

PAULINE STUDIES (PAST) [5]

Paul: Jew, Greek, and Roman



Edited by Stanley E. Porter

BRILL

Paul: Jew, Greek, and Roman

Pauline Studies

Series editor

Stanley E. Porter

Professor of New Testament at

McMaster Divinity College

Hamilton, Ontario

VOLUME 5

Paul: Jew, Greek, and Roman

Edited by
Stanley E. Porter



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2008

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Paul : Jew, Greek, and Roman / edited by Stanley E. Porter.

p. cm. — (Pauline studies, ISSN 1572-4913 ; v. 5)

Includes indexes.

ISBN 978-90-04-17159-6 (hardback : alk. paper)

1. Paul, the Apostle, Saint. I. Porter, Stanley E., 1956– II. Title. III. Series.

BS2506.3.P3825 2009

225.9*2—dc22

2008038933

ISSN 1572-4913

ISBN 978 90 04 17159 6

Copyright 2008 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.
Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Hotei Publishing,
IDC Publishers, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers and VSP.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated,
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic,
mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission
from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by
Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to
The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910,
Danvers, MA 01923, USA.

Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

CONTENTS

Preface	vii
Abbreviations	ix
Paul as Jew, Greek, and Roman: An Introduction	1
<i>Stanley E. Porter</i>	
Light Giving Sources: Examining the Extent of Scriptural Citation and Allusion Influence in 1 Corinthians	7
<i>H. H. Drake Williams III</i>	
Paul's Attitude towards the Law	39
<i>Panayotis Coutsoumpas</i>	
The Jewish Recipients of Galatians	51
<i>Bas Van Os</i>	
Unity and Diversity in Pauline Eschatology	65
<i>Andrew W. Pitts</i>	
Looking at the Metaphor of Christ's Body in 1 Corinthians 12 ...	93
<i>Timothy L. Carter</i>	
Paul and the Pagans	117
<i>Craig A. Evans</i>	
Paul and the Gymnasiarchs: Two Approaches to Pastoral Formation in Antiquity	141
<i>James R. Harrison</i>	
The <i>Polytheist</i> Identity of the "Weak," and Paul's Strategy to "Gain" Them: A New Reading of 1 Corinthians 8:1–11:1	179
<i>Mark D. Nanos</i>	
"Fleshly" versus Spirit Perspectives in Romans 8:5–8	211
<i>Craig S. Keener</i>	

Educating the Divided Soul in Paul and Plato: Reading Romans 7:7–25 and Plato’s <i>Republic</i>	231
<i>Joshua W. Jipp</i>	
Adopted as Sons (υιοθεσία): The Missing Piece in Pauline Soteriology	259
<i>Trevor J. Burke</i>	
Did Paul Speak Latin?	289
<i>Stanley E. Porter</i>	
Paul the Roman Citizen: Roman Citizenship in the Ancient World and its Importance for Understanding Acts 22:22–29	309
<i>Sean A. Adams</i>	
Index of Ancient Sources	327
Index of Modern Authors	363

PREFACE

This fifth volume in this series, *Pauline Studies*, is on Paul as Jew, Greek, and Roman. The four previous volumes are: *The Pauline Canon*, ed. Stanley E. Porter (PAST 1; Leiden: Brill, 2004), *Paul and His Opponents*, ed. Stanley E. Porter (PAST 2; Leiden: Brill, 2005), *Paul and His Theology*, ed. Stanley E. Porter (PAST 3; Leiden: Brill, 2006), and *Paul's World*, ed. Stanley E. Porter (PAST 4; Leiden: Brill, 2008). This series continues to grow, so that the next five volumes are now in the development stage. The number of different contributors to these volumes also continues to grow, and I would again welcome any previous contributors and certainly any new contributors to offer contributions to any and all of the volumes that have now moved into development. In a previous preface, I expressed thanks to those who have found these volumes helpful. I wish to repeat those thanks here. I thank those who have made use of the first four volumes, those who have given such favorable and encouraging reviews to these volumes, and those who are continuing to use these volumes to aid in their own research, writing and teaching. Like its four predecessors, this volume brings together a number of different papers by scholars engaged in discussion of the topic of Paul and his multi-dimensional cultural, ethnic and social background. I have not chosen to formally divide the essays into sections that correspond to Paul's Jewish, Greek or Roman background, but the essays do tend to divide in that way, with an approximately equal number for each. There is significant overlap as well, as readers will note. Some of the major questions regarding Paul's background are raised in this volume, while there are other essays that introduce and raise questions not usually broached in such a venue.

The next five volumes currently scheduled to appear are as follows:

Volume 6: Paul the Letter Writer (2009)

Volume 7: Paul and His Social Relations (2010)

Volume 8: Paul and Pseudepigraphy (2011)

Volume 9: Paul and Gnosis (2012)

Volume 10: Paul and Scripture (2013)

As noted before, I would like to invite any scholars interested in making contributions to one of more of these volumes to be in contact with

me regarding submission. Contact information is provided below. The usual pattern is for submission of an article by January 15 of the year in which the volume is to appear. The topics of the volumes are being defined and interpreted broadly, so that papers that deal, for example, with clearly related subjects are welcome. I look forward to producing these volumes in a timely manner to keep the series moving forward with one volume appearing each year.

I once again wish to thank all of the individual authors for their worthy contribution to this fifth volume of essays in the PAST series. When the series began, the initial plan was for five volumes, but the response has been more than was expected, including interest from a range of contributors. I hope that we can continue to welcome contributions from scholars who have contributed to previous volumes while welcoming new contributors as well. There is no pre-decided or prescribed balance to fresh and repeat contributors.

A volume such as this incurs many debts of gratitude and more tangible support. I wish first of all to thank the individual institutions that have supported the work of their scholars so that they can contribute to volumes such as these. I also wish to thank the several people at Brill with whom I have worked over the years, including especially Louise Schouten and Ivo Romein, who have continued to be a direct help in many ways as this project has taken shape and continued to develop and come to fruition. My desire is for this volume, like the others before it, to make a significant contribution to the topic of the background to Paul.

Stanley E. Porter

McMaster Divinity College
1280 Main St. W.
Hamilton, ON, Canada L8S 4K1
princpl@mcmaster.ca

ABBREVIATIONS

AB	Anchor Bible Commentary
ABD	<i>Anchor Bible Dictionary</i>
ABR	<i>Australian Biblical Review</i>
AGJU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums
AJA	<i>American Journal of Archaeology</i>
AJBI	<i>Annual of the Japanese Biblical Institute</i>
AnBib	Analecta biblica
ANTC	Abingdon New Testament Commentaries
ATANT	Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments
BBR	<i>Bulletin for Biblical Research</i>
BDAG	W. Bauer, F. W. Danker, W. F. Arndt, and F. W. Gingrich, <i>Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> , 3d ed., 1999
BDF	F. Blass and A. Debrunner, <i>A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> , ed. R. Funk
BECNT	Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament
BETL	Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium
BEvT	Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie
BHT	Beiträge zur historischen Theologie
<i>Bib</i>	<i>Biblica</i>
<i>BibInt</i>	<i>Biblical Interpretation</i>
<i>BibLeb</i>	<i>Bibel und Leben</i>
<i>BibSac</i>	<i>Bibliotheca Sacra</i>
BNTC	Black's New Testament Commentaries
BR	<i>Bible Review</i>
BT	<i>The Bible Translator</i>
BTB	<i>Biblical Theology Bulletin</i>
BWANT	Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament
BZ	<i>Biblische Zeitschrift</i>
BZNW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
CBC	Cambridge Bible Commentary
CBET	Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology

<i>CBQ</i>	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CC	Continental Commentaries
CNT	Commentaire du Nouveau Testament
ConBNT	Coniectanea neotestamentica: New Testament
<i>CQ</i>	<i>Classical Quarterly</i>
CRINT	Compendia rerum iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum
<i>CSR</i>	<i>Christian Scholar's Review</i>
<i>CTR</i>	<i>Criswell Theological Review</i>
DEL	Describing English Language
EBib	Études bibliques
EFN	Estudios de Filología Neotestamentaria
EKKNT	Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
<i>EncJud</i>	<i>Encyclopaedia Judaica</i> , 16 vols.
<i>EstBib</i>	<i>Estudios bíblicos</i>
<i>ETL</i>	<i>Ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium</i>
ETSSudies	Evangelical Theological Society Studies
<i>EvQ</i>	<i>Evangelical Quarterly</i>
<i>EvT</i>	<i>Evangelische Theologie</i>
<i>EWNT</i>	H. Balz and G. Schneider (eds.), <i>Exegetische Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament</i> , 3 vols., 1980–1983
<i>ExpTim</i>	<i>The Expository Times</i>
FB	Forschung zur Bibel
<i>FN</i>	<i>Filología Neotestamentaria</i>
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
GTA	Göttinger theologischer Arbeiten
<i>HBT</i>	<i>Horizons in Biblical Theology</i>
HNT	Handbuch zum Neuen Testament
HNTC	Harper's New Testament Commentaries
HSS	Harvard Semitic Studies
<i>HTR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
HTS	Harvard Theological Studies
IBC	Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching
ICC	International Critical Commentary
<i>Int</i>	<i>Interpretation</i>
IVPNTC	IVP New Testament Commentaries
<i>JETS</i>	<i>Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society</i>
<i>JR</i>	<i>Journal of Religion</i>

<i>JST</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
KEK	Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament (Meyer-Kommentar)
KNT	Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
LNTS	Library of New Testament Studies
<i>LS</i>	<i>Louvain Studies</i>
MeyerK	Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament
MNTC	Moffatt New Testament Commentary
NCB	New Century Bible
NCIB	New Clarendon Bible
NEG	Neue Echter Bibel
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament
NIGTC	New International Greek Testament Commentary
<i>NovT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
NovTSup	Novum Testamentum Supplements
NTAbh	Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen
NTG	New Testament Guides
NTL	New Testament Library
NTM	New Testament Monographs
<i>NovT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
OBS	Oxford Bible Series
OTL	Old Testament Library
OTM	Oxford Theological Monographs
<i>OTP</i>	J. H. Charlesworth (ed.), <i>Old Testament Pseudepigrapha</i> , 2 vols.
PNTC	Pillar New Testament Commentary
<i>PRSt</i>	<i>Perspectives in Religious Studies</i>
<i>PWSup</i>	A. F. Pauly, <i>Paulys Realencyclopädia der classischen Altertumswissenschaft</i> , rev. G. Wissowa, Supplement
<i>ResQ</i>	<i>Restoration Quarterly</i>
<i>RevExp</i>	<i>Review & Expositor</i>
RNT	Regensburger Neues Testament
RSPT	Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques
<i>RSR</i>	<i>Recherches de Science Religieuse</i>
<i>RTR</i>	<i>Reformed Theological Review</i>
SANT	Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testaments

SBG	Studies in Biblical Greek
SBLDS	SBL Dissertation Series
SBLRBS	SBL Resources for Biblical Study
SBLSBS	SBL Sources for Biblical Study
SBLSCS	SBL Septuagint and Cognate Studies
SBLSP	SBL Seminar Papers
SBS	Stuttgarter Bibelstudien
SBT	Studies in Biblical Theology
SD	Studies and Documents
SemeiaSt	Semeia Studies
<i>SEÅ</i>	<i>Svensk exegetisk årsbok</i>
<i>STJ</i>	<i>Scottish Journal of Theology</i>
SNT	Studien zum Neuen Testament
SNTG	Studies in New Testament Greek
SNTSMS	SNTS Monograph Series
SNTSU	Studien zum Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt
SÖAW	Sitzungen der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien
SP	Sacra Pagina
Str-B	H. L. Strack and P. Billerbeck, <i>Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch</i> , 6 vols., 1922–1961
SUNT	Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments
TB	Theologische Bücherei: Neudrucke und Berichte aus dem 20. Jahrhundert
<i>TBei</i>	<i>Theologische Beiträge</i>
<i>TDNT</i>	G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (eds.), <i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i> , trans. G. W. Bromiley, 10 vols., 1964–1976
TF	Theologische Forschung
THKNT	Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament
<i>ThPK</i>	<i>Theologisch-praktische Quartalschrift</i>
<i>ThTo</i>	<i>Theology Today</i>
<i>TJ</i>	<i>Trinity Journal</i>
<i>TLZ</i>	<i>Theologische Literaturzeitung</i>
TNTC	Tyndale New Testament Commentaries
<i>TTZ</i>	<i>Trierer theologische Zeitschrift</i>
<i>TWNT</i>	G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (eds.), <i>Theologische Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament</i> , 9 vols., 1932–1979
<i>TynBul</i>	<i>Tyndale Bulletin</i>
<i>TZ</i>	<i>Theologische Zeitschrift</i>
UNT	Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament

<i>VE</i>	<i>Vox evangelica</i>
<i>VR</i>	<i>Vox reformata</i>
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WEC	Wycliffe Exegetical Commentary
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
<i>WTJ</i>	<i>Westminster Theological Journal</i>
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
ZBNT	Zürcher Bibelkommentare NT
<i>ZNW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
<i>ZTK</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche</i>

PAUL AS JEW, GREEK, AND ROMAN: AN INTRODUCTION

Stanley E. Porter

McMaster Divinity College, Hamilton, ON, Canada

What does it mean to study Paul the Apostle as Jew, Greek, and Roman?¹ The framing of the question exposes the fact that the distinctions themselves involve a complex of ethnic, social, and cultural designations. Paul is both a complex individual of the ancient world, because he combines in his one personage features of life in each of these cultural-ethnic (and even religious) areas of the ancient world, and one of many people of that world who evidenced such complexity.

