religions

MDPI

Article

Εντροπη: Shame and Identity Formation in the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch

Yi-Sang Patrick Chan [1,2]

[1] East Asia School of Theology, Singapore 427407, Singapore; yisangpatrickchan@fuller.edu
[2] Evangel Seminary, G/F-3/F, 38-46 Nassau Street, Mei Foo Sun Chuen, Kowloon, Hong Kong

Abstract: Since the 1980s, biblical scholars have started to employ the framework of "honor and shame" to study the culture of the ancient Mediterranean region. However, this application of the social–scientific honor–shame model has led to "massive generalizations of 'honor' and 'shame'". In particular, when focusing on the concept of honor/shame rather than its lexemes, the social–scientific school ignores the nuanced nature of each Greek word group related to shame. By studying classical Greek literature, Douglas Cairns further points out a puzzling situation that the word group αἰδώς contains polarized meanings of both "to shame" and "to respect". In this paper, we examine the puzzling double meanings of "to shame/to respect" by focusing on the use of the word group ἐντροπή in the letters of Ignatius of Antioch. This paper argues that the word group ἐντροπὴ serves a rhetorical purpose of protecting the church's identity by rejecting beliefs/customs that are unacceptable to Christianity and promoting unity in the churches through obedience to church authorities. This paper also explores the fundamental epistemological issue of understanding emotion words in its ancient context. It provides a provisional definition for ἐντροπή, that it is a self-inhibitory emotion of sensitivity to one's proper place in social interaction to protect one's self-image.

Keywords: shame; honor–shame model; Bruce Malina

check for updates

Citation: Chan, Yi-Sang Patrick. 2024. Εντροπη: Shame and Identity Formation in the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch. *Religions* 15: 1258. https://doi.org/10.3390/rel15101258

Academic Editor: José María Salvador-González

Received: 27 August 2024
Revised: 10 October 2024
Accepted: 12 October 2024
Published: 16 October 2024

Copyright: © 2024 by the author. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

1. Introduction

Since the 1980s, by building upon the works of social anthropologists, biblical scholars started to employ the framework of "honor and shame" to study the culture of the ancient Mediterranean region.[1] Bruce Malina draws on the observations of Péristiany and Pitt-Rivers and argues that biblical interpretation has been influenced by a Western individualistic worldview, which is different from the first-century Mediterranean collectivistic world. Malina defines honor as "the value of a person in his or her own eyes *plus* that person's value in the eyes of his or her social group".[2] Honor is a claim to worth along with the social acknowledgment of worth, and it depends on the intersection of one's authority, gender status, and respect (Malina 2001). Then, building upon his agonistic understanding of ancient society, Malina interprets shame as the loss of social honor (i.e., shame vis-à-vis honor) and that shame can be either acquired or ascribed.[3] To avoid being seen as less valuable, a person must internalize those qualities and strive to live in accordance with the expectations of others, especially in the eyes of "those significant in-group others".[4] While it is true that people's concern for honor and shame will motivate people to pursue certain qualities that are highly regarded by society, this application of the social–scientific honor–shame model has led to "massive generalizations of 'honor' and 'shame'" in the Mediterranean world (Herzfeld 1980).

In particular, when focusing on the concept of honor–shame rather than its lexemes, Malina's honor–shame model fails to provide a clear definition of what counts as honor–shame.[5] Also, they did not pay attention to the nuanced nature of each Greek word group related to shame. By studying classical Greek literature, David Konston argues that "we typically discriminate guilt and shame, classical Greek appears to collapse the two into

a single concept".[6] Douglas Cairns further points out a puzzling situation that the word group αἰδώς contains polarized meanings of both "to shame" and "to respect" (Cairns 2011). Indeed, other than αἰδώς, this double meaning also occurs in other word groups, such as ἐντροπή and αἰσχύνη.[7] Although people's concern for honor and shame can drive them to seek qualities highly valued by society, if shame makes a person feel less valuable, how is it possible for the same word shame to mean both "respect" and "ashamed"?

Furthermore, the use of emotion words is closely tied to its societal culture.[8] With the same word, "shame", different cultures may nuance it differently. William Harris correctly argues that "The study of . . . emotions has been seriously impeded by our failure to realize, with a few noteworthy exceptions, that the relevant Greek and Latin terminology is very unlikely to correspond neatly to modern English usage" (Harris 2001). Then, how can we approach a given ancient shame word appropriately without superimposing the modern idea of shame?

In this paper, I will examine the puzzling double meanings of "to shame/to respect" by focusing on the use of the word group ἐντροπή in the letters of Ignatius of Antioch.[9] I will argue that the word group ἐντροπὴ serves a rhetorical purpose of protecting the church's identity by rejecting beliefs/customs that are unacceptable to Christianity and promoting unity in the churches through obedience to church authorities.[10] In order to do that, I will begin by exploring the fundamental epistemological issue of understanding emotion words in its ancient context. Then, to have a broader understanding of the function of ἐντροπή, I will engage with the work of Douglas Cairns, who has provided a detailed analysis of the Greek word shame. Based on Cairns' work, I will give a provisional definition for ἐντροπή, that it is a self-inhibitory emotion of sensitivity to one's proper place in social interaction to protect one's self-image. Then, I will investigate how ἐντροπή functions in its pragmatic narrative context in the letters of Ignatius. I will show that, with the use of the word group ἐντροπή, Ignatius can communicate the expectation of the church's members towards the church leadership and provide a set of criteria to define permissible actions and beliefs. This usage of ἐντροπή is then close to the functions of social cohesion promotion, just criticism, and the sense of shame, as explained by Cairns' work.

2. Epistemology of the Mapping of Emotion

The fact that ἐντροπή can mean both "to shame" and "to respect" may not be intuitive to the modern concept of shame, as these two terms appear to have opposing meanings. This puzzling situation alludes to a fundamental epistemological issue of understanding the ancient emotion of shame that "no two emotion terms in either language can map perfectly onto each other" (Kaster 2005). The following two facts complicate the difficulty in "mapping of the emotion". First, Douglas Cairns rightly argues that emotion words are closely connected to one's cognitive aspect—how one sees and responds to the world in *a particular way* (Cairns 2011). The emotion words are not culturally universal, but they reflect the cultural values embedded within a specific concept of emotion.[11] Hence, the study of ἐντροπή becomes a study of the Hellenistic value of honor–shame. Second, there is no perfect one-to-one correspondence between a Greek emotion word and the English vocabulary. Sometimes, ancient Greek uses one word to refer to a range of emotions identified by English vocabulary (Kaster 2005). For example, the word αἰδώς covers the emotions of shame, embarrassment, and guilt because the differences among these emotions are not significant enough to warrant distinct terminologies for ancient Greek.[12] After his 400 pages detailed analysis of the use of αἰδώς from Homer to Aristotle, Cairns overtly argues that "αἰδώς is not shame!" (Cairns 2011). In this regard, the ancient Greek usage of shame is so different from English. "The tendency to use basic English emotion words as the regular counterparts for Greek terms may lead us, however, to overlook or discount significant differences in the way the respective sentiments are conceived and experienced in the two cultures" (Konstan 2006). Then, when there is no single English terminology that can correctly translate the meaning of αἰδώς or ἐντροπή, how can we capture the meaning of those words in a way that is faithful to its context?

