SURVEILLANT DISCIPLINE

PANOPTIC VISION IN EARLY CHRISTIAN SELF-DEFINITION

David M. Reis, *University of Oregon*

Michel Foucault's groundbreaking work on power and knowledge has generated considerable interest among scholars seeking to clarify how these concepts operated in early Christian literature. One mode of power that Foucault identified as representative of the modern era finds expression in the Panopticon, the prison-house whose creator, Jeremy Bentham, designed to regulate inmates through observation. While Foucault thought that this technology marked a new age in the history of discipline and punishment, this essay argues that Bentham's discussion of the panoptic gaze and its effects on those surveiled can be found in the literature of antiquity. Early Christian writers used panoptic rhetoric both to establish the authority of God, Jesus, and early Christian leaders and to encourage their audiences to watch over themselves and others. They thus sought to establish a 'technology of the self' and circumscribe communal boundaries based upon a system marked by surveillant discipline.

'Discipline "makes" individuals'
— Michel Foucault

INTRODUCTION

'We are much less Greeks than we believe', remarked Foucault in his comparison of the mechanisms of power used in the ancient and modern worlds.[1] For Foucault, antiquity exercised authority through the spectacle, that ritualized drama in which power impressed itself upon the masses. This situation changed in the eighteenth century, however, when surveillance replaced the spectacle as the primary mechanism for disciplining society. As a result, 'the pomp of sovereignty [and] spectacular manifestations of power' found in ancient temples and amphitheatres gave way to the Panopticon, a technology designed to regulate others by means of an omnipresent, overpowering gaze (Foucault 1979: 216–217; 1980).

That the spectacle was a crucial vehicle for articulating power in the Hellenistic world is unquestionable: this feature of ancient life is central for understanding various facets of imperial culture.[2] Yet is it possible to maintain that panopticism did not appear until the modern age? Recent studies would suggest otherwise, having noted, for instance, the role of surveillance for monitoring civic and sexual identities, constructing gender and shaping the contours of orthodoxy and heresy.[3] Everyone, it seems, was either inspecting others or being scrutinized. In this, Christians were no different from their pagan counterparts: Tertullian's derisive comment on the centrality of the gaze found at Roman spectacles – 'nobody going to the games thinks of anything else but seeing and being seen' – might easily be extended to discussions of virtually all aspects of early Christian life.[4] By stressing that both actions and thoughts were under constant surveillance, New Testament and other early Christian writers sought to establish and reinforce an emerging technology of power based upon discipline and interrogation. Their panoptic discourse thus seeks to 'produce' Christians who are mindful of divine supervision, obedient and submissive to authority, and ever-watchful of their neighbours and themselves.

PANOPTIC CURRENTS IN GRECO-ROMAN ANTIQUITY

Such practices, however, were not unique to Christianity. Seeing and being seen were essential components in the rhythms of Greco-Roman social life.[5] Of all the senses, the philosophers regularly gave vision primacy for its capacity to contemplate God and the majesty of the universe.[6] Varro (*Ling. lat*. 6.80), too, recognizing the significance of eyes' power, states, 'I see (*video*) from sight, that is from force (*a vi*) … the strongest of the five senses … the force of the eyes' perception reaches even to the stars'. This observation, which reflects upon the active quality of vision, is a reminder that in the ancient world, vision had the power to penetrate and examine, to get to the 'truth' of the matter. Through vision, a person gained insight into another's character.[7] Thus Cicero (*Nat. deor*. II.145) remarks that 'the eyes judge (*iudicant*) beauty and arrangement … and also other more important matters, for they also recognize (*cognoscunt*) virtues and vices, the angry and the friendly, the joyful and the sad, the brave man and the coward, the bold and the craven', an idea expressed more succinctly by Plautus: 'Look, and you'll know' (*Bacch*. 123).

The power embedded in the gaze extended to all levels of society. In the highly orchestrated world of the empire, a system of 'mutual surveillance' appeared to confirm status and clarify social relationships.[8] Vision played a prominent role in the 'contest' or 'battlefield' of life; it was the medium through which honour was expressed or defended. As a result, in the cultural *agon* of antiquity, where active characteristics were superior to passive traits, commanding the authority to watch others was a sign of superiority, while acting as the subject of another's gaze contributed to a person's inferiority: 'the defendant … is a defendant because he is seen, the judge … because he sees, is a judge', as Tertullian wryly remarks.[9] Ancient sources repeatedly note that a well-timed stare might signify domination, abuse, or cruelty, while a gentle gaze signaled reverence and generosity to a person of lesser status.[10] Epictetus (*Diss*. IV.4.9–10) captures the intersection between vision and status when he describes the Cynic philosopher as one who approaches Caesar as confidently as he would someone of no reputation, for 'a man of tranquility, of imperturbability, [and] of sedateness', has mastered the power of the gaze, 'observing what happens rather than being … observed' (*blepeis mallon ta ginomena e blepe*).

Like Epictetus' Cynic, the gods and emperors also possessed surveillant powers. Classical playwrights contended that the deities graciously 'watched over' (*episkopein*) humanity, an idea that Epictetus refined when he argued that God's vision extended throughout the universe, perceiving not only people's deeds but also their inner motivations and ideas (*Diss*. II.14.11; see also Beyer 1964: 600, 609–610). Aelius Aristides (*Or*. 26.103–105) also remarks on the omniscience of the divine, noting that the gods, 'watching from above', benevolently assist the emperor in ordering the world. As the gods' representative on earth, the vision of the emperor is similarly acute. Plutarch calls him the 'image of God', while Horace compares the breadth of Augustus' *imperium* to the reach of the sun's rays.[11] Even Pliny (*Pan*. 80.3), not known for his hyperbole, exalts Trajan as a 'swift-moving star' in his management of the empire, exclaiming, you 'see all, hear all, and [are] present (*omnia invisere omnia audire … adesse*) at once with aid wherever your help is sought'. Like ship captains or generals, emperors watch everything to ensure the safety of those under their leadership (Dio Chrys. *Or*. 3.62–67). The asymmetrical nature of the gaze was not lost upon the empire's inhabitants, who nervously tolerated its more perverse forms[12] even while the state's propaganda machine inundated them with words and images underscoring the emperor's assiduous attention to the preservation of imperial concord (Lotz 2007:

27–52; Brent 1999: 67–71; Zanker 1990: 81, 91, 93, 99, 129). If military force carved out the boundaries of the empire, it was the watchful eye of the emperor that maintained its integrity, reminding the Romans of the immutable 'relationship of power between subject and ruler' (Price 1984: 248; Carter 2002: 455–466).

The activity of vision, whether understood as real or figural, was not simply a way to express power relationships. It was also regularly deployed in philosophical discussions on the good life. Epictetus (*Diss*. III.22.77–78), for instance, classifies the Cynic as the 'scout' (*kataskopos*) whom God charges with 'exercising oversight (*episkopountes*) … over all humanity, observing what they are doing, how they are spending their lives, what they are careful about and what they undutifully neglect'. Fulfilling his role to 'watch over (*hyperegrupneken*) humanity and toil on their behalf', he gains the courage to speak freely, and by virtue of his spotless character acquires the respect of others. Like a general, who 'oversees and reviews and watches over his troops, and punishes those who are guilty of a breach of discipline', Epictetus contends that the 'proper concern' of the philosopher is to observe humanity (*Diss*. III.22.97; Castelli 1991: 100–101). Moreover, as a representative and friend of God, the Cynic appropriates his moral capital so skillfully that he becomes omniscient: he 'has so many eyes' (*hosa ommata echei*), Epictetus (*Diss*. III.22.103) states, that the mythic creature Argus would be considered blind by comparison.

The philosopher does not only impart divine truths to humanity; he also acts as a model for imitation for those seeking to live a virtuous life. For Epictetus and others, Socrates, Epicurus and Diogenes functioned as such exemplars.[13] Seneca (*Ep*. 11.10; 24.1–26; 25.6) expands the list to include statesmen such as Cato, Laelius or Scipio, advising his friend Lucilius that any one of them should be kept 'ever before your eyes (*semper ante oculus*), living as if he were watching (*spectante*) you, and ordering all your actions as if he beheld (*vidente*) them'.[14] Even if a guide was not chosen, he still maintains that it is essential to live as if under constant scrutiny, from others as well as the self: 'act, in whatever you do, as … if anyone at all were looking on' (*tamquam spectat aliquis*); and '[e]xamine yourself; scrutinize and observe yourself in diverse ways' were Seneca's constant refrains.[15] So too Epictetus reminds his audience that embarking on the philosophic life should not be undertaken lightly, but rather calls for serious introspection: the candidate must first 'look into a mirror' to determine whether he has the mettle for embarking upon such an enterprise, for it is only through continual inspection and self-discipline that the soul could proclaim itself victorious in the contest of life (*Diss*. III.22.51–52; *Ench*. 29.4–7).