No one would dispute that Paul was a Jew. Both his letters and the other evidence that we have, including in the book of Acts, make clear that Paul was a Jew. As he himself states in Phil 3:5–6, he was circumcised on the eighth day, the day prescribed for such an act (Lev 12:3); from the race of Israel, that is, ethnically an Israelite from birth; from the tribe of Benjamin, that is, he knew his tribe, the one from the one son of Jacob born in Palestine and the one that produced the first king, Saul; a Hebrew of Hebrews, which is probably a linguistic distinction for a Jew who knew Hebrew or at least Aramaic, or possibly a designation for one descended from Jews who spoke the language (though he clearly uses Greek); a Pharisee in his training and attentiveness to the law; one who persecuted the church, that is, he went beyond what was required and zealously protected his ethnic faith from those who threatened it; and one who followed the law prescribed by Torah.² In other places in his letters, Paul makes mention of some of the same facts, as well as adding others. For example, in Rom 11:1 he mentions that he is an Israelite, a descendant of Abraham, and from the tribe of Benjamin; in 1 Cor 15:9, he acknowledges that he persecuted the church; in 2 Cor 11:2, he states that he is a Hebrew, an Israelite and descended

¹ An excellent attempt to answer such a question is R. Wallace and W. Williams, *The Three Worlds of Paul of Tarsus* (London: Routledge, 1994), written by two classicists.

² See P. O'Brien, *The Epistle to the Philippians* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 368–81, for discussion of the Philippians passage and marshalling of many parallels.

from Abraham; in Gal 1:13–14, he notes that he was a persecutor of the church and was very zealous for the traditions of his fathers; in Gal 1:23, he notes that there were those who were suspicious of the one, Paul, who had been persecuting them; in Gal 2:15, he states that he was born a Jew; and in 1 Tim 1:13, he says he was a persecutor. Acts supports much of this testimony regarding Paul. Acts 7:58, 8:1, 9:1–2 and 5, 22:4–5 and 26:10–11 attest to Paul as a persecutor of the church; Acts 22:3 records Paul stating that he is a Jew and, though reared in Tarsus in Cilicia, also educated under the priest Gamaliel according to the law of the fathers and zealous for God; and Acts 23:6 and 26:5 depict Paul as a Pharisee. In terms of being a Jew, Paul was ethnically and religiously a Jew, but, more than that, he was one who in many ways had advanced within the Jewish culture of the times.

Discussing the sense in which Paul is a Greek and Roman is more difficult. There have been a number of studies that have clearly showed that we can no longer think of Judaism in terms of its being distinct from Hellenism.³ In that sense, whether one is talking of Judaism in Palestine or in the diaspora, there is a distinct and clear sense in which there is cultural contact and assimilation that occurs. There have been several attempts to gauge the influence of Hellenism upon Judaism.⁴ This brings the question of Paul's Greekness to the fore. Though a Jew, he lived much of his life within the larger Greco-Roman world, one influenced in various ways and to various levels by Hellenistic and Roman culture and practices. We see this influence upon Paul in many ways. His letters are written in Greek (whether written by a scribe or by himself; he "signs" them in Greek), he cites the Greek Bible widely in his letters, and he expands upon the Greco-Roman letter form. If we turn to Acts, we note that Paul was born in Tarsus of Cilicia (Acts 22:3), that is, in the diaspora in a city that was known as a center of Greek learning because of its philosophical and educational traditions.

³ Some of these include: M. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period* (trans. J. Bowden; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974); idem, with C. Marksches, *The "Hellenization" of Judaea in the First Century after Christ* (trans. J. Bowden; London: SCM Press, 1989); J. D. Newsome, *Greeks, Romans, Jews: Currents of Culture and Belief in the New Testament World* (Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1992).

⁴ See, e.g., J. Goldstein, "Jewish Acceptance and Rejection of Hellenism," in E. P. Sanders, with A.I. Baumgarten and A. Mendelson (eds.), *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition. II. Aspects of Judaism in the Graeco-Roman Period* (London: SCM Press, 1981), 64–87; J. M. G. Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: From Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE–117 CE)* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996).

He was probably educated there, at least through the grammar school, before going to Jerusalem for his Pharisaical training, which accounts for his use of both spoken and written Greek (Acts 21:37).⁵ Whatever one thinks of Paul's educational background, that he came from Tarsus is not to be seriously disputed,⁶ as even Paul's own letters seem to confirm, when he notes that after his conversion he went to Arabia and Damascus, rather than Jerusalem (Gal 1:17). Paul, as a diaspora Jew, who had been born in Tarsus, was a person of diverse influences and experiences, including multiculturalism and multilingualism. In exploring the Greek dimension of Paul's existence, we mean more than simply whether he was or was not from Tarsus, but we include the influence upon his life and mission of his multifaceted background, including various elements of Hellenism, as a diaspora Jew at home in the Greco-Roman world. This would include the influence of Hellenistic cultural elements, such as social life and organization, linguistic elements, such as the use of the Greek language and Greek literature, and political elements, the result of living in a world that was first conquered and joined together by Alexander the Great before falling into the hands of the Romans.

Turning to the Roman dimension of Paul's social-cultural background, we note again that it is only in Acts that it is stated that Paul, besides being a citizen of Tarsus,⁷ was a Roman citizen (Acts 16:37; 22:25–28). There have been a number of biblical scholars who have doubted Paul's Roman citizenship.⁸ Most scholars, however, including classicists, find it difficult to dispute Paul's Roman citizenship.⁹ However, what it means for Paul to be a Roman is more than simply Roman

⁵ See S. E. Porter and A. W. Pitts, "Paul's Bible, his Education and his Access to the Scriptures of Israel," *Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism* 5 (2008): 9–41.

⁶ See M. Hengel, with R. Deines, *The Pre-Christian Paul* (trans. J. Bowden; London: SCM Press, 1991), 1–4.

⁷ On the issue of Paul's Tarsian citizenship, see Wallace and Williams, *Three Worlds*, 142.

⁸ See, e.g., J. C. Lentz, Jr., *Luke's Portrait of Paul* (SNTSMS 77; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 43–51. Lentz also doubts whether Paul was a "Greek citizen," that is, a citizen of Tarsus, and whether Pharisees were present in Tarsus (see pp. 23–61). Lentz seems to be trying to revive the so-called Paulinism hypothesis, promulgated in various forms by P. Vielhauer ("On the 'Paulinism' of Acts," in L. E. Keck and J. L. Martyn [eds.], *Studies in Luke-Acts* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1966], 33–50) and E. Haenchen (*The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary* [trans. B. Noble et al.; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1971], 112–16). See S. E. Porter, *The Paul of Acts: Essays in Literary Criticism, Rhetoric, and Theology* (WUNT 115; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), 187–206.

⁹ See, e.g., Wallace and Williams, *Three Worlds*, 137–46.

citizenship. It includes life as a diaspora Jew within the world controlled by Rome. No one disputes that Paul lived such a life as he wrote to various churches, planned his missionary journeys, and traveled throughout the Mediterranean. His plans included visits not only to Anatolia, but to Greece, Rome, and then Spain. All of this was possible because of the political scene that had been created by the rule of Rome, which came to be known as the *pax Romana*. It was first under Caesar Augustus, and then under his successors into the second century A.D., that such a unified territory that allowed such communication and travel became possible. Besides the unified transportation system, there were such Roman elements as a legal and judicial system, a political system and bureaucracy that attempted to impose reasonable rule throughout the Empire, an economic system created through political and physical unity, religious diversity, and a security system that helped to gain and maintain peace.¹⁰ The Roman world was one in which there was clearly a Roman presence, although its local manifestation could take a variety of forms, such as various types of governors or local rulers. In this world, Paul the diaspora Jew from Tarsus roamed relatively freely, traveling by road and by sea to various cities, where he founded churches of followers of Jesus Christ. It was in fact this same Roman system that then provided a means for him, once he was arrested for civil disobedience, to find a means of making his way to Rome on the basis of an appeal to Caesar for judgment of his case.¹¹

It is not enough, however, to define the three different spheres of Paul's existence. When the three areas are brought together, there are a number of different ways that the pieces can fit together, depending upon the particular issue at stake. The essays in this volume attempt to discuss various dimensions of the issue of Paul's Jewish, Greek, and Roman background, each by focusing upon a different dimension or dimensions of his thought and writing.

In the opening essay, Drake Williams opens up the issue of the use of Scripture in 1 Corinthians. In this article, he discusses eighteen instances in which Paul draws upon the Hebrew Bible, and establishes

¹⁰ On the *pax Romana* and its implications, see P. Petit, *Pax Romana* (trans. J. Willis: London: Batsford, 1976); K. Wengst, *Pax Romana and the Peace of Jesus Christ* (trans. J. Bowden; London: SCM Press, 1987).

¹¹ See H. W. Tajra, *The Trial of St. Paul* (WUNT 2.35; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1989), 142–47; cf. A. N. Sherwin-White, *Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament* (Sarum Lectures 1960–1961; Oxford: Clarendon, 1963), 57–70.

the influence that they have upon Paul's argument. He concludes that, though the amount of content may be small, the influence on Paul's argument is significant.

Returning to a major issue in Pauline studies, especially in terms of Paul's Jewish background, Panayotis Coutsoumpos examines Paul's attitude towards the law. Recognizing the new perspective on Paul, Coutsoumpos also urges caution, recognizing that the supposed new paradigm does not answer all the questions concerning Paul's relationship to the law.

Turning to Galatians specifically, Bas Van Os raises the question of the recipients of Paul's letter. After raising and answering three major questions regarding the recipients, he concludes that the recipients consisted of a mix of Jews and gentiles. He believes that this points to a south Galatian location, and helps to focus the nature of Pauline opposition.

In a wide-ranging essay, Andrew Pitts raises the specter of the unity and diversity in Paul's eschatology. Going against the trend in many studies, Pitts believes that there is an inherent unity to Paul's eschatology, while differences are accounted for on the basis of local rhetorical situations.

In an article that draws upon both Greco-Roman and Jewish backgrounds of Paul's experience, Timothy Carter examines the language of Christ's body as it is found in 1 Corinthians 12. Even by accounting for both of these bodies of material, however, according to Carter, does not exhaust the meaning of Paul's imagery.

