JONATHON LOOKADOO

The High Priest and the Temple

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe 473

Mohr Siebeck

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament · 2. Reihe

473

Jonathon Lookadoo

The High Priest and the Temple

Metaphorical Depictions of Jesus in the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch

Mohr Siebeck

Jonathon Lookadoo, born 1987; 2010 BA in Religion: Biblical Languages, Oklahoma Baptist University; 2013 MDiv, Beeson Divinity School; 2017 PhD in Theology, University of Otago; currently Assistant Professor at Presbyterian University and Theological Seminary, Seoul, Republic of Korea.
orcid.org/0000-0003-2137-5744

ISBN 978-3-16-156071-2 / eISBN 978-3-16-156072-9
DOI 10.1628/978-3-16-156072-9

ISSN 0340-9570 / eISSN 2568-7484
(Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 2. Reihe)

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available at *http://dnb.dnb.de*.

The book was printed by Laupp & Göbel in Gomaringen on non-aging paper and bound by Buchbinderei Nädele in Nehren.

Printed in Germany.

For my parents

Acknowledgments

Ignatius writes at several points about those who have refreshed him, and, although writing in a more comfortable setting, I am also glad of the opportunity at the end of the writing process to be able to thank those who have refreshed me.

This book began as a PhD thesis at the University of Otago. I am particularly grateful for the excellent supervisory work that I received from Paul Trebilco and James Harding. Paul's scholarship provides a model from which I have learned much and which I hope to have emulated in my own small way in the pages that follow. His willingness to read multiple drafts, quick turn-around times, and probing, big-picture questions lifted this study out of the mire of vaguely interesting observations about previous scholarship. James's attention to detail and help with languages not only saved me from countless embarrassing mistakes but also made this study more precise. Any errors that remain are of course my own.

My examiners also offered encouragements and suggestions for how to improve the manuscript when revising. I am grateful to Paul Foster, Paul Hartog, and Thomas Robinson for taking the time to examine this thesis and to David Tombs for convening the examination. I would like to thank Jörg Frey and the other editors for accepting the manuscript into the second series of the Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. I am likewise grateful to Klaus Hermannstädter for his interest in the project from an early stage and assistance throughout the project. He, Elena Müller, Henning Ziebritzki, and the team at Mohr Siebeck have made this book a reality. For their work, I am very appreciative.

The Department of Theology and Religion at the University of Otago was a friendly and supportive environment in which to study. I am thankful to those in the departmental seminars for hearing and commenting on drafts of my research. The Aotearoa New Zealand Association for Biblical Studies was a helpful and encouraging place to try out new ideas, and I appreciate their willingness to shelter this relocated American. The resourcefulness of the university's librarians, particularly the Interloans staff led by Jacinda Boivin, is much appreciated as they have often located obscure journal articles with limited information.

Interactions with others who study early Christianity have given this project a timely boost. Richard Bauckham, Martin Bauspieß, Dirk Jongkind, and Gregory Vall have given generously of their time to hear or read semi-coherent thoughts-in-progress. An exchange between the Otago Theology Department and the Evangelisches Stift in Tübingen facilitated my research by offering a chance to improve my German and by granting access to a first-class theological library. I am grateful to Professor Drecoll for overseeing my time there.

Conversations with fellow PhD students offered opportunities to share and receive help on this project as well as everyday matters in life. I am thankful for the daily lunches in the Humanities Common Room and the weekly pint at Eureka. I am especially thankful to Jonathan and Tess Hicks, who offered me a place to stay when I first arrived in Dunedin and insured that I settled in well, and to Nick Brennan, Malcolm Falloon, Luke Hoselton, Josh Hurd, and Jono Ryan, whose conversations urged me to look at both research and life with fresh eyes. Likewise, the support of friends from Christ the King Anglican Church in Birmingham, Alabama gave me a base from which I could work and to which I could seamlessly return. For this, I am grateful to Father Lyle and Mary Dorsett, the group that met for coffee at O'Henry's, and friends like Kyle and Melissa Clark, Kyle Logan, Erin and Jeff Martin, Matthew Neely, Michael and Jennifer Novotny, Bethany Rushing, and David and Andrea Tew.

Finally, this project would neither have started nor been completed without the generous support of my family. Meeting and marrying Jieun was the most joyous discovery of my time in Dunedin, and her selfless giving, inquiring mind, and novel perspectives have not only improved the book but life itself. Despite being younger, Joel and Chantelle have in many ways been a step ahead of me in life and have set an example for how things should be, while Chloe and Harper have added much joy to our weekly Skype sessions. Lastly, my parents, Fred and Charlene, have given financially and emotionally to my education for as long as I can remember. They have sacrificed much to bring me up and have encouraged me to pursue thoughts broadly and deeply. I am grateful, and this study is dedicated to them.

Anyang, Feast of St. Stephen 2017 Jonathon Lookadoo

Table of Contents

List of Abbreviations

The abbreviations in this work are found in Billie Jean Collins, Bob Buller, and John F. Klutsko, eds. *The SBL Handbook of Style: For Biblical Studies and Related Disciplines*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2014. Abbreviations that are not listed in *The SBL Handbook* are listed below.