INTERLUDE: BENTHAM'S PANOPTIC THEORY

This sketch of the significance of vision in antiquity corresponds with the major points of Jeremy Bentham's Panopticon, the name he gave to the prison building that emphasized coercion by means of observation (Semple 1993; Evans 1982: 195–235). Bentham imagined a prison shaped in a circle, with the inmates' cells located around the circumference, and at the centre, a lookout tower for the inspector (1962: 40–41, 82). In this scheme, vision rather than physical punishment was the primary disciplinary method: the inspector's position made all of the prisoners visible, but the use of blinds and strategic lighting made the inspector either completely invisible or visible only as an image or silhouette. Bentham thus combined the real presence of the inspector with his '*apparent omnipresence*', creating an impression of constant surveillance among the prisoners (40, 44–45; Evans 1982: 200, 206). Such discipline, he felt, would ultimately lead the inmates

to internalize the inspector's gaze, becoming, in effect, their own overseers, and transforming themselves from 'passive subjects to active workers at their own surveillance and normalization' (Shapiro 2003: 298). Moreover, when the prisoners socialized, Bentham predicted that inspection would lead them to monitor one another, in effect transforming them into fellow inspectors working for the moral improvement of all (45–47, 71–76, 164).

In his examination of Betham's model, Foucault (1980: 152, 155, 158; 1983: 130–131) lightly touches upon these last two features of panoptic surveillance, choosing instead to focus on the overpowering and coercive nature of the gaze. Yet self-discipline and communal oversight, ideas which Bentham (1962: 39) developed in his Postscript, are central for appreciating why he thought that he had discovered nothing less than 'a new mode of obtaining power of mind over mind'. The revolutionary aspect of this disciplinary technology lay in its application: not just prisons, but hospitals, insane asylums, manufacturing plants, and schools could all apply these techniques to re-form individuals for the betterment of society at large (39, 66).

THE DISCIPLINING GAZE: EARLY CHRISTIAN PANOPTICISM

These ideas, however, were not as novel as he had supposed, for early Christians, like their Greek and Roman counterparts, had already recognized the persuasive force derived from the deployment of a rhetoric of observation, and embedded it into their discussions of community order. As Christians 'wrote' themselves into the social world of the empire, the theme of surveillance repeatedly appears as a tool for self-definition. New Testament and early Christian authors thus speak of an invisible, omniscient God or a divine representative responsible for watching over humanity 'from above'. At the same time, they encouraged their audiences to deploy an equally important 'horizontal' gaze at their neighbours and themselves in order to ensure that every member of the community remained within the boundaries of 'true' Christianity.

THE NEW TESTAMENT

The vertical and horizontal dimensions of panopticism that Bentham outlined appear throughout the literature of the New Testament. Not surprisingly, God and Jesus are the ultimate inspectors: as an 'invisible' power, God, along with Jesus, his 'image',[16] possesses a vision that penetrates into the darkest corners of life: as Jesus states, 'there is nothing hidden, except to be disclosed; nor is anything secret, except to come to light' (Mk 4:22). In particular, God's concern for humanity reveals his caring oversight. The Jews, so Luke states, praise him because he has 'looked favourably' (*epeskepsato*) upon his people by bringing John the Baptist and Jesus into the world (1:68; 7:16; Fitzmyer 1981: 382–383, 660). In Acts 15:14 the apostle James too remarks on God's providential concern, but argues that it extends to non-Jews as well: 'God first looked favourably (*epeskapsato*) on the Gentiles, to take from among them a people for his name'. Just as God watches over the world, so too does Jesus act as an *episkopos*, a 'shepherd and guardian' (*poimena kai episkopos*) who heals people by turning them to the household of God (1 Pet 2:25; Achtemeier 1996: 204).

Yet the counterpart to this benevolent oversight is the punitive gaze that uncovers evil and admonishes surveilees that their salvation hangs in the balance. The Jesus of Revelation, for instance, repeatedly claims to 'know' (*oida*) both the external deeds and internal beliefs of the seven churches of Asia Minor and reminds them that salvation depends upon absolute fidelity

to him (2:1–3:22). This omniscience converges in panoptic statements such as those to the church Thyatira ('I am the one who searches minds and hearts, and I will give to each of you as your works deserve') and Sardis ('Wake up, and strengthen what remains and is on the point of death, for I have not found your works perfect in the sight (*enopion*) of my God') (2:23; 3:2).

These passages reveal the double-edged nature of divine observation. Depending upon one's relationship with God, his oversight is either a moment of comfort or a time for lamentation. As 1 Peter 3:12 maintains, 'the eyes of the Lord' (*ophthalmoi kuriou*) will fall upon the 'righteous', that is, those who live according to Christian principles, while 'the face of the Lord' (*prosopon … kuriou*) will punish those who do evil. The author of Hebrews similarly encapsulates the significance of panopticism when he states that before God 'no creature is hidden, but all are naked and laid bare to the eyes (*tois ophthalmois*) of the one to whom we must render an account' (4:13). Whether gentle or punitive, the divine gaze thus intersects with the promotion of correct beliefs and behaviour, reminding Christians that God's omniscience ultimately leads to rewards or punishments.

The panoptic accents credited to the apostles and the leaders of subsequent generations reinforce this strategy of coercive discipline. Luke (Acts 1:20; 20:17) shapes the apostles as overseers, a term applied as well to the Ephesian presbyters, and Paul (Phil 1:1) refers to the leaders in Philippi as *episkopoi* and *diakonoi*. Although the specific responsibilities of such figures remain obscure, and the distinctions between them are often fuzzy,[17] they apparently functioned to regulate community life through instruction, the exercise of judgment, and other administrative duties.[18] For Paul, this authority appears grounded in his understanding of the spirit, so that even when physically absent from his communities, he claims that his surveillant vision remains active and constant.[19] He thus pronounces judgment against a Corinthian congregant guilty of *porneia*, and apparently expects that the community will carry out his sentence of punishment (1 Cor 5:1–5; see also 2 Cor 10:1; 13:10; Phil 2:12). Alternatively, the author of Colossians casts a kindly glance on his addressees, informing them of his 'struggles' on behalf of all, even those who have not seen him in person. He then connects his agonistic achievements with his right to claim ecclesial oversight: although 'absent in body', he writes, 'I am with you in spirit, and I rejoice to see (*blepon*) your morale and the firmness of your faith' (2:5). This latter remark is especially instructive for understanding the letter's panoptic reach, for the author was neither the founder of this community, nor had he ever visited them. These facts, it would appear, are mere technicalities, for like Diogenes and Epictetus' Cynic, he is God's minister, commissioned to engage in a cosmic contest over truth in order to enlighten humanity (Col 1:21–29; 2:2–4, 8; MacDonald 2000: 78–95).

In the generations following the apostolic age, new leaders emerged to claim the role of guardians of the community's spiritual health. As Paul departs from Ephesus, Luke has the apostle exhort the elders to '[k]eep watch (*prosechete*) over yourselves and over all the flock (*poimnio*), of which the Holy Spirit has made you overseers (*episkopous*), to shepherd (*poimainein*) the church of God that he obtained with the blood of his own Son' (Acts 20:28). The same connection between shepherd and *episkopos* appears in 1 Peter 5:2, as the author instructs the presbyters 'to tend the flock (*poimanate*) of God that is in your charge, exercising the oversight (*episkopountes*) … as God would have you do it'.

While the transmission of authority was surely not as simple as these reports indicate, the rhetoric linking communal oversight to church officials is important for the shaping of communal discipline. The gaze of ecclesiastical officials, it would appear, keeps the corporate body unified (1 Tim 3:4–5). For 1 Timothy, the bishop should micro-manage his community, engaging with all members of the community, regulating widows and making a public spectacle of those who sin 'so that the rest … may stand in fear' (5:1–16, 20). The author does concede, however, that the bishop may not observe every act performed by the group, but even so he reassures Timothy that nothing escapes God's notice (5:24–25; Towner 2006: 376–378). This concession to human fallibility reveals the fragile character of the household of God, a point that underlies Luke's advice to the Ephesian leaders and Paul's admonition to the Romans 'to keep an eye on (*skopein*) those who cause dissensions and offenses, in opposition to the teaching that you have learned'.[20] All Christians must surveil each other in order to preserve the sanctity of the community. It is not enough, however, to judge others; the same critical eye must be directed inward to ensure there are no deviations from the straight path: '[t]ake care that you yourself (*skopon seauton … su*) are not tempted', Paul reminds the Galatians, for 'all must test their own work … [and] all must carry their own loads'.[21] At the same time, it is equally vital to watch those whose lives are worthy of commendation. Recalling the importance of finding a model for emulation, Paul exhorts the Philippians to 'join in imitating me (*summimetai mou*), and observe (*skopeite*) those who live according to the example (*tupon*) you have in us' (3:17).

THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS

The panoptic themes scattered throughout the New Testament are also in evidence in a few of the writings of the Apostolic Fathers, particularly those that address the problem of community discord and prescribe the 'true' way to perform Christianity. In their attempts to control and circumscribe beliefs and practices, it is not surprising to see these authors utilize a 'pastoral power' that attempts to regulate the community's outer performances and to direct the conscience of each member for the purpose of saving souls (Foucault 1983: 213–215; Castelli 1991: 122–124).

The earliest text in which these issues are especially prominent is *1 Clement*.[22] Written by a leading representative in Rome to a Corinthian community mired in controversy over the recent expulsion of its leaders, 'Clement' introduces panopticism to warn the schismatic Christians in Corinth that their actions contravene God's wishes and to persuade them to return to the 'apostolic' fold. To make this case he reminds the Corinthians of God's ultimate authority: as the 'the creator and overseer (*episkopon*) of every spirit', he is 'all-powerful' (*pantokrator*) and 'observes all things' (*pantepoptes*).[23] His surveillance, moreover, penetrates into the heart, so that 'none of our thoughts or disputes we have had are hidden from him' (21.3; see also 8.5; 13.4; 20.1–11; 21.2, 9; 27.2, 6–7; 28.1–4; 32.2–3). Because all people must subject themselves to his gaze, which is either compassionate or punitive (22.6), Clement exhorts the Corinthians to show reverence to God, 'leaving behind depraved desires for evil works' in order to 'be protected from the judgments that are to come' (28.1).

The prescription for receiving a favourable glance from God involves conforming one's dispositions to his will (29.1; 32.3–4; 35.4–5; 61.1). Specifically, God intends for humanity to imitate the principles of obedience, submission, and humility that define the cosmic order (16.17; 20.1–12; 21.1; 34.5; 56.1; 58.1; 60.4; Horrell 1996: 263, 279; Maier 1991: 131–132). This can

be achieved, Clement asserts, by modelling oneself after key figures in history whose actions corresponded to these virtues. Jesus, for instance, displayed humility during his earthly sojourn by playing the part of the suffering servant – experiencing pain through the assumption of human sins, he silently went to his death at the hands of his lawless enemies. Clement thus asks the Corinthians to follow his example, for, he states, 'if the Lord was humble-minded (*eta-peinophronesen*) in this way, what shall we ourselves do, who through him have assumed the yoke of his gracious favour?' (16.17; Maier 1991: 129–130).

In an even more concrete fashion, this 'image' of Jesus appears before the eyes of the congregation during the eucharistic celebration, when it is performed, that is, by the appropriate leaders. Clement's exhortation to restore the presbyters to their positions of authority becomes a critical test of the community's obedience and submission, for 'to gaze intently' (*atenisein*) on Christ's blood calls to mind his role in effecting repentance and salvation (7.4; Strelan 1991: 247–249; Fisher 1980). As the primary mediator between the heavenly and earthly realms, Jesus allows humanity to access God: it is through him that 'we gaze (*atenizomen*) into the heights of heaven … we see (*enoptrizometha*) the reflection of his perfect and superior countenance' (*ten amomon kai hypertaten opsin autou*), and we recognize that God 'has wished us to taste the knowledge of immortality' (36.1–2; see also 17.2; 19.2–3).

The scriptures too, inspired as they are by the Holy Spirit, offer another 'image' for discerning God's will. As a blueprint for 'acting in righteousness, truth, and patience, living in harmony, holding no grudges [and] living in love and peace with fervent goodness' (62.2–3), they provide specific examples about the dangers of ignorance, the value of humility, and, more generally, how to live in harmony with God's intent (39.1–9; 40.1; 45.1–8; 53.1–5). The great patriarchs, prophets, and kings of the Jewish tradition receive special commendation for their service to God, but Clement also praises others – unnamed Greco-Roman kings, Christian martyrs and the apostles – all of whom displayed virtues that must be emulated in the present (5.3–7; 6.2; 7.5–7; 9.2–12.8; 17.1-5; 18.1–17; 33.8; 55.1–6). The apostles, whom Clement thinks should be 'set before our eyes' (*labomen pro ophthalmon*), become Christian equivalents of Seneca's Cato and Scipio, revered 'saints' who can assist the Corinthians in eschewing divine wrath and (re)orienting themselves to God (5.3; 13.1; 14.1; 15.1; 19.1; 46.4).

It is not only the heroes of the past that deserve a place of honour; so too do present community leaders. According to Clement, the 'deposed' Corinthian presbyters are the legitimate successors to the apostles and had 'ministered (*leitourgesantas*) over the flock of Christ blamelessly and with humility, gently, and unselfishly' (44.3; 63.1). Because these presbyter-bishops carry out God's plan in Christian liturgical and community life (40.1–5; 41.1–2; 42.1–5; 44.1–2), Clement insists that they should be accorded honour and restored to their rightful place in the Corinthian community (1.3; 3.3; 21.6). When this is accomplished, Clement imagines the restoration of the Corinthians' relationship with God: they will have reacquired 'a deep and rich peace' marked by the presence of the Holy Spirit, and have entered into 'a gate of righteousness' that leads to an orderly life lived 'in Christ' (2.2; 48.2, 4). Those who refuse to do this are the enemies of God, preferring arrogance, *stasis* and disobedience over divine friendship (1.1; 3.1–4; 10.1; 35.5; 36.6; 41.3; 58.1; Maier 1991: 132–134).To determine the faithful from impious, Clement concludes that both self-inspection and the testing of others are essential for preserving the health of the community. One should thus pray for God's enlightenment in order to be counted among his elect (59.2–3). Confessing transgressions is also essential, a general rule for all members of

the group to follow (51.1, 3). In the case of the schismatics, Clement recommends that their confession must include the admission that they 'should be subject (*hypotagete*) to the presbyters and accept the discipline that leads to repentance' (*paideuthete eis metanoia*) (57.1). Furthermore, Clement insists, they should '[l]earn to be submissive (*mathete hypotassesthai*) … [and] lay aside the arrogant and haughty insolence' (57.2). At a communal level, interpersonal correction is also a necessary tool: '[w]e should welcome discipline (*paideian*) … no one should be irritated by it. It is good and supremely useful to rebuke one another, for this binds us to the will of God' (56.2). *Paideia* thus has a therapeutic function, transforming the observed into inspectors, as Bentham had imagined, healing those in danger of falling away from the faith and saving them from destruction (56.3–16; see also 13.3).

As the argument concludes, it appears that the letter, with all of its disciplinary force, seeks to mimic God's omniscience. To be sure, Clement never defends any of his statements by appealing to his own authority, and he hardly commands the stature enjoyed by later Roman bishops (Vinzent 2006: 404). Nevertheless, his letter represents the Roman church and demonstrates how this community could imagine itself 'looking over' the Corinthians with an authoritative demeanour: 'we see (*horomen*) that you have deposed some from the ministry held blamelessly in honour', he writes with exasperation (44.6). This stern tone coincides with other passages that admonish the Corinthians for their dangerous behaviour (7.1; 44.4; 46.5–9; 47.5–7; 59.1), yet alongside such comments are positive statements encouraging them to strive for their salvation and to follow the examples of past leaders (45.1; 46.1). Through this interplay, Clement attempts to (re)shape the community by reminding them that the true Christian is one who respects and submits to the authoritative traditions of the church.[24]

With similar aims in mind, Ignatius of Antioch, another 'outsider', appropriates a surveillant rhetoric in his letters addressed to various communities in Asia Minor. As with *1 Clement*, factionalism and harmony provide the backdrop for the utilization of this strategy. Having personal experience with these issues in Antioch, and encountering groups in Asia Minor that had a well-known reputation for diversity, Ignatius finds panopticism tailor made for promoting a Christian identity based upon obedience to authority and community concord.[25]

For Ignatius, the major obstacles for achieving Christian unity were the existence of false teachings and various practices done without the consent of ecclesial leaders. Although it is not clear whether all of the theological diversity he discusses was 'on the ground' in Asia Minor,[26] his repeated professions to know nothing of doctrinal error in these regions is most likely a rhetorical *topos*, and his confrontation with Judaizers in Philadelphia provides direct evidence that the bishop did not write solely from his experiences in Antioch (Schoedel 1985: 129). In fact, when read 'against the grain', his letters reveal communities professing various beliefs and practices. The Philadelphians apparently found the Jewish scriptures central for their identity, while *Ephesians* and *Smyrneans* reveal the existence of congregants who acted independently of episcopal leadership by arranging their own prayer meetings, eucharistic feasts, baptisms and weddings.[27] Even more overt challenges to authority existed in Magnesia and Tralles, with the latter community seemingly experiencing a division *within* its own ecclesiastical leadership (*Magn.* 3.1; 4.1; 7.1; *Trall.* 3.1; 12.2).[28]