Craig Evans wishes to recognize Paul's place among the pagan authors of antiquity. After presenting a list of possible parallels from ancient Greek and Roman authors, he goes further and identifies various legal and athletic terminology that Paul uses that reflects his familiarity with the Greco-Roman world of his time.

In an essay that explores an often neglected area of research, James Harrison looks at the possible influence of the gymnasiarchs on Paul's understanding of pastoral formation. To establish these correlations, Harrison draws upon a wealth of inscriptional evidence, especially association with the gymnasium.

Mark Nanos challenges the consensus when he argues that the "weak" in 1 Corinthians 8 are not Christ-believers, as he uses the term, but are "polytheists" for whom Christ also died. Nanos finds in this understanding of Paul that he draws upon a wide-ranging belief in fictive kinship among humanity.

Craig Keener, while recognizing that many scholars have drawn on Jewish backgrounds to understand Paul's description of flesh and spirit, instead reads Rom 8:5–8 from the standpoint of those knowledgeable in Greek and Roman philosophy. He finds that such a philosophical framework opens up the implications of this passage on several conceptual fronts.

Pursuing a similar line as the essay before, Joshua Jipp examines Rom 7:7–25 in terms of Plato's *Republic* and a subversion of the use of the philosophical discourse type called *akrasia*. Paul uses this discourse to counter his opponents in Rome, who are arguing against Paul's gospel.

In an attempt to bring the concept of adoption as sons up to the same level as other Pauline salvific terms, Trevor Burke explores what he considers the important Trinitarian implications of this concept. He especially notes the important sociological implications of sonship terminology.

Stanley Porter raises the specific question of whether Paul may have spoken Latin. In order to answer such a question, if even tentatively, he examines the possible occasions on which Paul may have used Latin, and the evidence from his letters, as well as Acts, that he may have done so.

In the final essay of the volume, Sean Adams tackles one of the perpetually difficult topics in Pauline studies, Paul's Roman citizenship. He notes the significance of citizenship of Rome, as well as Tarsus, during the first century, and attempts to place Paul within this civic milieu.

In all, these essays explore a range of topics related to Paul's Jewish, Greek, and Roman background. Some of the essays focus on one of these dimensions, while others introduce varying perspectives as they attempt to grapple with particular issues or passages. The overall result is a fuller appreciation of the complex yet rich and full cultural, ethnic, and social background that motivated the work and writing of Paul.

LIGHT GIVING SOURCES: EXAMINING THE EXTENT OF SCRIPTURAL CITATION AND ALLUSION INFLUENCE IN 1 CORINTHIANS

H. H. Drake Williams III

Tyndale Theological Seminary, Badhoevedorp, The Netherlands

The influences that shaped Paul have been an issue that has long concerned students of the apostle. Paul's writings express the impact of his Jewish upbringing, the surrounding Greco-Roman culture, and his Christian conversion. The relationship between these influences, however, is less than certain. N. T. Wright in his volume *Paul: In Fresh Perspective* begins his volume by addressing the sway of each of these upon Paul's life, describing them as "multiple, overlapping and sometimes competing narratives."¹ In *The Paul Quest*, Ben Witherington notes the importance and uncertainty of Paul's Jewish, Roman, and Christian background. He explores each of these in a chapter cleverly entitled "The Trinity of Paul's Identity."² The quest for a primary influence is still in doubt as S. J. Hafemann rightly stated in 1993 in his article entitled "Paul and His Interpreters" within the *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*. Referring to studies of Paul that consider his Jewish or Greco-Roman influence, Hafemann states, "the fundamental issue still to be resolved in Pauline studies is the determination of the primary religious and theological context within which Paul's thought is to be understood."³

A decisive answer to the interaction between these various worlds is well beyond the scope of one essay. In order to approach a conclusion on this matter, a starting place ought to identify agreed upon influence from a particular background. It then should consider how that influence extends into Paul's composition within individual letters.

¹ N. T. Wright, *Paul: In Fresh Perspective* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006), 6.

² B. Witherington, *The Paul Quest: The Renewed Search for the Jew of Tarsus* (Downers Grove/Leicester: IVP, 1998), 52.

³ S. J. Hafemann, "Paul and His Interpreters," in G. F. Hawthorne and R. P. Martin (eds.), *Dictionary of Paul and his Letters* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1993), 678. Such a perspective is affirmed also by B. S. Rosner, *Greed as Idolatry: The Origin and Meaning of a Pauline Metaphor* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 50.

When the data from each of Paul's backgrounds is assembled, conclusions may then be made regarding the influence of particular thought worlds upon Paul's writing.

The following article will crystallize the influence of Paul's Jewish background in 1 Corinthians. It will consider agreed upon Jewish influence within 1 Corinthians in the form of citations and allusions.⁴ There are eighteen such examples within 1 Corinthians that have been identified in major studies on Paul's use of Scripture.⁵ Commentaries as well as studies that examine First Corinthians exegetically or in relation to the Greco-Roman background generally agree on the presence of these Jewish references. After each reference is identified, the article will then explore how that Jewish influence extends within the text that surrounds the citation or allusion.

Isaiah 29:14 in 1 Corinthians 1:19

From the beginning of 1 Corinthians, Jewish elements can be found within Paul's instruction. After addressing the divisions within the church in 1 Cor 1:10–18, Paul inserts the first clearly Jewish idea within the letter, the quotation of Isa 29:14 in 1 Cor 1:19. It reads, "For it is written, 'I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and the discernment of the discerning I will thwart.'"⁶

While its presence is plain, there is uncertainty concerning the extent of its influence. Some believe that Paul uses this as a scriptural proof to sustain his argument.⁷ Another asserts that Paul rips the quotation

⁴ Due to space considerations, the investigation of echoes and themes cannot be considered. The certainty of these is less agreed upon than the citations and allusions.

⁵ See D. A. Koch, *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums: Untersuchungen zur Verwendung und zum Verständnis der Schrift bei Paulus* (BHT 69; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1986); C. Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture: Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature* (SNTSMS 69; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992); R. E. Ciampa and B. S. Rosner, "1 Corinthians," in G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson (eds.), *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Apollos/Baker, 2007), 695–752.

⁶ All Biblical citations are from the English Standard Version unless otherwise stated.

⁷ F. G. Lang, *Die Briefe an die Korinther* (NTD 7; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986), 29; C. K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (BNTC; London: A & C Black, 1968), 52; A. Robertson and A. Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1911), 18–19.

out of context applying it in the light of the cross.⁸ Another believes that Paul quoted Scripture in a rather confusing way in this passage to bolster his authority.⁹

An examination of the Jewish backdrop of the citation helps to make sense of his use of Isa 29:14. The citation is used to support Paul's grand assertions from 1 Cor 1:17–18. In these verses Paul refuses to preach with the wisdom of the word so that it will not empty the message of the cross. That word of the cross divides people into those who are being saved and those who are perishing. The Jewish citation, then, is an explanation of these key ideas that eventually continue through to the end of 1 Corinthians 3.¹⁰

It is reasonable to see the Isa 29:14 citation in 1 Cor 1:19 as an explanation of 1 Cor 1:17–18. Paul introduces the citation with the words *γέγραπται γάρ* which is the way that Paul introduces citations to explain his argument in other places.¹¹ The Isa 29:14 citation continues the concern of wisdom from 1 Cor 1:17, explaining why Paul is so against mixing the message of the cross with human wisdom. He would rather preach with a different word, the word of the cross, than to preach with this type of wisdom.¹² The citation explains why God has already discarded such wisdom since it is doomed.¹³

A fuller examination of Isa 29:14 in relation to its context and early Jewish ideas can also support the assertion that Paul has been making in 1 Cor 1:17–18. Rather than merely being used for rhetorical effect to reinforce Paul's authority in his argumentation, there are good reasons to assume that Paul saw this citation as fitting with his train of thought. If the context of Isa 29:14 is taken into consideration, the prophet is against a human wisdom that presents an alternative path

⁸ W. Schrage, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther. Teilband 1: 1 Kor 1,1–6,11* (EKK 7; Zurich: Benziger, 1991), 175.

⁹ C. Stanley, *Arguing with Scripture: The Rhetoric of Quotations in the Letters of Paul* (New York/London: T&T Clark, 2004), 80–83.

¹⁰ In his massive examination of Paul's use of Scripture, Koch considers this to be a *Ringkomposition*. Koch, *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums*, 273–77. W. Wuellner suggests that 1:19–3:20 is also to be seen as a unity calling it “haggadic homily genre.” W. Wuellner, “Haggadic Homily Genre in 1 Cor 1–3,” *JBL* 89 (1970): 199–204.

¹¹ Cf. Rom 12:19; 14:11; Gal 3:10; 4:22, 27.

¹² G. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 65, 68.

¹³ Lang, *Die Briefe an die Korinther*, 29; Barrett, *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 52.

for the salvation of God's people than trusting in God's word. Salvation is the issue within 1 Cor 1:17–18 as well as in Isaiah.

Another connection is with the greatness of the judgment that is expressed. Isa 29:14 is placed within a woe oracle addressed to all of God's people and one in which the hardened senses of God's people are on display. The text suggests the greatness of the judgment that is to occur.¹⁴ In 1 Cor 1:18, Paul divided humanity into groups in which one group is perishing and one that is being saved. Judgment is the end time consequence of those who follow the wisdom of the world and reject the cross of Christ.¹⁵ The citation is an expression of the judgment upon those who preach a worldly wisdom thereby rejecting the cross of Christ.

A messianic and salvific element can also be heard from a reading of the Isaiah quotation within context. The prophet uses the פלא root in this text, which is a root that is used in other messianic texts such as Isa 9:5.¹⁶ This messianic connection makes sense of Paul's use of the citation then in relation to Christ, although it is to Christ crucified.¹⁷

If the influence of contemporary Judaism is considered, it further makes sense of Paul's use of the Isa 29:14 citation in this place. When wisdom becomes absent or is hidden, great judgment and division occur. The remedy for this is the presence of the Messiah.¹⁸ This fits the broader context of 1 Cor 1:10–11 where division was addressed just prior to human wisdom.

Not only does the citation, context, and early Jewish interpretation fit with Paul's argument previous to 1 Cor 1:19, but it can also be seen to infer the subsequent ideas of 1 Cor 1:20. With the destruction of

¹⁴ Cf. Isa 6:9–10; 29:9–10; 42:18–20; 43:8; 44:18; 63:17. Cf. G. K. Beale, "Isaiah VI 9–13: A Retributive Taunt Against Idolatry," *VT* 41 (1991): 257–78; C. A. Evans, *To See and Not Perceive: Isaiah 6.9–10 in Early Jewish and Christian Interpretation* (JSOTSup 64; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989), 40–46, 215.

¹⁵ H. C. Kammler, *Kreuz und Weisheit* (WUNT 159; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 2003), 70–72; Schrage, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*, 1:175.

¹⁶ There are other possible messianic overtones which use this same root in Isa 25:1 and 28:29. Cf. E. J. Young, *The Book of Isaiah* (3 vols.; NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1965), 2:186.

¹⁷ For a further explanation of the context of Isa 29:14 in 1 Cor 1:19, see H. H. D. Williams, *The Wisdom of the Wise: The Presence and Function of Scripture within 1 Cor 1:18–3:23* (AGJU 49; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 56–58, 88–93.

¹⁸ Cf. 2 Bar. 48:31–37; 70:3–6; 4 Ezra 5:9–13; 13:29–32; 1 En. 91:14–15; 93:8; L.A.B. 40:4; 3 Macc 6:19–29. For further development of this idea in relation to Isa 29:14 in 1 Cor 1:19, see Williams, *The Wisdom of the Wise*, 61–73, 88–93.

wisdom, there is no place for the wise man, scribe, or the debater of this age. God has already put human wisdom to shame through the apocalyptic event of the cross, and thus this event has shattered the entire order of human wisdom.¹⁹

Jeremiah 9:23–24 in 1 Corinthians 1:26–31

Shortly following the citation in 1 Cor 1:19, Paul uses two Scripture references from Jer 9:23–24 to compose 1 Cor 1:26–31. The introductory formula *καθὼς γέγραπται* signals the presence of Jer 9:24 in 1 Cor 1:31. Considering that the encouragement to boast and not boast, the use of the word *καυχάομαι*, the presence of wisdom, strength, and riches are found within this passage, an allusion to Jer 9:23 is present within 1 Cor 1:27–29 as well.²⁰ These two verses from Jeremiah then form a framework in which to consider 1 Cor 1:26–31.