Returning to the work group ἐντροπή, Richard Trench explains that it "conveys at least a hint of that change of conduct, that return of a man upon himself, which a whole-some shame brings with it in him who is its subject" (Trench 1976). Trench's idea suggests that one can approach the word group ἐντροπή by referring back to its etymology- τρέπω, which means "to turn". However, scholars such as Robert Kaster argue against deriving the meaning based on a word's lexical form, as it fails to provide a satisfactory answer to account for its diverse usage.[13] Instead, he suggests that we should focus on its "narrative processes or scripts" (Kaster 2005). Kaster conceives a given emotion word as "the unitary experience of the whole package deal", which consists of the narrative data "to produce a particular kind of emotionalized consciousness, a particular set of thoughts and feeling" (Kaster 2005). Focusing on its pragmatic narrative context allows the emotion word to be returned "to a place in the spotlight", and to determine its "role in shaping judgments and beliefs" (Kaster 2005). Kaster's idea of focusing on the "narrative scripts" is similar to Ben Lappenga's study of another emotion word Ζῆλος. Lappenga advocates for the monosemy bias that a word has one "general meaning", and it is the "grab-bag of mental items" associated with the word that determines its meaning (Lappenga 2016). Lappenga named this process the "ad hoc enrichment of a univocal lexical meaning" (Lappenga 2016). Lappenga even argues that New Testament scholars should "exhaust the possibility of monosemy for a given word (or word group) before resorting to lexical polysemy" (Lappenga 2016).

In light of the above discussion, to understand the nuanced meanings of ἐντροπή, we need to resort to its usages in the pragmatic narrative context. The focus on the pragmatic context, in fact, aligns with Aristotle's contention that emotion words refer to "all those affections which cause men to change their opinion in regard to their judgements, and are accompanied by pleasure and pain; such are anger, pity, fear, and all similar emotions and their contraries" (Aristotle, *Rhet.* 2.1 [Freese]) (Translation from the *Rhetoric* follows that of Aristotle, Aristotle 1926). According to Aristotle, emotion words can help construct rhetorical arguments in the context of a deliberative or forensic situation to affect people's judgment. The focus on the rhetorical function is not to say that ancient Greek emotion words cannot refer to one's private feelings, but just that one of the chief purposes is "to instruct the orator in ways of influencing political deliberations and the verdicts of jurors" (Konstan 2006). In this regard, ancient Greek emotion words function in a complex social interaction in which "individuals are conscious of the motive of others and ready to respond in kind" (Konstan 2006). The function of rhetorical usage is then closely tied to its pragmatic social context, that emotion words reflect "[one's] identity claims which are explained largely in terms of changing social positions" (Parkinson 1995).

In the following, I will investigate how the word group ἐντροπή functions in its programmatic social context in the letters of Ignatius. To have a broader understanding of the functions of the word group ἐντροπή, I will first engage with the provisional definition provided by Cairns for the word group αἰδώς. Then, I will argue that Ignatius's use of the word group ἐντροπή leads the community to achieve the identity-protecting process.

3. Monsemy and Douglas Cairns's Analysis of Shame

In response to the polarized meaning of "to shame" and "to respect" for the word group αἰδως, Cairns begins by providing a provisional definition. He "[treats] the concept of αἰδως as a whole. . . [and this] avoids the dangers of dividing the inseparable that are inherent in the 'separable meanings' approach" (Cairns 2011). At the same time, he argues that "to consider the concept of αἰδως as a whole, however, is not to hold a priori that αἰδως -terms cannot be used in different, more or less distinct senses" (Cairns 2011). In this regard, Cairns' approach is similar to the monosemy bias of Lappenga, as Cairns observes the "ad hoc enrichment of a univocal lexical meaning" in its pragmatic narrative context. Regarding the provisional meaning of the word group αἰδώς, he suggests that it is an "inhibitory emotion based on sensitivity to and protectiveness of one's self-image".[14] This inhibitory emotion "[focuses] on one's idea of oneself, especially as that idea is afflicted by

or comes into contact with others, and, despite the change which takes place in usage, in values, and in social forms, this focus on self-versus-others remain constant" (Cairns 2011).

To deal with the puzzling meaning of "to shame" and "to respect", Cairns argues that the starting point for αἰδώς is to respond to the situation in which one's image is concerned. Αἰδως becomes an inhibitory emotion on how to relate to oneself and others in an appropriately modest way, and it is not only about maintaining one's prestige. The concern of one's status will give rise to different social effects, including a feeling of shame or embarrassment for one's failure, a consideration of the status of others, and the proper ways of social behaviors towards guests, friends, and people of special social status. These activities all "share a focus on the proper balance to be struck between one's own honor and those of others" (Cairns 2011). The effect is that "to limit one's own claim to honor is to accept one's status vis-à-vis others", and "to inhibit self-assertion is to recognize how such conduct would impinge upon the honor of others".[15] Also, αἰδως entails with it a cognitive process of self-assessment to avoid improper assertion of the self and to restrain from offending others. Thus, αἰδως is a kind of "social worry" that is crucial to "make social life possible" (Kaster 2005). Αἰδως is then more positive than the modern-day understanding of shame, as it is a value "for its maintenance of propriety in a *reciprocal* arrangement in which one's own honor is bound up with one's obligation to others" (Cairns 2011). The mutuality of αἰδως, which is to show proper attitude to the self and to the others, is considered as the function of social cohesion promotion.

There are also other senses of αἰδως in its pragmatic usages. First, it is about the occurrent emotion, which is "a particular cognitive pattern of response and physiological change, with physical symptoms" (Cairns 2011). The use of an occurrent emotion is similar to our modern-day understanding of the situation of embarrassment.[16]

Second, it is about the just criticism that there is an "attitude of repentance and repudiation which might be felt . . . [from] those with the power to pass judgment and sentence" (Cairns 2011). The purpose is to have a change of mind and "to elicit some substantive form" of change (Cairns 2011). To make people feel ashamed, the criticism must not be a minor correction of error but be able to discover a person's significant faults and be just. Otherwise, people might be indifferent to the criticism. Just criticism will make people feel ashamed, and the feeling of αἰδως will produce a sense of personal responsibility. A person would think that it is their responsibility to change. In essence, shame allows people to see problems to bring change to their lives.

Third, it is about the interiority of shame or sense of shame. In some situations, one may not be the subject of the shameful event, but he or she imagines "placing [his or her] own action in the category of the shameful, as evaluating it exactly as would someone who was subject to shame" (Cairns 2011). In these situations, a person "[sees] the distance between his circumstances and what he expects of himself, the person . . . does not need to wait for others whose opinion he values to criticize the gap" (Kaster 1997). As a result, a person may not actually experience the shameful event or may not have received just criticism from others. Αἰδώς spontaneously serves the prospective purpose of evaluating a future situation to avoid or modify acts that may lead to a state of disgrace. Aristotle also explains the idea of αἰδώς (sense of shame) as one's ability to be sensitive to recognize these potentially shameful events happening (Konstan 2006). On the other hand, a shameless person is one who is indifferent in regard to the things that will bring dishonor. (Aristotle *Rhet.* 2.6.2).