ABG	Arbeiten zur Bibel und ihrer Geschichte
AJEC	Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity
BEFAR	Bibliothèque des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome.
BibAC	The Bible in Ancient Christianity
Bibl.	*Bibliotheca*
BP	Bibliothèque de la Pléiade
BrDAG	Montanari, Franco, Madeleine Koh, Chad Matthew Schroeder, eds. *The Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek*. Leiden: Brill, 2015
BRS	Biblical Resources Series
BTH	Bibliothèque de théologie historique
CSL	Cambridge Studies in Linguistics
EC	*Early Christianity*
ESCJ	Studies in Christianity and Judaism/Études sur le christia-nisme et le judaisme
EUP	European University Papers
FKDG	Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte
HR	Historia Religionum
I.Eph.	Wankel, Hermann ed. *Die Inschriften von Ephesos*. Kommission für die Archäologische Erforschung Kleinasiens bei der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften; Österreichisches Archäologisches Institut; Institut für Altertumskunde der Universität Köln. 7 vols. Bonn: Rudolf Habelt, 1979–1981
IJST	*International Journal of Systematic Theology*
JSPL	*Journal for the Study of Paul and His Letters*
JBTS	*Journal of Biblical and Theological Studies*
JECH	*Journal of Early Christian History*
KfA	Kommentar zu frühchristlichen Apologeten
MSt	Millennium Studien/Millennium Studies
MVS	Menighedsfakultetets Videnskabelige Serie
NHMS	Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies
OAF	Oxford Apostolic Fathers
OSCC	Oklahoma Series in Classical Culture
PAST	Pauline Studies
PIOL	Publications de l'Institut orientaliste de Louvain
PPS	Popular Patristics Series
PPSD	Pauline and Patristic Scholars in Debate

PrTMS	Princeton Theological Monograph Series
Ps.Ign.	Pseudo-Ignatius (translator and interpolator of the long recension)
SAAA	Studies on the Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles
SBEC	Studies in the Bible and early Christianity
SBR	Studies of the Bible and Its Reception
SIJD	Schriften des Institutum Judaicum Delitzschianum
SLAG	Schriften der Luther-Agricola-Gesellschaft
SLit	*Studia Liturgica*
SUC	Schriften des Urchristentums
SVTG	Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum
TC	*Textual Criticism: A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism*
ThKNT	Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
UALG	Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte
UTB	Uni-Taschenbücher
VCSup	Vigiliae Christianae Supplements
VetC	*Vetera Christianorum*
VIEG	Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Europäische Geschichte, Mainz
WA	Luther, Martin. *D. Martin Luthers Werke*. 120 vols. Weimar: Böhlau, 1883–2009
YPR	Yale Publications in Religion

Chapter 1

Points of Departure

1.1. Introduction

It is nearly impossible to overestimate the significance of Jesus in the letters of Ignatius of Antioch. Although there is a small amount of textual ambiguity about precise phrases and word order, combinations of the words Ἰησοῦς, Χριστός, and κύριος appear roughly 140 times in seven letters.[1] Jesus is also referred to as "our hope" (ἡ ἐλπὶς ἡμῶν; *Magn.* 11), his flesh and blood are associated with faith and love (*Trall.* 8.1), and Jesus's suffering and death provide the model for Ignatius's own suffering and anticipated death as he is escorted across Asia by his Roman guards (*Rom.* 3.2–3; 5.1; 6.3).[2] In addition, Ignatius designates Jesus as θεός on multiple occasions,[3] links him uniquely with the Father, and emphatically insists, often in polemical contexts, that Jesus was simultaneously fully in the flesh during his time on earth.[4] To put it succinctly, "Ignatius embraces a high Christology."[5]

Jesus is also closely associated with the people who follow him. Ignatius prays that Magnesian Christians can share in the unity of the Father and Jesus

---

[1] A similar count is given by Paul Foster that includes "fairly standard Christological title[s]" along with references to Jesus by name ("Christ and the Apostles in the Epistles of Ignatius of Antioch," in *Early Christians between Ideal and Reality*, ed. Mark Grundeken and Joseph Verheyden, WUNT 342 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015], 116n.14).

[2] Callie Callon is right to argue that Ignatius's use of the term λεόπαρδοι in *Rom.* 5.1 is an insult rather than a reference to a military regiment ("A Re-examination of Ignatius' Use of the Term 'Leopards,'" *JTS* 66 [2015]: 585–595). This suggests treatment that might properly be described as "beastly." Due to the high number of citations from Ignatius's letters, the authorial prefix "Ign." has been omitted. Ignatius's letters to the *Ephesians* and *Romans* are abbreviated as "*Eph.*" and "*Rom.*," while "Eph" and "Rom" stand for the letters in the New Testament of the same name. Similarly, "Pol. *Phil.*" refers to Polycarp's *Philippians*, while "*Pol.*" denotes Ignatius's *Polycarp* and "Phil" designates Paul's letter to Philippi.

[3] *Eph.* inscr.; 1.1; 7.2; 15.3; 18.2; 19.3; *Trall.* 7.1; *Rom.* inscr. (twice); 3.3; 6.3; *Smyrn.* 1.1; 10.1; *Pol.* 8.3.

[4] E.g. *Eph.* 7.2; 18.2–19.1; *Magn.* 11; *Trall.* 9.1–2; *Smyrn.* 1.1–3.3; *Pol.* 3.2.

[5] Gregory Vall, *Learning Christ: Ignatius of Antioch and the Mystery of Redemption* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2013), 97. Similarly, J. N. D. Kelly writes, "The centre of Ignatius's thinking was Christ" (*Early Christian Doctrines*, 3rd ed. [London: Black, 1965], 92).