In this section Paul uses these Scripture verses from Jeremiah to speak about the Corinthians' past and present Christian calling.²¹ In 1 Cor 1:26, the Corinthians' present calling in Christ is in view. It is not based on their own wisdom, strength, or noble birth. Indeed, God's ways of calling his people have never been in this way which he speaks about in 1 Cor 1:27–28. God calls people to Christ not according to the flesh so that in the future no flesh can boast in the presence of God.²² He makes this point by using the wording of Jer 9:23 which comprises much of 1 Cor 1:27–29. By alluding to this text, it further strengthens God's historic work of calling people to himself apart from human abilities.

Instead of recognizing human abilities, God calls Christians to faith in him through the wise plan in Christ Jesus. As God's people, they

¹⁹ R. B. Hays, "The Conversion of the Imagination: Scripture and Eschatology in 1 Corinthians," *NTS* 45 (1999): 403–404.

²⁰ G. O'Day and C. Stanley note the presence of these references to the Jeremiah text within 1 Cor 1:26–31. G. O'Day, "Jeremiah 9:22–23 and 1 Corinthians 1:26–31: A Study of Intertextuality," *JBL* 109 (1990): 259–67; Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture*, 186–88.

²¹ Note this point is especially made by Schrage, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*, 1:208. Note that other versions such as the KJV, ESV, NIV, RSV tend to focus on the Corinthians' past. The sense of the past coming to Christ is better represented in 1 Cor 1:27–28 when the aorist of the verb *ἐκλέγω* is used.

²² Note the presence of the word *σάφξ*, a word that is regularly derogatory in Paul's expression, in 1 Cor 1:26, 29. Cf. Rom 3:20; Gal 2:16; 5:17.

rely on the new triad of Christ's righteousness, holiness, and redemption instead of the triad of human abilities—wisdom, strength, and noble birth. Here Paul then concludes by citing Jer 9:24 which he uses as the final word on Christian calling. By using this Scripture citation as the endpoint of his argument, it indicates that Paul sees the Corinthians' calling in Christ in agreement with the principle from Jeremiah's writing.

If the context and early Jewish interpretations of Jer 9:23–24 are considered within the passage, there are further indications of the influence of this passage of Scripture in 1 Cor 1:26–31. For example, from the context of the Scripture text in Jer 8:9 and 9:18, there is vocabulary of shame which is picked up in 1 Cor 1:27. There is also the reversal of roles, where those of wisdom, strength, and riches are no more and those who are weak, such as the wailing women, are called to hear the word of the Lord. Other places within early Judaism where the influence of Jer 9:23–24 is found also indicate this reversion of roles.²³

These overlaps with the Jeremiah context further suggest the substantial influence that it had in Paul's writing of 1 Cor 1:26–31.²⁴ As A. C. Thiselton says, "With Jer 9:22, the two verses trace the sequence of thought which Paul has been expounding and applying [in 1 Cor 1:26–31]...Paul does not use the quotation as a proof of something new, but as an instantiation of a principle which here receives climactic expression and corroboration."²⁵ Thus, as with the citation of Isa 29:14 used in 1 Cor 1:19, Paul's use of Jewish Scripture informs more of his writing than just the place where the citation occurs.

Isaiah 64:4 and 65:17 in 1 Corinthians 2:9

In 1 Cor 2:9 there is a citation that has been confusing to many regarding its source and its influence upon Paul's writing. The text reads, "But, as it is written, 'What no eye has seen, nor ear heard, nor the heart of man imagined, what God has prepared for those who love him.'"

²³ Cf. 1 Sam 2:10 (LXX), Ode 3:10, *L.A.B.* 50–51. For further explanation of these Jewish texts, see Williams, *The Wisdom of the Wise*, 113–24.

²⁴ See also J. R. Wagner, "‘Not Beyond the Things Which are Written’: A Call to Boast Only in the Lord (1 Cor 4:6)," *NTS* 44 (1998): 279–87; O'Day, "Jeremiah 9:22–23 and 1 Corinthians 1:26–31," 259–67; Ciampa and Rosner, "1 Corinthians," 700.

²⁵ A. C. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids/Carlisle: Eerdmans/Paternoster, 2000), 195.

Whereas some have considered it not to be Jewish²⁶ and others have considered it from unknown Jewish tradition,²⁷ it is best to consider the source of 1 Cor 2:9 as Jewish Scripture. A Scripture citation is preferable since it is introduced with the introductory formula καθὼς γέγραπται. This formula introduces Scripture within the rest of Paul's letters.²⁸ The quotation contains similar wording to Isa 64:3 LXX since both contain the words ὀφθαλμός, οὐκ, ἀκούω, ὅς, and ὁράω.

Some of the wording in 1 Cor 2:9 has been difficult to explain. Particularly, the confusing phrase καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἀνέβη does not appear connected to Isa 64:3. While there have been other proposals, the influence of Isa 65:17 is most likely here.²⁹ Paul often combines Scripture texts within citations.³⁰ To combine Isa 64:3 with a key text close in proximity in Scripture is likely, particularly when it is noted as such a key text in the section of Isaiah.³¹ Other early Jewish literature also combines the ideas from Isa 65:17 with Isa 64:3.³² The new creation idea that stems from Isa 65:17 is also one that is prominent

²⁶ B. A. Pearson, *The Pneumatikos-Psychikos Terminology in I Corinthians: A Study in the Theology of the Corinthian Opponents of Paul and its Relation to Gnosticism* (SBLDS 12; Cambridge, Mass.: SBL, 1973), 34; S. J. Patterson, "Paul and the Jesus Tradition: It's Time for Another Look," *HTR* 84 (1991): 23–41; Koch, *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums*, 41.

²⁷ O. Michel, *Paulus und seine Bibel* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1972), 33–34; J. Héring, *The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians* (London: Epworth, 1962), 18–19; R. G. Hamerton-Kelly, *Pre-existence, Wisdom, and the Son of Man: A Study of the Idea of Pre-existence in the New Testament* (SNTSMS 21; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973), 114; P. Prigent, "Ce que l'œil n'a pas vu, 1 Cor 2:9," *ThZ* (1958): 416–29; A. Feuillet, "L'Énigme de I Cor II, 9," *RB* 70 (1963): 52–74.

²⁸ Cf. Rom 3:17; 2:24; 3:4, 10; 4:17; 8:36; 9:13, 33; 10:15; 11:8, 26; 15:3, 9, 21; 2 Cor 8:15; 9:9. Cf. B. Metzger, "The Formulas Introducing Quotations of Scripture in the New Testament and the Mishnah," *JBL* 70 (1951): 297–307; A. T. Hanson, *The New Testament Interpretation of Scripture* (London: SPCK, 1980), 44.

²⁹ E.g., Hanson, *The New Testament Interpretation of Scripture*, 50–62; B. Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations* (London: SCM, 1961), 246.

³⁰ Cf. Rom 3:10–18; 9:25–26, 33; 11:26–27, 34–35; 1 Cor 15:54–55; Gal 3:10–14.

³¹ Cf. D. M. Carr, "Reading Isaiah from Beginning to End," in R. F. Melugin and M. A. Sweeney (eds.), *New Visions of Isaiah* (JSOTSup 214; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 204–13; O. H. Steck, *Studien zu Tritojesaja* (BZAW 203; Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1991), 221–25; K. Koenen has noted its prominence by calling Isa 65:17 the *Kern* of Isa 56–66. K. Koenen, *Ethik und Eschatologie im Tritojesajabuch: Eine literarkritische und redaktionsgeschichtliche Studie* (WMANT 62; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1990), 179.

³² *L.A.B.* 26:13 is most clear as A. T. Hanson has proposed. Hanson, *The New Testament Interpretation of Scripture*, 62–63. Other possibilities are *I En.* 41:1–3 and 52:1–4. See further Williams, *The Wisdom of the Wise*, 175–84.

throughout early Judaism.³³ An allusion to Isa 65:17 within this citation from Isa 64:3 is what appears most likely.

The influence of these texts can be seen to extend beyond 1 Cor 2:9. The context of Isa 64:3 concerned the hidden nature of God's revelation among men. That idea is found in 1 Cor 2:7–8 where Paul describes a secret and hidden wisdom that none of the rulers of this age understood. That wisdom is hidden from some. Yet, it is revealed to those whom the Lord calls to him (cf. 1 Cor 2:10). Such is suggested by the context of Isa 65:17 where the redeemed are able to see and appreciate God's revelation.

Isaiah 40:13 in 1 Corinthians 2:16

After declaring that he has received God's wisdom through the Spirit, Paul's argument progresses to 1 Cor 2:16. In this passage, Paul quotes his next Jewish source Isa 40:13. Paul writes, "For who has understood the mind of the Lord so as to instruct him?" But we have the mind of Christ."³⁴ Paul cites from the Septuagint version which has substituted mind for spirit.³⁵

The citation concludes well the argument of 1 Cor 2:12–16. Throughout this section, Paul has been writing that only the spiritual person is able to receive and judge the things from God. The natural person cannot receive these things or judge these things because they are from the Spirit. Since the reception of revelation is the concern of his argument, Paul can conclude 1 Cor 2:12–16 with the quotation from Isa 40:13, "For who has understood the mind of the Lord so as to instruct him?"

³³ For a broader survey of possible Isa 65:17 influence throughout Judaism, see U. Mell, *Neue Schöpfung: Eine traditionsgeschichtliche und exegetische Studie zu einem soteriologischen Grundsatz paulinischer Theologie* (BZNW 56; Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1989), 69–257.

³⁴ Most recognize this reference as a citation. E.g., Fee, *First Corinthians*, 119; H. Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians: A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975), 69; Schrage, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*, 166–67; Lang, *Die Briefe an die Korinther*, 47. C. Stanley suggests that it is an allusion. Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture*, 36. The passage is well recognized as having scriptural influence.

³⁵ Although Isa 40:13 says, "Who has measured the Spirit of the LORD, or what man shows him his counsel?" the LXX version of this text as well as its appearance in Wis 9:13, 17 substitutes the word "mind" for "Spirit."

When read in relation to its background within Judaism, the influence of the Isa 40:13 passage can be seen within 1 Cor 2:12–16.³⁶ When the context of the Isa 40:13 passage is considered, it is found in a series of questions that indicate that God alone is able to reveal his ways. Nobody is able to measure the waters in the hollow of their hands or weigh the mountains in scales. Nobody is able to teach the ways of justice to God (Isa 40:12, 14). In the same way, only the Lord is able to reveal his mind. Such ideas are also elucidated by other passages in early Jewish literature where Isa 40:13 is present.³⁷ Only the Lord can reveal his mind.

If the Jewish backdrop of this citation is kept in view, its influence also extends into Paul's writing following the citation. This can particularly help make sense of Paul's claim in 1 Cor 2:16b where he says, "we have the mind of Christ." While this may seem elitist at first glance, the surrounding context of 1 Corinthians as well as the context from Judaism indicates that Paul is also exhibiting his human frailty. Commenting on 1 Cor 2:16, Schrage rightfully notes that Paul claims the mind of Christ rather than the mind of the Lord. So far in 1 Corinthians, Christ is presented as a suffering figure (1 Cor 1:17, 23–24, 30; 2:2).³⁸ Thus by saying that he has Christ's mind, Paul is identifying with the suffering mindset of Christ as expressed in the cross, and not calling for a higher stature.³⁹

Suffering and frailty is reinforced by the Jewish backdrop of Isa 40:13. When this passage is viewed in its context, the spirit of the Lord is identified with the suffering servant. The same association with the "mind of the Lord" in Isaiah 40 also recalls the suffering figure (Isa 42:1; 48:16; 61:1; 63:10). Other early Jewish uses of the passage also refer to human weakness or suffering.⁴⁰

³⁶ F. Wilk also notes the parallels with "revealing" and "glory" from Isa 40:5a that appear in 1 Cor 2:8, 10 and "rulers" from Isa 40:23b that appears in 1 Cor 2:6, 8. F. Wilk, "Isaiah in 1 and 2 Corinthians," in S. Moyise and M. J. J. Menken (eds.), *Isaiah in the New Testament* (London/New York: T&T Clark, 2005), 141.

