more—as with 'Jesus the teacher'—there is something missing

---

[84]Translation, Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch,* 59.
[85]Dumeige, 118.

here: Ignatius gives no indication that he is aware of Jesus' historical reputation as a healer (e.g., Acts 10:38), much less that he has a Jesus-the-healer tradition in mind as a metaphor. At the very least, Ignatius does not appeal to this tradition. It seems, once again, that 'Jesus the one physician'—whether the title is an Ignatian invention or a received tradition—serves as a metaphorical figure to express the εὐαγγέλιον message of salvation in response to unacceptable preaching by outsiders.

Later, in *Eph.* 20.2, Ignatius uses another medical image to speak of the εὐαγγέλιον message. Ignatius describes the eucharist as "breaking one bread, which is the medicine of immortality, the antidote for not dying but living forever in Jesus Christ (ἕνα ἄρτον κλῶντες, ὅς ἐστιν φάρμακον ἀθανασίας, ἀντίδοτος τοῦ μὴ ἀποθανεῖν, ἀλλὰ ζῆν ἐν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ διὰ παντός)."[86] We have highlighted the εὐαγγέλιον motifs and themes in *Eph.* 20.1-2. The "one bread" recalls not only the "one physician," to which it is linked through medical imagery, but also the "one teacher" and the various 'ones' in *Magn.* 7.1. Thus, the eucharist, because it is the "flesh of Jesus which suffered for our sins" (*Smyrn.* 7.1), is the

---

[86]Cf., *Pol.* 2.1: "Not all wounds are healed by the same poultice (οὐ πᾶν πραῦμα τῇ αὐτῇ ἐμπλάστρῳ θεραπεύεται)." Compare, as well, *Pol.* 1.3 in which Ignatius tells Polycarp to "bear the illness of all as a perfect athlete (πάντων τὰς νόσους βάσταζε ὡς τέλειος ἀθλητής)." On the latter, see Schoedel, "Ignatius and the Reception of Matthew," 166.

medicine of immortality.[87] The eucharist is the medicine given by the one physician in his passion: through Jesus' παθός in the flesh, the εὐαγγέλιον is the "completion of immortality (τὸ δὲ εὐαγγέλιον ἀπάρτισμά ἐστιν ἀφθαρσίας)" (*Phld.* 9.2).

C. SUMMARY: THE GOSPEL OF IGNATIUS AND CHRISTOLOGY

In the introduction to Part Two, I stated that the overarching issue in this part is the boundary-setting function of the Ignatian εὐαγγέλιον. In this chapter we have viewed Ignatius' Christology as it is expressed through the εὐαγγέλιον, and have observed that the εὐαγγέλιον boundary-setting function is often displayed through an interaction between proper belief and church unity, both centered on Jesus. By way of conclusion, therefore, in the following paragraphs I will recapitulate the major examples of this interaction.

With respect to our more general look at the incarnation, the most immediate fact is Ignatius' use of "Jesus *our* God." Of the seven times Ignatius refers to Jesus as "God," only once does Ignatius speak of "Jesus, *my* God" (in *Rom.* 6.3, when he is very much concerned with his

---

[87]T. Schermann has pointed out that "ἀθανασία" was the name of a widely known drug of the time. Schoedel, however, rightly says that Schermann goes too far in seeing the Ignatian use as an answer to a specific pagan cult. T. Schermann, "Zur Erklärung der Stelle *epist. ad. Ephes.* 20,2 des Ignatius von Antiochien: φάρμακον ἀθανασίας κ.τ.λ.," *TQ* 92 (1910) 6-19; Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 97-98.

own situation). Ignatius is appealing to a common faith experience of those within his circle of influence.

Moreover, Ignatius speaks about Jesus' unity of flesh and spirit (e.g., *Eph.* 7.2; *Smyrn.* 3.2) as a particular way of describing the incarnation. This unity of the person of Jesus, in turn, becomes a model for the Christian living in the world (*Eph.* 8.2), as well as the image of Church unity (*Smyrn.* 3.1-4.1). These same issues also surface as the incarnation theme and the gospel motif of the παρουσία are juxtaposed. Thus, for example, in *Magn.* 7.2, the goal of the united faith is the "one Jesus Christ, who came forth from the one Father . . ." Finally in regard to Ignatius' concept of the incarnation, "the new human" (*Eph.* 20.1) and "the perfect human" (*Smyrn.* 4.2) are Ignatian titles for Jesus as the ultimate, or model human.

Within the same meaning context as the incarnation is the Ignatian use of "son of God." We have seen in *Eph.* 4.2 how Christians, united in correct belief about Jesus are in turn recognized by God as members of his son. Yet, it is primarily through the παρουσία motif of the εὐαγγέλιον that Ignatius' use of "son of God" surfaces. So, we find in *Magn.* 8.2 the one God revealed through Jesus Christ, his son. Significant too is Ignatius' particular take on the Pauline formula of Rom 1:1-3 in *Eph.* 20.2: "according to the flesh of the family of David, son of a human and son of God." Jesus in the incarnation is God's son.

However, it is with the bundle of expressions referring to the εὐαγγέλιον message of salvation that we find the boundaries of acceptable faith in Jesus most clearly drawn. The εὐαγγέλιον is "remarkable (ἐξαίρετος)" or unique in its excellence because in it are the coming of the Savior and his salvific deeds; the εὐαγγέλιον is, therefore, "the completion of immortality" (*Phld.* 9.2). This 'setting-apart' function of the Savior's deeds in the εὐαγγέλιον is seen as well in *Magn.* 5.2. Here, those who choose to live by the gospel are set apart by the "imprint (ἡ χαρακτήρ)" of God (cf., *Smyrn.* 5.3; *Trall.* 9.2). The εὐαγγέλιον message of salvation has no equal: without Jesus the Savior there is no "true life" (*Trall.* 9.2).

Jesus' suffering and resurrection "for us/our sake" refers as well to those within the Ignatian faith community. Those within the boundaries of true belief are those who live "not according to humanity but according to Jesus Christ who died for our sake" (*Trall.* 2.1). Also, this salvation "for our sake" is not so much a salvation from sin; rather, it is salvation from death (*Trall.* 2.1), it is "immortality" (*Eph.* 17.1; *Smyrn.* 2.3), "eternal life" (*Eph.* 18.1; *Magn.* 1.1; *Pol.* 2.3) and "resurrection" (*Trall.* 9.2; *Smyrn.* 5.3).

The theme of hope (ἡ ἐλπίς) is central to Ignatius' description of the salvation accomplished by Jesus through the εὐαγγέλιον events. For Ignatius, this hope distinguishes

the in-group of believers. Out of the nine theological uses of hope in Ignatius' letters, six refer to "our" hope (*Eph.* 1.2, 21.2; *Magn.* 11.1; *Trall.* insc., 2.2; *Phld.* 11.2), thus delineating the faith community. This is further confirmed by the four uses of "common (κοινός)" (*Eph.* 1.2, 21.2; *Phld.* 5.2, 11.2) to describe the hope. The phrase "one hope in love" of *Magn.* 7.1 may be included here also.

Moreover, we have seen that Ignatius' use of ἡ ἐλπίς in conjunction with the εὐαγγέλιον message does not place emphasis on the future fulfillment of that hope; rather, Christian hope in salvation serves as a frame which defines proper belief within the boundaries of the church of the present. Finally, as we have often observed, this hope also includes past figures of faith, the OT prophets who pointed to the εὐαγγέλιον in advance (*Phld.* 5.2).

Regarding our final two Christological titles, "the one teacher" and "the one physician," perhaps our most significant observation recognizes that Jesus in the guise of these titles functions as a figure of authority without appeal to either specific historical teachings or healings of Jesus. This means that, in the Ignatian corpus, the sole true teacher and the sole true physician are Christological figures which in themselves present acceptable belief in the gospel. Thus, for example, "Christ's instructions (χριστομαθία)" in *Phld.* 8.2 are directly tied with the person of Jesus through the salvific actions of the εὐαγγέλιον.

Likewise, in *Eph.* 7.2 it is the one physician who is God manifested in flesh, who is "in death, true life."

In this chapter I have concentrated on Ignatius' Christology and its boundary-setting relationship to the εὐαγγέλιον. Unavoidably I have touched on issues surrounding those who for Ignatius are outside the boundaries. In the following chapter these come to the fore as we turn to consider the gospel and error in the Ignatian letters.

CHAPTER V

OUTSIDE THE BOUNDARIES: OPPOSITION TO THE GOSPEL OF IGNATIUS

In the previous chapter, the first of Part Two, my concern was the Ignatian gospel and its relationship to various Christological expressions in the letters. Particularly important is the way in which the Christology of Ignatius' gospel functions in setting the boundaries of acceptable belief. This chapter continues within the same context by considering those outside the gospel boundaries. So, at the center of this discussion is error in the Ignatian letters.

This chapter is in two sections. First, in Section A, I will treat the nature and identity of those whom Ignatius places outside the perimeters of the εὐαγγέλιον message. Then, in Section B, Ignatius' response to his opponents will come to the fore as I turn to the letters themselves and examine the role of the gospel in that response. Thus, as always in Part Two, the boundary-setting function of Ignatius' εὐαγγέλιον is the primary concern in this chapter.

A. ERROR AND THE IGNATIAN LETTERS

In the following pages the task is to address not only the identity (that is, the number of groups involved), but also to highlight the nature of the erroneous belief and practice. The program in this section is twofold. First, by way of entry, I will consider in a general way various terms which Ignatius uses to refer to the opponents and their theology. Second, I will survey the scholarship with respect to the identity and number of the particular error(s); I will as well present my own position. This program accomplished, I will be able to, in Section B, turn to the Ignatian corpus itself and examine the role of the εὐαγγέλιον motifs and themes in separating the error from what Ignatius considers to be correct belief and practice.

1. TERMS OF SEPARATION

We have seen the frequently expressed Ignatian concept of unity. Directly opposed to this multi-faceted unity is the error which the bishop often describes in very strong terms. Thus, for example, those in error are "wild beasts" and "ravening dogs" (*Eph.* 7.1), "specious wolves" (*Phld.* 2.1), and "advocates of death" (*Smyrn.* 5.1) whose names Ignatius cannot bring himself even to write (*Smyrn.* 5.3). Such language itself serves to lay clear lines separating the true believers from unbelievers (i.e., *Magn.* 5.2).

The same function can be seen with Ignatius' use of ἡ κενοδοξία ("vain opinion") (*Magn.* 11; cf., *Phld.* 1.1). In *Magn.* 11 Ignatius warns aginst the "fishhooks of vain opinion" (μὴ ἐμπεσεῖν εἰς τὰ ἄγκιστρα τῆς κενοδοξίας). The limited NT use of ἡ κενοδοξία denotes "conceit" (Phil 2:3; cf., Gal 5:26). We find this sense as well in 1 *Clem.* 35.3, *Did.* 3.5 *Herm. Man.* 8.5, *Herm. Sim.* 8.9.3, and indeed in *Phld.* 1.1. Ignatius' use at *Magn.* 11, however, is more specifically in reference to the error about which he is warning. Thus, more than simply conceit or boasting, ἡ κενοδοξία in *Magn.* 11 is a conceited or vain opinion which is to be avoided by those who are believers.[1]

What is more, there are two terms which Ignatius uses in reference to the error that have "at least a quasi-technical sense":[2] "heresy (ἡ αἵρεσις)" (*Eph.* 6.2; *Trall.* 6.1) and "heterodoxy (ἡ ἑτεροδοξία)" (*Magn.* 8.1; *Smyrn.* 6.2). A *technical* use of these terms refers to Christian usage

---

[1]BAGD, 427; A. Oepke, "κενοδοξία," *TDNT* III, 662.

[2]Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 12, n. 65. See H. Schlier, "αἵρεσις" *TDNT* I, 183. See also H. von Staden, "Hairesis and Heresy: The Case of the *haireseis iatrikai*," pages 76-100 in B. F. Meyer, E. P. Sanders, eds, *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition*, vol. 3: *Self-Definition in the Greco-Roman World* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982) 96-97. For a treatment of the history of the scholarship on αἵρεσις, see M. Desjardins, "Bauer and Beyond: On Recent Scholarly Discussions of Αἵρεσις in the Early Chrstian Era," *SecCent* 8 (1991) 65-82.

Ignatius also uses σχίζω ("cause a division") once at *Phld.* 3.3 to refer to those who "walk in a strange doctrine (τις ἐν ἀλλοτρίᾳ γνώμῃ περιπατεῖ)." In this, the bishop is most akin to Acts 14:4 and 23:7 where Paul's preaching of the gospel leads to divisions in the community. There is, however, no indication that, for Luke or Ignatius, these are techincal usages to refer to error. C. Maurer, "σχίζω, σχίσμα" *TDNT* VII, 960, 963.

intended by the church to define its own doctrine and practice as correct in opposition to coherent groups which it sees as hostile to that doctrine.[3] This presupposes some degree of institutionalized orthodoxy. As we will soon see, with Ignatius, these terms are best described as "quasi-technical" because Ignatius stands at the beginning of the technical Christian use which first occurs further into the second century.[4]

With respect to αἵρεσις, the usual NT sense ranges from neutral (Acts 5:17) to somewhat ambivalent (Acts 24:5), denoting "a school of thought" or "a sect." Also, in a clearly negative context, Paul lists αἵρεσις as one of the works of the flesh (Gal 5:20; cf., 1 Cor 11:19). Yet Paul's negative use here is best translated as "faction."[5] Ignatius' more technical, pejorative use is *perhaps* already found in the later NT: in 2 Pet 2:1 false prophets and false teachers secretly brought αἵρεσις into the community.[6] With the possible exception of 2 Pet 2:1, however, none of the NT usages may be regarded as having the technical sense of "heresy" we find in the second century.

---

[3]M. Simon, "From Greek Haeresis to Christian Heresy," pages 101-116 in W. Schoedel and R. L. Wilken, eds., *Early Christian Literature and the Classical Intellectual Tradition* (Théologie historique 53; Paris: Beauchesne, 1979) 109.

[4]Thus, Justin *Apol.* 1.26.8; *Dial.* 17.1; 35.3; 51.2.

[5]Desjardins, 74. Cf., Schlier, "αἵρεσις," 182-183.

[6]The same sense can perhaps be found in Titus 3:10: "After a first and second admonition, have nothing more to do with anyone who causes division (αἱρετικὸν ἄνθρωπον μετὰ μίαν καὶ δευτέραν νουθεσίαν παριτοῦ)."

Returning, then, to Ignatius: in *Eph.* 6.2 αἵρεσις is the opposite of the "good order in God." for which Ignatius praises the Ephesians. More specifically, through parallel ὅτι clauses, the αἵρεσις is syntactically in opposition to living "according to truth" (ὅτι πάντες κατὰ ἀλήθειαν ζῆτε καὶ ὅτι ἐν ὑμῖν οὐδεμία αἵρεσις κατοικεῖ). Yet, Ignatius does not provide any clues in *Ephesians* with respect to the ideas which make up this αἵρεσις. The only information about the error is suggested through a λαλέω phrase: the Ephesians "do not listen to anyone except one who proclaims in truth about Jesus Christ (ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἀκούετέ τινος πλέον, ἢ περὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ λαλοῦντος ἐν ἀληθείᾳ)" (*Eph.* 6.2c).[7]

As we will soon see, however, the particular error—the αἵρεσις—Ignatius is confronting in Tralles is clearly docetic. In *Trall.* 6.1 Ignatius exhorts the Christians with a mixed metaphor: to "make use of only Christian food; avoid any strange plant which is heresy (μόνῃ τῇ χριστιανῇ τροφῇ χρῆσθε, ἀλλοτρίας δὲ βοτάνης ἀπέχεσθε, ἥτις ἐστὶν αἵρεσις)." Ignatius is thus opposing those who "preach to you apart from Jesus Christ (ὑμῖν χωρὶς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ λαλῇ τις)" (*Trall.* 9.1), who say that Jesus' "suffering was only in appearance (τὸ δοκεῖν πεπονθέναι αὐτὸν)" (*Trall.* 10.1). Preaching apart from Jesus Christ is preaching αἵρεσις.