To combat this divisive situation, Ignatius occasionally warns that those who act inappropriately will receive recompense from an invisible God, who along with Christ, watches over hu-

manity's actions.[29] Yet more pervasive is the bishop's desire to weave together a narrative grounded in the defence of his own authority and ecclesiastical leadership more generally. Ignatius does so first by announcing himself in each letter as an inspector-God. He is the self-styled 'God-bearer' (*theophoros*) who patterns his journey through Asia Minor upon the processions of the mystery religions and imperial cult.[30] Imitating the pageantry characteristic of these cults, Ignatius casts himself as an imitator of Jesus and proclaims the validity of the power of the Christian God. As a triumphant martyr, he can claim to possess knowledge of 'heavenly things' (*ta epourania*) and speak through a prophetic 'voice of God' (*theou phone*).[31]

Perhaps most importantly, the bishop uses the language of vision to assert his intimate understanding of each congregation, even though whatever knowledge he did have derived, in most cases, through select representatives. Just as Roman writers recognize eyesight as the medium for judging a person's virtue, Ignatius' claims to 'see', 'watch over' and 'know' each community demonstrate his authority as inspector.[32] The descriptions of these events is most often dressed in the rhetoric of praise and humility: following Cicero (*Inv*. II.66), who defines *observantia* as 'the act by which we show respect to and cherish our superiors in age or wisdom or honour or any high position', the bishop regularly commends these groups for their commitment to truth. Yet just below the surface of even benevolent gazes, undercurrents of challenge may appear. The power of vision to shame, a technique noted since Aristotle (*Rhet*. 1384a–b), appears, for instance, in *Magnesians*, when Ignatius clarifies his Christian vision by sternly warning against false teachings and divisive politics (2; 6.1–10.3).

The surveillance enacted by Ignatius also extends to the bishops, presbyters, and deacons of each community. For Ignatius, these figures assume their authority from the eucharistic celebration, during which they form 'an image of incorruption' (*tupon … aphtharsias*). When the congregation views the ceremony and receives the eucharist, they thus do not observe human leaders, but an illumined, divine-like presence.[33] Among these officials, the bishop has an especially elevated position: as the 'image of Father' (*Trall*. 3.1), he is responsible for all aspects of community life. Ignatius thus encourages Polycarp to seek 'greater understanding' (*sunesin pleiona*) and to strive for constant attentiveness, acquiring 'a spirit that never slumbers' so that he may 'deal gently with what is visible' (*phainomena*).[34] Achieving a 'one-sided' transparency within the community, then, is the goal toward which the bishop should strive: Ignatius specifically calls for Polycarp to hold more meetings, to speak with all members individually and to know them by name, to extend care to widows, and to 'bring gently those who are more pestiferous into subjection' (*hypotasse*) (*Pol*. 1.3; 2.1–2; 4.1–2). When successful, the bishop demonstrates his rhetorical finesse and a versatility in confronting changing circumstances – in short, he proves himself worthy of the title of *episkopos*, overseer (Maier 2004; Schoedel 1985: 262–265).

As reflections of the heavenly realm, the ecclesiastical council exhibits a harmonious and orderly relationship patterned on that of God and Jesus (*Eph*. 4.1–2; *Magn*. 7.1; 13.2). If the congregation seeks to reflect this heavenly condition, it too must also imitate this behaviour, for it is only then that a true community of God can be said to exist. A developing pattern in the letters, then, is to imitate ecclesiastical officials in the same way that they imitate the behaviour of Christ toward God (*Phld*. 7.2). Thus Ignatius casts himself as an imitator of Christ, whose sufferings he replicates as a martyr (*Rom*. 6.3; Reis 2005; Swartley 1973). At the same time, the link between imitation and suffering intersects with ethical qualities such as love, meekness, humility, and

obedience, and, ultimately, the theological goal of unity. The Ephesian bishop Onesimus and his deacon Burrhus, it would appear, comport themselves in just this fashion, for Ignatius singles them out as worthy of emulation by other Christians (*Eph*. 1.3; *Smyrn*. 12.1). Christians must embody the same qualities, following their shepherd as sheep and living harmoniously with the will of the ecclesiastical leadership, for purity exists only for those who remain within the walls of the sanctuary, the place where 'the powers of Satan are destroyed' (*Eph*. 5.2; 13.1; *Trall*. 7.1; *Phld*. 2.1). Not surprisingly, then, those who are 'subject to the bishop … live not in a human way but according to Jesus Christ' (*Trall*. 2.1; see also *Eph*. 2.2; 20.2; *Magn*. 4; 7.1; *Trall*. 2.2; *Phld*. 7.1–2; *Smyrn*. 8.1; *Pol*. 6.1). As a result, 'all who belong to God and Jesus Christ are with the bishop, and all those who come into the unity of the church through repentance will belong to God'; those who reject this call oppose 'the mind of God' and 'serve the devil' (*Phld*. 3.2–3; *Smyrn*. 6.2; 9.1).

What Ignatius seeks, then, is the elimination of 'division' (*merismos*) and 'strife' (*eris*) and the appearance of 'unity' (*henosis*, *henotes*) and 'concord' (*homonoia*) (Brent 2006: 231–311; Maier 2005). This is not achieved solely through the efforts of the bishop, however. The congregants too must regularly inspect themselves to ensure that they have not deviated from true teachings or engaged in divisive practices: it is essential to abstain from the 'evil plants' cultivated apart from Jesus, so that they can truly claim the name 'Christian' (*Phld*. 3.1; *Magn*. 4; 9.1–2). At the same time, Ignatius never loses sight of the communal nature of the faith, insisting that all members must keep watch over their neighbours to ensure the sanctity of the church: '[l]abour together with one another', he exhorts, 'compete together, run together, suffer together, lie down together, and be raised together as the household slaves, attendants, and servants of God … let none of you be found a deserter' (*Pol*. 6.1–2). It is only through this mutual inspection that the earthly community becomes 'fellow initiates' in the mysteries of Christ and members of the choir of the universal church (*Eph*. 4.1–2; 9.2; 12.2; 20.2; *Magn*. 9.1; *Smyrn*. 8.2).

If a crisis of leadership, doctrinal disputes, and diverse Christian practices elicited panoptic sentiments from Clement and Ignatius, it is a more general malaise within the Roman church that provokes the surveillant discourse found in the *Shepherd of Hermas*.[35] Dispirited over the compromises that he sees his church making with the world, particularly the wavering of faith by members entrenched in business affairs and attracted to wealth, Hermas seeks to rekindle his community's spiritual focus by sharing his revelatory experiences with various angelic beings (*Vis*. 1.1.8; 3.6.5–7; 3.9.5-6; *Mand*. 10.1.4; *Sim*. 2.5; 4.5; Maier 1991: 59–65; Osiek 1983: 39–57).

As in previous literature, Hermas reminds his audience that God possesses an 'invisible power' (*dunameon, ho aorato*) and observes his flock through his omniscience (*Vis*. 1.3.4; 3.12.3; *Mand*. 4.3.4; *Sim*. 8.6.2). His subordinates too possess surveillant powers, as the parable of the willow tree in *Similitude* 8 demonstrates. This episode describes how the gaze of Michael and his assistant the Shepherd penetrate into the minds of Christians to determine their fidelity to Christ. In successive stages, Hermas relates how these angelic figures 'examine' and 'watch over' Christians, assessing their behaviours and attitudes in order to determine their spiritual commitment and desire for repentance.[36] In this extended and nuanced examination, Hermas describes the inspection of thirteen types of Christians. At one end of the spectrum are three groups whose purity and steadfastness allow them to gain direct admittance into the tower of the church. At the other

extreme is a category comprised of apostates, betrayers, and blasphemers who have died to God. In between these groups lay nine others, whose entrance into the heavenly community is impeded by their various spiritual imperfections (Osiek 1999: 200).

The image of the tower appears again as a metaphor for the Christian elect in *Vision* 3 and *Similitude* 9. While there are slight variations between the two versions, the descriptions of the tower's construction are vehicles for Hermas to reflect upon the imperfections he sees within his present community while also looking forward to the time when the building is complete and all Christians are united in a common body (Verheyden 2006: 399). In order to achieve this goal, Hermas relates the construction of the church through the efforts of angels and twelve virgins, the latter of whom are ordered 'to watch over' (*phylassein*, *terousai*) their work in anticipation of Christ's appearance (*Sim*. 9.5.1; 9.7.3). As their efforts near completion, Christ arrives 'to examine' (*dokimazein*, *katanoein*, *episkepsasthai*) the progress and test the stones (i.e. the Christians) for their purity (*Sim*. 9.5.2, 6–7; 9.6.3; 9.10.4). During this process, Jesus, rejects some stones completely, while he gives those with fewer imperfections a second chance to pass the inspections conducted by the Shepherd and Hermas (*Sim*. 9.6.3–9.9.4).