(*Magn*. 1.2), while Jesus is depicted as a co-bishop with his Father when Ignatius writes to Polycarp (*Pol*. inscr.). Jesus's significance for the church becomes clear when looking at Ignatius's ecclesial typology.[6] Jesus is a type of the deacons in the heavenly ecclesiology, while the Father is connected to the bishop and the apostles to the elders (*Magn*. 6.1; *Trall*. 2.1–3.1). Yet Ignatius's typology is not employed consistently. Rather, it tells of the heavenly presence that Ignatius expected in ecclesial life while resisting strictly consistent identifications. Thus Jesus's presence in the church extends further than his connection with the deacons alone. Bishops are in the mind of Christ (*Eph*. 3.2), obedience to the presbyters is linked with the law of Jesus Christ (*Magn*. 2), and "wherever Christ Jesus is, there is the catholic church" (ὅπου ἂν ᾖ Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς, ἐκεῖ ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία; *Smyrn*. 8.2). Jesus's connection to bishops, presbyters, deacons, and the entire church indicate that Ignatius's typology is not absolutely consistent.

The connections between Jesus and his people are tightened by Ignatius's use of paired metaphors. For example, Jesus is ὁ καινὸς ἄνθρωπος (*Eph*. 20.1) and ὁ τέλειος ἄνθρωπος (*Smyrn*. 4.2). In turn, Ignatius expects that in his own death, he will be truly ἄνθρωπος (*Rom*. 6.2). Jesus and Ignatius are thus connected by a specific term in addition to Ignatius's imitation of his suffering and death. This study situates itself alongside other studies of Christology and ecclesiology in the Ignatian epistles by examining another set of paired metaphors: the high priest and the temple. Jesus is referred to as high priest only in *Phld*. 9.1. Ignatius's use of the term rarely receives much attention, while Stark claims more emphatically that Ignatius's use of the term ἀρχιερεύς "has not much significance to it."[7] Yet Ignatius employs the metaphors of high priest and door in the midst of a discussion in which he outlines the relation between the gospel and Jewish scripture as well as the role of the prophets. Moreover, there is a polemical edge to Ignatius's writing as he recounts a disagreement that he had with at least some in Philadelphia.

Only a few sentences before he speaks of Jesus as high priest, Ignatius calls the Philadelphians a temple (ναός; *Phld*. 7.2). The Philadelphians are to be unified with their bishop and otherwise behave in such a way as to demonstrate that they are God's temple. The rhetorical connections and role played by the high priest and temple in the argument of the letter remain to be worked out fully in chapters 3 and 4. For now it is enough to note that high priests and temples function within similar conceptual worlds. A high priest offers much of his or her service to a deity in temples. The two often go together. That these

---

[6] See similarly John Behr, *The Way to Nicaea* (Crestwood: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2001), 82.

[7] Alonzo Rosecrans Stark, "The Christology in the Apostolic Fathers" (PhD diss., University of Chicago, 1912), 24.

metaphors appear relatively close to one another in the same letter should raise questions about whether or not they work together in the argument.

Although Ignatius refers to Jesus as high priest only once in his letters, he refers to his audience as temples on three other occasions. Two of these references come in the same letter. The Ephesians are described as stones of the temple (*Eph.* 9.1), while in another passage each of the Ephesians comprises a temple individually (*Eph.* 15.3). In addition, some of the Ephesians serve as temple-bearers (ναοφόροι) in a processional metaphor (*Eph.* 9.2). Jesus is not spoken of as high priest anywhere in this letter. However, chapters 5 and 6 will argue that he is present in each of these three metaphors. Similarly, *Magn.* 7.2 positions Jesus and the temple, along with an altar, as objects toward which the Magnesians are instructed to run. Again, Jesus is not described as a high priest, but he is once more present in connection with Ignatius's temple imagery.

This study explores the relationship between Jesus and the temple by working from the pairing of the high priestly and temple metaphors in *Phld.* 7.2–9.1. From this, the study will work methodically to describe Jesus's role within the temple in other letters. By paying close attention to these two metaphors, the study contributes a historically and literarily focused exploration of Ignatius's Christology and ecclesiology and may be of use to future attempts to study the way in which Ignatius understands Jesus and his followers.

Finally, this study touches on similar imagery in surrounding literature within Ignatius's milieu. To attempt to integrate all of the sources that could shed light on Ignatius's use of the temple metaphor would extend this volume unnecessarily. For example, Allen Brent has made a strong case for reading Ignatius alongside other Greek rhetors and inscriptions from the Second Sophistic movement.[8] This rhetorical development was especially popular in Greece and Asia Minor and stretched from the late-first to early-third centuries CE. Brent finds the most striking similarities with literature in the first half of the second century.[9] While a discussion of Ignatius's conceptual background is not the primary aim of this study, brief examinations of certain early Jewish and early Christian texts may help in understanding Ignatius's letters by offering more or less contemporaneous comparative material from related movements that interacted with early Christianity in at least some instances over the course of the first two centuries CE. Although such comparison may deserve further attention in due course, the partial analysis in this study is intended to

[8] Allen Brent, "Ignatius' Pagan Background in Second Century Asia Minor," *ZAC* 10 (2006): 207–232; idem, *Ignatius of Antioch and the Second Sophistic: A Study of Early Christian Transformation of Pagan Culture*, STAC 36 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 41–311.

[9] On the Second Sophistic, see the studies of Graham Anderson, *The Second Sophistic: A Cultural Phenomenon in the Roman Empire* (London: Routledge, 1993); Tim Whitmarsh, *The Second Sophistic* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).

supplement the examination of Ignatius against the background of his Greco-Roman rhetorical environment

1.2. Literature Review

As this compressed allusion to Brent reveals, however, this study is one of many that have taken up Ignatius's letters. In addition to commentaries and monographs devoted to Ignatius's thought,[10] narrower studies regarding Ignatius's understanding of episcopacy, the social world described in his letters, and his role in the parting of the ways have also added significantly to studies of Christian origins.[11] Yet less has appeared with a direct focus on the high priestly and temple imagery. Two sets of studies may be mentioned briefly.