---

[7]Cf., the λαλέω phrase in *Trall.* 9.1, where Ignatius provides the content of the wrong preaching in 9.2.

In early Christian literature, ἡ ἑτεροδοξία occurs only in Ignatius' letters. In *Magn.* 8.1 it refers to the "strange opinions" of those who live according to Judaism and its "old fables (μυθεύματα τὰ παλαιά)." We find the participial form ἑτεροδοξοῦντας in *Smyrn.* 6.2 to refer to those who have "strange opinions about the grace of Jesus Christ (καταμάθετε δὲ τοὺς ἑτεροδοξοῦντας εἰς τὴν χάριν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ . . .)"; they are "against the purpose of God (πῶς ἐναντίοι εἰσὶν τῇ γνώμῃ τοῦ θεοῦ)." Then follows the practical results of their ἑτεροδοξία: they have no care for the needy.

Therefore, ἡ ἑτεροδοξία in the Ignatian corpus signifies both belief and practice which is unacceptable in Ignatius' system. While to translate it here as "heterodoxy" is an anachronism, Ignatius stands at the beginning of a more fully technical Christian sense of the word which sets the boundaries around an increasingly institutionalized orthodoxy.[8]

The use of ἑτεροδοξοῦντας in *Smyrn.* 6.2 brings us to a related Ignatian problem of terminology: Ignatius use of καθολική in *Smyrn.* 8.2. Those with strange opinions at Smyrna have separated themselves from the church and its leader, the bishop. Thus, Ignatius tells the Christians:

> ὅπου ἂν φανῇ ἐπίσκοπος ἐκεῖ τὸ πλῆθος ἤτω, ὥσπερ ὅπου ἂν ᾖ Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, ἐκεῖ ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία.

---

[8]Simon, 111-112.

> Wherever the bishop appears, there let the congregation be; just as wherever Jesus Christ is, there is the entire church.

A complete treatment of the problem is not possible here; however, it is apparent that Ignatius uses the phrase ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία with a general sense of a common unity among local churches centered on proper faith in Jesus. The presence of the theme of unity in true faith suggests that καθολική functions on a secondary level as a boundary-defining term between acceptable and unacceptable belief and practice. Yet, the primary function of καθολική for Ignatius is simply to speak of the supralocal church as distinguished from the local gathering which he refers to as "τό πλῆθος (the congregation)" (cf., *Magn.* 6.1; *Trall.* 1.1, 8.2). Only in this sense does Ignatius' single use of καθολική carry the meaning "universal" or "catholic."[9] We cannot, therefore, see ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία in *Smyrn.* 8.2 as a technical term which separates an orthodox church from a heretical church; rather, ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία is the church which is not divided even though it is composed of individual local churches.

Thus, while it is necessary to be cautious with respect to our reading of ἡ αἵρεσις and ἡ ἑτεροδοξία in the first half of the second century, the above citations demonstrate that

---

[9]Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 243-244; idem,, "Ignatius and the Reception of Matthew," 139. For various nuances on this same conclusion see A. Garciadiego, *Katholiké Ekklesía: El significado del epíteto "Católica" aplicado a "Iglesia" desde San Ignacio de Antioquía hasta Orígenes*," (Mexico City: Editorial Jus., 1953) 117-127; Lightfoot, 310-312, Zahn, 428-429.

the Ignatian usage of these terms is located at the beginnings of a technical Christian sense. This technical sense involves establishing the lines of demarcation between that which is considered true Christian belief and practice, and that which is not. The same, however, cannot be said of ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία. While there is indeed a sense of belief united against error with this phrase, it more accurately denotes a unity among local churches.

2. THE NATURE AND IDENTITY OF IGNATIUS' OPPONENTS

There has been a fair amount of scholarly concern regarding the nature and identity of the error Ignatius is countering. Scholars generally agree that in the Ignatian corpus the opponents exhibit two broad characteristics, judaizing and docetic. So far in this study I have referred to these on several occasions; here I may restate what they involve. By judaizing tendencies, I refer to those Christians who, more or less, accept Jewish practices while at the same time see Jesus as the messiah, all within the context of devotion to the Jewish Scriptures. With respect to Ignatius—aside from observance of the Sabbath (i.e., *Magn.* 9.1) and a "Jewish" reading of the OT—specific Jewish practices such as dietary observances are absent from the bishop's descriptions. As we will see, in his polemics against judaizers, it is most likely that Ignatius is confronting uncircumcised Gentile Christians "who have

developed an interest in things Jewish."[10] These judaizers, therefore, are not Jewish Christians.

Docetic opinions, as we have seen, refer directly to the person of Jesus. Simply put, docetic Christology states that Jesus only "appeared" or "seemed" to be human (hence, δοκεῖν ["to seem"] in *Trall.* 10.1); therefore, docetism not only denies the reality of the incarnation but it also holds that Jesus' suffering and death only appeared to happen.[11] While there is evidence of docetic tendencies in the NT (e.g., 1 John 4:2), it is not until the later second century that we find docetism as part of a clearly discrete gnostic system, that of Cerinthus as reported by Irenaeus.[12]

So, with respect to Ignatius, scholars generally agree that on the one hand judaizing convictions and practices are the issue in, for example, *Phld.* 6.1; and, on the other hand, ideas which are usually described as docetic are

---

[10]Schoedel, "Ignatius and the Reception of Matthew," 145; idem, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 16. For this same approach, see C. K. Barrett, "Jews and Judaizers in the Epistles of Ignatius," pages 220-244 in R. Hamerton-Kelly, R. Scroggs, *Jews, Greeks and Christians: Religious Cultures in Late Antiquity* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976) 235; and S. G. Wilson, "Gentile Judaizers," *NTS* 38 (1992) 605-616, 606-609. Cf., P. J. Donahue, "Jewish Christianity in Ignatius' Letters," *VC* 32 (1978) 80-93, 89.

[11]See J. G. Davies, "The Origins of Docetism," pages 13-35 in *Studia Patristica VI* (TU 81; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1962) 17; H. F. Wickings, "The Nativity Stories and Docetism," *NTS* 23 (1977) 457-460; E. M. Yamauchi, "The Crucifixion and Docetic Christology," *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 46 (1982) 1-20, 5.

[12]*Adv. haer.* 1.26.1.

evident in such texts as *Trall.* 10.1. Beyond this general agreement, however, there is little consensus.[13]

Therefore, much of the scholarly energy has been centered on whether Ignatius is confronting one or two errors. Representative among those scholars who posit a single error, with both judaizing and docetic characteristics, is E. Mollard.[14] Mollard bases his argument on two passages—*Magn.* 8-11 and the 'archives' passage of *Phld.* 8.2—in each of which he sees both judaizing and docetic tendencies combined in one system. Thus, he points to the clear references to Jewish practices in *Magn.* 8.1 and 10.3, combined with the suggestion of docetism in *Magn.* 11 (i.e., Ignatius' insistence that the εὐαγγέλιον events were "truly and certainly done by Jesus Christ [πραχθέντα ἀληθῶς καὶ βεβαίως ὑπὸ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ]").

Likewise, in regard to *Phld.* 8.2, Mollard states that Ignatius' interlocutor represents a group of docetists that

---

[13]Even with this general agreement, there is dissent: C. Trevett has proposed a third characteristic to the error (and indeed, three errors). This third error was an anti-episcopal movement on the part of a group of charismatics who did not accept Ignatius' prophetic ministry. C. Trevett, "Prophecy and Anti-Episcopal Activity: a Third Error Combatted by Ignatius," *JEH* 34 (1983) 1-18.

[14]E. Mollard, "The Heretics Combatted by Ignatius of Antioch," *JEH* 5 (1954) 1-6. Mollard's essay is not only the classic statement in this regard, it also presents the best case. See also Zahn, 56. Aside from Mollard, other recent scholars who see a single error include P. Prigent, "L'Hérésie Asiate et l'église confessante de l'Apocalypse à Ignace," *VC* 31 (1977) 1-7; I. A. Saliba, "The Bishop of Antioch and the Heretics: A Study of a Primitive Christology," *EvQ* 54 (1982) 65-76, see 66, n 4; J. Speigl, "Ignatius in Philadelphia: Ereignisse und Anliegen in den Ignatiusbriefen, *VC* 41 (1987) 360-376; and S. Wilson, "Gentile Judaizers," *NTS* 38 (1992) 605-616, especially 607-609.

"required proofs from the Old Testament for believing in the proclamation of a suffering Messiah."[15] Thus, they have docetic opinions about Jesus and find support for their position in the Hebrew scriptures; yet they are not judaizers in any other sense. For Mollard, this use of the OT explains why Ignatius refers to their docetism as Judaism and why Ignatius responds to it with the εὐαγγέλιον events.

Among the scholars who see two separate errors in the Ignatian corpus, judaizers and docetists, is J. Sumney.[16] Sumney finds no indication of opponents in Magnesia at all; he posits docetism in Smyrna and judaizing practices in Philadelphia.[17] Moreover, Sumney recognizes that Ignatius' own situation influences the way he views the problems of the various churches. This means that Ignatius, not having first-hand experience of the local situations in all of the churches, treats specific erroneous opinions with reference to others he is familiar with.[18] Hence, Sumney suggests that Ignatius knew first-hand of the judaizers' activity in Philadelphia and the docetic believers in Smyrna, and has only a general knowledge of the situation in Magnesia

---

[15]Mollard, 6. Mollard links this with the Jews in Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho* 90.1.

[16]J. L. Sumney, "Those Who 'Ignorantly Deny Him': The Opponents of Ignatius of Antioch," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 1 (1993) 345-365. Others who see two separate errors include Donahue, "Jewish Christianity"; J. Rohde, "Häresie und Schisma im ersten Clemensbrief und in den Ignatius-Briefen," *NovT* 10 (1968) 217-233, especially 229-232; Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 12, n. 66.

[17]Sumney, 364-365.

[18]See also Schoedel, Ibid., 125.

(through its bishop [*Magn.* 2.1]). Ignatius' polemical activity in *Magn.* 8-11, therefore, is more accurately seen as a reflection of his own experience elsewhere than what is actually the case in Magnesia. Hence, for Sumney there is no discernable error in Magnesia. Ignatius' own experience also accounts for the suggestion of a two-sided polemical activity in *Magn.* 8-11.

Also, concerning the 'archives' passage of *Phld.* 8.2 (and *Philadelpians* as a whole), Sumney views the situation not as involving Christians who want to adopt specific Jewish practices, but rather it is a situation of those who "see different ties between Judaism and Christianity than Ignatius does."[19] This is expressed through their exegesis of the Hebrew scriptures. Therefore, the error does not involve the incarnation or Christology *per se*, but rather the judaizers' sole reliance on Scripture to understand Christianity.

With these two general scholarly approaches before us, it is clear that *Magn.* 8.1-11.1 and *Phld.* 8.2 are the problematical passages. With respect to these passages, and thus the identity of the opponents in the Ignatian corpus, my view is as follows: the letters of Ignatius show that there are two distinct groups of opponents, one with judaizing tendencies and and the other with docetic.

---

[19]Sumney, 365.

Therefore, in *Magn.* 8-11, the basic situation which precipitates Ignatius' polemics involves Christians who emphasize Jewish practices.[20] Likewise, in *Phld.* 8.2 the tension involves use of the Hebrew scriptures in ways which Ignatius does not approve of, presumably by Gentile Christians. As for the remainder of the letters, based on *Trall.* 10.1, the αἵρεσις (*Trall.* 6.1) at Tralles is docetic. Docetism is also the error which engenders the credal summary and the following arguments in *Smyrn.* 1.1-5.3.[21] Further along in this chapter, when I turn specifically to the judaizing error evident in *Magnesians* and *Philadelphians*, and the docetic error in *Trallians* and *Smyrnaeans*, I will elaborate on my reasons for seeing two separate errors.

---

[20]Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 118. This is in contrast to Sumney who contends that "explicit statements yield no clear evidence that there are opponents or even divisions in Magnesia." Thus, for Sumney, Ignatius is concerned that false teachings from elsewhere might threaten Magnesia and so he argues against both errors in *Magn.* 8.1-11.1. Sumney, 361.

[21]Those with a "strange teaching (ἑτεροδιδασκαλέω)" (*Pol.* 3.1) are the docetics of Smyrna.

With respect to *Ephesians* we encounter a problem in identifying the error or errors. In this letter Ignatius does not provide clues to his opponents' theological ideas. He only generally describes the false teachers themselves: in 9.1 they have an "evil doctrine (κακὴν διδαχήν)," and in 16.1 they "corrupt the faith of God by evil teaching (ἐὰν πίστιν θεοῦ ἐν κακῇ διδασκαλίᾳ φθείρῃ)." Especially in *Eph.* 6.2, 7.2, and 18.2, however, we find εὐαγγέλιον themes and motifs directed against this generalized error.

Moreover, *Romans* is the only Ignatian letter which has no ostensible evidence of theological error.

In the discussion to follow, therefore, I will concentrate my energies on those letters in which there are clear indications of what Ignatius considers the divisive ideas of his opponents.

This being said, it is also vital to recognize, along with Schoedel and Sumney, that all we have to work with are these letters; thus, especially with respect to the somewhat ambivalent evidence in *Magnesians*, Ignatius' own experience and world-view colors the evidence we have before us. As we will see, while presumably Ignatius knows of judaizing tendencies at Magnesia (through his meeting with the Magnesian leaders [*Magn.* 2, 6.1]), he shapes the polemic by intensifying the situation with his own experience of the Philadelphians (*Phld.* 7.1).[22] This is true with the docetists as well. Thus, with respect to both errors, in his overriding concern to promote unity of faith and practice (e.g., *Phld.* 8.1), Ignatius himself exaggerates and thereby polarizes either judaizing or docetic tendencies in the churches into discrete groups. He is thereby able to isolate these groups and place them outside the limits of proper belief and practice.[23] This is perhaps most evident in *Phld.* 8.2 where Ignatius reports the 'archives' conversation he had had with someone (presumably in Philadelphia) which then becomes the centerpiece of his argument aginst judaizing activity.

Here we are brought back to the εὐαγγέλιον. In his polemics against *both* the judaizing and docetic errors which

---

[22]Speigl, 369.

[23]Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 12. "Polarized" is Schoedel's well chosen word to describe the situation.

he has seemingly largely polarized, Ignatius constantly appeals to his Christology. In other words, Ignatius' polemical activity is defined by his Christology, and, therefore, ultimately, by his εὐαγγέλιον. Hence, even though there is no evidence in Ignatius' letters that the judaizing error questioned the incarnation or the reality of the suffering of Jesus (as with the docetists), Ignatius grounds his polemics against the judaizers in the εὐαγγέλιον events of the passion and resurrection of Jesus.[24] This accounts for the tension scholars have observed in *Magn.* 8.1-11.1 where we find what are ostensibly anti-docetic statements (*Magn.* 11.1) within an argument against judaizing practices. The same is true for *Phld.* 8.2: as we have seen, Ignatius finishes his argument by appealing to the εὐαγγέλιον events—in lieu of the Hebrew Scriptures—as the only "archives" required. For Ignatius, belief in the events of the εὐαγγέλιον are the central facts which determine Christian identity.[25]

B. THE TWO ERRORS AND THE GOSPEL OF IGNATIUS

In this section, my goal is to discuss those passages in which Ignatius is combating the judaizing and docetic errors. We will, of course, encounter familiar passages; however, the specific vantage point will be how the motifs

---

[24]Ibid.