³⁷ See Wis 9:13–17; 1 QS 11.18–20; 1 QH 7.32–33; 1 QH 10.1–4; 2 Bar 14:8–11; 75:1–5; 1 En. 93:11–14; 4 Ezra 4:10–11; 5:33–40; Jdt 8:14; 2 En. 33:4. See Williams, *The Wisdom of the Wise*, 218–25.

³⁸ Schrage, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*, 1:267.

³⁹ Cf. Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 275; R. Jewett, *Paul's Anthropological Terms* (Leiden: Brill, 1971), 361. Note how this suffering mindset finds further expression throughout the letter (cf. 1 Cor 4:8–13).

⁴⁰ Cf. 2 Bar. 14:8–11; 4 Ezra 13:54–55. For further discussion see Williams, *The Wisdom of the Wise*, 220–24.

Job 5:13 in 1 Corinthians 3:19

At the conclusion of his argument on wisdom, Paul introduces two citations—one from Job 5:13 and the other from Ps 94:10. They conclude his argument against human wisdom which he began in 1 Cor 1:17. From the middle of 1 Corinthians 1, Paul has been arguing that human wisdom is powerless and foolish in God's sight (1 Cor 1:18–2:5). Because of the ineffectiveness of human wisdom, he introduces and explains his own wisdom that he presents (1 Cor 2:6–16). Then at the end of 1 Corinthians 3, he returns to the ineffectiveness of human wisdom. In this final portion of 1 Cor 3:18–23, Paul cites both Job 5:13 and Ps 94:11.

Many see the extent of the influence of these citations in 1 Cor 1:18–3:23 in different ways. Some scholars have argued that the citations of Job 5:13 and Ps 94:10 are concluding parts of midrashic homilies that extend from 1 Cor 1:18 until 1 Cor 3:23.⁴¹ Some have proposed that these two citations primarily function to support 1 Cor 3:18–19.⁴² Another believes that these citations have a summarizing function referring readers back to Paul's argument particularly in 1 Cor 1:18–25.⁴³ While many of these assertions are true, these citations read in the light of their context and Jewish backdrop, can be seen as having influence in Paul's writing in 1 Corinthians 3.

First, the Job 5:13 citation supports well the ideas found in 1 Cor 3:18.⁴⁴ Paul's exhortation in 1 Cor 3:18 is for the Corinthians not to deceive themselves. If anyone thinks that they are wise in this age, they should become a fool. Following this, Paul quotes from Job 5:13 in 1 Cor 3:19 which reads, "For the wisdom of this world is folly with God. For it is written, 'He catches the wise in their craftiness.'"

The context of Job supports the placement of this exhortation especially well. The words are uttered by Eliphaz, one of Job's mistaken

⁴¹ E. E. Ellis, *Prophecy and Hermeneutic: New Testament Essays* (WUNT 18; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1978), 214; V. P. Branick, "Source and Redaction Analysis of 1 Corinthians 1–3," *JBL* 101 (1982): 266.

⁴² Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 80; Fee, *First Corinthians*, 152; Lang, *Die Briefe an die Korinther*, 57; Robertson and Plummer, *First Corinthians*, 70–71.

⁴³ Koch, *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums*, 275.

⁴⁴ Note that there are many other early Jewish texts that contain the ideas found from the Job 5:13 citation. E.g., Bar 3:20–28; *Pss. Sol.* 8:20; Wis 17:7–11; 3 Macc 1–2; Jdt 2:2–3. For a further discussion of the early Jewish ideas that are similar to Job 5:13, see Williams, *The Wisdom of the Wise*, 307–15.

counselors during the loss of his family and estate. While Eliphaz's words are truthful, he is an example of one who considered himself to be wise but was caught in his craftiness. Eliphaz's advice along with his other supposedly wise friends Bildad and Zophar are seen to be foolish at the end of Job's plight (Job 42:7–9). Thus, read in context, the influence of Job 5:13 extends to 1 Cor 3:18.

When read in the light of its context, the ideas of the citation fit well into the discussion concerning human leaders in 1 Corinthians 3. Throughout 1 Corinthians 3, Paul has been exhorting the Corinthians not to rely on human leaders whether Paul who planted or Apollos who watered (1 Cor 3:6–7). They are not to divide over these leaders or boast in them (1 Cor 3:21–22). While truthful, Eliphaz's words as a failed wise human leader from Job 5:13 emphasize the points Paul is making within 1 Corinthians 3 considerably.

Psalm 94:11 in 1 Corinthians 3:20

In 1 Cor 3:20 Paul cites Ps 94:11, writing “and again, The Lord knows the thoughts of the wise, that they are futile.” It follows immediately upon his citation of Job 5:13 in 1 Cor 3:19. As with the citation from Job, its influence can be seen to extend beyond the quotation in 1 Cor 3:20 but also into Paul's surrounding writing.

The citation from Ps 94:11 serves first to support Paul's assertion that the wisdom of this world is foolishness and worthless in God's sight (1 Cor 3:19; cf. 1 Cor 1:18–25). This is the same idea that the Job 5:13 citation supported. The context of Psalm 94 supports the claim that human wisdom is worthless. The psalm contains many warnings for those who are wise in their own estimation. God is the one whose abilities are far greater than those who are in the world (Ps 94:8–10). God is also the one who can avenge and judge the earth (Ps 94:1–3, 13, 23). Such ideas are also found throughout many sections of contemporary Jewish literature.⁴⁵

The influence from Ps 94:11 can be seen to extend to the ideas that follow after 1 Cor 3:20. In 1 Cor 3:21–23, Paul's next point in his

⁴⁵ See texts like 4Q184 1–3, 8–11, 13–15; 1QS 5.18b–20; 11QTgJob 30.1–10 (Job 38:3–13); Wis 9:13–18; 13:1–2; Bar 3:29–37; 4 Ezra 4:1–12; L.A.B. 49; 1 Macc 2:61–64; Pss. Sol. 14:6–10; Sus 42–43; Sib. Or. 3:8–10, 24–35. Williams, *The Wisdom of the Wise*, 315–24.

argument is that all things are theirs in Christ. The context of Psalm 94 indicates that there is great reward for those within God's plan. In this psalm the Lord teaches his people, does not abandon his people, and aids his people in time of need (Ps 94:12–23).⁴⁶ The righteous will ultimately be blessed in the future since they have God's promised loyal commitment (Ps 94:12–15). The great blessing of the righteous both now and in the future is a central theme that is found in the broader context of Ps 94:11.⁴⁷ The presence of this citation from Ps 94:11 thus supports Paul's assertions that human thinking is futile and also leads to his next point in 1 Cor 3:21–23 that great blessings are found for those who follow his ways.⁴⁸

Deuteronomy 17:7 in 1 Corinthians 5:13

At the end of his discussion of the man in incest, Paul inserts his next citation.⁴⁹ This citation from Deut 17:7 is found in 1 Cor 5:13 which reads as follows, "God judges those outside. 'Purge the evil person from among you.'" The passage noticeably supports the ideas of 1 Cor 5:12. In this text Paul is calling for the Corinthian church to judge those in their midst. When Deut 17:7 is considered in relation to its other broader Jewish context, it becomes apparent that the ideas from this text extend even further than simply 1 Cor 5:12.⁵⁰

The exhortation to purge certain people from the midst of God's people is a frequent one in the book of Deuteronomy.⁵¹ Indeed, Deut

⁴⁶ See also the citation of Ps 94:14 in Rom 11:2 where Paul proclaims the certainty of the Lord's commitment to the Jewish people even in spite of their sin. J. D. G. Dunn, *Romans 9–16* (WBC 38B; Dallas: Word, 1988), 636–37; R. A. Harrisville, "Paul and the Psalms: A Formal Study," *Word and World* 5 (1985): 177.

⁴⁷ Blessing for God's people despite the impending judgment and destruction on human wisdom is also an idea found within early Jewish literature. Cf. Wis 9:13–18; *L.A.B.* 49; 1 Macc 2:61–64; *Pss. Sol.* 14:6–10; Sus 42–43. Williams, *The Wisdom of the Wise*, 318–25.

⁴⁸ For further discussion on Ps 94:11 in 1 Cor 3:20, see Williams, "1 Corinthians," in S. Moyise and M. J. J. Menken (eds.), *The Psalms in the New Testament* (London/New York: T&T Clark, 2004), 164–677.

⁴⁹ Reasons for the arrogance and complacency that Paul addresses in the Corinthian community abound. For a summary see Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 382.

⁵⁰ For other Jewish references within 1 Cor 5, see B. S. Rosner, *Paul, Scripture, and Ethics* (AGJU 22; Leiden: Brill, 1994).

⁵¹ In early Judaism, the Damascus document illustrates exclusion on the basis of the covenant. Ciampa and Rosner, "1 Corinthians," 709.

17:7 is representative of other passages in Deuteronomy where the theme of exclusion is found (cf. Deut 13:5; 19:19; 21:21; 22:21; 24:7; cf. Judg 20:13). When the idea of expulsion is considered throughout the book of Deuteronomy, God's people are exhorted to exclude a number of deviant behaviors such as: the sexually immoral (Deut 22:21–22, 30), idolater (Deut 13:1–5; 17:2–7), reviler (Deut 19:16–19), drunkard (21:18–21), and robber (Deut 24:7). These ideas bear a remarkable similarity to 1 Cor 5:11 where Paul says, “But now I am writing you that you must not associate with anyone who calls himself a brother but is sexually immoral or greedy, an idolater or a slanderer, a drunkard or a swindler. With such a man do not even eat.”

The context of these references in Deuteronomy also encourages expulsion from the community in order to keep poor behavior spreading. In the context of Deuteronomy 17, purging deviant behavior from the midst of God's people will lead to fear, thus preventing the bad behavior from spreading (Deut 17:13). The idea is repeated within other places in Deuteronomy where exclusion is encouraged (cf. Deut 13:12–18; 17:2–7; 21:18–21). Such an idea is found in 1 Cor 5:6–8. In these verses Paul is speaking about the possibility of leaven infecting the whole lump of dough. By removing the evil leaven, the community is protected. Thus, the context of expulsion from Deuteronomy extends beyond 1 Cor 5:11–12 but also to 1 Cor 5:6–8.⁵²

Finally, the sense of corporate responsibility that runs throughout 1 Corinthians 5 also can be found in the context of these Deuteronomic references. From Deut 19:13 and 21:9, the guilt of particular sins touches the entire community. The sense of corporate guilt can also be found in 1 Corinthians 5. In 1 Cor 5:2 Paul writes, “And you are arrogant! Ought you not rather to mourn? Let him who has done this be removed from among you.” In this case, Paul uses the second person personal pronoun *ὑμεῖς*, indicating that the Corinthian church needed to expel certain ones doing deviant things from its midst.⁵³

Thus when 1 Cor 5:13 is read in the light of its Jewish background, Paul has used this Jewish text as a capstone for his argument. The text encourages the expulsion of certain members as 1 Cor 5:12 indicates.

⁵² B. S. Rosner, “Deuteronomy in the New Testament,” in M. J. J. Menken and S. Moyise (eds.), *Deuteronomy in the New Testament* (LNTS 358; London: T&T Clark, 2007), 122–23.

⁵³ See further B. S. Rosner, “*Ouchi mallon epenthēstate*: Corporate Responsibility in 1 Corinthians 5,” *NTS* 38 (1992): 470–73.