[10] For commentaries, see e.g. J. B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers: Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp: Revised Texts with Introductions, Notes, Dissertations, and Translations*, 2nd ed., 2 vols. in 5 parts (London: Macmillan, 1889–1891); Walter Bauer, *Die Briefe des Ignatius von Antiochia und der Polykarpbrief*, HNT Ergänzungsband, Die apostolischen Väter 2 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1920); Robert M. Grant, *Ignatius of Antioch*, The Apostolic Fathers: A New Translation and Commentary 4 (Camden: Thomas Nelson, 1967); Henning Paulsen, *Die Briefe des Ignatius von Antiochia und der Polykarpbrief*, HNT 18, Die apostolischen Väter 2 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1985); William R. Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985). For monographs, see e.g. Theodor Zahn, *Ignatius von Antiochien* (Gotha: Perthes, 1873); Eduard von der Goltz, *Ignatius von Antiochien als Christ und Theologe: Eine dogmengeschichtliche Untersuchung*, TUGAL 12.3 (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1894); Virginia Corwin, *St. Ignatius and Christianity in Antioch*, YPR 1 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960); Henning Paulsen, *Studien zur Theologie des Ignatius von Antiochien*, FKDG 29 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978); Vall, *Learning Christ*. See also the concise study of Cyril Charles Richardson (*The Christianity of Ignatius of Antioch* [New York: Columbia University Press, 1935]) and the collected essays of Peter Meinhold (*Studien zu Ignatius von Antiochien*, VIEG 97 [Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1979]).

[11] E.g. episcopacy: Harry O. Maier, *The Social Setting of the Ministry as Reflected in the Writings of Hermas, Clement, and Ignatius*, SR 1 (Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1991), 147–198; Alistair C. Stewart, *The Original Bishops: Office and Order in the First Christian Communities* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2014), 238–295; Ignatius's social world: Christine Trevett, *A Study of Ignatius of Antioch in Syria and Asia*, SBEC 29 (Lewiston: Edwin Mellen, 1992); eadem, *Christian Women and the Time of the Apostolic Fathers (AD c. 80–160): Corinth, Rome and Asia Minor* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2006), 167–273; Paul Trebilco, *The Early Christians in Ephesus from Paul to Ignatius*, WUNT 166 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 628–711; the parting of the ways: Thomas A. Robinson, *Ignatius of Antioch and the Parting of the Ways: Early Jewish-Christian Relations* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2009); James D. G. Dunn, *Neither Jew nor Greek: A Contested Identity*, Christianity in the Making 3 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015), 650–654, 671–672.

1.2.1. High Priestly Metaphors

To begin with, the role of Jesus as high priest in *Phld*. 9.1 has been explored in several articles by Ferdinando Bergamelli and a recent study by Ole Jakob Filtvedt and Martin Wessbrandt.

1.2.1.1. Ferdinando Bergamelli

Although Bergamelli includes the reference to the high priest in *Phld*. 9.1 as part of his investigation into Jesus's mediatorial role in Ignatius's thought, he focuses on the image of the door rather than the high priest.[12] He rightly connects his interpretation to the discussion of the gospel and archives in *Phld*. 8.2,[13] and he views Jesus as the mediator and door through which everyone must access the Father.[14] "Tutti coloro quindi che vogliono arrivare alla vera conoscenza del Padre, devono '*entrare per mezzo di questa Porta*.'"[15] Bergamelli's focus on Jesus as an intermediary will prove instructive to the study of Jesus as high priest in chapter 3. However, the metaphor of high priest is secondary to his purposes because his articles explore the image of the door more fully. In addition, the temple metaphors are largely left out, leaving the relationship between the two metaphors unexamined.

1.2.1.2. Ole Jakob Filtvedt and Martin Wessbrandt

Filtvedt and Wessbrandt have likewise taken up *Phld*. 9.1 in their study of Jesus's high priesthood in early Christian texts. They correctly note that Ignatius utilizes the metaphors in order to speak about revelation, that is, the way in which God is made known to the Philadelphians.[16] Jesus thus provides access to God. However, one of the chief aims of the article is to ask "what hypothesis would best explain the similarities as well as the independence" that Hebrews, 1 Clement, *Phld*. 9.1, Polycarp's *Philippians*, and the Martyrdom of Polycarp display.[17] Their preferred hypothesis is liturgical use. Although the suggestion

---

[12] Ferdinando Bergamelli, "Gesù Cristo e gli archivi (*Filadelfiesi* 8,2): Cristo centro delle scritture secondo Ignazio di Antiochia," in *Esegesi e catechesi nei padri (secc. II–IV)*, ed. Sergio Felici (Rome: LAS, 1993), 35–47; idem, "Dal Padre al Padre: Il Padre come principio e termine del Cristo," *Salesianum* 62 (2000): 421–431; idem, "Gesù Cristo *Porta* del Padre (*Filadelfiesi* 9,1): Il Cristo Mediatore e Rivelatore del Padre in Ignazio di Antiochia," in *"In Lui ci ha scelti" (Ef. 1,4): Studi in onore del Prof. Giorgio Gozzelino*, ed. Sabino Frigato (Rome: LAS, 2001), 33–43.

[13] Bergamelli, "Dal Padre al Padre," 426.

[14] Bergamelli, "Gesù Cristo e gli archivi," 41–42.

[15] "Therefore, all those who want to reach the true knowledge of the Father must '*enter through the door*'" (Bergamelli, "Gesù Cristo *Porta* del Padre," 38). Italics are in the original.

[16] Ole Jakob Filtvedt and Martin Wessbrandt, "Exploring the High Priesthood of Jesus in Early Christian Sources," *ZNW* 106 (2015): 110.