Last, shame is about internalized moral cultivation, which is the evaluation of oneself with respect to some ideal. The internalized standard manifests even in the absence of others and it is about one's failure to perform a particular set of defined duties or ideals. In this way, the use of αἰδως is close to our modern-day understanding of guilt or conscience. Also, αἰδως carries with it a retrospective sense of being concerned with one's internal possession of virtue. Shame results from imagining particular acts or events that may expose one's ethical failure. The association of αἰδώς with internal moral virtue development indeed

aligns with Aristotle, who considers the role of αἰδώς as moral cultivation and αἰδώς acting as a semi-virtue of the learner.

In light of the above, how do these different senses of αἰδως shed light on our understanding of Ignatius' teaching? Although the word group αἰδώς is different from the word ἐντροπή, Cairns' study is still relevant for the following reasons: (1) the difference between αἰδώς and ἐντροπή is not significant as those words are inter-changeable,[17] (2) both αἰδώς and ἐντροπή are commonly translated as "shame" in Greek lexicons, and share the same puzzling meaning of both "to shame" and "to respect", (3) scholars suggest that, for the diachronic development, the word αἰδώς is an Attic word in poetic usage, and it is later on replaced by αἰσχύνω and εντρεπω (Cairns 2011). In view of the above, an engagement with Cairns' assists our understanding of how αἰσχύνη functions in the letters of Ignatius.

Based on Cairns' work, I propose that ἐντροπή is a self-inhibitory emotion that is sensitive to one's proper place in social interaction to protect one's self-image.[18] This self-inhibitory emotion becomes a "social worry" to avoid drawing improper attention to oneself and to maintain appropriate relationships with people of different social ranks.[19] Based on this provisional definition, I will investigate how ἐντροπή functions in the letters of Ignatius. I will argue that the word group ἐντροπή serves to protect the church's identity by rejecting unacceptable beliefs and promotes the church's concord and unity through obedience to church authorities. When compared with Cairns' analysis of αἰδως, Ignatius' use of the word group ἐντροπή is close to the function of promoting social cohesion, just criticism, and the sense of shame.

4. Issues at Stakes for the Letters of Ignatius

During the first half of the second century, Ignatius was sent to Rome for martyrdom under the custody of soldiers (Ign. *Rom.* 5:1).[20] Those seven letters represent Ignatius' construal of Christian identity regarding what it meant to act and believe in accordance to Christianity (Ign. *Magn.* 10:1, Ign. *Rom.* 3:3, Ign. *Phld.* 6.1). Three characteristics emerge from the letters. First, Ignatius is addressing the issue of individuals disrupting the unity of the community (Ign. *Phld.* 2:1–2, 3:1–2). Those people hold meetings without the presence of the bishop, which reflects their refusal to submit under the authority of the bishop (Ign. *Eph.* 5:3, Ign. *Magn.* 7, Ign. *Trall.* 2:2, Ign. *Smyrn.* 7,8). Those people are condemned as not meeting the criteria in accordance with the commandment, which may refer to the principles of faith and love that are essential for the unity of the church (Ign. *Magn.* 1:2, 4:2). Second, some are influenced by docetic Christology (Ign. *Trall*. 9–10), and they do not consider Jesus as having suffered crucifixion. They consider Jesus as merely suffering in appearance (τὸ δοκεῖν), thereby denying his resurrection (Ign. *Trall.* 10:1, Ign. *Smyrn.* 2:1, 4: 2). Third, some are still "living in accordance to Judaism" (Ign. *Magn.* 8:1, 9:1, 10:3; Ign. *Phld.* 6:1). They encourage the community to practice Judaism by observing Sabbath and other ancient practices (Ign. *Magn.* 8–10, Ign. *Phld.* 6:1). Ignatius considers the practice of Judaism as incompatible to the teaching of Christianity (Ign. *Magn.* 8:1, 10:3), and he explicitly argues that "it is utterly absurd to profess Jesus Christ and to practice Judaism" at the same time (Ign. *Magn.* 10:3).

Scholars suggest that the above characteristics do not refer to three separate groups of opponents but are linked together (see Marshall 2005; Schoedel 1985). For example, John Marshall argues that it is a strand of Jewish Christianity that considers Jesus as an angelic mediator (Marshall 2005). "Ignatius' opponents are most plausibly understood as devotees of Jesus who performed Jewish practices and who understood Jesus as an incorporeal angel" (Marshall 2005). Then, according to Marshall, if those opponents consider Jesus as τὸ δοκεῖν (appearance), they would undermine the importance of the Lord's Day, which is supervised by the bishop; instead, they would hold another separate meeting at the synagogue (Marshall 2005). Marshall's suggestion explains how the above three characteristics can be evident in one particular group and how the belief in Jesus as an angelic being would lead to the church's division.

On the other hand, Harry Maier argues that the underlying social setting is similar to that of the Johannine letters (2John 10, 3John 5–10), in which churches meet in separate households (Maier 2002). Those household leaders are the wealthy patrons of the church, and they have the independent authority to decide whether "to receive or refuse those who come as representative other churches and to hold their own meetings if they wish" (Maier 2002). Maier's idea may have found support from Ign. *Smyrn.* 6:1, which states that there is a rival leader at Smyrna.

Indeed, it is difficult to determine who are the particular opponents that Ignatius is condemning. Nonetheless, a few characteristics are noteworthy in the consideration of the nature of the opponents. First, those opponents are fellow Christians who refuse to confess Jesus's humanity. Ignatius prays that they will repent and might "change their mind in regard to the passion [of Jesus] which is our resurrection". (Ign. *Smyrn.* 5:1–3). Second, the above three characteristics are linked together and may be exhibited by the same group. "It is difficult . . . to classify the activities of Ignatius' opponents as indicative of heresy or dissension", since the two things are closely interrelated (Maier 2002). There may also be a "series of rival meetings occurring in all of these churches" that are influenced by those unacceptable teachings (Maier 2002). Last, if we take Maier's suggestion seriously, Ignatius' letters may reflect the power dynamic occurring in the church that affects the theology and the practices of the church members. In this regard, Ignatius' letters are circumstanced letters responding to the particular situations happening among the congregations, and the letters should not be treated as merely abstract theoretical treaties.[21] In particular, his teaching on showing ἐντροπή to the bishop and deacons should be understood in the context of the church's power struggle rather than treating it as Ignatius' personal agenda in establishing the threefold order of ministry. In the next section, I will explore how Ignatius employs the word group ἐντροπή to respond to the issues happening in churches and to achieve the identity-shaping process for the communities.