The unfolding of these stories allows Hermas to explore once again the nature of authentic Christianity. Baptism and a belief in Christ are essential for inclusion into the church, and the prophets of antiquity, the apostles, martyrs, and church leaders all form the tower's foundation.[37] While these thoughts are hardly unique, the *Shepherd's* use of gender imagery to think through the process of salvation is distinctive and provocative. Casting himself in the role of *paterfamilias* and pastor, Hermas appears at the beginning of the text as a failed man, one whose business dealings left him spiritually weakened and unable to keep his 'family' (i.e. the church) organised and orderly (*Vis*. 1.1.8; 1.3.2; 2.3.1). Because this weakness threatens the salvation of all, he receives a vision to 'be a man' (*andrizou*), that is, to erase any traces of 'double-mindedness' in order to prove himself an effective minister of his congregants (*Vis*. 1.4.3; *Mand*. 9.8–9; 12.3.6; Young, Steve 1994). The specific charge for this gender transformation involves the possession of *enkrateia*, that 'manly' virtue personified, paradoxically, in the second virgin, and the trait he masters through a night spent with the virgins in holy continence (*Vis*. 3.8.4; *Sim*. 9.10.6–9.11.8; Wudel 2004). As he undergoes this transformation, he becomes spiritually reinvigorated: like his triple vision of the church, which gradually becomes younger as it regains strength, Hermas too describes his own rejuvenation during his experience with the angelic virgins (*Vis*. 3.10.1–3.13.4; *Sim*. 9.11.5). By modelling himself upon their virtues and assuming their garments, he has fulfilled the prerequisite for entrance into God's kingdom (*Sim*. 9.13.2, 4; 10.3.1).

The Shepherd also serves as a model for Hermas, guiding him in the final stages of his gender transformation. Yet an angel is quick to remind Hermas that this new-found condition is not permanent, but contingent upon his ability to act with masculine vigour: he must keep his *oikos* clean and orderly by ministering 'in a manly way (*viriliter*), proclaim[ing] to everyone the Lord's mighty works' (*Sim*. 10.4.1). In addition to his role as a community leader, then, Hermas must fulfil his prophetic call; he must act as a 'scout', observing his congregants and offering them his divinely-inspired message of repentance: 'Go and tell everyone', the Shepherd exhorts Hermas, 'to repent and live for God' (*Sim*. 8.11.1; see also *Vis*. 3.8.11; *Mand*. 12.3.2; *Sim*. 8.6.3–6; 9.7.7). For Hermas, *metanoia* entails following God's commands, most of which orbit around the establishment of an alternative community characterized by compassion and social justice (*Mand*.

2.2-4; 8.7–12; *Sim*. 1.1–11). An inspection of self and others, however, is necessary to ensure one treads along the right path: Hermas specifically asks the wealthy to visualize their actions with the *eschaton* in mind: '[c]onsider (*blepete*) the judgment that is coming. You who have an abundance should therefore seek out the hungry' (*Vis*. 3.9.5). Even the highest levels of leadership are not immune to critique. In an observation deriving from personal experience, he reminds church leaders that they are unable 'to discipline' (*paideuein*) others when they themselves are callous to God's commands: 'discipline one another' (*paideuete … allelous*), he exhorts, 'and be at peace among yourselves' (*Vis*. 3.9.10).

By recounting his own spiritual struggles and eventual '(re)conversion' to God, Hermas becomes an *exemplum* for his community. Just as he conquered double-mindedness, so too can the community, if they remain faithful to God's commandments.[38] Yet no one's status within the tower remains secure: Christ may replace the lapsed elect with more worthy candidates, and others who fail the initial admission may permanently forfeit their opportunity to attain salvation (*Vis*. 3.9.5–6; *Sim*. 9.6.3–5; 9.9.5–6; 10.4.4). In this situation of uncertainty, the *Shepherd* presents a narrative in which eternal life depends upon a meticulous monitoring of the self and others.[39]

LATE ANTIQUE CHRISTIANITY

As the office of the bishop became solidified in late antiquity, Christian authors exploit the supervisory role given to 'overseers' in the early church. The *Didascalia*, for instance, maintains that the bishop must 'command and admonish all the people' and make himself an example for the congregation to emulate. The author supports the bishop's authority by citing Ezekiel 33:1–6, a passage in which God confers upon the prophet the status of 'watchman', who, when the sword of violence appears, blows a horn to alert his people and save them from danger. For the *Didascalia*, the bishop is the watchman who preaches the gospel (i.e. the horn) in order to save his flock from the impending judgment (i.e. the sword). Through these efforts, he seeks to preserve the spiritual health of his community, a job that not only leads them to salvation but also prevents his own destruction (4.2.6). Later bishops took this responsibility to heart, imagining themselves as newly commissioned Ezekiels invested with an omniscient gaze (Leyser 1998: 166–170; Maier 1996).

The mode of surveillance originating with the bishop did not, however, erase the necessity for self-inspection. The way in which spiritual purity and the observation of self collide in late Christian circles appears in particularly dramatic form in Prudentius' *Psychomachia*.[40] This allegorical poem, which details an epic battle between the Virtues and Vices played out within the individual,[41] provides a script for 'performing' orthodox Christianity by examining the soul's progression toward perfection as a form of 'spiritual combat' that occurs through the power of vision and rigorous self-inspection. Through the development of these themes, Prudentius instructs Christians, particularly Rome's aristocratic elites, how to repel the recent resurgence of paganism and the persistence of heresy so that they can identify themselves as faithful members of the church, safely within the fold of Christian orthodoxy (Smith 1976: 73–108; Kuefler 2001: 105–124).

Throughout the epic, Prudentius exploits the agonistic nature of vision to explore the type of Christian identity he seeks to advance. The first contest, between 'Faith' (*Fides*) and 'Worship-of-the-Old-Gods' (*Veterum Cultura Deorum*), makes explicit the poet's intention to draw the

battle lines between Christian and Roman worldviews. When Faith appears, her dress and comportment are hardly consistent with the prototypical warrior, yet she nevertheless quickly dispatches her opponent, crushing her head to the ground, squeezing out her eyes and trampling upon them under her feet (32–33). If the eyes are the locus of power, as Varro remarked, then this victory signals the beginning of a new age, one that has rendered impotent all of the cultural capital upon which *Romanitas* was founded (Nugent 1985: 22–24; Smith 1976: 20–21; 27–28; 71; 163–167; 236; 243–244).

Attention to the eyes and vision in subsequent battles reinforce this hypothesis. In the second encounter, after 'Lust the Sodomite' (*Sodomita Libido*) fails to blind 'Chastity' (*Pudicitia*) with a torch, Prudentius exclaims that the servants of God will no longer have to fear her deadly flames of immorality (40–57). The force of the eyes appears again during the confrontation between 'Patience' (*Patientia*) and 'Anger' (*Ira*): as the battle commences, raving Anger, foaming at the mouth, 'darts her eyes, all shot with blood and gall'. Yet Patience repulses this venomous look 'with staid countenance' (*gravi … vultu*) and a 'fixed gaze' (*defixa oculus*), remaining resolute until her opponent eventually self-destructs (109–161). The authority derived from the eyes also reveals itself in the character of 'Pride' (*Superbia*), who, seated upon her horse, 'looks down' (*despectans*) upon the armies with 'swelling disdain' (*tumido … fastu*) and 'observes' (*spectans*) her enemy 'Humility' (*Mens Humilis*) with a 'menacing look and voice' (*vultuque et voce minatur*) (182, 196–197). In a fit of rage, Pride attacks Humility but falls injured into a ditch before reaching her target. In response, Humility casts 'a look of kindliness' (*gaudia vultu*) upon her opponent, but quickly ends the battle by summoning all of the *auctoritas* of a Roman general or emperor: rejecting her opponent's pleas for mercy, Humility grabs her hair, turns her face upward for a last look and decisively severs her neck (277–283).

Through these engagements, Prudentius presents the Christian soul triumphing over Roman immorality through its authoritative gaze. When the final battle concludes, and peace is restored, the poem turns to the importance of inspection for solidifying the boundaries of the community of true believers. This section begins with a joyous victory march of the Virtues, whom 'Concord' (*Concordia*) leads back to their walled city (629–664). The celebration, however, is only temporary, for 'Discord' (*Discordia*), also named 'Heresy' (*Heresis*), suddenly reveals herself amid the celebration by attacking Concord. Although she only manages to inflict a surface wound, Faith quickly responds, skewering Discord's tongue and, with the assistance of the other Virtues, rending her limb from limb (665–725). With this last obstacle overcome, the victors build a 'platform' (*tribunal*) on the 'peak-topped hillock' (*tumulus*) in the middle of their city (730–732). Ascending to this 'watchtower' (*speculam*), the site from which 'the eye can freely range afar on every side without obstruction', Faith and Concord observe and regulate the activities of the soul (732–733). The gaze of these inspectors penetrates the entire city (i.e. the soul), ensuring that no 'member of the soul' (*pars Mentis*) can find a 'hiding place' (*conceptacula*) in the body. They must instead remain visible, keeping the curtains of their tents drawn back to expose them to their leaders' surveillance (740–745).