[25]Maier, *Social Setting*, 164.

and themes of Ignatius' εὐαγγέλιον function in his polemical efforts. Thus, first I will treat the judaizing error in *Magnesians* and *Philadelphians*, and second I will consider the docetic activity in *Trallians* and *Smyrnaeans*.

1. THE GOSPEL OF IGNATIUS AND JUDAIZING ACTIVITY

We return, then, to *Magn.* 8.1-11.1. Up to *Magn.* 8.1 Ignatius has been encouraging unity by upholding the authority of Damas, the Magnesian bishop, with whom he has been permitted to meet (i.e., *Magn.* 2). This exhortation to unity culminates in the passage centered on the repeated use of "one" (μία [*Magn.* 7.1b] and ἕνα [*Magn.* 7.2]).

With this exhortation accomplished, Ignatius turns pointedly to the error he wishes to confront. That it has to do (at least for Ignatius) with judaizing practices, there can be no doubt. First, in *Magn.* 8.1, Ignatius suggests indirectly—through a warning about being deceived—that those who are living by "strange opinions (ἑτεροδοξίαι)" and "old fables (μυθεύματα τὰ παλαιά)" are living "according to Judaism (κατὰ Ἰουδαϊσμὸν ζῆν)."[26] This is living in an old way

---

[26]Cf., ἑτεροδοξοῦντας in *Smyrn.* 6.2.

There is a textual difficulty with this κατὰ phrase. The major Greek text of the middle recension has "κατὰ νόμον Ἰουδαϊσμὸν ζῶμεν (we live Judaism according to the law)." This, Schoedel points out, is "unlikely Greek" which is corrected in the Greek text of the long recension: "κατὰ νόμον Ἰουδαϊκόν ζῶμεν (we live according to the Jewish law)." The Latin witness has "κατὰ Ἰουδαϊσμὸν ζῆν (living according to Judaism)." This is the most acceptable reading for two reasons: it is paralleled with "κατὰ Χριστιανισμὸν ζῆν (living according to Christianity)" in *Magn.* 10.1; and, taking into account Ignatius' few uses of νόμος, it is likely

that is past and therefore of no value (i.e., *Magn.* 9.1, 10.2; cf., *Eph.* 19.3[27]); indeed, it is the opposite of "living according to Christianity (κατὰ Χριστιανισμὸν ζῆν)" in *Magn.* 10.1. As we will soon observe, this contrast with the old ways defines Ignatius' approach to the judaizing error in *Magnesians*.

Moreover, Ignatius states that living according to Judaism is the same as confessing that one has not "received grace" (ὁμολογοῦμεν χάριν μὴ εἰληφέναι). This confessing may be seen in light of the other Ignatian uses of ὁμολογέω which we have noted elsewhere are directly linked with the εὐαγγέλιον motifs and themes (i.e., *Smyrn.* 5.2, 7.1). Of greater significance, however, is Ignatius' use of "grace (χάρις)." While it is without doubt too facile to parallel Ignatius' opposition between grace and "Judaism" with Paul's opposition between grace and the Law (as in Rom 6:14; cf., Gal 2:21, 5:4), there is still a Pauline side to Ignatius' use of χάρις.[28] For Paul, the concept of χάρις includes "the

---

that the issue of the law was added through a later Pauline influence. Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 119, n. 7.

[27]Here, in the star-hymn, the result of the coming of Jesus and his passion is that "the old kingdom perished, God being revealed as human to bring newness of eternal life (παλαιὰ βασιλεία διεφθείρετο θεοῦ ἀνθρωπίνος φανερουμένου εἰς καινότητα ἀϊδίου ζωῆς)." In this regard one thinks as well of the Ignatian title, Jesus, "the new human (καινὸς ἄνθρωπως)" at *Eph.* 21.1 (Jesus, "the perfect human [τέλειος ἄνθρωπος] at *Smyrn.* 4.2 may be seen in the same light).

[28]Cf., Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 119.

entire process of salvation in Christ."[29] Thus, this grace is given through the crucifixion of Christ (Gal 2:15-21) and is therefore central to the gospel message (Gal 1:6).[30]

For Ignatius, as well, εὐαγγέλιον motifs and themes are clearly linked with his concept of χάρις: in *Eph.* 20.2, for example, Ignatius encourages the Ephesians to "come together in grace . . . in one faith and in Jesus Christ (πάντες ἐν χάριτι . . . ἐν μιᾷ πίστει καὶ ἐν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ)." Ignatius then describes this one faith by means of the manifestation of Jesus and the everlasting life of the εὐαγγέλιον message (*Eph.* 20.2c).[31] Thus, for Ignatius χάρις refers to God's favor granted to believers, most specifically through the salvation accomplished by Jesus.[32]

Returning to *Magn.* 8, in response to the judaizing error Ignatius carries the χάρις theme forward as he makes reference to the OT Prophets in 8.2. They did not live

---

[29]H. D. Betz, *Galatians*, 126. Betz is referring specifically to ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ in Gal 2:21. See, as well, H. Conzelmann, "χάρις, κ.τ.λ." *TDNT* IX, 393, 394.

[30]Also, we cannot overlook the Lukan intramural phrases τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ (Acts 20:24) and ὁ λόγος τῆς χάριτος αυτοῦ (Acts 14:3, 20:32) that we highlighted earlier. In fact, Luke is alone among the Synoptic tradition to use χάρις. In John, by the way, χάρις is only found in the prologue (1:14, 16, 17).

[31]Ignatius speaks of χάρις fifteen times: *Eph.* 11.1, 20.2; *Magn.* insc, 2.1, 8.1; *Rom.* insc, 1.2; *Phld.* 8.1, 11.1; *Smyrn.* 6.2, 9.2, 11.1, 13.2; *Pol.* 1.2, 7.3.

It is significant to note here that Ignatius also employs the χάρις theme in *Smyrn.* 6.2 to counter the docetics: they have "strange opinions about the grace of Jesus Christ (καταμάθετε δὲ τοὺς ἑτεροδοξοῦντας εἰς τὴν χάριν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ . . .)." Thus, χάρις figures in Ignatius' arguments against both errors.

[32]Cf., Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 239.

according to Judaism but "lived according to Jesus Christ (κατὰ Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν ἔζησαν)" through whose χάρις they were able to persuade the disobedient of the manifestation of the one God in Jesus. The χάρις of God (*Rom.* insc.) comes into the world through Jesus. Χάρις, therefore, is the indicator of living "according to Christianity," in contrast to living "according to Judaism."

This contrast next comes to the fore in the guise of "old" and "new" ways. Thus, as he continues his argument against judaizing in *Magn.* 9.1 (through recourse to the OT Prophets), Ignatius reiterates the "old fables" of 8.1 with living in "old ways (ἐν παλαιοῖς πράγμασιν ἀναστραφέντες)" (9.1) which, in turn, is contrasted with the "newness of hope" (... εἰς καινότητα ἐλπίδος ἦλθον) of no longer living for the Sabbath but observing the Lord's Day (ἡ κυριακός).[33] For Ignatius, the new hope is centered on the salvific death of Jesus which is observed (or celebrated) on that day. It is this hope in the gospel message which makes the old ways passé. Moreover, as with the Prophets who were persecuted for "living according to Jesus Christ" (*Magn.* 8.2), this hope is in the context of endurance (καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ὑπομένομεν). Then, Ignatius concludes *Magn.* 9 by pointing out that the Prophets

---

[33]For a similar use of ἡ κυριακός to refer to Sunday, or the "Lord's Day" see Rev 1:10 (ἐγενόμην ἐν πνεύματι ἐν τῇ κυριακῇ ἡμέρᾳ . . .); Ignatius in *Magn.* 9.1, however, does not use ἡμέρα ("day"). For ἡ κυριακός as the "Lord's Day" without ἡμέρα see *Did.* 15.1 (with κυρίου) and the title for Melito's work *On the Lord's Day* (Περὶ κυριακῆς λόγος) as listed by Eusebius (*Hist. eccl.* 4.26.2).

ultimately shared in this salvation at the coming (πάρειμι) of Jesus, "their teacher."

Ignatius continues this contrast between the old and new ways in *Magn.* 10.1-2. From his exhortation to the Magnesians in 10.1, it appears that for Ignatius the judaizers, with their emphasis on the "old ways," ignore Christ's "goodness (ἡ χρηστότης)" (10.1a). This "goodness" can only be the salvific events Ignatius has mentioned in 9.1-2. Then, taking his cue from the reference to Jesus as the only teacher and being his disciples (*Magn.* 9.1, 2), Ignatius says, "In this, let us be his disciples and let us learn to live according to Christianity (διὰ τοῦτο, μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ γενόμενοι, μάθωμεν κατὰ Χριστιανσμὸν ζῆν)." Again, we have the new life as Christians in contrast to one that, in its reliance on the old ways, is insensible toward the "goodness" of the the εὐαγγέλιον message.

Next, using the Pauline image of leaven (1 Cor 5:7-8; cf., Gal 5:9), Ignatius sets up an opposition between "evil leaven" which is "old and sour" and the "new leaven which is Jesus Christ" (ὑπέρθεσθε οὖν τὴν κακὴν ζύμην, τὴν παλαιωθεῖσαν καὶ ἐνοξίσασαν, καὶ μεταβάλεσθε εἰς νέαν ζύμην, ὅ ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός) (*Magn.* 10.1). Then, shifting to the metaphor of salt (cf., Matt 5:13; Mark 14:34-35; Luke 9:49-50), Ignatius urges the Magnesians to be "salted in him (ἁλίσθητε ἐν αὐτῷ)" to avoid

being revealed as "spoiled (διαφθείρω)"—again suggesting something which is old and "useless (ἀνωφελής)" (8.1).[34]

Thus far in this treatment of *Magn.* 8.1-11.1 we have observed how Ignatius structures his argument against judaizing activity around a constant contrast between the old and the new ways.[35] For Ignatius, the old, useless way is clearly a life which emphasizes Jewish practices (9.1) and looks to the Hebrew Scriptures (the "old fables" of 8.1) for its foundation. The new way, on the other hand, is characterized by grace (8.1, 2) and hope (9.1) centered on Jesus, the manifestation of God (8.2) whose death gives life (9.1). Therefore, behind this pervasive contrast between the old and new lies Ignatius' εὐαγγέλιον.

This is confirmed in *Magn.* 10.3. Hence, we have one of the λαλέω phrases which, as we have seen, refers to preaching the εὐαγγέλιον: "It is absurd to preach Jesus Christ and to judaize (ἄτοπόν ἐστιν, Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν λαλεῖν καὶ ἰουδαΐζειν)." Here again we find, with the opposing infinitives λαλεῖν and ἰουδαΐζειν, the contrast between the new and the old ways. Preaching the εὐαγγέλιον is absurd if one is at the same time practicing the old ways of the judaizers.

---

[34]It is significant in this regard that διαφθείρω is also used to refer to the destruction of the "old kingdom" in the star-hymn at *Eph.* 19.3. This, to make way for the "newness of eternal life" through the manifestation of God as human (θεοῦ ἀνθρωπίνως φανερουμένου εἰς καινότητα ἀϊδίου ζωῆς).

[35]Cf., Matt 9:16-17; Mark 2:21-22; Luke 5:36-39.

Ignatius follows the λαλέω phrase with a further statement of the relationship between Christianity and Judaism:

> ὁ γὰρ Χριστιανισμὸς οὐκ εἰς Ἰουδαϊσμὸν ἐπίστευσεν, ἀλλ' Ἰουδαϊσμὸς εἰς Χριστιανισμὸν, ᾧ πᾶσα γλῶσσα πιστεύσασα εἰς θεὸν συνήχθη.
>
> For Christianity did not believe in Judaism, but Judaism in Christianity, into which every tongue believing in God has been brought together. (*Magn.* 10.3b)

Presumably, here Ignatius is referring to the forward looking activity of the OT Prophets in living "according to Jesus Christ" (*Magn.* 8.1; *Phld.* 5.2; cf., *Smyrn.* 7.2).[36] This reading is supported by the last phrase in *Magn.* 10.3b. Christianity is the universal way of belief: everyone who believes in God is brought together. We are reminded here once more of the equally inclusive statement in *Phld.* 9.1 in which Jesus is the "door to the Father (αὐτὸς ὢν θύρα τοῦ πατρός,)" through which enter all those in the history of faith including the Prophets, Apostles and the church, all into the unity of God. Significantly, as we will soon see, this passage is within the context of Ignatius' argument against judaizing at Philadelphia.

---

[36]Cf., Schoedel (*Ignatius of Antioch*, 126) who sees this as a reference to the "first generation of Jewish Christians referred to in *Magn.* 9.1" who left Judaism to become Christian. As I stated above in my discussion of *Magn.* 9.1, it seems best to see that passage as a reference to the OT Prophets Ignatius mentions in *Magn.* 8.2. Hence, my reading of *Magn.* 10.3b.

Ignatius concludes his argument against judaizing activity in *Magn.* 11.1 first by recognizing his lack of first-hand knowledge of such activity at Magnesia (although we may presume from *Magn.* 2 and 6.1 that Ignatius has some knowledge of judaizing tendencies from the Magnesian leaders). He wants to warn the Magnesian Christians about judaizing tendencies so that they might not fall on the "fishhooks of vain opinion." So, in opposition to this κενοδοξία, Ignatius exhorts the Magnesians

> πεπληροφορῆσθαι ἐν τῇ γεννήσει καὶ τῷ πάθει καὶ τῇ ἀναστάσει τῇ γενομένῃ ἐν καιρῷ τῆς ἡγεμονίας Ποντίου Πιλάτου· πραχθέντα ἀληθῶς καὶ βεβαίως ὑπὸ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τῆς ἐλπίδος ἡμῶν, . .
>
> to be fully convinced of the birth and passion and resurrection which took place at the time of the procuratorship of Pontius Pilate: things truly and certainly done by Jesus Christ, our hope . . .

This, of course, is one of Ignatius' pivotal expressions of the εὐαγγέλιον (cf., *Trall.* 9; *Smyrn.* 1). Elsewhere I have highlighted the various components of this passage. Thus, we recognize the prime εὐαγγέλιον motifs—the παρουσία (here, in the guise of the γέννησις), the πάθος, and the ἀνάστασις—in the context of the acceptance term πληροφορέω.[37] Moreover, for Ignatius the historical reference to Pilate serves to underscore the reality of the εὐαγγέλιον

---

[37]It is notable that, as we have seen, Ignatius uses πληροφορέω also in conjunction with the parallel Christological summary of *Smyrn.* 1.1 in his polemic against the docetists. This is an indication that Ignatius sees the εὐαγγέλιον motifs as the answer to both judaizing and docetic errors.

events; on another level, this historical reference is an indication that Ignatius is working with material from a traditional faith statement.[38] We have also examined the εὐαγγέλιον theme of hope and how Ignatius' Christology is expressed through the title "Jesus the common hope."

With respect to the phrase "things truly and certainly done by Jesus Christ," we have what is ostensibly an anti-docetic statement.[39] For, to emphasize the reality of the salvific events is to counter the docetic denial of the reality of the incarnation. We have seen that the scholarly discussion concerning the number of errors behind this *Magnesians* text arises largely from this statement.

Yet, from the above discussion of *Magn.* 8.1-11.1, we have recognized that there are strong indications of a judaizing error behind Ignatius' arguments in this passage. What is more, we have also have taken into account Ignatius' own world-view and understood that he is defining the situation at Magnesia himself. He treats the judaizing error in Magnesia—as with the docetic error elsewhere—as a cause of disunity and thus responds to it with the message of the εὐαγγέλιον motifs at the foundation of his argument.