5. Unity and Concord: Εντροπη for Promoting Social Cohesion

The word group ἐντροπή appears four times in Ignatius' letters and is translated as both "to shame" and "to respect" in Ignatius' letters. Regarding the meaning of "to respect", Ignatius urges the community to give "all the respect" (ἐντροπή) to bishop Damas (Ign. *Magn.* 3:1). He also encourages the community to "respect" (ἐντρέπεσθε) one another in order to maintain the three orders of ministry—bishop, presbyter, and deacons (Ign. *Magn.* 6:2, cf. Ign. *Trall.* 3.1, Ign. *Smyrn.* 8.1).[22] On the other hand, regarding the meaning of "to shame", he mentions that his word would make the community "ashamed" (ἐντρέπεσθε) (Ign. *Magn.* 12:1). In the following, I will argue that Ignatius uses the word group ἐντροπή to protect the identity of the community by enforcing the group ethos of showing respect to the leading authorities, and to draw a strict line between Christianity and Judaism.[23]

5.1. To Respect the Bishop (Ign. Magn. 3:1)

In his letter to Magnesians, Ignatius employs the word group ἐντρέπω to urge the believers to respect the bishop Damas, in order to uphold the concord of the community (Ign. *Magn.* 3:1). Ignatius starts this letter with a prayer that there may be a "union of flesh and spirit" among the believers. The union of flesh and spirit originated from Jesus Christ and is now used to refer to the Magnesian community (Ign. *Magn.* 1:2). The pairing of "flesh and spirit" is followed by the works of "faith and love" in the community (Ign. *Magn.* 1:2). The juxtaposition of these pairs expresses Ignatius' prayerful wish for the solidarity of the community. In fact, the union between the Father and the Son serves as the model for the unity of the community (Ign. *Magn.* 7:2, 13:2). Also, Ignatius points out that this unity is highly correlated to one's attitudes toward the bishop, deacons, and the presbyters. By using the terms "grace" and "law" to signify the qualities of the bishop and the presbyters, Ignatius has high regard for them as they represent the fullness of the divine revelation (Ign. *Magn.* 2:1) To achieve the purpose of unity, Ignatius urges the community to show "all the respect" (ἐντροπή) to bishop Damas, despite his youthfulness (Ign. *Magn.* 3:1).

Then, Ignatius continues to give a few reasons for this act of submission. He argues for the divine status of the bishop by stating that to yield respect to the bishop is, in fact, honoring God the Father (Ign. *Magn.* 3:1). To deceive the bishop is then equivalent to cheating God, who is unseen and all-powerful (Ign. *Mag.* 3:1–2). Indeed, Ignatius' high regard for the bishop is also evident in his letter to Ephesians, stating that "For Jesus Christ, our inseparable life, is the mind of the Father, just as the bishops appointed throughout the world are in the mind of Christ". (Ign. *Eph.* 3:2). Ehrman translates the second part of this verse to mean bishops "share the mind of Jesus Christ".[24] The bishops are even "presiding in the place of God" (Ign. *Mag.* 6:1). Thus, for Ignatius, the bishops have "a unique blend of local and universal authority", and they are "presided over their congregations in God's place and by God's spirit" (Smith 2011).

Since Ignatius has a high view of the status of the bishop, to show ἐντροπή to the bishop is not merely an act of courtesy but serves to centralize the activities of the church and to uphold the unity of the community. Regarding the idea that the bishop is the τύπον τοῦ πατρός (Ign. *Trall.* 3:1), Allen Brent rightly argues for the bridging function of the bishop in expressing the divine realities so that that the assembly would be able to participate in the divine reality (Brent 2006). It is through the three-fold ministry that one can bridge the spiritual and earthly realms. As the bishop bears the image of God, it is unacceptable to profess devotion to God while not submitting to the authority of the bishop. Ignatius argues against those who "do everything without regard for [the bishop]" (Ign. *Magn.* 4:1), as they only have an empty talk without a work of obedience. This idea of "doing everything without regard for the bishop" is repeated in other places (cf. Ign. *Magn.* 7.1, Ign. *Trall.* 7.2; Ign. *Phld.* 4). Those people are condemned as not meeting the criteria in accordance with the commandment, which may refer to the principles of faith and love that are essential for the unity of the church (Ign. *Magn.* 4:1, cf. Ign. *Magn.* 1:2). These people are also choosing the way of death in following the worldly way and refusing to have a humble submission to the bishop, all of which are considered as bearing the stamp of the world. (Ign. *Magn.* 5:2).

In light of this, to show ἐντροπή to the bishop means to align oneself with the teaching of the church authority. The use of ἐντροπή word group has the rhetorical purposes of achieving unity of the church and fighting against unacceptable teachings by securing everybody under the leadership of the bishop and elders (Campbell 1994). Under this context, the word group ἐντροπή functions in several ways: (1) it demonstrates the full awareness of the people that the bishop is the image bearer of God, (2) it urges the people to know their place in the community and to show the bishop proper respect, (3) it restrains oneself from having any dissent activities or theology, including holding a meeting without the supervision of the bishop, (4) it centralizes church's activities under the leadership of the bishop, and (5) it fosters social bond between the community members and the church authorities. This attitude of ἐντροπή would then hold the church together, like "the strings of a harp and the congregation sings in tune with it so as to render fitting praise to God (*Eph.* 4:1–2)". (Campbell 1994). The use of the word group ἐντροπή is close to the function of social cohesion promotion, as mentioned by Douglas Cairns.

5.2. To Respect One Another (Ign. Magn. 6:2)

Other than arguing for submission to the bishop, in his letter to Magnesians, Ignatius also uses the word group ἐντρέπω to urge community members "to respect one another" for the concord of the whole community. Ignatius stresses that concord for the whole community is achieved because of the three orders of ministry, with the bishop "presiding in the place of God", the presbyters "in the place of the council of the apostles", and the deacons "entrusted with the ministry of Jesus Christ". (Ign. *Magn.* 6:1). Given their authority as entrusted by Jesus, Ignatius urges the Magnesians to "respect" one another (Ign. *Magn.* 2:2, ἐντρέπεσθε). This designation of "one another" may refer to the community in general, as followed by the term "neighbor". However, it may also include those who are in leading positions, as Ignatius later argues that the community needs to be "united

with the bishop and with those who lead". (Ign. *Magn.* 6:2). To love one another is based on one's authority as sent by God. This way of obedience is modeled after Christ's obedience to the Father (Ign. *Magn.* 13:2) and can be applied to other relationships, such as husband–wife (Pol. *Phil.* 5:1). The end result of showing respect is harmony (Ign. *Magn.* 6:2). As such, the word group ἐντρέπω functions to invite the Magnesians to examine their attitude toward the ministers and others, to ensure that there is no division among them. This usage of ἐντρέπω serves the function of social cohesion promotion, as mentioned by Douglas Cairns.