[17] Filtvedt and Wessbrandt, "Exploring the High Priesthood," 97.

is plausible, the sights of the study that follows are set primarily on Ignatius's own usage of the priestly and temple metaphors. While the question of how early Christian priestly imagery developed is interesting, it is not the question that this monograph seeks to engage. Rather, I am interested primarily in how Ignatius's priestly depiction of Jesus occurs in his own letters and only secondarily in comparing Ignatius's use of this metaphor with other early Christian usage. The question of how similar imagery developed across early Christian literature is left for other studies.

1.2.2. Temple Metaphors

Two scholars have given more attention to the place of temple metaphors in Ignatius's letters while also studying the interaction between priestly and temple language together.[18]

1.2.2.1. Peter Legarth

The only monograph that treats the topic of Ignatius's temple metaphors is Peter Legarth's 1992 thesis from the University of Lund that was published in Menighedsfakultetets Videnskabelige Serie.[19] In addition to the Danish thesis and English summary at the end of the monograph, Legarth published a condensed version of his arguments in a 1996 journal article.[20] After noting the close relationship between Christology and ecclesiology in the New Testament,[21] he outlines expectations for a new temple in early Jewish texts and the New Testament.[22] He finds that there is consistently only one God who is predicated of the temple, although this God may be referred to in a number of ways, including θεός, יהוה, שם, and כבוד.[23] Messianic figures are not prominent in the depictions of the new temple, and Legarth finds that God is both the builder of the temple and the one who is to be worshipped there.[24]

---

[18] David J. Downs has also noted recently that the temple images are used for the corporate union of believers but leaves space to develop the study of the metaphors ("The Pauline Concept of Union with Christ in Ignatius of Antioch," in *The Apostolic Fathers and Paul*, ed. Todd D. Still and David E. Wilhite, PPSD 2 [London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2017], 160n.49).

[19] Peter V. Legarth, *Guds tempel: Tempelsymbolisme og kristologi hos Ignatius af Antiokia*, MVS 3 (Århus: Kolon, 1992).

[20] Peter V. Legarth, "Tempelsymbolik und Christologie bei Ignatius von Antiochien," *KD* 42 (1996): 37–64. For the English summary, see *Guds tempel*, 344–354.

[21] Legarth, *Guds tempel*, 9–11.

[22] Legarth, *Guds tempel*, 12–97; idem, "Tempelsymbolik," 38–47.

[23] Legarth, *Guds tempel*, 14–17, 46; idem, "Tempelsymbolik," 38.

[24] Although the Messiah is the builder of the temple in Sib.Or. 5.422–425, Legarth notes that this passage is balanced by the portrayal of God as the maker of the temple (Sib.Or. 5.433; Legarth, *Guds tempel*, 19; idem, "Tempelsymbolik," 39). Likewise, although Jesus is the God who dwells among people as the Word (John 1.14), when he refers to his body as

The theocentric presentations of the temple continue in Ignatius's writings in which the temple belongs to God (*Eph*. 9.1–2; 15.3; *Magn*. 7.2; *Phld*. 7.2). Yet Ignatius's theocentric depiction of the temple becomes more complex, since he likewise refers to Jesus as θεός.[25] This comes as part of Ignatius's answer to a central question in early Christianity, namely, who is Jesus? For Ignatius, theology is Christocentric.[26] A central finding of Legarth's study develops when Ignatius's understanding of Jesus as θεός comes into contact with his theocentric presentation of the temple. According to Legarth, whereas messianic figures play an unobtrusive role in the temples of early Jewish and early Christian texts that precede Ignatius, Jesus is a vital figure in the temple metaphors found in Ignatius's letters. Yet his role in the temple is not always consistent, and this creates "et spændingsforhold mellem tempelsymbolisme og kristologien."[27] The tension arises from a theocentric temple metaphor on the one hand, and a Christology that portrays Jesus as both God and subordinate to the Father on the other. Legarth claims that Ignatius does not predicate θεός of Jesus in the passages in which he is portrayed as obedient to the Father, and this is due to Jesus's subordinate role in the temple.[28] Jesus is not referred to as θεός in the temple metaphors of *Eph*. 9.1–2, *Magn*. 7.2, or *Phld*. 7.2, but he is described as θεός in *Eph*. 15.3. According to Legarth, temple symbolism thus plays both a catalyzing and a reductive role in Ignatius's Christology as it provokes Ignatius to refer to Jesus as God in some passages, while it constrains him elsewhere to speak of Jesus as a mediator or high priest.[29]

Legarth's monograph is a tightly argued analysis not only of Ignatius's temple and priestly metaphors but also of related cultic language. It is thoroughly researched and well-versed in the relevant early Jewish and early Christian texts that can shed light on Ignatius's metaphor. The interpretations of particular Ignatian passages often demonstrate sensitivity and shed light on these underexplored images in the Ignatian corpus. However, little attention is given to the rhetorical flow of Ignatius's letters. For example, the treatment of ναός

---

the temple, he also speaks of his Father's house (John 2.16; Legarth, *Guds tempel*, 63; idem, "Tempelsymbolik," 44).

[25] *Eph*. inscr.; 1.1; 7.2; 15.3; 18.2; 19.3; *Trall*. 7.1; *Rom*. inscr. (twice); 3.3; 6.3; *Smyrn*. 1.1; 10.1; *Pol*. 8.3. Paul R. Gilliam argues that at least some of these references bear the marks of fourth-century debates over Jesus's identity (*Ignatius of Antioch and the Arian Controversy*, VCSup 140 [Leiden: Brill, 2017], 11–28). While Gilliam's proposal deserves further attention, I simply note here that Ignatius refers to Jesus as θεός at multiple points in the middle recension.

[26] Legarth, *Guds tempel*, 131; idem, "Tempelsymbolik," 47.