---

[38]Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 129. For other expressions of such faith summaries which appeal to the historical involvement of Pilate in Jesus' death, see Justin, *Apol.* 1.13.3; 1.61.13; *Dial.* 30.3; and Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 2.32.4; 3.4.2.

[39]Only here does Ignatius link βεβαίως ("certainly") with ἀληθῶς in emphasizing the reality the gospel motifs. Otherwise, it is always simply ἀληθῶς (*Trall.* 9.1 [three times], 9.2; *Smyrn.* 1.1 [bis], 1.2, 2.1 [bis]; cf., *Eph.* 17.2) and always within an anti-docetic context.

Ignatius' answer to church disunity, no matter the cause, is the εὐαγγέλιον.[40]

Having so examined the judaizing error in *Magn.* 8.1-11.1, we may now consider the other Ignatian letter which carries evidence of judaizing activity, *Philadelphians*. There are three passages which draw one's attention in this regard, *Phld.* 6.1, 8.2, and 9.1-2.

Turning to *Phld.* 6.1, we find Ignatius delineating the boundaries between Judaism (ὁ Ἰουδαϊσμός) and Christianity (ὁ Χριστιανισμός). Yet, it is clear that by "Judaism" Ignatius is referring to interpreting (ἑρμηνεύω) the Hebrew scriptures —specifically the OT Prophets of *Phld.* 5.2—in contrast to preaching the εὐαγγέλιον message (which Ignatius connects with both himself and the Prophets in *Phld.* 5.1-2). Therefore, the next statement indicates that the conflict arises from the oral proclamation of opposing positions: "it is better to hear Christianity from a man who is circumcised than Judaism from one who is uncircumcised (ἄμεινον γάρ ἐστιν παρὰ ἀνδρὸς περιτομὴν ἔχοντος χριστιανισμὸν ἀκούειν, ἢ παρὰ ἀκροβύστου ἰουδαϊσμόν)" (*Phld.* 6.1a).

With respect to this sentence, in the first clause (ἄμεινον γάρ . . . ἀκούειν,) Ignatius looks back not only to the witness of the OT Prophets he has discussed in 5.2 (cf.,

---

[40]E.g., *Phld.* 3.3: "if anyone walks about in strange doctrine, that one has no part in the passion (εἴ τις ἐν ἀλλοτρίᾳ γνώμῃ περιπατεῖ, οὗτος τῷ πάθει οὐ συγκατατίθεται)." Cf., *Magn.* 5.2; *Trall.* 11.2; *Smyrn.* 1.2; *Rom.* 6.3.

Magn. 9.1), but he is also evidently referring to the witness of (circumcised) Jewish Christians.[41] Thus, while he may be alluding to the early witness by the first Jews who became Christian, it is also possible that Ignatius is referring to a group of Jewish Christians at Philadelphia. However, from this rather cryptic passage certainty in this regard is not possible.[42]

In any case, it is the second group (. . . ἢ παρὰ ἀκροβύστου Ἰουδαϊσμόν) which Ignatius wants to address. These are uncircumcised Gentile Christians who are involved in judaizing activity.[43] Hence, they are the ones in 6.1a who interpret "Judaism." This judaizing activity specifically involves an emphasis on supporting Christian belief through an interpretation of the OT.

The implication here is that to come from Judaism to Christianity is acceptable; but, turning to "Judaism" by basing one's Christianity on Jewish practices (as in *Magn.* 9.1) and interpretation of the OT (*Phld.* 8.2), places one outside Christianity. This is the same point Ignatius has made with respect to the OT Prophets in *Magn.* 10.3, "Christianity did not believe in Judaism, but Judaism in Christianity (ὁ γὰρ Χριστιανισμὸς οὐκ εἰς Ἰουδαϊσμὸν ἐπίστευσεν, ἀλλ'

---

[41]Speigl, 369-370.

[42]Cf., Barrett, 234.

[43]Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 202. Furthermore, recognizing the emphasis on ἑρμηνεύω, Schoedel states that these Gentile Christians at Philadelphia are "more interested in the idea of Judaism than the practice of it." Ibid., 203.

Ἰουδαϊσμὸς εἰς Χριστιανισμὸν)." Thus, the Prophets, who are included in "the gospel of the common hope" (*Phld.* 5.2), demonstrate that it is better to come from Judaism and preach Christianity than be a Gentile (or anyone, for that matter) who looks to Judaism to support Christianity.

Next, in *Phld.* 6.1b, Ignatius reiterates his position that whether one comes to Christianity from Judaism, or if one is a Gentile Christian, it is the εὐαγγέλιον which determines a person's Christianity. Thus, with a negative version of the λαλέω intramural phrase, Ignatius states,

> ἐὰν δὲ ἀμφότεροι περὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μὴ λαλῶσιν, οὗτοι ἐμοὶ στῆλαί εἰσιν καὶ τάφοι νεκρῶν, ἐφ' οἷς γέγραπται μόνον ὀνόματα ἀνθρώπων.
>
> But if either of them [circumcised or not] do not preach about Jesus Christ, they are to me tombstones and sepulchres of the dead on which are written only the names of people. (*Phld.* 6.1b)

To preach the εὐαγγέλιον message is the sole determining factor in Christianity. Without the message of the εὐαγγέλιον, the church is divided; therefore, in 6.2 Ignatius exhorts the Philadelphians to avoid the divisive activity expressed through the erroneous interpretation and to "come together with undivided hearts (ἀλλὰ πάντες ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ γίνεσθε ἐν ἀμερίστῳ καρδίᾳ)."

The issues are the same in *Phld.* 8.2 and 9.1-2. Elsewhere I have fully treated these passages; here we may briefly revisit them by recognizing that (as in 6.1) it is the judaizing interpretation of the OT as a foundation for

Christianity that Ignatius is working against. Thus, in the 'archive' passage of 8.2, the "teaching of Christ (κατὰ χριστομαθίαν) (8.2a)"—which, as I have suggested, is identified with the εὐαγγέλιον—is Ignatius' answer to basing Christianity on the OT. Jesus himself, with the εὐαγγέλιον events of his "cross, and death and resurrection," is the only acceptable archive upon which to base Christianity.

Likewise, as Ignatius continues in *Phld.* 9.1-2, the problem of judaizing interpretation of the OT is behind Ignatius' exposition. First, in 9.1, in contrast to the priests of Israel, Jesus is the greater "high priest" because through him (as the "door of the Father [θύρα τοῦ πατρός]") all the figures of faith from Abraham to the church have access to unity with God. Those include primarily the foundational figures of Judaism in the OT: "Abraham and Isaac and Jacob and the Prophets." Again, as in *Magn.* 10.3, "Judaism" depends on Christ, not the other way around.

Then, in *Phld.* 9.2, Ignatius concludes his response to the judaizers of Philadelphia by summarizing his position with a εὐαγγέλιον statement:

> ἐξαίρετον δέ τι ἔχει τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, τὴν παρουσίαν τοῦ σωτῆρος, κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τὸ πάθος αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὴν ἀνάστασιν. οἱ γὰρ ἀγαπητοὶ προφῆται κατήγγειλαν εἰς αὐτόν· τὸ δὲ εὐαγγέλιον ἀπάρτισμά ἐστιν ἀφθαρσίας.
>
> But the gospel has something distinctive, the coming of the savior, our lord Jesus Christ, his passion and

> resurrection. For the beloved Prophets directed their announcement toward him; but the gospel is the completion of incorruption.

Ignatius' summation thus includes expressions of not only the prime εὐαγγέλιον motifs. but also the relationship between the εὐαγγέλιον and Jewish traditions. In contrast to judaizing interpretations of scripture, the εὐαγγέλιον is unique because it contains the salvific events of Jesus, it is "the completion of incorruption." Basing Christianity on a judaizing interpretation of the Hebrew scriptures, therefore, misses the mark by looking elswhere. The proof of this is that—as in *Magn.* 8.1; *Phld.* 5.2; *Smyrn.* 7.2—the Jewish Prophets themselves looked ahead to Jesus.

Thus, in his polemics against the judaizing error in *Magnesians* and *Philadelphians*, Ignatius is upholding church unity by pointing out that the message of the εὐαγγέλιον is the only acceptable ground of faith. Turning to Jewish practices (*Magn.* 9.1) or interpretations of the OT (*Magn.* 8.1; *Phld.* 6.1, 8.2) as the ground of faith is "absurd" (*Magn.* 10.3) because such judaizing activity relies on supports that are old and therefore "useless" (*Magn.* 8.1). Such activity is opposed to the "new hope" of "living according to Christianity" (*Magn.* 10.1).

2. THE GOSPEL OF IGNATIUS AND DOCETIC ACTIVITY

With respect to indications of docetic activity in the Ignatian letters, we find clear references to such activity in *Trallians* and *Smyrnaeans*. In the following discussion I will consider two major blocks of material from these letters: *Trall.* 9.1-11.2 and *Smyrn.* 1.1-7.2. In keeping with my program, I will treat these pericopae with Ignatius' εὐαγγέλιον in mind.

In *Trall.* 6.1-2 Ignatius warns the Trallians about αἵρεσις. Using a mixture of metaphors involving "weed" and "deadly drug," he states that those in error "mingle Jesus Christ with themselves, in a show of integrity (οἳ ἑαυτοῖς παρεμπλέκουσιν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν καταξιοπιστευόμενοι)."[44] This most likely refers to erroneous ideas being mixed with the truth of the gospel message.

Yet, it is not until 10.1 that Ignatius provides us with the divisive position of his opponents. He begins in 9.1-2 by presenting the opposite of their position, the εὐαγγέλιον. So, in 9.1a, in one of his intramural λαλέω phrases, Ignatius exhorts the Trallians: "Be deaf then when anyone preaches to you apart from Jesus Christ . . . (κωφώθητε οὖν, ὅταν ὑμῖν χωρὶς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ λαλῇ τις . . .)." This phrase leads into one of Ignatius' fullest Christological statements:

---

[44]Translation, Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 146.

. . . τοῦ ἐκ γένους Δαυείδ, τοῦ ἐκ Μαρίας, ὃς ἀληθῶς ἐγεννήθη, ἔφαγέν τε καὶ ἔπιεν, ἀληθῶς ἐδιώχθη ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου. ἀληθῶς ἐσταυρώθη καὶ ἀπέθανεν, βλεπόντων τῶν ἐπουρανίων καὶ ἐπιγείων καὶ ὑποχθονίων. ὃς καὶ ἀληθῶς ἠγέθη ἀπὸ νεκρῶν, ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ, κατὰ τὸ ὁμοίωμα ὃς καὶ ἡμᾶς τοὺς πιστεύοντας αὐτῷ οὕτως ἐγερεῖ ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, οὗ χωρὶς τὸ ἀληθινὸν ζῆν οὐκ ἔχομεν.

[9.1] . . . of the family of David, of Mary, who was truly born, both ate and drank, was truly persecuted under Pontius Pilate, was truly crucified and died, as heavenly, earthly, and subearthly things looked on, [9.2] who was also truly raised from the dead, his Father having raised him, in whose likeness his Father will also so raise us up who believe in him through Jesus Christ, apart from whom we do not have true life.[45]

Elsewhere we have observed the various εὐαγγέλιον themes and motifs which make up this Christological summary. I have also noted that it is evident that here Ignatius employs traditional expressions from various sources and not a fixed credal text. This means that, while traditional expressions are present, Ignatius uses this material in such a way that it serves his particular purpose: "Ignatius' formulation is *designed* to answer docetism."[46]

This is most obviously seen in the repeated use of the adverb "truly (ἀληθῶς)" to describe the gospel events. Ignatius emphasizes the reality of those events in answer to docetic Christology which, as we will soon see in *Trall.* 10, holds that Jesus "suffered in appearance" only. The

---

[45]Translation, Ibid., 152.

[46]Ibid., 153 (the emphasis is mine); see also von Campenhausen, "Das Bekenntnis," 245-246.

inclusion of the historical figures of David, Mary and Pilate certainly serves this same function. Moreover, Ignatius' statement that Jesus "ate and drank" (cf., *Smyrn.* 3.3; Luke 24:42-43; Acts 10:41) further underscores the anti-docetic nature of the passage.[47]

Especially striking in this regard, however, is the fact that in this particular expression of his Christology Ignatius pointedly shifts the tradition. Thus, apparently basing his formula on a tradition arising from Paul's two-step formula in Rom 1:1-3 ("born . . . according to flesh . . . recognized as son of God . . . according to the spirit of holiness"), Ignatius omits indication of Jesus' divine origins as son of God. Jesus' relationship with God is indeed suggested by the reference to the Father at the end of the formula; yet, this is not, as one might expect, presented directly in conjunction with Jesus' fleshly existence.[48] In *Trall.* 9.1-2 Ignatius is not concerned with presenting Jesus' origins from God; he is, rather, primarily intent on presenting the reality of the human history of Jesus.

---

[47]Ignatius, in *Smyrn.* 3.3, however takes another tack with this phrase. While in *Trall.* 9.1 Jesus "ate and drank" in the ordinary course of life, in *Smyrn.* 3.3 Ignatius emphasizes that after the resurrection Jesus ate and drank.

[48]We have observed annother sort of a shift in *Eph.* 20.2. There, while both Jesus' origins in the flesh and in the "spirit" are present, the two step movement of the Pauline formula is absent: Jesus is from the start a union of flesh and spirit. This is also the case with *Eph.* 18.2 and, as we will soon see, *Smyrn.* 1.1.

In short, therefore, Ignatius' shift to an emphasis on the earthly (fleshly) origins of Jesus, in conjunction with the references to historical figures, as well as his repeated use of ἀληθῶς, all coalesce into a strongly anti-docetic Christological statement of the gospel message.

Ignatius ends the Christological summary with a reference to the εὐαγγέλιον message of salvation. Thus, because Jesus' resurrection those "who believe in him" will be raised by the Father. This human resurrection is in continuity with such Pauline expressions as those found in Rom 8:11, 1 Cor 6:14, 15:12-22 and 1 Thess 4:14 (cf., Pol. *Phil.*2.2). For Ignatius, this is the message of salvation as eternal life we have discussed elsewhere. Thus, in a reiteration of the opening λαλέω phrase, Ignatius concludes the Christological formula by referring to "Jesus Christ, apart from whom we do not have true life."[49]

Next, in *Trall.* 10, Ignatius provides us with the teaching of the docetists. They are "without God (ἄθεοι)" (cf., *Trall.* 3.2) and, in direct opposition to those "who believe in him" (9.2), they are "unbelievers (ἄπιστοι)." They are ἄπιστοι because they hold that Jesus only "suffered in appearance (τὸ δοκεῖν πεπονθέναι)." This key phrase as it stands suggests an aboslute docetism which denied that Jesus

---

[49]Moreover, perhaps we may see a further suggestion of Ignatius' anti-docetic purpose in his use of the adjective ἀληθινός. This is an Ignatian way of referring to Jesus (i.e., *Eph.* 7.2, 11.1; *Smyrn.* 4.1).

had flesh as a human being.[50] As we will soon see, Ignatius mentions only the suffering of Jesus here because he wants to link Jesus' suffering with his own. We may presume, however, that—at least for Ignatius—the docetists deny not only the fleshly παθός of Jesus, but also the fleshly reality of all of the events of the historical Jesus. This means that while the fleshly παθός of Jesus is apparently the central problem for the docetists, Ignatius sees that denial as necessarily extended to the entire life of Jesus.[51] This is confirmed not only by the full Christological summary of *Trall.* 9.1-2 but also the parallel summary of *Smyrn.* 1.1-2.

Ignatius then uses the false teaching to describe the false teachers themselves: "it is they who are [only] an appearance (αὐτοὶ ὄντες τὸ δοκεῖν)." Presumably this is to say that while they may seem (or claim) to be Christian, in reality they are not true Christians because of their false teaching (thus, *Trall.* 3.2). As we will see, Ignatius uses this same tactic more forcefully against the docetists of Smryna.