5.3. To Respect the Deacon (Ign. Trall. 3.1, Ign. Smyrn. 8.1)

The word διάκονος (deacon) appears 18 times in Ignatius' letters. It is important to note that Ignatius uses the term συνδούλος (fellow slave) when referring to the work of the deacons (Ign. *Eph.* 2:1; Ign. *Magn.* 2:1; Ign. *Smyrn.* 12:2; Ign. *Phld* 4.1). However, Ignatius does not use δούλος to describe himself. Then, what does it mean to show ἐντροπή to a fellow slave (Ign. *Trall*. 3:1, Ign. *Smyrn.* 8:1)? It seems that the use of συνδούλου in depicting deacons serves to emphasize their active role in practical ministry, and the close personal bond between Ignatius and certain deacons (Ign. *Mag.* 2:1). Ignatius also describes himself as one who is bound (δεδεμαι), as opposed to the Magnesians who are released (λελυμένοι). In light of this, the idea that deacons as fellow slaves refers to the fact that they serve the church earnestly.

In his letter to Trallians, Ignatius emphasizes that the deacons should not be overshadowed by their regular task of managing drinks and food. Ignatius affirms that they constitute the very identity of the church. Deacons are "the mysteries of Jesus Christ. . . servants of the church of God" (Ign. *Trall.* 2:3). The phrase "mysteries of Jesus Christ" may refer to the word of God or the ministry of Jesus Christ (cf. Ign. *Magn.* 6:1, Ign. *Phld.* 11:1, Ign. *Smyrn.* 10:1). Ignatius also has high regard for the deacons, as shown by his appreciation of deacon Zotion for his obedience to the bishop and presbytery (Ign. *Magn.* 2:1). Ignatius even urges people to show ἐντροπή to the deacons as Jesus Christ himself (Ign. *Trall.* 3:1). The authority of the deacons is once again affirmed by the phrase "without these (referring to bishop, presbyters and deacons) no group can be called a church" (Ign. *Trall.* 3:1). In this regard, it is clear that, for Ignatius, *all* three orders of ministry represent the church's authority, with the bishop "presiding in the place of God", the presbyters "in the place of the council of the apostles", and the deacons "entrusted with the ministry of Jesus Christ". (cf. Ign. *Magn.* 6:1). Ignatius appeals to the community not only be obedient to the bishop but to the three-order ministry (cf. Ign. *Mag.* 13:1). Given that the deacons constitute part of the church's leadership, to show ἐντροπή to the deacons implies aligning oneself with the authority of the church. Doing this further implies stopping any division among the churches and rejecting any unacceptable teachings, as Ignatius viewed all meetings held without the presence of deacons as schismatic (Ign. *Trall.* 7:2).

Then, in his letter to Smyrnaeans, Ignatius is responding to the issue of Docetism (Ign. *Smyrn.* 4:2–6:2). Perhaps in the household gatherings, as suggested by Harry Maier, the leaders have welcomed false teachers (Ign. *Smyrn.* 4:1, cf. Ign. *Eph.* 9:1, Ign. *Phld.* 11:1) to teach the doctrine of Docetism (Maier 2002). The phrase "do not let a high position make anyone proud" (Ign. *Smyrn.* 6:1) may suggest that it is a member in a high position who is causing the divisions in the church.[25] The docetic teachers may also be connected to the people inciting trouble in Ign. *Eph.* 9:1, who traveled from Ephesus to Smyrna and gained considerable influence in the household meetings. Nevertheless, Ignatius warns the congregation, "let no one be misled" (Ign. *Smyrn.* 6:1).[26] Indeed, their docetic teaching eventually leads to the destruction of the love and unity of the church. The opponents not only welcome false teachers into the congregation, but they also neglect caring for the widow, orphan, oppressed, prisoner, and the hungry and thirsty (Ign. *Smyrn.* 6:2). Following Ignatius' condemnation of the lack of love, he immediately argues that "they [the opponents] refuse to acknowledge that the Eucharist is the flesh of our savior Jesus Christ" (Ign. *Smyrn.* 6:2). "Those who deny the gift of God [would] perish in their

contentiousness. . . [and] it would be more to their advantage to love, in order that they might also rise up" (Ign. *Smyrn.* 6:2). In light of this, there is a close connection between docetic teaching and the neglect of care is evident. As David Downs succinctly summarizes, "Ignatius implies that a lack of love- that is, caring for the needy- and a denial of salvific importance of the flesh of Jesus Christ are tied together" (Downs 2016).

Under this context, Ignatius urges the church to flee from the divisions, to follow the bishop and the council of presbyters, and to ἐντρέπεσθε deacons in accordance with the commandments of God (Ign. *Smyrn.* 8:1). Ignatius' advice is immediately followed by his idea that the only valid Eucharist is under the authority of the bishop (Ign. *Smyrn.* 8:1). In this regard, to ἐντρέπεσθε the church leaders, including the deacons, implies centralizing church's activities under the supervision of the bishop, thereby aligning oneself with the authority of church leadership. This way of showing allegiance also means renouncing any docetic teachings, which would further shape people's view on their practice of love for the poor.

To conclude, to show ἐντροπή to the deacon means (1) to stay away from those opponents who cause division in the church, (2) to renounce the false teaching of Docetism and to accept Jesus's bodily resurrection and death, (3) to have a renewed understanding on their practice of love to the needy, (4) to know one's proper place and to show appropriate respect to the church leadership, and (5) to allow the church's leaders "to increase control and solidarity among the groups which constitute the community, rather than prescribing a single valid meeting" (Maier 2002). This usage of ἐντρέπω aligns with the functions of social cohesion promotion, as mentioned by Douglas Cairns.

5.4. Summary

To sum up, Ignatius uses the word ἐντροπή to promote the social cohesion of the churches by urging the community members to respect the church authority and one another. To show ἐντροπή to the church authorities means that people need to have full awareness of the authorities that are bestowed by God. People need to be aware of their proper place in the community and show appropriate, respectful attitudes to the bishop, elders, and deacons. People also need to engage in constant self-assessment to restrain themselves from participating in dissent activities or theologies, such as holding a meeting without the consent of the bishop or inviting false teachers into their meetings, which may further lead to division. Furthermore, to show ἐντροπή to the church authorities means to denounce unacceptable teachings, whether it is Docetism or continual adherence to Jewish practices. In effect, to show ἐντροπή entails centralizing and strengthening the bishop's control over the church's activities and its theology, thereby enhancing unity and concord. Εντροπὴν, in this context, demonstrates the function of mutuality in that it emphasizes both a proper restraint on oneself and others. Εντροπὴν then becomes an "important force for social control" and it "[regulates] the behavior of . . . individuals in a civil community" (Kaster 2005).

6. Maintaining Central Beliefs: Εντροπη as Just Criticism and Sense of Shame

In his letter to Magnesians, after mentioning the issue of adhering to certain Jewish customs and teachings (Ign. *Magn.* 8–10), Ignatius uses the word group ἐντρέπω to mention that his word would make the community "ashamed" (ἐντρέπεσθε) (Ign. *Magn.* 12:1). Michael Holmes translates this phrase as "you feel ashamed", but Bart Ehrman translates this as "you are respectful". Such discrepancy in their translation further attests to the puzzling question of why ἐντρέπω can mean both "to shame" and "to respect" at the same time. In this section, I will argue that the word group ἐντρέπω serves the functions of just criticism and the sense of shame in the context of Ign. *Mag.* 12:1.