[27] "A relationship of tension between temple symbolism and Christology" (Legarth, *Guds tempel*, 340). Similarly, Legarth elsewhere describes "das spannungsgeladene Verhältnis zwischen der Tempelsymbolik und der Christologie" ("Tempelsymbolik," 63).

[28] Legarth, *Guds tempel*, 341; idem, "Tempelsymbolik," 63.

[29] Legarth, *Guds tempel*, 343; idem, "Tempelsymbolik," 63.

in *Eph*. 9.1 and 15.3 is separated by a study of *Phld*. 7.2–8.1, while the treatment of the temple in *Phld*. 7.2 comes early in Legarth's examination but the high priest of *Phld*. 9.1 is placed at the end.[30] Legarth's thematic organization yields interesting insights into individual passages but does not respect the occasional nature of Ignatius's letters. In addition, it obscures insights that can be drawn from consideration of the epistolary structure of each document, since the letters can stand as separate compositions. To study cultic metaphors in Ignatius's letters while taking seriously the metaphors' placement in particular letters may alter the more uniform presentation in Legarth's analysis.

Other questions may be raised about Legarth's study. First, although the similarities in temples, altars, priests, and sacrificial language seem prima facie capable of being classified together, when reading through Ignatius's letters and *Guds tempel*, the suspicion arises that Ignatius's discussions of the altar on which he is sacrificed (*Rom*. 2.2), the one altar that grounds Philadelphian eucharistic practice (*Phld*. 4), and the temple that the Ephesians comprise as unified stones (*Eph*. 9.1) are employed for a variety of reasons. Although chapter 8 will include a larger attempt to demonstrate the variety of Ignatius's cultic language,[31] the majority of this study will focus on the temple and priestly metaphors in order to show the different ways in which Ignatius employs them. Second, Legarth refers to temple symbolism as a catalyzing and reductive force in Ignatius's Christology, since Jesus is both God and obedient to the Father in the temple. The catalyzation comes because Jesus is included as God in the temple (*Eph*. 15.3). However, Legarth also sees Jesus as a reductive force, since Jesus can only be included as the person of worship in the temple if he is referred to as θεός and not, for example, if he is referred to as κύριος or Ἰησοῦς Χριστός. Yet such an attribution implies that the metaphor played a causative role in Ignatius's depiction of Jesus as both the God who should be worshipped and the model of obedience. There may be other forces at work in Ignatius's Christology, and if Jesus is both divine and mediator outside of the temple metaphors, this would bring into question Legarth's ascription to the temple of a simultaneously catalytic and reductive role. It may be that the temple metaphors reflect Ignatius's beliefs about Jesus rather than actively form them.

However, the point that most requires clarification is Legarth's claim that there is a tension-filled relationship between temple symbolism and Christology. The location of Legarth's singular "tension" is ambiguous. Two tensions may be in place. First, it is possible that there is a tension regarding the identity of the God who is deserving of worship in the temple. Sometimes the Father is

---

[30] *Eph*. 9.1: Legarth, *Guds tempel*, 139–183; idem, "Tempelsymbolik," 48–50; *Eph*. 15.3: *Guds tempel* 207–217; "Tempelsymbolik," 52–53; *Phld*. 7.2–8.1: *Guds tempel*, 184–206; "Tempelsymbolik," 51–52; *Phld*. 9.1: *Guds tempel*, 323–337; "Tempelsymbolik," 61–63.

[31] See section 8.2. Although placed at the end, it is hoped that section 8.2 will justify the more detailed study of a smaller selection of texts than Legarth.

the central figure (*Eph*. 9.1), at other times it is Jesus (*Eph*. 15.3), and at still other points there is possible ambiguity (*Magn*. 7.2; *Phld*. 7.2). Thus the tension could turn on the question of who is deserving of worship. Second, there may be a tension in the role that Jesus plays in the temple metaphors. Jesus is depicted as a mediator and high priest in some texts (*Eph*. 9.1; *Phld*. 9.1), but he is the God who is to be worshipped in the temple elsewhere (*Eph*. 15.3). Perhaps, then, one could identify "spændingsfyldte forholder" (tension-filled relationships) in Legarth's understanding of Ignatius's temple metaphors rather than "et spændingsfyldte forhold" (a tension-filled relationship).[32] Further, Legarth maintains that Ignatius's Christology has not been fully integrated into the temple metaphor of *Phld*. 7.2 because it is the Father to whom the temple belongs and no theocentric thoughts about Jesus are to be found in the passage.[33] The lack of integration between Ignatius's attributions of θεός to Jesus and the Father's role as the God who is worshipped in the temple seems to be a corollary of Legarth's tension-filled relationship, but it is not entirely clear how this observation relates to the relationship.

Since Legarth demonstrates his understanding through a close reading and interpretation, the tension that he perceives will be addressed fully in the exegetical chapters as the study progresses. However, two things may be noted in preparation. First, if the so-called tension between Jesus as mediator and Jesus as God can be found elsewhere in the letters, this would suggest that the tension, if there is one, exists further afield than in Ignatius's cultic language alone. In this case, the temple would provide an example of tension in Ignatian Christology but would be unlikely to serve as the cause of the tension. Second, Legarth's christological tension assumes that a mediatorial figure is less than God. However, if only God can reveal Godself, as Ignatius occasionally seems to hint (e.g. *Eph*. 19.2; *Magn*. 8.2), then God must serve as the revealer or mediator to humans in addition to receiving human worship. If the assumption that mediation implies tension with worship can be challenged in Ignatius's letters, it may be possible to resolve the christological tension that Legarth finds.