---

[50]We may compare this with the docetism evident in 1 John 4:2-3. In 1 John "the issue is not that the sucessionists are denying the incarnation or the physical reality of Jesus' humanity; they are denying that what Jesus was or did in the flesh was related to his being the Christ, i.e., was salvific." R. Brown, *The Epistles of John* (AB 30; Garden City: Doubleday, 1985) 505.

[51]Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 155. See also, Zahn, 384-385.

Continuing in *Trall.* 10 Ignatius personalizes his argument by referring to his own situation. The idea is that if the docetists are right, then Ignatius' present suffering and expected death are in vain. Again, this same argument is more developed in *Smyrn.* 4.2. Here, the reality of the εὐαγγέλιον events expressed in 9.1-2 provides a framework of meaning for Ignatius' situation. Because Jesus' suffering, death and resurrection were real, Ignatius —one of those "who believe in him" (9.2)—can align his own sufferings with Christ's and thus depend on the hope of salvation through Christ's resurrection (cf., 9.2).

The final passage of Ignatius' polemics against the Trallian docetists, *Trall.* 11.1-2, contains further warnings. Speaking of the false teachers, the bishop exhorts the Christians to "Flee, therefore, from these wicked offshoots, which bear deadly fruit that if someone tastes, he immediately dies (φεύγετε οὖν τὰς κακὰς παραφυάδας τὰς γεννώσας καρπὸν θανατηφόρον, οὗ ἐὰν γεύσηταί τις, παρ' αὐτὰ ἀποθνήσκει)." The docetists have sprung like a branch from the church, but they are death-dealing because they "are not the planting of the Father" (11.1b; cf., Matt 15:13, *Gos. Thom.* 40).[52] Because their teaching about Jesus denies the reality of the εὐαγγέλιον events, they have no access to the resurrection.

---

[52]On the relationship of this phrase with Matthean traditions, see Schoedel, "Ignatius and the Reception of Matthew," 172-173.

Thus, anyone who partakes of their teaching (their "deadly fruit") dies.

The contrast to this evil offshoot is the subject of 11.2. Rather than being death-giving offshoots, if they were "the planting of the Father (. . . φυτεία πατρός)" (11.1), they would be "branches of the cross . . . their fruit would be incorruptable (ἐφαίνοντο ἂν κλάδοι τοῦ σταυροῦ, καὶ ἦν ἂν ὁ καρπὸς αὐτῶν ἄφθαρτος)." Branching from the cross—as from a tree—implies a recognition of the truth of the passion and suggests the salvation gained through the resurrection.[53] Ignatius then moves from the cross to the passion of Jesus: through his passion, Jesus calls those who are "his members (ὄντας μέλη αὐτοῦ)" into the unity which God promises (cf., *Eph.* 14.1).

Thus, for Ignatius the answer to the docetic error at Tralles lies with the acceptance that Jesus' earthly existence and salvific deeds as historical events which have ultimate repercussions for Christian living in Ignatius' world. If the deeds of Jesus contained in the εὐαγγέλιον only "appeared" to happen, then for Ignatius the entire system of Christianity, including Ignatius' own hopes, falls apart. It is all "in vain (δωρεάν)" (10.1c). As we consider *Smyrn.* 1.1-7.2 in the following paragraphs, it will soon become

---

[53]Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 157; Daniélou, *Primitive Christian Symbols*, 36-37.

evident that Ignatius uses essentially the same tack in countering the docetists at Smyrna.

Turning then to *Smyrn.* 1.1-7.2, we see that Ignatius begins the body of the letter in 1.1 by praising the true faith of the Smyrnaeans. Anticipating his eventual warnings against the docetic error, he describes the correct faith of the Smyrneans as "immovable (ἐν ἀκινήτῳ πίστει)" as if it were "nailed to the cross of the Lord Jesus Christ . . . (ὥσπερ καθηλωμένους ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ . . .)" (*Smyrn.* 1.1a). Thus, fixed in their correct faith, the Smyrneans cannot be budged by erroneous teachings about Jesus. What is more, in 1.1a Ignatius further sets the stage for his anti-docetic arguments by recognizing that the Smyrneans are "established in love by the blood of Christ (ἡδρασμένους ἐν ἀγάπῃ ἐν τῷ αἵματι Χριστοῦ)." So, Ignatius suggests that true belief in the fleshly passion of Jesus has brought about the unity of Christian love in Smyrna.

Next,—as we saw in *Trall.* 9.1-2—before directly addressing the error at hand, Ignatius lays out the content of the correct faith in the εὐαγγέλιον in summary form. Hence, the Smyrneans are fully "convinced (πληροφορέω)" (cf., *Magn.* 8.2, 11.1; *Phld.* insc.; *1 Clem.* 42.3) that Jesus is

> ἀληθῶς ὄντα ἐκ γένους Δαυεὶδ κατὰ σάρκα, υἱὸν Θεοῦ κατὰ θέλημα καὶ δύναμιν θεοῦ, γεγεννημένον ἀληθῶς ἐκ παρθένου, βεβαπτισμένον ὑπὸ Ἰωάννου, ἵνα πληρωθῇ πᾶσα δικαιοσύνη ὑπ' αὐτοῦ· ἀληθῶς ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου καὶ Ἡρώδου πετάρχου καθηλωμένον ὑπερ ἡμῶν ἐν σαρκί, ἀφ' οὗ καρποῦ ἡμεῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ θεομακαρίστου αὐτοῦ πάθους ἵνα ἄρῃ σύσσημον εἰς

τοὺς αἰῶνας διὰ τῆς ἀναστάσεως εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους καὶ πιστοὺς αὐτοῦ, εἴτε ἐν Ἰουδαίοις εἴτε ἐν ἔθνεσιν, ἐν ἑνὶ σώματι τῆς ἐκκλησίας αὐτοῦ.

[1.1b] truly of the family of David according to the flesh, Son of God according to the will and power of God, truly born of a virgin, baptized by John that all righteousness might be fulfilled by him, [1.2] truly nailed for us in the flesh under Pontius Pilate and Herod the tetrarch—from the fruit of which are we, from his divinely blessed passion—that he might raise an ensign to the ages through his resurrection to his saints and believers whether among the Jews or among the Gentiles in the one body of his church.[54]

With respect to this Christological statement, we have elsewhere treated all of the εὐαγγέλιον motifs and themes. Here we may briefly revisit the shift Ignatius makes with the tradition found in Rom 1:3-4. While in *Trall.* 9.1 we observed that Ignatius omits any direct mention of Jesus as son of God (he refers to the Father only in passing), here in *Smyrn.* 1.1-2, the title "son of God" is given its meaning by the two expressions of Jesus' human origins which surround it. So, rather than the link we find in Rom 1:3-4 between "son of God" and the resurrection (thus emphasizing the relationship between the Father and son), Ignatius uses "son of God" to express the divine origin of the fleshly Christ in the world.[55]

Noteworthy too is the particular expression of the resurrection in the final sequence (*Smyrn.* 1.2c). Whereas

---

[54]Translation, Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 220; I have, however, altered Schoedel's sense lines.

[55]Ibid., 222.

in *Trall.* 9.2 Ignatius makes the direct connection between the resurrection of Jesus and that of believers, in *Smyrn.* 1.2 the bishop refers to Jesus' resurrection to underscore the universality of the εὐαγγέλιον message. The cross of Jesus is the "ensign (σύσσημον)" of salvation through the passion and resurrection. Because of this salvific message, believers of all times ("for all ages [εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας]"),[56] among both Jews and Gentiles, are included "in the one body of [Christ's] church."

Overall, this Christological summary is somewhat more complex than its parallel in *Trall.* 9.1-2. Yet, in regard to the docetic error, we see that Ignatius employs the same sorts of countering measures. Again, we notice immediately Ignatius' use of "truly (ἀληθῶς)" to punctuate the formula, specifically the lineage, birth, crucifixion of Jesus. Again, as well, we find references to historical figures, namely David, Pilate and Herod. These, along with the lead-in reference to the Smyrnaeans being "established in love by the blood of Christ (ἡδρασμένους ἐν ἀγάπῃ ἐν τῷ αἵματι Χριστοῦ)," all work together to answer any docetic denial of the physical reality of the εὐαγγέλιον events. As in *Trall.* 9.1-

---

[56]Schoedel points out that the phrase εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας here primarily has a "temporal significance," while the use of the dative in *Eph.* 8.1 ("church famous to the ages [ἐκκλησίας τῆς διαβοήτου τοῖς αἰῶσιν]") has a spatial sense and "refers to the world." *Ignatius of Antioch*, 223, n. 17.

2, therefore, the εὐαγγέλιον events in *Smyrn.* 1.1-2 are presented within an anti-docetic frame of meaning.

In the next sequence of passages—*Smyrn.* 2.1-7.2—Ignatius turns to the docetists themselves, presents the specifics of their error from his point of view, and describes correct belief which flows from the Christological summary with which he began.

First, Ignatius emphasizes the reality of Jesus' πάθος and the εὐαγγέλιον message of salvation arising from it: Jesus' πάθος was "for us, that we might be saved (δι' ἡμᾶς, ἵνα σωθῶμεν·)" (*Smyrn.* 2.1a). The docetists (again, as in *Trall.* 10.1, they are "οἱ ἄπιστοι"), on the other hand, destroy the meaning of this ἵνα clause by denying the reality of its antecedent: they say that Jesus "suffered in appearance (τὸ δοκεῖν πεπονθέναι)." For Ignatius, to deny the reality of the passion automatically precludes the resurrection and the salvation gained from it.[57] So, in a reversal paralleled by *Trall.* 10.1a (and more developed here), Ignatius turns their belief back on them and says that it is they who are only an appearance: "and as they think, so it will happen to them, being without bodies and like demons (καὶ καθὼς φρονοῦσιν, καὶ συμβήσεται αὐτοῖς, οὖσιν ἀσωμάτοις καὶ δαιμονικοῖς)" (*Smyrn.* 2.1b). To say that Jesus, in his suffering and resurrection, did not really have flesh (i.e., *Smyrn.* 5.2) deprives one of the

---

[57]Ibid., 225.

union with Jesus spoken of in *Smyrn.* 1.1a and 3.2. This is a union "both in flesh and spirit (σαρκί τε καὶ πνεύματι)" with Jesus which ultimately brings eternal life.

Obviously Ignatius takes his cue in 2.1b from the passage which follows, in 3.1-3. We have already considered the tradition history of this resurrection story; here we may regard its anti-docetic function. Ignatius first makes the point that even *after* the resurrection Jesus had flesh. Thus, for Ignatius, it is not simply with respect to the passion that the docetists are in error: their denial of Jesus' suffering in the flesh extends to the resurrection as well. In Ignatius' telling of the tradition, Jesus says to the disciples that he is "not a bodiless demon (ὅτι οὐκ εἰμὶ δαιμόνιον ασώματον)," thus providing Ignatius with his comeback to the docetists in 2.1b.

The anti-docetic polemic is carried forward as Ignatius concludes the resurrection story. The disciples "immediately touched him and believed, being intermingled with his flesh and spirit (καὶ αὐθὺς αὐτοῦ ἥψαντο καὶ ἐπίσευσαν, κραθέντες τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ πνεύματι)" (3.2b).[58] In their (correct) belief, they are united with Jesus (as in *Smyrn.*

---

[58]That the disciples actually touched Jesus is in not in Luke's version of the tradition (Luke 24:36-43); however, as we have seen, this tradition has a history outside of Luke and Ignatius. Thus, we cannot be certain if the 'touching' is an Ignatian addition to the tradition or part of the tradition itself. No matter the case, the final clause contains the favorite polarity 'flesh and spirit' and is thus probably Ignatius' own. See Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch,* 227.

1.1; also, *Magn.* 1.2, 13.1) and through this union they "despised even death and were found to be above death (διὰ τοῦτο καὶ θανάτου κατεφρόνησαν, ηὑρέθησαν δὲ ὑπὲρ θάνατον)" (3.2c); in other words, they become aware of the message of salvation.[59] Finally, in 3.3 Ignatius concludes the narrative by underscoring the reality of Jesus' flesh "even after the resurrection" (3.1) with the statement that "after the resurrection he ate and drank with them as a being of flesh, although spiritually united with the Father (μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἀνάστασιν συνέφαγεν αὐτοῖς καὶ συνέπιεν ὡς σαρκικός, καίπερ πνευματικῶς ἡνωμένος τῷ πατρι)."[60]

In *Smyrn.* 4.1 Ignatius writes a warning about the docetists, "beasts in human form." He tells the Smyrnaeans not to receive or even to meet them. They are only to pray for them, so that "somehow they might repent, difficult as that is." But Ignatius states this is possible only in "the power of Jesus Christ, our true life (τούτου δὲ ἔχει ἐξουσίαν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, τὸ ἀληθινὸν ἡμῶν ζῆν)."

Next, in 4.2, the bishop uses the same argument that we saw in *Trall.* 10: docetic belief deprives Ignatius' own

---

[59]One is remided here of the conclusion of the star-hymn: "God being revealed as Human to bring newness of eternal life, and what had been prepared by God had its beginning; hence all things were disturbed becaus the destruction of death was being worked out" (*Eph.* 19.3).

[60]Cf., the anti-docetic phrase in *Trall.* 9.1 where, as we have seen, Jesus "ate and drank" in his lifetime. Here in *Smyrn.* 3.3 Ignatius is concerned primarily with Jesus after the resurrection. This is perhaps an indication that the docetists had a specific teaching on Jesus' resurrection and did not deny it outright. Ibid., 225.

sufferings and expected death of their link to the sufferings of Jesus. Without this link, Ignatius' endurance is—as he says in *Trall.* 10—"in vain." In a dramatic sequence Ignatius then states that his own suffering with Jesus brings him to God:

> ἀλλ' ἐγγὺς μαχαίρας ἐγγὺς θεοῦ, μεταξὺ θεοῦ· μόνον ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς τὸ συμπαθεῖν αὐτῷ πάντα ὑπομένω, αὐτοῦ με ἐνδυναμοῦντος τοῦ τελείου ἀνθρώπου.
>
> near the sword is near God, with the beasts is with God; only in the name of Jesus Christ am I enduring all things to suffer with him: he, the perfect human, empowers me.

Thus, Jesus, who suffered in the flesh as the perfect human, enables Ignatius to endure his own suffering toward union with God.

Ignatius continues his warnings about the docetists in *Smyrn.* 5.1a by again reversing their opinions: they deny Jesus but in reality he is denying them.[61] Because of their erroneous opinions about Jesus, they have denied themselves the eternal life of the εὐαγγέλιον: they are thus "advocates of death rather than of the truth (ὄντὲ συνήγοροι τοῦ θανάτου μᾶλλον ἢ τῆς ἀληθείας)."

Next Ignatius mentions the εὐαγγέλιον:

> οὓς οὐκ ἔπεισαν αἱ προφητεῖαι οὐδὲ ὁ νόμος Μωύσεως, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ μέχρι νῦν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, οὐδὲ τὰ ἡμέτερα τῶν κατ' ἄνδρα παθήματα.

---

[61]Cf., *Trall.* 5.2; *Rom.* 8.1; *Smyrn.* 9.1.

> These are the ones who were not persuaded by the prophecies, nor the law of Moses, nor even the gospel until now, nor our own individual sufferings. (*Smyrn.* 5.1b)

While, by mentioning the "prophecies" and the "law of Moses," Ignatius is appealing on one level to the OT, he is not referring to specific texts; the scriptures, rather, exist for Ignatius as a general source of authority.[62] However, the scriptures are seconded by the primacy of the εὐαγγέλιον. "Now" is the time of the εὐαγγέλιον as the true authority (*Phld.* 5.2; 8.2); thus, the OT has some authority but it is past and the εὐαγγέλιον message is superior. Moreover, linked with the εὐαγγέλιον is the suffering of Christians, indeed—as we have just seen with *Smyrn.* 4.2—the suffering of Ignatius himself. In any case, the docetists are not persuaded by any of these.