The particular deviant behaviors from 1 Cor 5:11 are anticipated from Deut 17:7 read in the context of Deuteronomy. The motive to keep bad behavior from spreading (1 Cor 5:6–8) can be found also from Deuteronomy. Finally, the responsibility that the entire Corinthian church shares (1 Cor 5:2) is also anticipated from references in Deuteronomy.

Genesis 2:24 in 1 Corinthians 6:16

In 1 Cor 6:12–20, Paul addresses the Corinthians about their human bodies, particularly with regards to sexual immorality. Some within the Corinthian community felt that they could be free to do anything with their bodies (1 Cor 6:12–13). Paul rebukes the Corinthians and urges them not to unite themselves to a prostitute (1 Cor 6:15). In 1 Cor 6:16 he then quotes Gen 2:24 writing, “Or do you not know that he who is joined to a prostitute becomes one body with her? For, as it is written, ‘The two will become one flesh.’”

The citation is used to support the idea that sexually uniting with a prostitute makes a person one with her. It is important to note that Paul could have appealed to a number of different Jewish references that prohibit sexual immorality. This is implied by his use of the words οὐκ οἶδατε in 1 Cor 6:16. Paul uses these words in ten places in 1 Corinthians, referring to common ideas which in general refer to concepts in Scripture.⁵⁴

By citing Gen 2:24 in 1 Cor 6:16, Paul particularly highlights the ideas of unity found in the surrounding context of 1 Cor 6:15–17. In 1 Cor 6:15 Paul exclaims that the Corinthians are members of Christ’s body. The ESV translation emphasizes the idea of unity in its translation: “Shall I then take the members of Christ and make them members of a prostitute?”⁵⁵ In 1 Cor 6:16, the apostle uses the word κολλάομαι, a word that means “to join, bond, glue, or bond indissolubly,” perhaps

⁵⁴ Cf. B. S. Rosner, “Temple and Holiness in 1 Corinthians 5,” *TynBul* 42.1 (1991): 137–45. Examples of texts that Paul could have used as reminders are: Judg 16; Prov 5, 7.

⁵⁵ Dale Martin also notes this idea of membership and belonging when he writes, “The man who has sex with a prostitute is, in Paul’s construction, Christ’s ‘member’ entering the body of the prostitute.” D. Martin, *The Corinthian Body* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 176.

going so far as to obligate himself.⁵⁶ In 1 Cor 6:16–17, Paul connects oneness in body with unity in spirit.

Unity is in view from the context of Genesis and places within early Judaism. The surrounding context of Gen 2:24 reveals that it was used to describe the ideal marriage. After she is fashioned from his rib, Adam meets Eve and declares that she is “bone of my bone and flesh of my flesh.” Genesis then continues by concluding that a man shall leave his father and mother and cleave to his wife.⁵⁷ This aspect of unity is considered as part of the use of this passage when it is interpreted in Mal 2:15–16 when the prophet applies this text to divorce.⁵⁸

Deuteronomy 25:4 in 1 Corinthians 9:10

The next generally agreed upon use of Jewish Scripture in 1 Corinthians can be found in the midst of Paul’s argument concerning weak and strong brothers. This argument begins in 1 Corinthians 8 and extends to 1 Corinthians 10. In 1 Corinthians 9, Paul presents himself as an example of one who is denying his own rights in the light of weaker brothers. Rather than appealing to his rights to accept payment for his services amongst the Corinthians, he chooses to deny these rights. From 1 Cor 9:1–7, Paul argues from many human examples that the one who serves has rights to compensation for his service. In 1 Cor 9:8, however, Paul appeals to the text of Scripture, eventually citing from Deut 25:4. In 1 Cor 9:9 he cites this passage which says, “For it is written in the Law of Moses, ‘You shall not muzzle an ox when it treads out the grain.’ Is it for oxen that God is concerned?”

This citation has troubled many with regards to its function.⁵⁹ Some see this as arbitrary prooftexting.⁶⁰ One finds it contrary to Paul’s

⁵⁶ S. E. Porter, “How should κολλώμενος in 1 Cor 6:16–17 Be Translated?” *ETL* 67 (1991): 105–106.

⁵⁷ The LXX of Gen 2:24 uses the word προσκολλάομαι which is a compound of the word κολλάω.

⁵⁸ Cf. Matt 19:5–6.

⁵⁹ For a further survey see Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 685–88.

⁶⁰ While not agreeing with this approach, R. B. Hays claims that many see the citation as arbitrary prooftexting in this way. R. B. Hays, *First Corinthians* (Interpretation; Louisville: John Knox Press, 1997), 151.

exegesis.⁶¹ Many have suggested that this passage is allegorical.⁶² Others believe that it is analogical.⁶³ As a result, many do not see that such a citation can extend into Paul's argument at all.

An examination of the context of this passage from Deuteronomy 25 can help explain why Paul has appealed to this Scripture. The surrounding statutes from Deuteronomy 24–25 (especially Deut 24:6–7, 10–22; 25:1–3) concern the dignity and fair treatment of one's fellow human beings. The text about oxen fits seemingly oddly within concerns for the fair treatment of the poor, marginalized, sojourners, orphans, and widows. Considering the context of Deuteronomy 25 makes sense why Paul would have considered this text about oxen in relation to human concerns since so much of Deuteronomy 25 relates to the dignity of human beings.⁶⁴

Human concerns can be further seen attached to Deut 25:4 when early Jewish interpretation of this text is considered. For example, Philo and Josephus both refer to this Scripture. When the relevant ideas are introduced in Philo's *On the Virtues* 125, Philo tells the reader that he will address the principle of behaving in a dignified way to all people and even to animals. He recounts the significance of the laws concerning the kind treatment of animals so that humans will do the same, and then he applies these in relation to Deut 25:4 (*Virt.* 145–147). The Law was not given for the sake of irrational animals, but for those who can think and reason. Josephus cites Deut 25:4 also. He cites the passage in *Ant.* 4.233 in connection with his laws of gleaning. Instead of applying the passage strictly to animals, he applies it also to human coworkers. It is not right to "bind the mouth of oxen treading out the corn on the threshing floor, since it is not right to deprive our coworkers of

⁶¹ Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 154–55.

⁶² Many have noted this to be allegorical exegesis. Cf. A. T. Hanson, *The Living Utterances of God: The New Testament Exegesis of the Old* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1983), 136; J. Jeremias, "Paulus als Hillelit," in E. Ellis and M. Wilcox (eds.), *Neotestamentica et Semitica: Studies in Honor of Matthew Black* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1969), 89; Schrage, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*, 2:299–301.

⁶³ R. C. H. Lenski, *The Interpretation of St. Paul's First and Second Epistles to the Corinthians* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1937), 361–62; Fee, *First Corinthians*, 407.

⁶⁴ Hays, *First Corinthians*, 151. See also R. B. Hays, *Echoes of Scriptures in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 165–68.

the fruit.”⁶⁵ Other rabbinic writings also indicate that the passage is applicable to humans as well.⁶⁶

Thus seen in relation to its Jewish background, Deut 25:4 fits well into Paul’s argument. It grounds 1 Cor 9:8 explaining Paul’s appeal to the Jewish Law. It also leads on to his next thought in 1 Cor 9:10–11. God cares for his people and ultimately the Christian worker. The citation thus functions as the climactic proof of Paul’s argument that he has the right to receive material things from the Corinthians.

Exodus 32 in 1 Corinthians 10:1–10

In 1 Cor 10:1–10, Paul returns to the theme that has been his concern since 1 Corinthians 8, the insistence that some of the Corinthians not eat food that has been sacrificed to idols. Paul’s argument about food sacrificed to idols and weak and strong brothers began in 1 Corinthians 8. Food sacrificed to idols was a significant issue at Corinth for it was likely that “scarcely any other meat would be for sale except for that supplied by the temple.”⁶⁷ This led the weak brothers to abstain from eating food and the strong brothers to believe that they could eat such food without sinning.

In 1 Cor 8:1–13, Paul encourages love for Christian brothers to be the primary concern for weak and strong brothers. Within his argument he states clearly that an idol is of no account in this world for there is no God but one (1 Cor 8:4–6). While stating this, however, he also notes that a weaker brother may be confused and may not have such knowledge, and thus, it is important for the strong to act in a way that demonstrates care for the weaker brother (1 Cor 8:7–13). In 1 Cor 8:13, Paul states that he will not eat certain foods if it will cause a brother with lesser knowledge to stumble. In 1 Corinthians 9, he then uses himself as an example of one who gave up his rights so that others, namely the Corinthians, would prosper (1 Cor 9:9–23).

⁶⁵ Rosner, “Deuteronomy in 1 and 2 Corinthians,” 128.

⁶⁶ Cf. *m. B. Mesī’a* 7.2; *b. B. Mesī’a* 89a; *b. Yebam.* 4a; *b. Sanh.* 19ab; *m. Yād.* 4.7; *b. Git.* 62a; *b. Mak.* 23a; *b. Yebam.* 4a. See D. I. Brewer, “Paul’s Literal Interpretation of ‘Do not Muzzle the Ox,’” in P. Helm and C. Trueman (eds.), *The Trustworthiness of God: Perspectives on the Nature of Scripture* (Leicester: Apollos, 2002), 145–56; P. J. Tomson, *Paul and the Jewish Law* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1990), 129.

⁶⁷ J. Murphy-O’Connor, *St. Paul’s Corinth: Texts and Archaeology* (Wilmington: Glazier, 1983), 33.

Now in 1 Cor 10:1–10, he warns the Corinthians of the danger of feeling strong in the Lord. In this section Paul alludes as well as cites from Exodus 32 in order to dissuade the Corinthians from this attitude. The section includes a citation of Exod 32:6 in 1 Cor 10:7.⁶⁸

The argument of 1 Cor 10:1–10 is divided into two parts. In the first part in 1 Cor 10:1–5, Paul sets forth Israel (“our fathers”) as an example of those who failed to obtain the prize. They had their forms of baptism and Lord’s Supper as well as the privileges that were analogous to the Corinthian people. Still, God was displeased with most of them, and as a result, their bodies were scattered all over the desert. In the second part (1 Cor 10:7–10), he applies this directly to the Corinthians, offering four illustrations from the Exodus as to why some of God’s people were overthrown. Idolatry is listed as the first violation of God’s people, but then immorality, testing, and grumbling are also stated. He challenges the strong brothers to be careful that they do not fall, for God’s people from the past serve as examples to warn those who think that they are strong (1 Cor 10:6, 11–12).

A variety of scholars see the function of 1 Cor 10:1–10 in different ways. Some suggest that this section is a harsher response to the Corinthians rather than a weaker, more tolerant one that Paul uses for the same issue in other places.⁶⁹ Others completely separate this passage from 1 Corinthians 10 and from other passages immediately surrounding it.⁷⁰ Another believes that the passage is a midrash of Old Testament passages which predate 1 Corinthians, and thus do not directly relate to the problems that he is addressing in 1 Corinthians.⁷¹ Another sees this passage as a careful fabrication of Scripture references that will increase Paul’s authority and thus control the Corinthians so that they

⁶⁸ There are issues regarding “the rock” from 1 Cor 10:4 and typology from 1 Cor 10:6 which cannot be covered in such a short space. For a good summary of the relevant issues see Ciampa and Rosner, “1 Corinthians,” 723–27.

⁶⁹ In this view 1 Cor 8:1–13 and 10:23–33 are the “weak” letters and 10:1–22 would be the “harsh” one. Cf. K. Yeo, *Rhetorical Interaction in 1 Cor 8 and 10: A Formal Analysis with Preliminary Suggestions for a Chinese Cross-Cultural Hermeneutic* (BibInt 9; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 1–14.

⁷⁰ There are a variety of different ways that these divisions occur. Cf. J. Weiss, *Der erste Korintherbrief* (KEK 5; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977), xi–xliii; G. Sellin, “Hauptprobleme des ersten Korintherbriefes,” *ANRW* 2:25:4 (1987), 2, 964–86; J. Héring, *The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians* (London: Epworth, 1962), xii–xiv.