1.2.2.2. René Kieffer

Although Legarth's treatment is the only monograph on Ignatius and the temple, René Kieffer has contributed an insightful chapter on the topic. Originally presented at a 1998 symposium in Tübingen, Kieffer's contribution takes up

[32] See Legarth, *Guds tempel*, 217; idem, "Tempelsymbolik," 53. "Et spændingsfyldte forhold" is brought to the fore with reference to *Eph*. 15.3.

[33] Legarth, *Guds tempel*, 205–206; idem, "Tempelsymbolik," 52.

Ignatius's cultic imagery alongside other studies of the heavenly city and heavenly Jerusalem.[34] Kieffer makes the case that the metaphor of the heavenly city should be linked to the Ignatian temple metaphors because God is portrayed as dwelling in the church. While Kieffer acknowledges that he is informed by Legarth's thesis, his interest is iconographic. "Nous espérons ainsi pouvoir cerner de près l'iconographie qui détermine la symbolique du temple et de l'autel chez Ignace."[35]

Kieffer works through much of the same material as Legarth and is again an insightful reader. He likewise views the temple and altar as referring to similar entities, but he collects the references in *Ephesians* and *Philadelphians* into discrete sections.[36] This allows for more attention to be given to intra-epistolary connections. Despite this different focus from Legarth's more topical study, little attention is given to the role of cultic imagery in the argumentative contexts in which they occur. For example, given the placement of the temple in *Phld.* 7.2 between Ignatius's comments about Judaism in *Phld.* 6.1 and the archives in *Phld.* 8.2, one might ask how the temple metaphor aids Ignatius's argument in this context.[37] This limited attention to Ignatius's rhetoric becomes more evident as he turns to metaphors that occur outside of *Ephesians* and *Philadelphians*. These are treated more briefly and with hardly any attention to how the imagery may be connected to the original letter. Thus, although Kieffer is right to read passages from the same letter alongside one another and that Ignatius's imagery is often employed for polemical purposes, it remains to show how cultic metaphors contribute to Ignatius's argument as well as to illustrate the way in which the imagery aids Ignatius's polemic.

Finally, Kieffer comments on Legarth's christological tension with regard to *Eph.* 15.3. More will be said about this in chapter 6, but Kieffer rightly points out that Legarth "par suite de la présence du mot θεός, ramène trop facilement l'aspect christologique de notre texte au théocentrisme du temple chez Ignace."[38] Since Ignatius refers to Jesus as θεός outside of the temple, Kieffer is correct that it is difficult to justify Legarth's theocentric and Christocentric distinction in the temple. Theology and Christology run together for Ignatius. Yet Kieffer is in danger of making a similar mistake when he writes, "Dans les textes vraiment théocentriques comme 9,1ss, le temple est marqué par le Père et non par le Christ."[39] Yet this statement ignores Ignatius's emphatic statement

[34] René Kieffer, "La demeure divine dans le temple et sur l'autel chez Ignace d'Antioche," in *La cité de Dieu: Die Stadt Gottes: 3. Symposium Strasbourg, Tübingen, Uppsala 19.–23. September 1998 in Tübingen*, ed. Martin Hengel, Siegfried Mittmann, and Anna Maria Schwemer, WUNT 129 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 287–301.

[35] Kieffer, "La demeure divine," 288.

[36] Kieffer, "La demeure divine," 289–298.

[37] Kieffer treats this passage in "La demeure divine," 295–296.

[38] Kieffer, "La demeure divine," 294n.20.

[39] Kieffer, "La demeure divine," 294n.20.

that Jesus is God and his active portrayal of Jesus in the temple metaphor of *Eph*. 9.1. Clear examples from *Ephesians* would include at least *Eph*. 7.2 and 18.2–19.3. To make a strong distinction between theocentric and Christocentric texts without regard for Ignatius's statements elsewhere in his letters risks distorting the proper understanding of Jesus in the temple metaphors. Further attention to the way in which these metaphors interact with other statements in nearby contexts will lessen the likelihood of making a similar mistake in this study.

1.3. Methodology

The methodological approach utilized in this book is relatively routine for New Testament and early Christian studies as well as more broadly in classics.[40] It employs the historical, theological, philological, and literary tools that have been commonplace for the past two centuries,[41] although it does not do so without an awareness that both the tools and their use have been criticized. Since this study engages Ignatius's metaphors more specifically, an additional comment about metaphor is appropriate. In neither case does this study add significantly to methodological discussions, so the comments will be succinct and aim to signal some of the general trends that have impacted the current analysis.[42] The real test for this volume's success will lie in whether the application of these rather conventional tools can shed light on Ignatius's letters.

1.3.1. History, Theology, and Philology

The interpretation of Ignatius's letters found in the following chapters aims to be informed by knowledge of Ignatius's environment. This broadly includes

---

[40] For a similar methodological statement, see Matthew V. Novenson, *Christ among the Messiahs: Christ Language in Paul and Messiah Language in Ancient Judaism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 3.

[41] Of course, the theological tools have a unique place in biblical studies, since many scholars likewise have ties to or are in contact with those who have ties to theological communities who look to the Bible as a source of theological truth.