In 5.2 Ignatius' next move is to point out an incongruity: the docetists praise him while at the same time they "blaspheme my lord by not confessing that he bears flesh (. . . τὸν δὲ κύριόν μου βλασφημεῖ, μὴ ὁμολογῶν αὐτὸν σαρκοφόρον)." For Ignatius, they cannot righly praise him (which, evidently, they did) because to deny the reality of Jesus' suffering negates Ignatius' *raison d'être*: to endure in union with the sufferings of Jesus. They have no right to praise Ignatius because they deny that Jesus "bears flesh

---

[62]Zahn points to this passage to support his position that there is one error in the Ignatian letters with both judaistic and docetic characteristics. Zahn, 56.

(σαρκοφόρος)" and are thus "bearer[s] of a corpse (νεκροφόρος)" (cf., *Smyrn.* 2). This suggests once again that through their opinions the docetists deprive themselves of eternal life.[63]

Ignatius does not give their "unbelieving names (τὰ δὲ ὀνόματα αὐτῶν, ὄντα ἄπιστα)"; he does not even want to remember them "until they repent about the passion, which is our resurrection (μέχρις οὗ μετανοήσωσιν εἰς τὸ πάθος, ὅ ἐστιν ἡμῶν ἀνάστασις)" (5.3). The docetists' failure is with the εὐαγγέλιον.

With respect to *Smyrn.* 6.1, there is little direct reference to the εὐαγγέλιον motifs and themes. The closest we have is the docetists' incurring judgment by their failure "to believe in the blood of Christ (ἐὰν μὴ πιστεύσωσιν εἰς τὸ αἷμα Χριστοῦ)." In other words, they are not "established in love by the blood of Christ" (*Smyrn.* 1.1a); by their failure to believe they are a source of disunity.

In 6.2, however, Ignatius turns directly once more to the error itself and warns the Smyrnaeans to observe how those holding "strange opinions about the grace of Jesus Christ which came to us (καταμάθετε δὲ τοὺς ἑτεροδοξοῦντας εἰς τὴν χάριν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τὴν εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐλθοῦσαν)" are "against the purpose of God (πῶς ἐναντίοι εἰσὶν τῇ γνώμῃ τοῦ θεοῦ)." Thus, as with the judaizers in *Magn.* 8.1, we find "strange opinions" (in

---

[63]Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 235.

Smyrn. 6.2 with ἑτεροδοξοῦντας) defined by a failure in regard to grace. We have observed that Ignatius' notion of χάρις owes much to the Pauline notion of the gospel message (cf., Gal 2:15-21). Here the "grace of Jesus Christ *which came to us*" suggests the παρουσία of Jesus, the inaugural event of the εὐαγγέλιον (cf., *Eph.* 20.2). The strange opinions about Jesus' grace therefore means that the docetists are "against the purpose of God": in their strange opinions about God's χάρις, they deny the reality of God's intentions expressed in the salvific events accomplished by Jesus (cf., *Eph.* 20.2; *Magn.* 8.2; *Rom.* insc.).

The practical results of the docetists' failure are Ignatius' next topic. God's purpose is seen in the εὐαγγέλιον events; for Ignatius, correct belief in the εὐαγγέλιον is the foundation for church unity (i.e., *Smyrn.* 7.2). As we have seen, one of the expressions of this unity is Christian love (*Smyrn.* 1.1a). Ignatius states in *Smyrn.* 6.2b that the docetists fail in this love:

> περὶ ἀγάπης οὐ μέλει αὐτοῖς, οὐ περὶ χήρας, οὐ περὶ ὀρφανοῦ, οὐ περὶ θλίομένου, οὐ περὶ δεδεμένου ἢ λελυμένου, οὐ περὶ πεινῶντος ἢ διψῶντος.
>
> They have no concern for love, none for the widow, none for the orphan, none for the distressed, none for the imprisoned or released, none for the hungry or thirsty.

Perhaps because of their denial of the fleshly existence of Jesus, the docetists saw no need in care for the earthly concerns of others. Yet, it seems more accurate to see this as Ignatius' own extension of their beliefs. For Ignatius

docetic beliefs destroy the unity of the church, a unity that is lived out through love for the needy. Again, because of their position, they are not "established in love by the blood of Christ" (*Smyrn.* 1.1a; cf., 6.1). Therefore, to separate clearly the docetists from proper Christians, Ignatius accuses them of disunity through a failure in the fundamental Christian tenet, love for one another.[64]

Next, in *Smyrn.* 7.1, Ignatius continues discussing the practical results of docetic belief, here with direct reference to the εὐαγγέλιον. Thus, in a passage we have discussed elsewhere, Ignatius states that the docetists do not partake in the eucharist because they

> τὸ μὴ ὁμολογεῖν τὴν εὐχαριστίαν σάρκα εἶναι τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τὴν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν παθοῦσαν, ἣν τῇ χρηστότητι ὁ πατὴρ ἤγειρεν.
>
> do not confess that the eucharist is the flesh of our savior Jesus Christ which suffered for our sins, [flesh] which the Father raised by his goodness.

Here, Ignatius is bringing the εὐαγγέλιον events into the present by linking the passion and resurrection with the eucharist. Thus, as we have seen in *Phld.* 5.1, the historical flesh of Jesus is tied with the εὐαγγέλιον events and message in the present church (thus, the εὐαγγέλιον "until now" in *Smyrn.* 5.1b). The docetists, who deny the reality of Jesus' suffering in the flesh, do not confess that the

---

[64]Ibid., 240.

eucharist is that same flesh and thus doubly fail with respect to the εὐαγγέλιον.

In *Smyrn.* 7.1b Ignatius then alludes to Christian love once more. In their failure with respect to the historical and eucharistic flesh of Jesus, the docetists are those who, "speaking against the gift of God, die in their arguing (οἱ οὖν ἀντιλέγοντες τῇ δωρεᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ συζητοῦντες ἀποθνήσκουσιν)." The answer to this loss of eternal life is "to have love so that they might also rise (συνέφερεν δὲ αὐτοῖς ἀγαπᾶν, ἵνα καὶ ἀναστῶσιν)." For Ignatius, "faith and love are everything, to which nothing can be preferred (τὸ γὰρ ὅλον ἐστὶν πίστις καὶ ἀγάπη, ὧν οὐδὲν προκέκριται)" (*Smyrn.* 6.1).

Ignatius concludes his polemic against the docetists by turning directly to the εὐαγγέλιον. The Smyrnaeans are to avoid the docetists (as Ignatius himself does [*Smyrn.* 5.3]) and "to heed the Prophets, and especially the gospel, in which the passion has been made clear to us and the resurrection accomplished (προσέχειν δὲ τοῖς προφήταις, ἐξαιρέτως δὲ τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ, ἐν ᾧ τὸ πάθος ἡμῖν δεδήλωται καὶ ἡ ἀνάστασις τετελείωται)" (*Smyrn.* 7.2). In this, Ignatius is suggesting that the εὐαγγέλιον (toward which the Prophets pointed) shows how wrong the docetists are; it separates believers from the unbelievers (i.e., *Trall.* 10). Ignatius, therefore, provides the Smyrnaeans with the source for correct belief. To complete his argument, Ignatius concludes with his underlying concern, church unity: "And flee from divisions

as the beginning of evils (τοὺς δὲ μερισμοὺς φεύγετε ὡς ἀρχὴν κακῶν)" (*Smyrn.* 7.2c).

Thus, the εὐαγγέλιον plays a central role in Ignatius' polemics against the docetics. Docetic error, for Ignatius, cuts to the heart of Christianity. In Ignatius' view, the docetic denial of the incarnation—and the events of Jesus' life, death and resurrection which flow from it—negates the salvation which Jesus accomplished through these events. Therefore, for Ignatius, not only does docetic error deprive the docetists themselves of salvation, but it destroys the unity of the church by denying that salvation to Christians in general. To reject the reality of Jesus' suffering, death and resurrection in the flesh, therefore, places one outside the boundaries of the καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία (*Smyrn.* 8.2).

C. SUMMARY: ERROR AND THE IGNATIAN GOSPEL

With respect to the error evident in the Ignatian letters, we have seen that there are two discrete errors: judaizing in *Magnesians* and *Philadelphians*, and docetic in *Trallians* and *Smyrnaeans*. Ignatius' use of specific terms of separation to refer to the opponents—most notably ἡ αἵρεσις (*Eph.* 6.2; *Trall.* 6.1) and ἡ ἑτεροδοξία (*Magn.* 8.1; cf., *Smyrn.* 6.2), as well as various execrative epithets (e.g., "advocates of death" [*Smyrn.* 5.1])—all serve to set the boundaries around proper belief. Moreover, Ignatius himself

evidently is often responsible for polarizing the situation by pointing out what are for him the implications of the error. Thus, he is able to separate clearly those who are within the boundaries of correct belief from those who are outside the boundaries.

We have observed as well that for Ignatius the fundamental difficulty with both of these errors is the same: they destroy the unity of the church. Thus, because the ground of church unity is common belief in the salvific message of the gospel, Ignatius is able to confront both errors by upholding for the church the centrality of the εὐαγγέλιον. Any deviation from unity in faith and practice ultimately challenges the message of the εὐαγγέλιον.

Therefore, the salvific events of the εὐαγγέλιον function as the boundary lines Ignatius has drawn around the church. In this sense, the εὐαγγέλιον motifs become group-defining symbols.[65] Hence, true believers become "branches of the cross" (*Trall.* 11.2) and true faith is as if it were "nailed to the cross of the Lord Jesus Christ . . ." (*Smyrn.* 1.1a).

---

[65]Maier, *Social Setting*, 164.

CONCLUSIONS

THE GOSPEL AND IGNATIUS OF ANTIOCH

In the introduction to this dissertation, I recognized Ignatius' pivotal place in the history of early Christianity. We have seen throughout this study that Ignatius' articulation and use of traditions about Jesus not only looks back to previous gospel expressions, but also sets the stage for what follows. Ignatius stands at the beginnings of Christianity's efforts toward consolidation of belief and practice.

My stated task was to isolate and examine the Ignatian concept of the εὐαγγέλιον within its environment. This task was to include as well a treatment of how Ignatius uses the εὐαγγέλιον to delineate the boundaries of Christian belief and practice.

Therefore, in Part One we observed first the use of the term τὸ εὐαγγέλιον in the Ignatian corpus. Early in that discussion, the oral, preached nature of Ignatius' εὐαγγέλιον came to the surface. This means that, for example, the γέγραπται of *Phld.* 8.2 certainly does not refer to a written text of authoritative Christian scripture or τὸ εὐαγγέλιον. Indeed, even as a reference to the OT, γέγραπται in *Phld.* 8.2

suggests a favorite Ignatian theme connected with the εὐαγγέλιον: the *oral* witness to Jesus by the Prophets in advance. Thus, Ignatius is primarily interested in the OT Prophets as witnessing figures and not as texts. Otherwise, Ignatius shows little interest in any sacred text as a foundation of faith.

We have examined as well the lineaments of Ignatius' εὐαγγέλιον. The motifs of παρουσία, σταυρός, θάνατος, πάθος, and ἀνάστασις emerged as the content of the Ignatian εὐαγγέλιον message. Within this content, the particular use of παρουσία and πάθος reveal Ignatius' position as pointing forward in the history of the Christian articulation of the gospel. Thus, Ignatius' use of παρουσία (*Phld.* 9.1) as Jesus' first coming—as well as the manifestation themes which he links with it—is a departure from the end-time concept of Jesus' παρουσία in the NT. Likewise, Ignatius is the first to speak of the πάθος of Jesus to refer to the suffering and death. We have seen, in fact, that for Ignatius the σταυρός and θάνατος motifs collapse into a single primary motif: the πάθος. Therefore, at the heart of Ignatius' preached gospel is Jesus' πάθος and ἀνάστασις.

Our survey of τὸ εὐαγγέλιον in early Christianity has revealed Ignatius' pivotal position as well. Overall, in his emphasis on an oral, preached εὐαγγέλιον message, Ignatius follows virtually all of the gospel expressions which came before him in the NT and the Apostolic Fathers. Of all of

these, however, Ignatius appeals most strongly to the Pauline idea of the gospel. Thus, not only is the Ignatian εὐαγγέλιον a preached message as in Paul, but it also owes much to the content and specific expressions directly associated with Paul's gospel.

Yet, again, Ignatius moves beyond Paul. First, while the content of Paul's εὐαγγέλιον expressions vary considerably (i.e., Rom 1:2-4; 1 Cor 15:1-5), Ignatius exhibits a tendency to fix the content of the message. The εὐαγγέλιον motifs for Ignatius are more starkly distinct when compared to Paul. Hence, Ignatius' εὐαγγέλιον is specifically defined by the salvific πάθος and ἀνάστασις. Moreover, we have observed that in his use of the traditions behind Rom 1:2-4, Ignatius has shifted the Christological category centered on Jesus' status as son of God: for Ignatius, Jesus is God's son from the outset (cf., "declared to be son of God . . . by resurrection from the dead" [Rom 1.4]).

With respect to the gospels of early Christianity before Ignatius, aside from common motifs of death and resurrection and themes such as Jesus' manifestation and Christian hope, there are few direct contact points. The situation with Matthew, however, is unique because of the often discussed Matthew-like passages in Ignatius' letters. I have recognized that, while Ignatius evidently knows Matthean material, he does not directly link this material either with Jesus or the εὐαγγέλιον message. The closest

Ignatius comes to Matthew's idea of gospel is with the suffering/resurrection sequence, and with the general emphasis on Jesus as teacher. However, we have seen that both of these complexes of motifs and themes are common threads with other gospel expressions.

Returning to the orality of Ignatius' εὐαγγέλιον, we have seen that an examination of the environment within the Ignatian letters provides a confirmation of that oral nature. Thus, the verbs of transmission and acceptance (καταγγέλλω: *Phld.* 9.2, ἐπαγγέλλομαι: *Eph.* 14:2, πληροφορέω: *Magn.* 11.1, ὁμολογέω: *Smyrn.* 5.2) strongly suggest a preached gospel message.

More significant in this respect, though, is Ignatius' use of intramural phrases which encapsulate the εὐαγγέλιον message for those within his circle of influence. We have observed these same sorts of phrases not only in the Pauline corpus, but also in the Synoptic Gospels. Most telling for my purposes is Ignatius' use of λαλεῖν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν ("to preach Jesus Christ": *Eph.* 6.2, *Magn.* 10.3, *Trall.* 9.1, *Rom.* 7.1, *Phld.* 6.1) to refer to preaching the εὐαγγέλιον. "Jesus Christ" and the salvation he accomplished is the content of the preached εὐαγγέλιον message. In the same way, the use of τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς κοινῆς ἐλπίδος ("the gospel of the common hope": *Eph.* 21.2; *Phld.* 11.2) refers to the salvation gained through Jesus at the center of the εὐαγγέλιον message. This is further confirmed by phrases in which

"Ἰησοῦς Χριστός" replaces "εὐαγγέλιον" as the antecedent of "the common hope" (i.e., *Eph.* 21.2; *Phld.* 11.2; cf., *Magn.* 11; *Trall.* insc., 2.1). Within their Ignatian context, these intramural phrases function as abbreviations for the preached message of the εὐαγγέλιον. They are in-house summary phrases of the message.