The soul needs to subordinate itself to this regimentation precisely because its condition in the world remains perilous. In spite of the victories achieved through warfare, Prudentius concedes that evil in its various guises remains a constant threat, lurking both within and outside the soul. Just as the *anima* may bask in the glow of God's presence, the battles against the Vices demonstrate that it occasionally suffers from passivity, becomes too easily seduced by worldly luxuries, and

is susceptible to external heretical forces. In maddening cycles, Prudentius states, humans turn toward and then away from God (899–907). Self-inspection, a second level of observatory regulation, thus becomes an integral practice for breaking free from this pattern. Such is the position of *Concordia*, who climbs the tower to exhort the *sensus* of the soul to remain wary of dissention:

> be on the watch (*cavete*) … that there be no discordant thought among our Sentiments (*Sensibus*), that no foreign faction (*secta exotica*) arise in us from the occasion of hidden quarrels; for a divided will creates disorder in our inmost nature, making two parties in a heart at variance. Let our understanding be united by love, our life be in accord with a single aim; where there is separation there is no strength (758–763).

As long as one lives in the world, then, the battle for the soul and community is never completely finished, in large part because the lines demarcating virtue and vice are not always easily detected (Nugent 1985: 70). Yet through his elaboration of these conflicts, Prudentius provides Christians with a map for negotiating the complexities that life presents and for charting out their own salvation (Smith 1976: 119, 126, 145–146, 161).

In this ongoing struggle between opposing forces, Prudentius follows earlier authors by highlighting the significance of *imitatio*. In the *Psychomachia*, Judith, Job, David and other Old Testament figures become *exempla* who exhibit virtues necessary for overcoming specific adversaries.[42] The figure of Abraham is particularly instructive, for he exhibited an unwavering faith and warrior spirit that made him pleasing to God. Christians too should engage in battle, but one that is directed against 'the monsters in the enslaved heart' (pref. 10–14). Emulating Abraham thus involves internalizing his character through the practice of a rigorous, internal vigilance: 'we must watch (*vigilandum*) in the armour of our faithful hearts that every part of the body that is in captivity and enslaved to foul desire must be set free by gathering together all of our inner strength' (pref. 50–55). Ultimately, however, it is Christ who provides the best means for immunizing the soul against vice during its earthly sojourn, a point that bookends the poem. While the beginning of the story has Christ arming the soul with the virtues necessary for destroying the 'wantonness in the heart' (*ludibria cordis*), the conclusion describes the Virtues constructing a temple for him in their soul, the 'New Jerusalem' (14–17; 804–822; Nugent 1985: 60–62; Smith 1976: 132–141; 296–300). It is through this commingling of divinity and soul that Christians receive membership in the household of God (pref. 59–68).

ARCHITECTURE, DISCOURSE, AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF IDENTITY

William Churchill once remarked, '[w]e shape our buildings, and afterwards our buildings shape us' (Corbeill 2002: 202). Foucault would undoubtedly agree, finding in Bentham's Panopticon a model contributing to a new discourse on the relationship between discipline and power.[43] Yet it has become something of a commonplace to assert that discourse has a similar effect on human identity, a point that Foucault also did much to promote. Developing this position, discursive theorists have repeatedly shown that speech acts do not reflect reality or 'truth', but rather produce representations of it. As Tim Murphy has observed, 'discourse is the means by which the world is socially constructed … [n]either language nor the mind is seen as a mirror which reflects the essential content of reality. Instead, both are seen as productive activities which construct the

objects that they apprehend' (Murphy 2000: 399–400; see also Pile and Thrift 1995: 2–5). Furthermore, in contrast to an earlier belief in the priority of the mind over language, discursive theory posits that 'language, as a concrete, social structure, exists *prior* to individuals and, therefore, that it is only because of language that individuals exist' (Murphy 2000: 402; emphasis mine).

Scholars of early Christianity have profited from this theoretical model, demonstrating how, in myriad ways and through various 'subject positions', early Christians deployed communication strategies to construct rather than simply describe identities.[44] Christine Trevett has recently described ancient Christian texts as 'rhetorical implements of power' that created truth, gradually forging a sense of 'Christian-ness' among disparate communities.[45] Panopticism appears as just such a 'technology', shaping Christian self-definition through the creation of a surveillant gaze. By exploiting the well-established connection between vision and authority, these authors sought to define power relationships in order to establish obedience and combat error, while at the same time inculcating an ideology of self-interrogation and offering hope for a present (and future) within the economy of God. The cornerstone of Bentham's Panopticon thus appears grounded in ancient rhetorical argumentation. Perhaps, then, we are not so different from the Greeks after all.

ENDNOTES

1   This essay represents an expansion of a paper originally presented at the Fifteenth International Conference on Patristic Studies (Oxford; August, 2007).

2   Bell (2004); Castelli (2004); Frederick (2002); Beacham (1999); Bergmann and Kondoleon (1999); Futrell (1997); Potter (1993).

3   Bartsch (2006); Frederick (2002); Leyser (1998); Maier (1996, 1997).

4   Ter. *Spec*. 25: *Nemo denique in spectaculo ineundo prius cogitat nisi videri et videre*. See also Clem. Alex. *Paid*. III.11.69–70, 76–77, 79, 82–83.

5   This section draws upon Hekster (2005) and Barton (2002).

6   Pl. *Tim*. 47a–b; Cic. *Nat. deor*. II.140, 142–143; Sen. *Ep*. 94.56; Epic. *Diss*. I. 6.19–25; Mar. Aur. *Med*. 11.27. Christian sources include *Diogn*. 10.2; Min. Fel. *Oct*. 17.2; 32.4.

7   Ter. *Andr*. 91–95; Plaut. *Merc*. 319; Cic. *Rosc. com*. 50.147; Tac. *Ann*. 13.12.2; Dio Chrys. *Or*. 3.3.

8   For instance, Arist. *Pax* 543–544; Cic. *Off*. I.146. See also Zanker (1990): 149–153.

9   Ter. *Spec*. 20. See also the remarks by Dio Chrysostom (*Or*. 8.12–18) on Diogenes' ability to confront and battle the 'hardships' (*ponous*) of life (e.g. hunger, cold, thirst). It is these 'antagonists', Dio states, that most people avoid, 'never looking them in the face' (*oudepote enantion blepontes*).

10   Domination, abuse, and cruelty: Cic. *Pis*. 41.99; Epic. *Diss*. III.22.10; Suet. *Aug*. 79.2; *Cal*. 36.2; Tac. *Hist*. III.39; *Agr*. 45; Plin. *Pan*. 34.3; reverence and generosity: Cic. *Inv*. II.66; Sen. *Clem*. I.19.8.

11   Plut. *Ad. princip. inerudit*. 780E: *archon d' eikon theou tou panta kosmountos*; Hor. *Odes* 4.14.5.

12   During the games, Nero had 'watchers' secretly observe those present in the audience, and along with Domitian, experimented with enclosures that enabled them to watch the crowd while keeping themselves hidden. See Suet. *Ner*. 12.2.; Tac. *Ann*. 16.5; Plin. *Pan*. 51.5. The office of censor was also charged with watching over citizens, a job 'that ideally every citizen should undertake', as Bartsch (2006: 136) argues.

13   For instance, Epic. *Diss*. III.5.14–19; III.7.34; II.22.26; III.24.40; III.26.23–24; IV.1.169–177; *Ench*. 51.3; Mar. Aur. *Med*. 9.41.

14   Sen. *Ep*. 11.8; see also *Ep*. 25.5: 'It is, indeed, nobler by far to live as you would live under the eyes of some good man, always at your side' (*boni viri ac semper praesentis oculis*). Tacitus (*Ann*. 15.62) notes that before his death, Seneca instructed his friends to use his image as a model for future behaviour, while Zanker (1990: 159–162, 207) argues that Augustus similarly imagined himself as an *exemplum*.

15   Sen. *Ep*. 25.5–6; 16.2; see also *Ep*. 11.8–11; 28.9–10; 52.8–9; 83.1; 98.4; *Ira* II.28.8.

16   Jn 1:18; Rom 1:20; Col. 1:15; 1 Tim 1:17; 6:15–16; 1 Jn 4:12.

17   For instance, Titus 1:5–8.

18   Young, Frances M (1994); Brown (1980).

19   Kovacs (2005: 85) notes Origen's belief that this gift of spiritual presence is reserved for apostles and prophets. For a broader treatment of Paul's rhetoric of coercion, see Castelli (1991): 89–117.

20   Acts 20:28; Rom 16:17; see also Mk 13:5, 21; Gal 6:1.

21   Gal 6:1, 4–5; see also Mt 7:3; Lk 11:35; 2 Cor 13:5; 1 Pet 5:8.

22   Recent studies include Gregory (2002); Horrell (1996): 238–280; Jefford (1996): 98–116; Lindemann (1992); Jeffers (1991): 90–105; Maier (1991): 87–146; Tugwell (1989): 89–103.