[42] Perhaps George J. Brooke's comments about historiography in the Dead Sea Scrolls may be applied here. Historiography "should be handled, not as a topic in the foreground but as a matter of background" ("Types of Historiography in the Qumran Scrolls," in *Ancient and Modern Scriptural Historiography: L'Historiographie biblique, ancienne et moderne*, ed. George J. Brooke and Thomas Römer, BETL 207 [Leuven: Peeters, 2007], 230; repr. in George J. Brooke, *Reading the Dead Sea Scrolls: Essays in Method*, EJL 39 [Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013], 192). This is not to deny the importance of methodological studies of historiography but to acknowledge that this study makes little fresh contribution to the subject.

the early Christian world of the first half of the second century CE.[43] Of course, this aim is frustrated to a large degree by the lack of first-hand evidence that is available about Ignatius. The sources are primarily his own letters and Pol. *Phil*. 9.1 and 13.1. Although Irenaeus and Origen each quote portions of Ignatius's letters,[44] our next account comes from Eusebius in the fourth century (*Hist. eccl.* 3.22; 3.36). Yet reading Ignatius with a view towards his historical context is not a fully formed methodology but instead signals an interpretive goal toward which to strive. The study borrows from discussions in New Testament and early Christian historical studies and is particularly indebted to Martin Hengel's vision of New Testament research as outlined in his 1993 address to the Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas, in which Hengel notes that he prefers not to speak of old and new methods but instead of the multiplicity of philological-historical methods that should be tested over several years.[45] He concludes:

> Wir sollten nicht vergessen, daß vor nicht allzu langer Zeit am Fach neues Testament alle theologischen Disziplinen Anteil hatten, daß alle bedeutsamen Theologen immer auch Ausleger des Neuen Testamentes waren. Als *theologische* Disziplin sollten wir jedoch gleichzeitig nicht vergessen, daß wir immer auch ein – gewiß kleiner – Bereich innerhalb der Altertumswissenschaften sind und daß uns die saubere Anwendung der philologisch-historischen Methoden gerade mit diesen verbindet und wir vor allem von dort her reiche und notwendige Anregungen empfangen.[46]

This study aims to follow such a vision by interpreting the metaphors in Ignatius's letters with care for historical details that may clarify them. Yet two more concerns can be noted from Hengel's statement. First, he makes note of the place of New Testament studies as a theological discipline. To this may be added that Ignatius's letters, while far from systematic, contain a number of theological claims, that is, claims about the identity of God and how people should live in relation to that God. This study will attempt to be sympathetic to Ignatius's own thought when trying to understand his letters. Second, Hengel outlines the importance of philology for early Christian studies.[47] Since Ignatius wrote in Greek and his letters were subsequently translated into Latin, Syriac, Armenian, Coptic, and Arabic, this study has attempted to be philologically

---

[43] More specific comments on the date of Ignatius's letters may be found in section 1.4.1.

[44] Irenaeus quotes *Rom.* 4.1 without naming Ignatius in *Haer.* 5.28.4, and Origen refers to Ignatius by name when citing *Rom.* 7.2 (*Cant.* prologue) and *Eph.* 19.1 (*Hom. Luc.* 6). These passages are usefully collected in Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2.1.143–144.

[45] Martin Hengel, "Aufgaben der neutestamentlichen Wissenschaft," *NTS* 40 (1994): 352; idem, "Tasks of New Testament Scholarship," *BBR* 6 (1996): 84.

[46] Hengel, "Aufgaben," 356. A similar statement may be found in Hengel, "Tasks," 86.

[47] Earlier in the paper, Hengel laments the degradation of philological education and responds, "Klassische Philologie und Historische Theologie sind in einer ungeschichtlich-denkenden postmodernen Welt mehr den je aufeinander angewiesen" (Hengel, "Aufgaben," 339; idem, "Tasks," 78).

informed.[48] Particular concerns arise about the definitions of words, grammar, and Greek rhetoric, and these are examined at appropriate times in the following pages. An additional attempt at philological comprehensiveness may be found in the text-critical footnotes for Ignatian passages that speak of the high priest and temple. However, as a study of high priestly and temple metaphors in Ignatius, this historically, theologically, and philologically focused study must say an additional word about the role of metaphor.

1.3.2. Metaphor

Two ways of treating the topic of metaphors seem initially appealing. The first would begin by recognizing that all language and thought, or at least most of it, is metaphorical.[49] On this first way, all manner of language could be brought in to inform the understanding of metaphor. Particularly interesting examples might include the place that so-called dead metaphors might play in a language as well as the role of metaphor in verbs of perception.[50] Yet, as this example of what could be covered under a metaphorical approach to language illustrates, such an approach would take one far afield from Ignatius with little initial hope of shedding much light on his high priestly and temple metaphors. For the purposes of this study, then, it seems preferable to outline a more modest understanding of metaphors that are readily identified in literature, oratory, and poetry. Despite the relatively common understanding of metaphor that is shared reasonably widely, at least by those with similar cultural backgrounds, this second way of treating the topic suffers from the problem of definition.[51]

---

[48] I have consulted the Greek, Latin, and Syriac texts in Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2.2; 2.3, and the Greek texts of the middle recension that can be found in other editions. The textual apparatuses of several critical editions, and the comments found in commentaries and critical editions have informed the textual decisions made in this study.

[49] I. A. Richards, *The Philosophy of Rhetoric* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1936), 92–95.

[50] On dead metaphors, see Owen Barfield, *Poetic Diction: A Study in Meaning*, 2nd ed. (London: Faber & Faber, 1952), 60–76; C. S. Lewis, "Bluspels and Flalansferes: A Semantic Nightmare," in *Rehabilitations and Other Essays* (London: Oxford University Press, 1939), 133–158. For a consideration of English verbs of perception within the context of Indo-European languages, see Eve E. Sweetser, *From Etymology to Pragmatics: Metaphorical and Cultural Aspects of Semantic Structure*, CSL 54 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 23–48.

[51] Noting that he and his students do not agree about how to define a metaphor, Wayne C. Booth observes that both parties "have found innumerable instances of what all of us happily call metaphors regardless of our definition" ("Metaphor as Rhetoric: The Problem of Evaluation," in *On Metaphor*, ed. Sheldon Sacks [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979], 49).