What is more, we have observed how the phrase λαλεῖν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν carries at least a suggestion of preaching with prophetic or charismatic characteristics. Building on this suggestion, I have highlighted several Ignatian passages in which such a prophetic or charismatic preaching ministry is evident. Thus, for example, we have the prophetic event Ignatius describes three times in *Phld.* 7.1-7.2. That the charismatic or prophetic preaching is at least in part ministry to the εὐαγγέλιον message is confirmed not only here, but also in *Eph.* 20.1-2 where the prime εὐαγγέλιον motifs and themes figure in an expected revelation.

With this prophetic character of Ignatius' ministry to the εὐαγγέλιον, we have what is evidently the source of authority upon which Ignatius bases his Christianity. As we have seen, Ignatius avoids direct reference to the authority of OT (or any other) texts as a foundation for Christian belief and practice. It appears, rather, that Ignatius considers his preaching to carry an ultimate, unimpeachable authority: the authority of the "voice of God" (*Phld.* 7.2b). Ignatius' leadership as ἐπίσκοπος, therefore,

includes this 'preaching in the Spirit' within its architecture of authority.

Throughout the progress of Part One, the function of Ignatius' εὐαγγέλιον occasionally came to the surface. In Part Two the function became my central concern. We have seen that the overarching function of the Ignatian εὐαγγέλιον is to set down the boundaries of what is for Ignatius correct belief and practice.

Because, in Ignatius' view, Jesus and the central motifs of the εὐαγγέλιον are the defining features of Christian life, Ignatius' Christology provides the greatest insight to the theological world within the boundaries. As an approach to Ignatius' Christology I have first highlighted expressions of the incarnation. In general, we have observed that Ignatius' expressions of the incarnation are both a departure from previous expressions and, in their own context, unambiguous in speaking of Jesus as God.

This being said, most vital for my purposes is the fact that Ignatius' expressions of the incarnation—in conjunction with the εὐαγγέλιον—serve a group-defining function in Ignatian Christianity. Thus, Jesus is "*our* God" (i.e., *Eph.* 18.2; *Rom.* insc.). This group-defining function is also behind Ignatius' references to Jesus' unity of flesh and spirit (e.g., *Eph.* 7.2; *Smyrn.* 3.2) as a particular way of describing the incarnation. This unity is a model for the Christian living in the world (*Eph.* 8.2), as well as the

image of church unity (*Smyrn.* 3.1-4.1). Finally, the Christological epithets "the new human" (*Eph.* 20.1) and "the perfect human" (*Smyrn.* 4.2) ultimately refer to the incarnation as the exemplar of Christian unity.

These latter epithets provide an entry into our more specific treatment of a series of titles for Jesus as further expressions of the εὐαγγέλιον boundary-setting function. Thus, the Ignatian use of "son of God," linked with the εὐαγγέλιον motif of the παρουσία (i.e., *Magn.* 8.2), is a vehicle for Ignatius' insistence on the preservation of unity: Christians, united in correct belief about Jesus, are recognized by God as "members of his son" (*Eph.* 4.2).

However, it is with the complex of expressions surrounding "Jesus the Savior" that we find the boundaries of acceptable faith in Jesus most clearly drawn. The coming of the Savior and his salvific deeds are what makes the εὐαγγέλιον "remarkable" or unique in its excellence; the εὐαγγέλιον is the "completion of immortality" (*Phld.* 9.2). Indeed, those who live by the εὐαγγέλιον are set apart by the "imprint of God" (*Magn.* 5.2). Jesus' salvation "for us/for our sake" is the impetus for living within the boundaries of true faith (*Trall.* 2.1).

I have spoken of the intramural phrase τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς κοινῆς ἐλπίδος. This common hope distinguishes the in-group of believers: it is "our" hope (*Eph.* 1.2, 21.2; *Magn.* 11.1; *Trall.* insc., 2.2; *Phld.* 11.2) held in common (*Eph.* 1.2,

21.2; *Phld.* 5.2, 11.2; cf., *Magn.* 7.1). While this unifying hope ultimately points to eventual eternal life—that is, salvation grounded in the εὐαγγέλιον—Ignatius' concept of hope serves primarily in the present, as a frame which defines true belief within Ignatius' circle of influence.

Regarding our last two Ignatian Christological titles, "the one teacher" and "the one physician," we have seen that Jesus in guise of these titles functions as a figure of authority, without appeal to specific historical teachings or healings of Jesus. Again, Jesus is the only reference for Christian life. Thus, in this light, "Christ's instructions" (*Phld.* 8.2) are the salvific deeds of the εὐαγγέλιον. Likewise, Jesus is the one physician who is God manifested in flesh, who is "in death, true life" (*Eph.* 7.2).

Finally, we turn outside the boundaries of Ignatian Christianity. It is evident from the letters that Ignatius is confronting two discrete errors: judaizing in *Magnesians* and *Philadelphians*, and docetic in *Trallians* and *Smyrnaeans*. We have observed the often strident use of terms of separation in Ignatius' letters. Not only does this language clearly delineate the boundaries, but it enables us to recognize Ignatius' own activity in polarizing the situation in the various churches.

For Ignatius the problem with both errors is the same: they destroy the unity of the church. Because church unity

is founded on a common belief in the salvific message of the gospel, for Ignatius the answer to both errors is to uphold the centrality of the εὐαγγέλιον. Thus, we have seen how Ignatius has specifically structured the received material containing the εὐαγγέλιον motifs and themes to answer his opponents. This is most evident in the Christological summaries embedded in *Trall.* 9.1-2 and *Smyrn.* 1.1-2. The εὐαγγέλιον motifs are group-defining symbols.

Therefore, Ignatius' εὐαγγέλιον is a preached message of salvation. It stands alone and unique with no need for support from texts. The content of the εὐαγγέλιον message is the salvific advent, passion, and resurrection of Jesus, the son of God. For Ignatius, correct belief in this message is the central feature of Christian life. The thread that runs throughout the Ignatian letters is the concern for Christian unity. This unity is defined by "the gospel of the common hope."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Texts

Aland, K., et al. *The Greek New Testament*. United Bible Societies, 1983.

Charlesworth, J. H., ed. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 vols. Garden City: Doubleday, 1985.

Grant, R. M., ed. *The Apostolic Fathers: A New Translation and Commentary*. 5 vols. New York: Thomas Nelson, 1965.

Lake, K. *The Apostolic Fathers*. 2 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard, 1935.

_____. *Eusebius: The Ecclesiastical History*. 2 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard, 1992.

Lattke, M. *Die Oden Salomos in ihrer Bedeutung für Neues Testament und Gnosis*. OBO 25/1. Fribourg: Editions Universitaires; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1979.

Lightfoot, J. *The Apostolic Fathers*. 5 vols. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1989.

Lindemann, A. and H. Paulsen. *Die Apostolischen Väter*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1992.

Metzger, B. M. and R. E. Murphy, eds. *The New Oxford Annotated Bible*. New York: Oxford, 1991.

Migne, J. P. *Patrologiae Cursus Completus*. Series Graeca. 161 vols. Paris: Garnier et Migne, 1894.

Schneemelcher, W., ed. *New Testament Apocrypha*. Rev. Ed. R. McL. Wilson, trans. 2 vols. Louisville: Westminster/ John Knox, 1991-1992.

Septuaginta. 2 vols. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1965.

Stroker, W. D. *Extracanonical Sayings of Jesus*. Atlanta: Scholars, 1989.

Reference Works

Bauer, W. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. W. F. Arndt, F. W. Gingrich, trans. Revised and augmented by F. W. Gingrich, F. D. Danker. Second edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979.

Blass, F. and A. Debrunner. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. F. W. Funk, trans. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Goodspeed, E. J. *Index Patristicus sive Clavis Patrum Apostolicorum Operum*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1993.

The Institute for New Testament Textual Research and the Computer Center of Münster University, eds. *Concordance to the Novum Testamentum Graece*. In collaboration with H. Bachmann and W. A. Slaby. Third edition. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1987.

Kittel, G., ed. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. G. W. Bromiley, trans. and ed. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964.

Lampe, G. W. H., ed. *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1961.

Liddell, H. G. and R. Scott. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1968.

Studies

Ash, J. L. "The Decline of Ecstatic Prophecy in the Early Church," *TS* 37 (1976) 227-252.

Aune, D. E. "Divine Names and Epithets in Ignatius." Unpublished Paper, n.d.

_____. *The New Testament in Its Literary Environment*. Philadelphia: Wesminster, 1987.

_____. "The Odes of Solomon and Early Christian Prophecy," *NTS* 28 (1982) 435-460.

_____. "The Phenomenon of Early Christian 'Anti-Sacramentalism.'" In *Studies in New Testament and Early Christian Literature*, ed. D. Aune, 194-214. Leiden: Brill, 1972.

_____. *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983.

_____. "The Social Matrix of the Apocalypse of John," *BR* 26 (1981) 27-28.

Bardsley, H. J. "The Testamony of Ignatius and Polycarp to the Writings of St. John." *JTS* 14 (1913) 207-220.

Barnard, L. W. "Is the Epistle of Barnabas a Paschal Homily?" In *Studies in the Apostolic Fathers and Their Background*, ed. L. W. Barnard, 73-85. New York: Schocken, 1966.

Barrett, C. K. "Jews and Judaizers in the Epistles of Ignatius." In *Jews, Greeks and Christians: Religious Cultures in Late Antiquity*, ed. R. Hamerton-Kelly and R. Scroggs, 220-244. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976.

Bauckham, R. "The Study of Gospel Traditions Outside the Canonical Gospels: Problems and Prospects." In *Gospel Perspectives: The Jesus Tradition Outside the Gospels*, ed. D. Wenham, 369-403. Sheffield: JSOT, 1984.

Bauer, W. and H. Paulsen. *Die Briefe des Ignatius von Antiochia und der Polykarpbrief.* Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1985.

_____. *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity.* R. Kraft, G. Krodel, et al., trans. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971.

Best E. *Disciples and Discipleship.* Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1986.

Betz, H. D. *Galatians.* Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979.

Betz, O. "Jesus' Gospel of the Kingdom." In *The Gospel and the Gospels*, ed. P. Stuhlmacher, 53-74. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991.

den Boer, W. "Some Remarks on the Beginnings of Christian Historiography." In *Studia Patristica*, ed. F. L. Cross, 348-362. Vol. IV, part II. Berlin: Akademie- Verlag, 1961.

Borgen, P. "Ignatius and the Traditions on the Birth of Jesus." In *Paul Preaches Circumcision and Pleases Men and Other Essays on Christian Origins.* Trondheim: Tapir, 1983.

Bornkamm, G. *Paul.* D. M. G. Stalker, trans. New York Harper & Row, 1971.

Braun, F.-M. *Jean le théologien et son évangile dans l'église ancienne.* 3 vols. Paris: J. Gabalda, 1959.

Brent, A. "History and Eschatological Mysticism in Ignatius of Antioch." *ETL* 65 (1989) 309-329.

_____. The Ignatian Epistles and the Threefold Ecclesiastical Order." *JRH* 17 (1972) 18-32.

Brown, M. P. *The Authentic Writings of Ignatius.* Durham: Duke University, 1963.

Brown, R. *The Birth of the Messiah*. Garden City: Doubleday, 1977.

_____. *The Epistles of John*. AB 30. Garden City: Doubleday, 1985.

_____. *The Gospel According to John*. AB 29-29A. Garden City: Doubleday, 1970.

Bruce, F. F. *The Acts of the Apostles*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990.

Bultmann, R. "Ignatius and Paul." In *Existence and Faith*, trans. S. M. Ogden. London: Collins, 1961.

Bunge, W. F. *The Christology of Ignatius of Antioch*. ThD Thesis. Cambridge: Harvard University, 1966.

Burghardt, W. "Did Saint Ignatius of Antioch Know the Fourth Gospel?" *TS* 1 (1940) 1-26.

Burke, P. "The Monarchiacal Episcopate at the End of the First Century." *JES* 7 (1970) 499-518.

Byrne, B. *Romans*. SP 6. Collegeville: Liturgical, 1996.

von Campenhausen, H. "Das Bekenntnis im Urchristentum." *ZNW* 63 (1972) 210-253.

_____. *Ecclesiastical Authority and Spiritual Power in the Church of the First Three Centuries*. J. A. Baker, trans. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1969.

_____. *Die Idee des martyriums in der alten Kirche*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964.

Cerfaux, L. "'L'Évangile éternel' (Apoc., XIV,6)." *ETL* 39 (1963) 672-681.

Chadwick, H. "The Silence of the Bishops in Ignatius." *HTR* 43 (1950) 169-172.

Collins, R. F. "'The Gospel of Our Lord Jesus' (2 Thes 1,8) A Symbolic Shift of Paradigm." In *The Thessalonian Correspondence*, ed. R. F. Collins, 426-440. Leuven: University Press, 1990.

Committee of the Oxford Society of Historical Theology. *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1905.

Connolly, R. H. "The Didache in Relation to the Epistle of Barnabas." *JTS* 33 (1932) 237-253.

Conzelmann, H. *Acts of the Apostles*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.

_____. *1 Corinthians*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975.

_____. *The Theology of St. Luke*. G. Buswell, trans. New York: Harper & Row, 1961

Corwin, V. *St. Ignatius and Christianity in Antioch*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960.

Crehan, J. *Early Christian Baptism and the Creed*. London: Burns, Oates and Washbourne, 1950.

Cullmann, O. *Baptism in the New Testament*. J. K. S. Reid, trans. London: SCM, 1961.

_____. *Christ and Time*. F. Filson, trans. Philadelphia: Westminister, 1964.

_____. *The Christology of the New Testament*. S. C. Guthrie, C. A. M. Hall, trans. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963.

_____. *Les Premières Confessions de foi Chrétiennes*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1948.

Daniélou, J. *Primitive Christian Symbols*. Baltimore: Helicon, 1964.

_____. *The Theology of Jewish Christianity*. J. A. Baker, trans. Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1964.

Daube, D. "Τρία μυστήρια κραυγῆς: Ignatius, *Ephesians*, XIX.1." *JTS* 16 (1965) 128-129.

Davies, J. G. "The Origins of Docetism." In *Studia Patristica VI*, ed. F. L. Cross, 13-35. TU 81. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1962.

Davids, A. "Irrtum und Heresie: 1 Clem.—Ignatius von Antiochien—Justinus." *Kairos* 15 (1973) 165-187. Also in *Wahrheit und Tradition: Festschrift für Endre Inanka*, ed. W. Beierwaltes, et al., 165-187. Salzburg: Müller, 1974.

Deichgräber, R. *Gotteshymnus und Christushymnus in der frühen Christenheit*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987.

Desjardins, M. "Bauer and Beyond: On Recent Scholarly Discussions of Αἵρεσις in the Early Christian Era." *SecCent* 8 (1991) 65-82.

Dibelius, M. and H. Conzelmann. *The Pastoral Epistles*. Hermeneia. P. Buttolph and A. Yarbro, trans. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1972.

Donahue, P. J. "Jewish Christianity in Ignatius' Letters." *VC* 32 (1978) 80-93.

Donfried, K. P. *The Setting of Second Clement in Early Christianity*. Leiden Brill, 1974.

Droge, A. J. and J. D. Tabor. *A Noble Death: Suicide and Martyrdom Among Christians and Jews in Antiquity*. San Francisco: Harper, 1992.

Dumeige, G. "Le Christ médecin dans la littérature chrétienne des premiers siècles." *Rivista di archeologia cristiana* 48 (1972) 115-141.

Dunn, J. D. G. *Christology in the Making*. 2nd edition. Grand Rapids: Eerdmanns, 1996.

Elze, M. *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zur Christologie der Ignatiusbriefe*. Tübingen: Univ. Bibl., 1963.

Fee, G. *Paul's Letter to the Philippians*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.

Fitzmyer, J. "The Gospel in the Theology of Paul." *Int* 33 (1979) 339-375.