⁷¹ W. A. Meeks, “‘And Rose Up to Play’: Midrash and Paraenesis in 1 Cor 10:1–22,” *JSTNT* 16 (1982): 64–78.

might do what Paul says.⁷² Another sees this section as a central means for interpreting the gospel to the Corinthians.⁷³

Read in the light of the context of Exodus and early Judaism, the allusions and citation from Exodus fit well in relation to Paul's overall argument of 1 Corinthians 8–10. Rather than being less related to Paul's surrounding argument as some suggest, they function well in relation to eating food sacrificed to idols. Paul's recounting of these particular events from the Exodus functions in a similar way to other passages recorded in Jewish Scripture which warn God's people not to follow the example of their forefathers (cf. Deut 32:1–43; Pss 78, 106; Neh 9:5–37). Rather than using the scriptural examples as a means to bolster his authority, it appears that Paul is likely following the same example of other Jewish writers. He recounts the history of God's family as Jewish writers did in the past so that the current readers will not fall. Thus by referring to these Scripture texts, Paul is saying to the Corinthians, who believe themselves to be strong, if you reject God's mercy now, it will lead to dire consequences as their "strong forefathers" previously.⁷⁴

Not only does this Exodus 32 reference fit well within the argument about weak and strong brothers, but it fits well into the overall argument of 1 Corinthians which concerns unity. Other Jewish writers have referred to these same Jewish events as a means to encourage unity and discourage factionalism. Margaret Mitchell notes that these same events from Exodus have been used by other Jewish writers such as Philo and Josephus.⁷⁵ Unity is a main issue within 1 Corinthians which begins the letter (cf. 1:10). A concern for Paul in 1 Corinthians 8–10 is the unity of weak and strong brothers rather than an attempt to control the Corinthians. The use of this reference to Scripture reinforces Paul's overall concern for unity within the letter.

⁷² Stanley, *Arguing with Scripture*, 90.

⁷³ L. Goppelt, "Paulus und die Heilsgeschichte: Schlussfolgerungen aus Röm iv und 1 Kor x:1–13," *NTS* 13 (1966): 32, cf. 31–42. Cf. L. Goppelt, *Typus: The Theological Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New* (trans. D. H. Madvig; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982).

⁷⁴ Fee, *First Corinthians*, 442.

⁷⁵ E.g. *Spec. Laws* 4.129; *On Moses* 1.161–164, 305; 2.174, 283; *On Posterity* 182–185; *On Drunkenness* 95; Josephus, *Ant.* 3.295; 4.12, 140. M. Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians* (HUT 28; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1991), 138–40.

The references from Scripture also can be seen to extend into Paul's discussion which follows 1 Cor 10:1–10. 1 Cor 10:11 states, "Now these things happened to them as an example, but they were written down for our instruction, on whom the end of the ages has come." The understanding that Scripture was always relevant to God's people was common to Jewish and Christian people.⁷⁶ In 1 Cor 10:11, Paul then extends the Exodus events into this verse, calling for the Corinthians to take heed of their own seeming position of strength.⁷⁷ The Corinthians are confronting a temptation that is common to man, the falling into idolatry (1 Cor 10:13). This temptation has just been warned against in the Exodus references in 1 Cor 10:1–10.⁷⁸ They should beware of participating in pagan festivals.

Deuteronomy 32:17 in 1 Corinthians 10:20

As Paul continues his argument about food sacrificed to idols and weak and strong brothers in 1 Corinthians 10, he continues to urge the seemingly strong brother to flee idolatry (1 Cor 10:14). In 1 Cor 10:15–17, he then appeals to the significance of cultic meals as a means to encourage eating in the presence of the right company. A reader might be wondering though why this is a concern. If there is only one true God and food sacrificed to idols is not thereby tainted (1 Cor 8:4; 10:19), why should there be any objection to participating in pagan religious meals? Paul answers this with a quotation from Deut 32:17 in 1 Cor 10:20 which reads, "No, I imply that what pagans sacrifice they offer to demons and not to God. I do not want you to be participants with demons."

A reading of the Deut 32:17 passage in context and in relation to early Jewish literature indicates why this passage follows as the appropriate answer to 1 Cor 10:19. In the context of Deuteronomy 32, God is presented as faithful, upright, caring, and righteous (Deut 32:4, 8–14).

⁷⁶ B. S. Rosner, "Written for Us': Paul's View of Scripture," in P. E. Satterthwaite and D. F. Wright (eds.), *A Pathway into the Holy Scripture* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 81–105.

⁷⁷ Note that a reference to Num 11 fits well with the allusions to Exod 32. See further M. Collier, "'That We Might Not Crave Evil': The Structure and Argument of 1 Corinthians 10:1–13," *JSNL* 55 (1994): 55–75.

⁷⁸ D. E. Garland, *1 Corinthians* (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2003), 467. Cf. Ciampa and Rosner, "1 Corinthians," 727.

God's people, however, wander and stray as a result of their unfaithfulness. They worship other gods, which then progresses to sacrificing to demons who are not gods (Deut 32:16–17). As a result of involvement with idols, they provoke God to jealousy.

Other places within Judaism interpret Deut 32:17 and consider it as a “touchstone of spiritual corruption.” The Deut 32:17 text is interpreted in Ps 106:37 as an act of harlotry before God. Bar 4:7 points to idol worship as the reason why the nation of Israel goes into exile. *Lev. Rab.* 22.8 connects Deut 32:17 with the sacrifice of idols and demons mentioned in Lev 17:7.⁷⁹ Being mildly connected with this abhorrent practice is a great worry for Paul, and thus he urges the strong brother not to be a part of these pagan feasts.⁸⁰

Besides supporting Paul's ideas in 1 Cor 10:19, the citation from Deut 32:17 continues to exert influence in Paul's following discourse. B. S. Rosner notes how the context from Deut 32:17 is expressed in 1 Cor 10:22, “Shall we provoke the Lord?”⁸¹ Such a concern repeats the sentiments of Deut 32:21 which reads, “They have made me jealous with what is no god; they have provoked me to anger with their idols.” Thus, this echo reinforces the connection with the idea from Deuteronomy 32 in the discourse beyond 1 Cor 10:20.

Rosner notes further influence of Deuteronomy 32 in 1 Cor 10:22 in relation to the sentence, “Are we stronger than he?” God is “the Rock” or “Strong One” in Deut 32:4, 15, 18, 30, 31. The strength of the Lord was displayed in Deut 32:30, 36–38 for the purpose of showing the Lord's great power and the lack of strength of pagan nations. Surely, God's people in Israel's time and in current times are not stronger than he.⁸² The warning of judgment and God's strength found in Deut 32:17 thus extends into Paul's writing from 1 Cor 10:20 to 1 Cor 10:22.

Psalm 24:1 in 1 Corinthians 10:25

The next clear reference to a text from the Psalms within the Corinthian correspondence is Ps 24:1 in 1 Cor 10:26. This reference is found in

⁷⁹ Rosner, “Deuteronomy in 1 and 2 Corinthians,” 130–31.

⁸⁰ Hays, *First Corinthians*, 169.

⁸¹ Rosner notes an echo of Deut 32:21 in 1 Cor 10:22. Rosner, “Deuteronomy in 1 and 2 Corinthians,” 131.

⁸² Ciampa and Rosner, “1 Corinthians,” 729.

direct support of Paul's statement in 1 Cor 10:25, where he encourages the Corinthians to eat whatever is sold in the marketplace without questioning one's conscience. It also is found in Paul's conclusion to his discussion regarding food sacrificed to idols and weak and strong brothers (1 Cor 10:23–11:1). This section of Paul's writing functions as a recapitulation of his argument from a few chapters earlier regarding weak and strong brothers.⁸³

Paul is now concluding his argument about food sacrificed to idols and weak and strong brothers with some final statements. In 1 Cor 10:23 he cites a Corinthian slogan, stating that everything is permissible but noting that not everything is beneficial or constructive. In 1 Cor 10:24 Paul returns to encouraging selflessness, by stating that nobody should seek his own good, but the good of others (cf. 1 Cor 8:1–13). He then states his conclusion about food offered to idols that is sold in the marketplace. It can be eaten without raising any question of conscience (1 Cor 10:25). Since this may be questionable to some who have followed his argument thus far,⁸⁴ Paul refers to Ps 24:1 in 1 Cor 10:26 saying "For 'the earth is the Lord's, and the fullness thereof.'"⁸⁵

When seen in relation to its Jewish context, Ps 24:1 supports Paul's assertion that the Corinthians can have freedom to eat what is purchased in the marketplace from 1 Cor 10:25. The text supports Paul's argument by causing the Corinthians to remember that God created all things including the meat that they eat and the idols of this world. Since God rules over these, the Corinthians should not worry about their own conscience when they eat.⁸⁶ The entirety of what is in the world was created by God, which this allusion from Ps 24:1 sets forward plainly

⁸³ Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 779–80.

⁸⁴ Note even some commentators' surprise. Fee, *First Corinthians*, 480; Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 783–84.

⁸⁵ There is some debate, however, about how such a reference ought to be categorized. Some scholars see Ps 24:1 as a citation, detectable because of the change of style in Paul's writing and the notable similarity between the two texts. Lang, *Die Briefe an die Korinther*, 130; Koch, *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums*, 21–24; Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 785; Fee, *First Corinthians*, 482. Others regard it as an allusion. Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture*, 37, 195; M. Fox, "The Identification of Quotations in Biblical Literature," *JAW* 92 (1980): 427.

⁸⁶ For the debate on whether the self-awareness is the potential eater's or the weak Christian brother's, see Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 640–44, 784–85.

and which is representative of a well-known idea within Paul's thinking and from Old Testament and contemporary Jewish writing.⁸⁷

The ideas from Ps 24:1 also extend into Paul's subsequent writing in 1 Corinthians 10. Since all of the earth is the Lord's, their conscience should be regulated in the Lord. Paul thus can conclude in 1 Cor 10:31, "So, whether you eat or drink, or whatever you do, do everything for the glory of God." The Corinthians should not feel as if they possess unrestrained freedom. Instead, they should conclude that they should do everything for God's glory since this is the logical outcome of living in the light of God the Creator.

Freedom in relation to reverence for the Lord can be seen within the ideas of Psalm 24 and early Judaism. The context of Ps 24:1 declares that the earth is the Lord's and then clearly states that it is the one who has a pure heart and clean hands who can approach him (Ps 24:3–4). A number of places within early Jewish literature use Ps 24:1 to teach obligation to thank God for one's food. On the basis of this text, one should not taste food until this benediction was said over it.⁸⁸ Thus, in summary, freedom of conscience within the framework of reverence for the Lord fits the ideas from Psalm 24 which extend from the citation of Ps 24:1 in 1 Cor 10:26 into 1 Cor 10:30.

Isaiah 28:11–12 in 1 Corinthians 14:21

The next clear reference to Scripture is found in Paul's discussion about spiritual gifts. The citation of Isa 28:11–12 appears in 1 Cor 14:21. From 1 Corinthians 12, Paul has been arguing for a diversity of gifts to be expressed amongst the Corinthian congregation. In 1 Corinthians 14, Paul turns his attention to tongues and prophecy which were likely fascinating the church at Corinth. In the early part of this chapter, he has been writing about the superiority of prophecy over tongues. Having discussed the edifying ability of prophecy, he now continues by discussing the effect that tongues has on a new person

⁸⁷ Cf. Gen 1–2; Ps 104:24; Isa 40:28; 42:5; 45:12; Amos 4:13; Col 2:16; 1 Tim 4:4; Jdt 9:12; 13:18; Wis 1:14; Sir 17:1; 38:4; 49:14; Bar 3:32; Bel 1:5; 4 Ezra 6:38ff.