23   'Creator and overseer': 59.3; 'all–powerful': 2.3; 32.4; 56.6; 62.2; 'observes all things': 55.6; 64.1 (see also Pol. *Phil*. 7.2)

24   It is possible that the Corinthians requested the letter (1.1; 47.7), a point that has led some to imagine that this reflects Rome's power as an emerging force in Christian circles (cf. Ign. *Rom*. 3.1; Herm. *Vis*. 2.4.3). Caution is necessary here, for Clement never invokes the Roman *ekklesia* to reinforce his argument, and it would appear that the letter's 'oversight' might equally have been directed to Rome itself (7.1; cf. Lindemann, 1992: 17). Nevertheless, the text's rhetoric of surveillance implies an assertion of power. Eusebius (*Hist. eccl*. III.16.1; IV.23.11) attests to the popularity of the letter, not only in Corinth, but in other communities as well.

25   On Ignatius' Antiochean experience, see Lieu (1996): 25; Trevett (1992): 59–66; Schoedel (1985): 10–11; Corwin (1960): 31–51. For Christian diversity in Asia Minor, see Trevett (2006): 314–330; Bauer (1971): 77–94.

26   Ignatius refers to 'heresy' (*hairesis*, *Eph*. 6.2; *Trall*. 6.1), 'heterodoxy' (*heterodoxia*, *Magn*. 8.1; *Smyrn*. 6.2; *Pol*. 3.1), and 'schism' (*skisma*, *Phld*. 3.3). On the difficulties involved in identifying the opponents, see Paulsen (1985): 64–65.

27   *Eph*. 5.2–3 (see also *Trall*. 7.2); *Smyrn*. 8.1–2; *Pol*. 5.2.

28   Young, Frances M (1994): 146) suggest that Ignatius' letters may reflect an attempt to bolster the office of bishop against the authority of the council of presbyters.

29   'Invisible' God: *Magn*. 3.2; *Pol*. 2.2; 3.2; divine omnipresence: *Eph*. 14.2: 'those who profess to belong to Christ will be seen (*ophthesontai*) by what they do'; 15.3; *Magn*. 3.2; 8.2; *Phld*. 7.1.

30   Each letter's salutation contains the epithet 'God-bearer'. For Ignatius' letters as a counterscript to mystery religions and the imperial cult, see Brent (2006); Brent (1999): 210–250; Harland (2003).

31   'Heavenly things': *Trall*. 5.1; 'voice of God': *Phld*. 7.2; cf. *Smyrn*. 4.2. See also Brent (2006): 122, 128, 140–144.

32   *Eph*. 2.1 (*pantas hymas kata agapen eidon*); *Magn*. 2 (*exiothen idein hymas*); 6.1 (*prosopois to pan plethos etheoresa en pistei*); *Trall*. 1.1 (*to pan plethos hymon … theoreisthai*); *Rom*. 1.1 (*epetuchon idein hymon ta axiothea prosopa*; through prayer alone!); *Phld*. 5.1 (*asphalizomai hymas*); *Smyrn*. 1.1 (*enoesa gar hymas katertismenous*).

33   *Magn*. 6.1 (on *typos* for *topos* in *Magn*. 6.1, see Brent (2006): 30–38); cf. *Smyrn*. 8.1. See also Brent (2006): 27, 85, 89, 133.

34   *Pol*. 1.3; 2.2. See too Dio Chrysostom (*Or*. 1.13–14; 3.65), who states that the emperor must be ever alert, sleeping little or not at all.

35   Recent studies on the *Shepherd of Hermas* include Verheyden (2006); Gregory (2002); Osiek (1999); Jefford (1996): 134–158; Jeffers (1991): 106–120; Maier (1991): 55–86; Tugwell (1989): 47–88.

36   Michael 'examines' (*katanoei*) the branches (i.e. the law or Son of God) that he gave to the Christians, and he 'watches over' (*episkeptetai*) them (*Sim*. 8.1.5; 8.3.3); Michael orders the Shepherd to 'examine' (*katanoeson*) the imperfect Christians and warns him to 'take care (*blepe*) that no one escape your notice' (*Sim*. 8.2.5).

37   Baptism and Christ: *Vis*. 3.2.4; *Mand*. 4.3.1–2; *Sim*. 9.2.1–2; 9.12.1–8; prophets, apostles, martyrs, and church leaders: *Vis*. 3.5.1–4; *Sim*. 9.4.2–3; 9.16.1–7.

38   *Vis*. 5.7. The plural verbs in this passage suggest that the recipients of this exhortation are those in Hermas' congregation.

39   Wudel (2004: 47) argues that the text 'depicts a discursive process of salvation by an elaboration of techniques of self–scrutiny, an ongoing, albeit precarious, process of acute self-examination and relentless questioning'.

40   Recent studies include Hermann (1989): 7–36; Nugent (1985); Smith (1976).

41   On the various interpretations of the poem's title, see Smith (1976): 113–114; Gnilka (1963): 19–26.

42   Judith and *Pudicitia* (58–65), Job and *Patientia*: (162–171); David, *Mens Humilis*, and *Spes* (291–304); David, Samuel, Jonathan and *Sobrieties* (383–406). In the case of David and Goliath, Prudentius asks his audience to conjure a visual image of the story: '[w]e have seen (*vidimus*) how Goliath … fell by a weak hand' (291–292).

43   Recent discussions attest to the durable nature of this technology of surveillance. See for instance, the articles published in the electronic journal *Surveillance & Society* 1 (3): 2003, an issue titled 'Foucault and Panopticism Revisited'. David Wood, ed. Accessed 8 September, 2007. Available from http://www.surveillance–and–society.org/journalv1i3.htm. Boyne (2000: 302) argues that 'there are some marked trends which seem to indicate that Western societies may be moving somewhat closer to a general condition of Panoptical surveillance'. Boyne's thesis has received confirmation most recently in the form of an announcement from the United States' Transportation Security Administration (TSA). Its press release, 'TSA Expands Career Opportunities for Transportation Security Officers', unveils a plan to train as many as five hundred employees in the 'Screening Passengers by Observation' (SPOT) program. These 'invisible' inspectors, called 'Behavior Detection Officers', will be placed in airports for the purposes of 'identifying potentially high-risk individuals based on involuntary physical and psychological reactions'. Released online 17 July, 2007. Accessed 8 September 2007. Available from: http://www.tsa.gov/press/releases/2006/press_release_0684.shtm.

44   See, for instance, King (2003: 225): 'the thing itself is a product of its own production, reproducing its producer's positionality, particularity, and contingency'.

45   Trevett (2006): 328. See also Cameron (1991: 32): 'Christianity *was* … its discourses' (emphasis in original); Brown (1983: 1): 'books … were there to *produce* persons' (emphasis mine).

REFERENCES

Achtemeier, Paul J. 1996. *1 Peter: A Commentary on 1 Peter*. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress Press.

Bartsch, Shadi. 2006. *The Mirror of the Self: Sexuality, Self-Knowledge, and the Gaze in the Roman Empire*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Barton, Carlin. 2002. 'Being in the Eyes: Shame and Sight in Ancient Rome'. In *The Roman Gaze: Vision, Power, and the Body*, edited by Frederick, David. Baltimore, Maryland: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Bauer, Walter. 1971. *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*, edited by Kraft, Robert A.; Krodel, Gerhard, translated by Philadelphia Seminar on Christian Origins. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Fortress Press.

Beacham, Richard C. 1999. *Spectacle Entertainments of Early Imperial Rome*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press.

Bell, Andrew. 2004. *Spectacular Power in the Greek and Roman City*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Bentham, Jeremy. 1962. *Panopticon, or, The Inspection-House, &c*. Vol. 4 of *The Works of Jeremy Bentham*, edited by Bowring, John. New York: Russell & Russell.

Bergmann, Bettina; Kondoleon, Christine, eds. 1999. *The Art of Ancient Spectacle*. Studies in the History of Art, 56. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press.

Beyer, Hermann W. 1964. '*Episkeptomai*'. Vol. 2 of *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by Kittle, Gerhard, translated by Bromily, Geoffrey W. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Boyne, Roy. 2000. 'Post-Panopticism'. *Economy and Society* 29: 285-307.

Brent, Allen. 2006. *Ignatius of Antioch and the Second Sophistic: A Study of an Early Christian Transformation of Pagan Culture*. Studies and Texts in Antiquity and Christianity, 36. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Brent, Allen. 1999. *The Imperial Cult and the Development of Church Order: Concepts and Images of Authority in Paganism and Christianity before the Age of Cyprian*. Texts and Studies of Early Christian Life and Language, 45. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Brown, Peter. 1983. 'The Saint as Exemplar in Late Antiquity'. *Representations* 1: 1-25.

Brown, Raymond E 1980. 'Episkope and Episkopos: The New Testament Evidence'. *Theological Studies* 41: 322-338.

Cameron, Averil. 1991. *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire: The Development of Christian Discourse*. Berkeley, California: University of California Press.

Carter, Warren. 2002. 'Vulnerable Power: The Roman Empire Challenged by the Early Christians'. In *Handbook of Early Christianity: Social Science Approaches*, edited by Blasi, Anthony, J.; Duhaime, Jean; Turcotte, Paul-André. New York: Altamira Press.