_____. *Romans: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 33. New York: Doubleday, 1993.

Ford, J. M. *Revelation*. AB 38. Garden City: Doubleday, 1975.

Garciadiego, A. *Katholiké Ekklesía: El significado del epíteto "Católica" aplicado a "Iglesia" desde San Ignacio de Antioquía hasta Orígenes*." Mexico City: Editorial Jus., 1953.

Gillespie, T. *The First Theologians: A Study in Early Christian Prophecy*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994.

Grant, R. M. "Hermeneutics and Tradition in Ignatius of Antioch." *Archivio di Filosofia* 1-2 (1963) 183-201.

_____. "Jewish Christianity at Antioch in the Second Century." *RSR* 60 (1972) 97-108.

_____. "The Odes of Solomon and the Church of Antioch." *JBL* 63 (1944) 363-77.

_____. "Scripture and Tradition in St. Ignatius of Antioch" *CBQ* 25 (1963) 322-35.

Goppelt, L. *A Commentary on I Peter*. F. Hahn, ed. J. E. Alsup, trans. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993.

Guelich, R. "The Gospel Genre." In *The Gospel and the Gospels*, ed. P. Stuhlmacher, 173-208. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991.

Gundry, R. "ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ: How Soon a Book?" *JBL* 115 (1996) 321-325.

Hadidian, D. Y. "Tous de euangelistas in Eph. IV.11." *CBQ* 28 (1966) 317-321.

Hagner, D. A. "The Sayings of Jesus in the Apostolic Fathers and Justin Martyr." In *Gospel Perspectives: The Jesus Tradition Outside the Gospels*, ed. D. Wenham, 233-268. Vol. 5. Sheffield: JSOT, 1984.

Hanson, A. T. "The Theology of Suffering in the Pastoral Epistles and Ignatius of Antioch." In *Studia Patristica XVII.2*, ed. E. A. Livingstone, 694-696. Oxford: Pergamon, 1982.

Harrison, P. N. *Polycarp's Two Epistles to the Philippians*. Cambridge: University Press, 1936.

Hengel, M. *Studies in the Gospel of Mark*. J. Bowden, trans. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.

Hoffman, D. "The Authority of Scripture and Apostolic Doctrine in Ignatius of Antioch." *JETS* 28 (1985) 71-79.

Jay, E. "From Presbyter-Bishops to Bishops and Presbyters: Christian Ministry in the Second Century: A Survey." *SecCent* 1 (1981) 125-162.

Jaschke, H. "«λαλεῖν» bei Lukas: Ein Beitrag sur lukanischen Theologie." *BZ* 15 (1971) 109-114.

Jefford, C. N. "Did Ignatius of Antioch Know the Didache?" In *The Didache in Context*, ed. C. N. Jefford, 330-351. New York: Brill, 1995.

_____. *The Sayings of Jesus in the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*. Leiden: Brill, 1989.

Jervis, A. and P. Richardson, eds. *Gospel in Paul: Studies on Corithians, Galatians and Romans for Richard N. Longenecker*. Sheffield: J.S.N.T.; Supplement Series 108, 1994.

Jewett, R. "The Redaction and Use of an Early Christian Confession in Romans 1:3-4." In *The Living Text*, ed. D. Groh and R. Jewett, 99-122. Lanham: University Press of America, 1985.

Johnson, S. "Parallels Between the Letters of Ignatius and the Johannine Epistles." In *Perspectives on Language and Text*, ed. E. Conrad and E. Newing, 327-338. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1987.

Joly, R. *Le Dossier d'Ignace d'Antioche*. Bruxelles: Éditions de l'Université de Bruxelles, 1979.

Käsemann, E. *Commentary on Romans*. G. E. Bromiley, trans. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980.

Kelly, J. N. D. *Early Christian Creeds*. London: Longman, 1972.

Kertelge, K. "The Epiphany of Jesus in the Gospel (Mark)." In *The Interpretation of Mark*, ed. W. Telford, 78-94. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.

Kingsbury, J. D. *Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1975.

Kloppenborg, J. "An Analysis of the Pre-Pauline Formula 1 Cor 15:3b-5 In Light of Some Recent Literature." *CBQ* 40 (1978) 351-367.

_____. *The Formation of Q*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.

_____. *Q Parallels: Synopsis, Critical Notes & Concordance*. Sonoma: Polebridge, 1988.

Koester [Kŏster], H. *Ancient Christian Gospels*. Philadelphia: Trinity, 1990.

_____. "From the Kerygma-Gospel to Written Gospels." *NTS* 35, (1989) 361-381.

_____. "History and Cult in the Gospel of John and in Ignatius of Antioch." *JTC* 1 (1965) 111-125.

_____. *Synoptische Überlieferung bei den apostolischen Vätern*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1957.

_____. "Writings and the Spirit: Authority and Politics in Ancient Christianity." *HTR* 84:4 (1991) 353-372.

Köhler, W.-D. *Die Rezeption des Matthäusevangeliums in der Zeit vor Irenäus*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1987.

Kraft, R. A. "Barnabas and the Didache." In *The Apostolic Fathers: A New Translation and Commentary*, ed. R. M. Grant, vol. 3. New York: Thomas Nelson, 1965.

Lambrecht, J. "Line of Thought in 1 Cor 15, 1-11." *Greg* 72, 4 (1991) 655-670.

Laeuchli, S. "The Drama of Replay." In *Searching in the Syntax of Things*, ed. M. Friedman, et al., 69-126. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1972.

Lindemann, A. "Paul in the Writings of the Apostolic Fathers." In *Paul and Legacies of Paul*, ed. W. S. Babcock, 25-45. Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1990.

Lohmeyer, E. *Das Evangelium des Markus*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967.

Lohse, E. *Colossians and Philemon*. W. R. Poehlmann and R. J. Karris, trans. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971.

_____. "Die Entstehung des Bischofsamtes in der frühen Christenheit." *ZNW* 71 (1980) 58-73.

Lona, H. E. "Der Sprachgebrauch von σάρξ, σάρκικός bei Ignatius von Antiochien." *ZKT* 108 (1986) 383-408.

Lührmann D. *Das Offenbarungsverständinis bei Paulus und in den paulinischen Gemeinden.* Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1965.

Massaux, É. *The Influence of the Gospel of Saint Matthew on Christian Literature Before Saint Irenaeus.* Bk. 1, *The First Ecclesiastical Writers,* ed. N. Belval and S. Hecht. Macon: Mercer, 1990.

Maier, H. O. "The Charismatic Authority of Ignatius of Antioch." *SR* 18 (1989) 185-199.

_____. *The Social Setting of the Ministry as Reflected in the Writings of Hermas, Clement and Ignatius.* Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier Univ., 1991.

Marxsen, W. *Mark the Evangelist.* J Boyce, D. Juel, et al., trans. Nashville: Abingdon, 1969.

Maurer, C. *Ignatius von Antiochien und das Johannesevangelium.* Zurich: Zwingli, 1949.

Meier, J. P. *The Vision of Matthew: Christ, Church and Morality in the First Gospel.* New York: Paulist, 1979.

_____. "Matthew and Ignatius: A Response to William R. Schoedel." In *Social History of the Matthean Community,* ed. D. Balch, 178-186. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.

Meinhold, P. "Die geschichtstheologischen Konzeptionen des Ignatius von Antiochien." In *Kyriakon: Feschrift Johannes Quasten,* ed. P. Granfield and J. Jungmann, 182-191. Vol. 1. Münster: Aschendorff, 1970.

_____. *Studien zu Ignatius von Antiochien.* Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1979.

Moffat, J. "An Approach to Ignatius." *HTR* 29 (1936) 1-38.

Mollard, E. "The Heretics Combatted by Ignatius of Antioch." *JEH* 5 (1954) 1-6.

Morris, L. *The Cross in The New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1965.

_____. *The Gospel According to Matthew*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992.

Murphy-O'Connor, J. "Tradition and Redaction in 1 Cor 15:3-7." *CBQ* 43 (1981) 582-589.

Neufeld, V. *The Earliest Christian Confessions*. Leiden: Brill, 1963.

Niederwimmer, K. *Die Didache*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1988.

Norden, E. *Agnostos Theos*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1956.

Paulsen, H. *Studien zur Theologie des Ignatius von Antiochien*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978.

Preiss, T. "La mystique de l'imitation du Christ et de l'unité chez Ignace d'Antioche." *RHPR* 17 (1938) 197-241.

Prigent, P. "L'Hérésie Asiate et l'église confessante de l'Apocalypse à Ignace." *VC* 31 (1977) 1-7.

Rathke, H. *Ignatius von Antiochien und die Paulusbriefe*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1967.

Reinach, S. "Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, and the ARXEIA." In *Anatolian Studies Presented to Sir William Mitchell Ramsay*, ed. W. Buckler and W. Calder, 330-340. Manchester: University Press, 1923.

Rohde, J. "Häresie und Schisma im Ersten Clemensbrief und in den Ignatius-Briefen." *NovT* 10 (1968) 217-233.

Rius-Camps, J. *The Four Authentic letters of Ignatius the Martyr*. Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1980.

_____. "Ignacio de Antioquia, ¿testigo ocular de la muerte y resurrección de Jesús?" *Bib* 70 (1989) 449-473.

Saliba, I. "The Bishop of Antioch and the Heretics: A Study of a Primitive Christology." *EvQ* 54 (1982) 24-37.

Schaff, P. *The Creeds of Christendom*. Vol I. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1877.

Schenk, W. *Die Philipperbrief des Paulus*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1984.

Schermann, T. "Zur Erklärung der Stelle *epist. ad. Ephes.* 20,2 des Ignatius von Antiochien: φάρμακον ἀθανασίας κ.τ.λ." *TQ* 92 (1910) 6-19.

Schlier, H. *Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den Ignatiusbriefen*. Gießen: Töpelmann, 1929.

Schnackenburg, R. *Ephesians*. H. Heron, trans. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1991.

Schniewind, J. *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1936.

Schoedel, W. *Ignatius of Antioch*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.

_____. "Ignatius and the Archives." *HTR* 71 (1978) 97-106.

_____. "Ignatius and the Reception of the Gospel of Matthew in Antioch." In *Social History of the Matthean Community*, ed. D. Balch, 29-186. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.

_____. "Theological Norms and Social Perspectives in Ignatius of Antioch." In *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition: The Shaping of Christianity in the Second and Third Centuries*, ed. E. P. Sanders, 30-56. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980.

Schölligen, G. "Monepiskopat und monarchischer Episkopat: Eine Bemerkung zur Terminologie." *ZNW* 77 (1986) 146-151.

Schütz, J. H. "Charisma and Social Reality in Primitive Christianity." *JR* 54 (1974) 51-70.

_____. *Paul and the Anatomy of Apostolic Authority*. London/New York: Cambridge, 1975.

Schweizer, E. "Concerning the Speeches in Acts." In *Studies in Luke-Acts*, ed. L. E. Keck and J. L. Martyn, 208-216. Nashville: Abingdon, 1966.

Sibinga, J. S. "Ignatius and Matthew." *NovTest* 8 (1966) 263-283.

Simon, M. "From Greek Hairesis to Christian Heresy." In *Early Christian Literature and the Classical Intellectual Tradition in Honorem Robert M. Grant*, ed. W. Schoedel and R. L. Wilken, 101-106. Paris: Beauchesne, 1979.

Snyder, G. F. "The Historical Jesus in the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch." *BR* 8 (1963) 3-12.

Soards, M. L. *The Speeches in Acts: Their Content, Context, and Concerns*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1994.

Speigl, J. "Ignatius in Philadelphia: Ereignisse und Anliegen in den Ignatiusbriefen. *VC* 41 (1987) 360-376.

von Staden, H. "Hairesis and Heresy: The Case of the *haireseis iatrikai*." In *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition*, vol. 3: *Self-Definition in the Greco-Roman World*, ed. B. F. Meyer, E. P. Sanders, 76-100. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982.

Stander, H. F. "The Starhymn in the Epistle of Ignatius to the Ephesians (19:2-3)." *VC* 43 (1989) 209-214.

Stauffer, E. *New Testament Theology*. J. Marsh, trans. London: SCM, 1955.

Stoops, R. F. "If I Suffer . . . Epistolary Authority in Ignatius of Antioch." *HTR* 80:2 (1987) 161-78.

Streeter, B. H. *The Primitive Church*. London: Macmillan, 1930.

Stuhlmacher, P. *Das paulinische Evangelium*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1968.

_____. "The Pauline Gospel." In *The Gospel and the Gospels*, ed. P. Stuhlmacher, 149-172. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991.

Sumney, J. "Those who 'Ignorantly Deny Him': The Opponents of Ignatius of Antioch." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 4 (1993) 345-365.

Swartley, W. M. "The Imitatio Christi in the Ignatian Letters." *VC* 27 (1973) 81-103.

Trevett, C. "Approaching Matthew From the Second Century: the Under-Used Ignatian Correspondence." *JSNT* 20 (1984) 59-67.

_____. *Ignatius and His Opponents in the Divided Church of Antioch in Relation to Some Aspects of the Early Syrian Christian Tradition*. Sheffield: University of Sheffield, 1980.

_____. "Ignatius and the Monstrous Regiment of Women." *Studia Patristica* 21 (1989) 202-214.

_____. "Ignatius 'To the Romans' and I Clement LIV-LVI." *VC* 43 (1989) 35-52.

_____. "Prophecy and Anti-Episcopal Activity: a Third Error Combatted by Ignatius?" *JEH* 34 (1983) 1-18.

Wetter, G. P. *Altchristliche Liturgien: Das christliche Mysterium*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1921.

Weber, M. *Economy and Society*. G. Roth, C. Wittich, et al., trans. New York: Bedminster, 1968.

_____. *The Sociology of Religion*. E. Fischoff, trans. Boston: Beacon, 1964.

Wickings, H. F. "The Nativity Stories and Docetism." *NTS* 23 (1977) 457-460.

Wifstrand, A. "The Homily of Melito on the Passion," *VC* 2 (1948) 201-223.

Wilder, A. N. *Early Christian Rhetoric: The Language of the Gospel*. Cambridge: Harvard, 1971.

Wilkins, M. J. "The Interplay of Ministry, Martyrdom and Discipleship in Ignatius of Antioch." In *Worship, Theology and Ministry in the Eary Church*, ed. M. J. Wilkins and T. Paige, 294-315. Sheffield: JSOT, 1992.

Wilson, S. "Gentile Judaizers." *NTS* 38 (1992) 605-616.

Yamauchi, E. M. "The Crucifixion and Docetic Christology." *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 46 (1982) 1-20.

Yarbro Collins, A. *Crisis and Catharsis: The Power of the Apocalypse*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1984.

Zahn, T. *Ignatius von Antiochien*. Gotha: Friedrich Andreas Perthes, 1873.

VITA

Charles Thomas Brown was born on March 19, 1954. In 1976 he professed vows in the Congregation of the Priests of the Sacred Heart; he was ordained to the priesthood in 1984.

Brown received a B.A. degree from Loyola University Chicago in 1979. In 1984 Brown received an M.Div. degree from the Catholic Theological Union at Chicago; in 1991 he received an M.A. degree from the same institution.

Between 1984 and 1987, Brown ministered in Zaïre, central Africa.

DISSERTATION APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by Charles T. Brown, S.C.J. has been read and approved by the following committee:

Thomas H. Tobin, S.J., Ph.D.
Associate Professor, Theology
Loyola University Chicago

Urban C. von Wahlde, Ph.D
Professor, Theology
Loyola University Chicago

Jon Nilson, Ph.D.
Associate Professor, Theology
Loyola University Chicago

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the dissertation is now given final approval by the committee with reference to content and form.

The dissertation is, therefore, accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

April 2, 1997
Date

Thomas H. Tobin, S.J.
Director's Signature