Ignatius argues that adherence to certain Jewish customs and teachings is contrary to the teaching of the Scripture (Ign. *Magn.* 8–10) and is endangering the concord of the community. Some people in the community are encouraging the community to live in accordance with Judaism by observing Sabbath and other ancient practices (Ign. *Magn.* 8:1,

9:1). Ignatius considers it as "bad yeast" that has become "stale and sour" (Ign. *Magn.* 8:1, 10:3). He explicitly argues that "it is utterly absurd to profess Jesus Christ and to practice Judaism" at the same time (Ign. *Magn.* 10:3). In this regard, Ignatius argues that to practice Judaism is adhering to the old practices, and the term "old" is used to describe things that are opposed to God (*Eph.* 19:3). The issue at stake is whether one is living "according to Christ Jesus", and not "according to Judaism" (Ign. *Magn.* 8:2). Furthermore, Ignatius considers certain teachings of Judaism as "strange doctrine or antiquated myths" (Ign. *Mag.* 8:1). He names one of these wrong teachings, which echo with Jewish fables (Ign. *Mag.* 8:2) (Goulder 1999). Those "strange doctrines" are also evident in the anti-Docetism warning in Ign. *Magn.* 11.

Under this context, Ignatius explains that the reason for writing is not to criticize the Magnesian community but to warn them against possible problems in adhering to certain Jewish customs and teachings (Ign. *Magn.* 11:1). Ignatius even praises the Magnesian community for not being conceited and mentions that he himself cannot be compared with one of them (Ign. *Magn.* 12:1). However, this does not mean that there are no problems within the community. For example, Ignatius expresses appreciation towards the Philadelphians for maintaining harmony while having full knowledge of the division that is happening in the community (Ign. *Phld.* 1:1, 7:2). In this regard, Ignatius words of praise appear to serve as a rhetorical device that invites the community to re-examine their own practices, which is also evident in the quotation of Prov 18:17 LXX.

The original context of Prov 18:17 LXX is about handling conflicts in the law court to settle disputes. The co-text of Prov 18:17 LXX points to the importance of active listening by pointing out that the foolish ones choose to be heard rather than to listen carefully (Prov 18:13 LXX). In contrast, the wise ones are aware of selective listening, and they would seek the wisdom teaching to be "internalized to [have] good effect (Koptak 2003). The focus on active listening continues by pointing out that the litigation will not be settled until both sides are heard (Prov 18:17 LXX). The one who considers themselves righteous need to present evidence to plead not guilty. In this context, by combining rhetorical praise with a legal metaphor from Prov 18:17 LXX, Ignatius urges the Magnesian community to re-examine their practices if they are guilty of living according to Judaism. The ultimate judgment rests with God, who will resolve disputes and separate those who contend in legal matters (Prov 18:18 LXX). Therefore, to avoid being shamed, the Magnesian community must assess their practices if they are indeed continuing to adhere to Judaism.

Hence, Ignatius' use of the word group ἐντρέπω is then close to the functions of just criticism and the sense of shame, as mentioned by Cairns. It functions in the following ways: (1) it explicitly denounces the act of continual adherence to certain Jewish practices and customs, (2) it allows people to see how the continuing Jewish practices would endanger their Christian identity, (3) it urges people to have an attitude of repentance and repudiation, (4) it makes people feel ashamed so that they have a sense of personal responsibility, and (5) it encourages people to modify their behavior or act so that they will avoid leading to the state of disgrace in the future.

7. Conclusions

In this paper, by focusing on the letters of Ignatius, I investigated the puzzling fact that the word group ἐντροπή can mean both "to shame" and "to respect". Ignatius is one author who uses ἐντροπή to mean both to shame and to respect. The central thesis of this paper is that Ignatius uses the word group ἐντροπή to shape the church's identity by rejecting beliefs/customs that are unacceptable to Christianity and to promote the church's unity through obedience to church authorities. The puzzling situation of meaning both "to shame/to respect" points to the fundamental issue that the emotion words in ancient Greek and modern English cannot map perfectly to one another. Also, there is no single English terminology that can correctly capture the meaning of ἐντροπή. In light of this, I suggested that we need to pay attention to the pragmatic narrative context to understand the functions of the word ἐντροπή.

To broaden our understanding of the functions of ἐντροπή, I engaged with the work of Douglas Cairns, who studied the classical usage of the word αἰδώς. Then, stemming from Cairns' work, I first provided a provisional definition of ἐντροπή. I suggest that ἐντροπή is a self-inhibitory emotion of sensitivity to one's proper place in social interaction to protect one's self-image.

Then, turning to the letters of Ignatius, I argued that, when this word group is used in association with the bishop, deacons, and other church authorities, it functions to promote social cohesion. The use of the word group ἐντροπή asks the community members to be fully aware of church leaders' authorities bestowed by God. Εντροπὴν becomes a force for social control as it regulates the behavior and theology of the church members. Second, I argued that, when this word group is used in association with the problems of the church, it functions as just criticism and instills a sense of shame among the congregation. Εντροπὴν urges people to have an attitude of repentance and to change their minds to avoid continuing the unacceptable practices/teachings.

The significance of this paper is as follows. First, it poses a challenge to Bruce Malina's honor–shame model, which has often provided a generalized meaning of 'honor' and 'shame' in the Mediterranean world. In particular, they fail to notice that certain shame word groups (1) contain both the meanings of shame and guilt and (2) can be translated as both "to shame" and "to respect"., as examined in this paper. Second, this paper has broadened our understanding of the use of shame in the ancient context. As opposed to the traditional Western understanding that shame is the feeling resulting from transgression against one's identity, this paper demonstrated that shame can be used in a positive way to shape people's identity in alignment with God. Last, the study of the word ἐντροπή reveals the underlying epistemological issue of the danger of simply projecting our modern understanding of shame into the ancient world. Understanding the use of emotion words in the ancient context is in itself a cross-cultural study.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement: Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement: No new data were created or analyzed in this study. Data sharing is not applicable to this article.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflicts of interest.

Notes

1 For a detailed explanation of the development of the social–historical and social–scientific criticism, see Horrell (2002).

2 Malina (2001, pp. 29–30). "Authority" refers to the ability to control others without coercive force. "Gender status" refers to acceptable behaviors concerning different genders. "Respect" refers to attitudes towards superiors and divine beings.

3 The agonistic nature of honor–shame is based on the idea that honor is a limited good in the 1st CE Mediterranean world. See Malina (2001, p. 36).