Castelli, Elizabeth A. 2004. *Martyrdom and Memory: Early Christian Culture Making*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Castelli, Elizabeth A. 1991. *Imitating Paul: A Discourse of Power*. Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster/John Knox Press.

Connolly, R. Hugh. 1969. *Didascalia Apostolorum: The Syria Version Translated and Accompanied by the Verona Latin Fragments*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Corbeill, Anthony. 2002. 'Political Movement: Walking and Ideology in Republican Rome'. In *The Roman Gaze: Vision, Power, and the Body*, edited by Frederick, David. Baltimore, Maryland: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Corwin, Virginia. 1960. *St. Ignatius and Christianity in Antioch*. Yale Publications in Religion, 1. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press.

Evans, Robin. 1982. *The Fabrication of Virtue: English Prison Architecture, 1750–1840*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fisher, Edmund W 1980. '"Let Us Look Upon the Blood-of-Christ" (1 Clement 7:4'. *Vigiliae Christianae* 34: 218–236.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. 1981. *The Gospel According to Luke (I–IX): Introduction, Translation, and Notes*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc.

Frederick, David. ed. 2002. *The Roman Gaze: Vision, Power, and the Body*. Baltimore, Maryland: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Foucault, Michel. 1979. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, translated by Alan Sheridan. New York: Vintage Books.

Foucault, Michel. 1980. 'The Eye of Power'. In *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972–1977*, edited by Gordon, Colin, translated by Gordon, Colin; Marshall, Leo; Mepham, John; Soper, Kate. New York: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, Michel. 1983. 'The Subject and Power,' in *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*, 2nd ed., Dreyfus, Hubert L.; Rabinow, Paul. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Futrell, Alison. 1997. *Blood in the Arena: The Spectacle of Roman Power*. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press.

Gnilka, Christian. *Studien zur 'Psychomachie' des Prudentius*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1963.

Gregory, Andrew. 2002. 'Disturbing Trajectories: *1 Clement*, the *Shepherd of Hermas* and the Development of Early Roman Christianity'. In *Rome in the Bible and the Early Church*, edited by Oakes, Peter. Carlisle, United Kingdom: Paternoster Press.

Harland, Philip A 2003. 'Christ-Bearers and Fellow-Initiates: Local Cultural Life and Christian Identity in Ignatius' Letters'. *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 11: 481–499.

Hekster, Olivier. 2005. 'Captured in the Gaze of Power: Visibility, Games and Roman Imperial Representation'. In *Imaginary Kings: Royal Images in the Ancient Near East, Greece and Rome*, edited by Hekster, Olivier; Fowler, Richard. Oriens et Occidens, 11. Munich: Franz Steiner Verlag.

Hermann, John P. 1989. *Allegories of War: Language and Violence in Old English Poetry*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press.

Horrell, David G. 1996. *The Social Ethos of the Corinthian Correspondence: Interests and Ideology from 1 Corinthians to 1 Clement*. Studies of the New Testament and Its World. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Jeffers, James S. 1991. *Conflict at Rome: Social Order and Hierarchy in Early Christianity*. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress Press.

Jefford, Clayton N. 1996. *Reading the Apostolic Fathers: An Introduction*. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers.

King, Karen L. 2003. *What Is Gnosticism?* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Kovacs, Judith L. 2005. *1 Corinthians: Interpreted by Early Christian Commentators*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Kuefler, Mathew. 2001. *The Manly Eunuch: Masculinity, Gender Ambiguity, and Christian Ideology in Late Antiquity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Leyser, Conrad. 1998. 'Vulnerability and Power: The Early Christian Rhetoric of Masculine Authority'. *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 80: 159–173.

Lieu, Judith. 1996. *Image and Reality: The Jews in the World of the Christians in the Second Century*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Lindemann, Andreas. 1992. *Die Clemsbriefe*. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, 17. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr.

Lotz, John-Paul. 2007. *Ignatius and Concord: The Background and Use of the Language of Concord in the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch*. Patristic Studies, 8. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

MacDonald, Margaret Y. 2000. *Colossians and Ephesians*. Sacra Pagina Series, 17. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press.

Maier, Harry O. 2005. 'The Politics and Rhetoric of Discord and Concord in Paul and Ignatius'. In *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers*, edited by Gregory, Andrew F.; Tuckett, Christopher M. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Maier, Harry O 2004. 'The Politics of the Silent Bishop: Silence and Persuasion in Ignatius of Antioch'. *Journal of Theological Studies* 55: 503–519.

Maier, Harry O 1997. 'Staging the Gaze: Early Christian Apocalypses and Narrative Self-Representation'. *Harvard Theological Review* 90: 131–154.

Maier, Harry O 1996. '"Manichee!": Leo the Great and the Orthodox Panopticon'. *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 4: 441–460.

Maier, Harry O. 1991. *The Social Setting of the Ministry as Reflected in the Writings of Hermas, Clement and Ignatius*. Dissertations SR, 1. Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier Press.

Murphy, Tim. 2000. 'Discourse'. In *Guide to the Study of Religion*, edited by Braun, Willi; McCutcheon, Russell T. New York: Cassell.

Nugent, S. Georgia. 1985. *Allegory and Poetics: The Structure and Imagery of Prudentius' 'Psychomachia'*. Studien zur klassischen Philologie, 14. New York: Verlag Peter Lang.

Osiek, Carolyn. 1999. *Shepherd of Hermas*. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress Press.

Osiek, Carolyn. 1983. *Rich and Poor in the Shepherd of Hermas: An Exegetical-Social Investigation*. The Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series, 15. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic Biblical Association of America.

Paulsen, Henning. 1985. *Die Briefe des Ignatius von Antiochia und der Brief des Polycarp von Smyrna*. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, 18. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr.

Pile, Steve; Thrift, Nigel, eds. 1995. 'Introduction'. In *Mapping the Subject: geographies of cultural transformation*, edited by Pile, Steve; Thrift, Nigel. New York: Routledge.

Potter, David. 1993. 'Martyrdom as Spectacle'. In *Theater and Society in the Classical World*, edited by Scodel, Ruth. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press.

Price, S.R.F. 1984. *Rituals and Power: The Roman imperial cult in Asia Minor*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Reis, David M. 2005. 'Following in Paul's Footsteps: *Mimesis* and Power in Ignatius of Antioch'. In *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers*, edited by Gregory, Andrew F.; Tuckett, Christopher M. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Schoedel, William R. 1985. *Ignatius of Antioch: A Commentary on the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch*. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Fortress Press.

Shapiro, Gary. 2003. *Archaeologies of Vision: Foucault and Nietzsche on Seeing and Saying*. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press.

Semple, Janet. 1993. *Bentham's Prison: A Study of the Panopticon Penitentiary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Smith, Macklin. 1976. *Prudentius' Psychomachia: A Reexamination*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Strelan, Rick. 1991. 'Strange Stares: ATENIZEIN in Acts'. *Novum Testamentum* 41: 235–255.

Swartley, Willard M 1973. 'The Imitatio Christi in the Ignatian Letters'. *Vigiliae Christianae* 27: 81–103.

Towner, Philip H. 2006. *The Letters of Timothy and Titus*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Transportation Security Administration. 'TSA Expands Career Opportunities for Transportation Security Officers'. Released online 17 July 2007. Accessed 8 September, 2007. Available from: http://www.tsa.gov/press/releases/2006/press_release_0684.shtm.

Trevett, Christine. 2006. 'Asia Minor and Achaea'. Vol. 1 of *The Cambridge History of Christianity: Origins to Constantine*, edited by Mitchell, Margaret M.; Young, Frances M. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Trevett, Christine. 1992. *A Study of Ignatius of Antioch in Syria and Asia*. Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity, 29. Lewiston, New York: The Edwin Mellen Press.

Tugwell, Simon. 1989. *The Apostolic Fathers*. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Morehouse Publishing.

Verheyden, Joseph. 2006. 'The Shepherd of Hermas'. *The Expository Times* 117: 397–401.

Vinzent, Markus. 2006. 'Rome'. Vol. 1 of *The Cambridge History of Christianity: Origins to Constantine*, edited by Mitchell, Margaret M.; Young, Frances M. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wood, David, ed. 2003. *Surveillance & Society* 1 (3). Accessed 8 September 2007. Available from: http://www.surveillance-and-society.org/journalv1i3.htm.

Wudel, B. Diane. 2004. 'The Seduction of Self-Control: Hermas and the Problem of Desire'. *Religion & Theology* 11: 39–47.

Young, Frances M 1994. 'On EPISKOPOS and PRESBYTEROS'. *Journal of Theological Studies* 45: 142–148.

Young, Steve. 1994. 'Being a Man: The Pursuit of Manliness in The Shepherd of Hermas'. *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 2: 237–255.

Zanker, Paul. 1990. *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, translated by Alan Shapiro. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press.