4 Malina (2001, p. 52). There are other scholars who refuse to superimpose Malina's honor–shame model onto the text and attempt to offer a more sophisticated and culturally nuanced understanding of honor–shame. DeSilva suggests that honor–shame discourse helps maintain adherence to the moral values of a subcultural group. Specifically, when individuals enter a minority culture, they must redefine what constitutes significant others within that community to uphold the group's moral values and mitigate the coercive influence of the dominant culture. In doing so, deSilva expands the honor–shame dynamic by exploring the following four key aspects: honor–shame in the dominant culture and honor–shame within the minority culture. However, deSilva's concept of honor discourse still operates within an agonistic framework centered on the competition for honor and the avoidance of shame. Pursuing moral qualities, in his view, is only feasible when fully engaged in this system of challenge and response. In this paper, I argue that, in ancient literature, shame can manifest as a display of modest, inhibitory behavior, as well as sensitivity to appropriate conduct at the right moments and the maintenance of proper reciprocal relationships with others. See DeSilva (2000, p. 25).

5 Crook highlights two mistakes in Malina's model. First, Crook argues that Malina's model focuses on an individual's attempt to seek honor and avoid shame, but, in a collectivistic society, the meaning of honor–shame is determined by the People's Court of Reputation (PCR)—the significant body that defines the values and norms of a social group. Also, Crook recognizes that there

are several competing PCRs in any social situation, and their values conflict. Thus, to explain the value conflict between the dominant and minority cultures, Crook proposes that "the court of reputation has been shifted away from the general public" toward the minority culture. Furthermore, Crook rejects Malina's claim that challenges and ripostes can only occur between parties of equal status, as there are different scenarios in the Bible where challenges come from people of lower status. Crook explains how those challenges can still be considered a threat to the superior because their source of affirmation comes from the PCR. In this regard, Crook suggests replacing Malina's terms "ascribed honour" and "acquired honour" with the new terms "attributed honour" and "distributed honour". The new definitions stress the absolute authority of the PCRs that the PCRs can attribute or distribute honor or shame in a given society. Zeba (2012).

6 Konstan (2006, p. 15). For more discussion of the use of the word αἰδώς to signify both shame and guilt, see Cairns (2011, pp. 14–26).

7 Regarding the word group ἐντροπή, the lexical meanings provided in BDAG contain both "to shame" and to "have regard for/ respect". See BDAG, s.v. "ἐντρέπω". When it is translated as "to respect", see (Ign. *Trall.* 3.1, Ign. *Smyrn.* 8.1, Ign. *Magn.* 3:1). When it is translated as "to shame", see 1Cor 4:14, 6:5, 15:34. Regarding the word group αἰσχύνη, it consistently carries a negative sense of dishonor, referring to shameful deeds, disgrace, or humiliation in every occurrence in the New Testament and Septuagint. It appears 41 times in NT writings and 258 times in LXX. However, αἰσχύνη is translated as "to respect" when associated with the fear of the slaves (Did. 4:11, Barn. 19:7). Last, regarding the word group αἰδώς, LSJ defines αἰδώς "as a moral feeling, reverence, awe, respect for the feeling or opinion of others or for one's own conscience, and so *shame*,..., *sense of honor*". See LSJ, s.v. "αἰδώς". Regarding the meaning of "be ashamed", see Jdt 9:3, 4 Macc 12:11. For the meaning of "to respect", see 1Clem. 21:6, 4 Macc 5:7, Prov 24:23 LXX. This word appears more in classical Greek literature, such as Socrates and Aristotle's writing, and less in the LXX and NT. In this regard, some scholars argue that αἰδώς is an Attic word and commonly used in prose. For more discussion, see Tarnopolsky (2010).

8 Although the concept of shame and its specific meaning can vary across cultures, the bodily reaction associated with shame (the internal experience expressed externally) is universally recognized. This aspect could be further examined, but it falls outside this article's scope.

9 In this paper, I take the seven letters of the middle recension to be the authentic work of Ignatius of Antioch. For more discussion on the development of the collection of Ignatius' letters, see Pratscher (2010, pp. 91–115). Also, unless otherwise specified, in this paper, the translation of Ignatius' letters will be based on Holmes (2007).

10 Regarding the word group ἐντροπὴ, I am focusing on the noun ἐντροπὴ and the verb εντρεπω.

11 For more discussion on the cross-cultural mapping of emotion, see Kleinman (1991). Neurology also studies how different cultures perceive the same color differently: see Pastoureau and Cruse (2018). Also, Konston argues against Charles Darwin's claim that certain emotions are innate and universal to all humankind. See Konstan (2006, pp. 18–20).

12 For a more detailed explanation, see Cairns (2011, pp. 7–24).

13 Kaster (2005, pp. 7–8). Similarly, Anna Wierzbicka argues that the study of English emotion words should not focus on their lexical form. See Wierzbicka (1999).

14 Cairns (2011, p. 13). David Harvey's analysis on facework also aligns with Cairns' idea that shame is an inhibitory emotion. According to Harvey, Harvey introduces a more nuanced conception of shame as face-sensitivity, emphasizing the importance of maintaining a reciprocal public image in relation to others within a group. To maintain one's status in a group, a person must embody both the moral and social qualities deemed essential. His concept of facework aligns with my argument that shame is a self-inhibitory modest attitude, facilitating appropriate and respectful interactions among community members. See Harvey (2016).

15 (Cairns 2011, p. 13). Cairns' observation aligns with Gabrielle Taylor who argues that the issue at stake for shame is then not simply about the presence of the observer but is a "realization of an adverse discrepancy between the agent's assumptions about himself till now and the perspective offered by a more detached observer". Taylor (1985, p. 66).

16 Cairns did not provide a systematic summary of the different functions of αἰδως. Adopting Carins' insights, I summarize the above functions by myself.

17 For example, ἐντροπή and αἰσχύνω are used synonymously in LXX Isa 44:11; 45:16-17. Regarding the difference between αἰσχύνω and αἰδως, scholars studying classical Stoic theory suggest that αἰδως is a prospective "good emotion" of showing caution to one's situation, while αἰσχύνω is normal emotion close to fear. Then, αἰδως is restricted to the Stoic sage's usage, which is to guide against any unworthy behaviors. See Graver (2007, p. 208). David Konston also argues that Nemesius is the first to argue that αἰσχύνω is a retrospective emotion and αἰδως is a prospective emotion. See Konstan (2006, p. 97). However, in certain Greek literature, αἰσχύνω and αἰδως are used inter-changeable, cf. Odyssey, 7.305-06, 21.323-29. Douglas Cairns is helpful to summarize that "In ordinary Greek aidōs and aischunē are synonyms, except when the latter refers to a disgraceful state of affairs rather than the individual's reaction to that state, but aidōs is the older and more poetic term, and it draws its claim to be considered as a virtue from its use in highly poetic contexts where something of the importance originally accorded the concept is preserved". See Cairns (2011, p. 10).

[18] Cairns (2011, p. 13). For a fuller investigation of the provisional meaning of the word group ἐντροπή, we need to use the deduction method to study each of its occurrences in ancient Greek literature. Due to the scope of this paper, I will adopt the provisional definition from the study of Carins.

[19] I borrow the term "social worry" from Robert Kaster, who studies the function of shame word groups in its Latin form. See Kaster (2005, pp. 1–27).

[20] Recently, scholars have been arguing against the dating of Ignatius' letters during the reign of Trajan (98–117 CE). For example, Thomas Lechner argues that the letters were composed no earlier than AD 165–175 to respond to the challenges posed by the teachings of Valentinus and other gnostic leaders. Thus, I take a broader timeframe for the dating of Ignatius' letters. See (Barnes 2008, pp. 119–30; Lechner 1999). For scholars reacting against the arguments of Thomas Lechner and Reinhard M. Hübner, see (Edwards 1998, pp. 214–26; Lindemann 1997, pp. 185–94).

[21] For more discussion on the social context of Ignatius' letters, see Stoops (1987, pp. 161–78). Also, Ignatius' letter should not be understood as anti-semantic, as he is opposed to the certain practices of Judaism, and not Jews per se. See the discussion of Smith (2011, pp. 37–56).

[22] In Ign. *Magn.* 3:1 and 6:2, both Michael Holmes and Bart Ehrman translate the word group ἐντρέπω as "respect". See (Holmes 2007, pp. 207, 211; Ignatius of Antioch 2003, pp. 243, 247).

[23] Robert Stoops rightly reminds us that Ignatius wrote an individual letter rather than as the representative of the church. Also, Ignatius himself had not visited all the churches, but he felt the obligation to respond to their internal issues. See Stoops (1987, p. 163). Also, for the teachings of ethics in Ignatius' writings, see Horn (2013, pp. 3–27).

[24] Ign. *Eph.* 3:2 [Ehrman].

[25] Both Maier and Schoedel suggest that the opponent is a presbyter (Maier 2002, pp. 147–98; Schoedel 1985, p. 230).

[26] The opponents in those household meetings may even be anti-bishop in Smyrna, as there is only "one altar, one bishop" (Ign. *Phld*. 4). Schoedel (1985, p. 236).

References

Aristotle. 1926. *The Art of Rhetoric*. Translated by John Henry Freese. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Barnes, Timonthy D. 2008. The Date of Ignatius. *ExpTim* 120: 119–30. [CrossRef]

Brent, Allen. 2006. The Enigma of Ignatius of Antioch. *JEH* 57: 429–56. [CrossRef]

Cairns, Douglas L. 2011. *Aidōs: The Psychology and Ethics of Honour and Shame in Ancient Greek Literature*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Campbell, R. Alastair. 1994. *The Elders: Seniority within Earliest Christianity*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.

DeSilva, David Arthur. 2000. *Honor, Patronage, Kinship & Purity: Unlocking New Testament Culture*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press.

Downs, David J. 2016. *Alms: Charity, Reward, and Atonement in Early Christianity*. Waco: Baylor University Press.

Edwards, Mark J. 1998. Ignatius and the second century: An answer to R. Hübner. *ZAC* 2: 214–26.

Goulder, Michael D. 1999. Ignatius' 'Docetists'. *VC* 53: 16–30. [CrossRef]

Graver, Margaret. 2007. *Stoicism & Emotion*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Harris, William V. 2001. *Restraining Rage: The Ideology of Anger Control in Classical Antiquity*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Harvey, David Stephen. 2016. Face in Galatians: 'Boasting in the Cross' as Reconfigured Honour in Paul's Letter. Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Manchester, Manchester, UK.

Herzfeld, Michael. 1980. Honor and Shame: Problems in the Comparative Analysis of Moral Systems. *Man* 15: 339–51. [CrossRef]

Holmes, Michael W. 2007. *The Apostolic Fathers-Greek Texts and English Translations*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

Horn, Friedrich Wilhelm. 2013. *Ethische Normen des frühen Christentums: Gut—Leben—Leib—Tugend*. WUNT 313. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Horrell, David G. 2002. Social Sciences Studying Formative Christian Phenomena: A Creative Movement. In *Handbook of Early Christianity: Social Science Approaches*. Edited by Anthony J. Blasi, Jean Duhaime and Paul-André Turcotte. Walnut Creek: Altamira, pp. 3–28.

Ignatius of Antioch. 2003. *The Apostolic Fathers*. Translated by Bart D. Ehrman. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, vol. 1.

Kaster, Robert A. 1997. The Shame of the Romans. *TAPA* 127: 1–19. [CrossRef]

Kaster, Robert A. 2005. *Emotion, Restraint, and Community in Ancient Rome*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kleinman, Arthur. 1991. *Rethinking Psychiatry: From Cultural Category to Personal Experience*. New York: Free Press.

Konstan, David. 2006. *The Emotions of the Ancient Greeks: Studies in Aristotle and Classical Literature*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Koptak, Paul E. 2003. *Proverbs: From Biblical Text to Contemporary Life*. NIVAC. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Lappenga, Benjamin J. 2016. *Paul's Language of Zῆλος: Monosemy and the Rhetoric of Identity and Practice*. BIS 137. Leiden: Brill, pp. 8–9.

Lechner, Thomas. 1999. *Ignatius Adversus Valentinianos? Chronologische und Theologischictliche Studien zu den Briefen des Ignatius von Antiochien*. VCSup 47. Leiden: Brill.

Lindemann, Andreas. 1997. Antwort auf die Thesen zur Echtheit und Datierung der sieben Briefe des Ignatius von Antiochien. *ZAC* 1: 185–94.

Maier, Harry. 2002. *The Social Setting of the Ministry as Reflected in the Writings of Hermas, Clement and Ignatius*. SCJ 11. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

Malina, Bruce J. 2001. *The New Testament World: Insights from Cultural Anthropology*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox.
Marshall, John W. 2005. The Objects of Ignatius' Wrath and Jewish Angelic Mediators. *JEH* 56: 1–23. [CrossRef]
Parkinson, Brian. 1995. *Ideas and Realities of Emotion*. London: Routledge.
Pastoureau, Michel, and Mark Cruse. 2018. *Blue: The History of a Color*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Pratscher, Wilhelm. 2010. *The Apostolic Fathers: An Introduction*. Waco: Baylor University Press.
Schoedel, William R. 1985. *Ignatius of Antioch: A Commentary on the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch*. Hermeneia 81. Philadelphia: Fortress.
Smith, Carl B. 2011. Ministry, Martyrdom, and other Mysteries: Pauline Influence on Ignatius of Antioch. In *Paul and the Second Century*. Edited by Michael F. Bird and Joseph R. Dodson. London: T & T Clark, pp. 37–56.
Stoops, Robert F. 1987. If I Suffer... Epistolary Authority in Ignatius of Antioch. *HTR* 80: 161–78. [CrossRef]
Tarnopolsky, Christina H. 2010. *Prudes, Perverts, and Tyrants: Plato's Gorgias and the Politics of Shame*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Taylor, Gabriele. 1985. *Pride, Shame, and Guilt: Emotions of Self-Assessment*. Oxford: Clarendon.
Trench, Richard Chenevix. 1976. *Synonyms of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
Wierzbicka, Anna. 1999. *Emotions across Languages and Cultures: Diversity and Universals*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Zeba, Crook. 2012. *Reconceptualising Conversion: Patronage, Loyalty, and Conversion in the Religions of the Ancient Mediterranean*. BZNW 130. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.