⁸⁸ Ciampa and Rosner, "1 Corinthians," 729; Lang, *Die Briefe an die Korinther*, 130. Cf. *Tōs. Ber.* IV, 1. Barrett suggests the emergence of thanksgiving at meals from Ps 24:1. C. K. Barrett, "Things Sacrificed to Idols," in *Essays on Paul* (London: SPCK, 1982), 40–59.

entering the Corinthian assembly. It is in this context that Paul cites from Isa 28:11–12.⁸⁹

There are differing opinions as to the use of the citation. One believes that he is patronizing the Corinthians by calling them children and then using Scripture to superimpose his authority over the situation, while distorting the meaning of the text.⁹⁰ Some believe that Paul is using the text to apply to unbelievers,⁹¹ while others see it applied to believers.⁹²

While there is insufficient space within this study to decide on these matters, it is clear that there are significant overlaps between the context of Isaiah 28 and 1 Corinthians 14.⁹³ Those who are “wise” and “gifted” in their own eyes dismiss the plain message as “childish” when in reality it is the wise who think and act as children (Isa 28:1–10; 1 Cor 14:6–20). The hatred for plain speech leads to alienation with confusing tongues.⁹⁴ The idea of not knowing what is being said from Isa 28:10 can be seen in 1 Cor 14:16. The idea of the leaders of God’s people being confused from Isa 28:7 can be seen in the confusion amidst the Corinthian community in 1 Cor 14:23.⁹⁵ The sense of judgment from the woe oracle of Isaiah 28 and its places in early Jewish literature can be found in the tone of judgment in 1 Corinthians 14.⁹⁶ Thus, the context of Isaiah 28 dovetails with 1 Corinthians 14, suggesting that the citation’s influence extends beyond 1 Cor 14:21.

⁸⁹ Many have considered the differences in wording between Isa 28:11–12 and 1 Cor 14:21. The explanations for these differences are fairly complex. Stanley states, “Determining the precise relationship between the wording of 1 Cor 14:21 and the text of the LXX is one of the greatest challenges in the corpus of Pauline citations.” Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture*, 97–205, citation from page 98. Stanley devotes nine pages to the explanation of this wording.

⁹⁰ Stanley, *Arguing with Scripture*, 92.

⁹¹ Fee, *First Corinthians*, 677, 680.

⁹² Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 1121.

⁹³ Ciampa and Rosner recognize, “The relationship between Paul’s quotation of Isa 28:11–12 in 1 Cor 14:21, the conclusion in 14:22, and the examples given in 14:23–25 has proven to be extremely difficult to unravel.” Ciampa and Rosner, “1 Corinthians,” 742.

⁹⁴ For a survey of interpretive views on 1 Cor 14:22, which is acknowledged as one of the most confusing verses in 1 Corinthians, see Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 1122–26.

⁹⁵ Wilk, “Isaiah in 1 and 2 Corinthians,” 143.

⁹⁶ See the *Isaiah Targum* and 1 QH 10.19; 12.16. See Ciampa and Rosner, “1 Corinthians,” 741.

Psalm 110:1 in 1 Corinthians 15:25 and Psalm 8:6 in 1 Corinthians 15:27

Paul's next citation occurs in 1 Cor 15:27 in the midst of his affirmation that there will be a resurrection of the dead (1 Cor 15:12–34). Some within the Corinthian congregation doubted whether there would be such a resurrection (1 Cor 15:12). Paul addresses these doubts by considering the consequences of their lives without a resurrection. He states that if there is no resurrection of the dead, then Christ has not been raised (1 Cor 15:13). Moreover, if there is no resurrection of the dead, then their faith is useless, they are still in their sins, those who have died are eternally lost, they are without hope, and Paul is guilty of being a false witness of God (1 Cor 15:14–19). These consequences would be grave indeed.

Of course, there is no need to worry about these hypothetical consequences as Paul explains that Christ has been raised from the dead (1 Cor 15:21). The end will come when all powers, dominions, and authorities are destroyed, and he hands over the kingdom to God the Father (1 Cor 15:24–26). In support of Paul's claim that all powers and authorities will be placed under Christ's feet and thus be subjected to God, he refers to two texts from the Psalms. In 1 Cor 15:25 he alludes to Ps 110:1, and then he cites Ps 8:7 in 1 Cor 15:27.

The presence of these two texts from the Psalms is well recognized.⁹⁷ Ps 8:7 is well recognized as a citation within 1 Cor 15:27 as many have noticed.⁹⁸ While there are a few who would consider Ps 110:1 as a citation, it is best seen as an allusion. It is likely that Paul had Ps 110:1 in mind since it is an often repeated text within early Jewish literature and within Christian writings.⁹⁹ There is a recognizable change in style and grammar from what surrounds this reference in 1 Corinthians 15. Furthermore, the reference to Ps 110:1 is often combined with Ps 8:7

⁹⁷ Hays, *First Corinthians*, 265; Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 272; Schrage, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*, 3:176–77; Robertson and Plummer, *First Corinthians*, 356; Fee, *First Corinthians*, 754–55.

⁹⁸ Fee, *First Corinthians*, 757; Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 1235; Schrage, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*, 3:181.

⁹⁹ See M. Hengel, *Studies in Early Christology* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1995), 185–214. Cf. D. M. Hay, *Glory at the Right Hand: Psalm 110 in Early Christianity* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1973). Consider these appearances of Ps 110:1 in the New Testament: Matt 22:44; 26:64; Mark 12:36; 14:62; 16:19; Luke 20:42–43; 22:69; Acts 2:33–34; 5:31; 7:55–56; Rom 8:34; 1 Cor 15:25; Eph 1:20; Col 3:1; Heb 1:3, 13; 8:1; 10:12–13f; 12:2; 1 Pet 3:22.

in other passages of writing in the New Testament and early Christian literature (Eph 1:20–22; 1 Pet 3:22; Polycarp *Phil* 1:1–2).¹⁰⁰

Both Ps 8:7 and 110:1 contribute to Paul's argument in 1 Corinthians 15. The destruction of every ruler, power, and authority which is found in 1 Cor 15:24 immediately precedes the allusion to Ps 110:1 in 1 Cor 15:25. The subjugation of all creation to Christ and ultimately to God can be seen from Ps 8:7 in 1 Cor 15:27. When both of these texts are considered together, they provide a double grounding for the total reign of Christ over every ruler, power, and authority.

The context and parallels in Jewish interpretation of each of these texts contributes to the idea of subjection in Paul's argument. The context of Psalm 110 speaks of sitting at the right hand of God in two places (Ps 110:1, 5). Throughout the Psalm the ideas of rule and power are associated with the one who sits in that place (Ps 110:2, 3, 6). Being seated at the right hand of God tells of the great power and authority that one has in that position.¹⁰¹ The one at God's right hand is closely allied with him and in a seat of great privilege and authority (cf. Ps 2:4).¹⁰² As a result of the power and authority that are found at the right hand of God, enemies will be subjugated, people will volunteer to serve, kings will be shattered, and judgment will be pronounced upon the nations (Ps 110:2–3, 5–6). The power and authority that is found at God's right hand is set forward clearly in early Jewish literature, too, much of which may have been influenced by Ps 110:1.¹⁰³ The context and early Jewish parallels help to bolster Paul's claims that every dominion, power, and authority, and even death itself will be subjected to Christ in the future.

The context of Psalm 8 and Jewish parallels also supports Paul's claim of the subjection of all things to Christ. Instead of considering power in relation to sitting at the right hand of God as in Psalm 110, authority and dominion are portrayed in relation to all of creation. Repeatedly, Psalm 8 speaks of the authority of God over all creation (8:3–5, 10). The majesty and dominion of God is repeated in the opening and closing of Psalm 8, suggesting that this is the main theme

¹⁰⁰ Hengel, *Studies in Early Christology*, 163–72.

¹⁰¹ A. Soggin, “יָמִי,” *ThWAT* 3 (1982), 660–61. Cf. Gen 35:18; 1 Kgs 2:19; Ps 45:10; 80:18; Eccl 10:2.

¹⁰² Cf. M. Dahood, *Psalms III: 101–150* (AB 17A; Garden City: Doubleday, 1970), 113–14.

¹⁰³ Cf. *1 En.* 51:3; 55:4; 61:8; 62:2; 4Q491. Hengel, *Studies in Early Christology*, 185–212.

of the Psalm. In Ps 8:4–5, the natural human response to God’s acts of creation is awe and recognition. Ps 8:5–8 describes how God will make humankind master over the works of his hands, and this leads to praise for God’s creating ability (Ps 8:10).¹⁰⁴ Similar references to creation in early Jewish literature also elicit respect for God’s dominion, power, and strength.¹⁰⁵ While the citations are found in 1 Cor 15:25, 28, Ps 110:1 and Ps 8:7 together with their contexts and parallels within early Jewish literature establish strong support for Paul’s argumentation in 1 Cor 15:25–28.¹⁰⁶

Isaiah 22:13 in 1 Corinthians 15:32

As Paul makes his way through the defense of the resurrection, he considers what life would be like if Christ were not raised. Paul points to his apostolic existence, arguing that his suffering makes sense only in the light of the resurrection (1 Cor 1:30–32). Concluding his argumentation, he cites a saying from Isa 22:13, “What do I gain if, humanly speaking, I fought with beasts at Ephesus? If the dead are not raised, ‘Let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die.’” While the statement could look like a Corinthian slogan, it is recognized by most commentators that it is from Isaiah 22.¹⁰⁷

The main ideas from the context of Isaiah 22 dovetails with a world without a resurrection that Paul is postulating in 1 Cor 15. Isaiah 22 concerns a siege that is due to occur upon the people of Jerusalem. Rather than repenting, they decide to “party like there is no tomorrow” since there is no hope.¹⁰⁸ This fits the hopeless existence without a resurrection that Paul is describing in 1 Corinthians 15. As D. E. Garland rightly says, “Resurrection means endless hope, but no resurrection means a hopeless end and hopelessness breeds dissipation.”¹⁰⁹

Wilk notes some other parallels between Isaiah 22 and 1 Corinthians 15. He notes the parallel ideas between not looking to God (Isa 22:11) and those without knowledge of God (1 Cor 15:34). He notes

¹⁰⁴ P. C. Craigie, *Psalms 1–50* (WBC 19; Waco: Word, 1983), 107–10.

¹⁰⁵ Cf. Sir 16:17–20; 4 Ezra 3:1–5; 6:38–59.

¹⁰⁶ For a Christological idea in early Jewish interpretations of these two texts from the Psalms, see Koch, *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums*, 245.

¹⁰⁷ A. C. Thiselton is one of the few commentators who links this saying also with Epicurean thought. Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 1252–53.

¹⁰⁸ Hays, *1 Corinthians*, 268.

¹⁰⁹ Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 721.

the sin that will not be forgiven until one dies (Isa 22:14b) parallels the exhortation not to sin (1 Cor 15:34). The broader context of Isaiah 22 also concerns a charge against people who are ignorant of God, decide on hedonism, and then fall into sin. These ideas dovetail with the greater context of 1 Corinthians 15.¹¹⁰ Thus, as with many prior citations in 1 Corinthians, influence from the citation extends into Paul's surrounding discourse.

Genesis 2:7 in 1 Corinthians 15:45

In 1 Cor 15:35–36 Paul speaks about the type of body that Christians will receive upon the resurrection. He begins with the point that there is a body that the Lord gives. While there is some reference to the former body, the glory of the heavenly body will be substantially different as the glory of the sun is different from that of the moon and stars. So it is with the resurrection of the dead. The resurrected will receive a Spirit-animated and imperishable body of a greater glory.¹¹¹

Into this discussion of resurrected bodies, Paul reintroduces Adam and Christ (cf. 1 Cor 15:21–22). They are considered again in 1 Cor 15:44–45, which contains a reference to Gen 2:7 and reads, “It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body. If there is a natural body, there is also a spiritual body. Thus it is written, ‘The first man Adam became a living being’; the last Adam became a life-giving spirit.”

Paul uses this reference to Adam to support his discussion of the spiritual body found in Christ. If there is a natural body as is found in Adam, then there must be a spiritual body as is found in Christ. As Garland explains, “If there is a natural body represented by the first Adam in a sown body, then there must be a spiritual body represented by the last Adam, the risen Christ.”¹¹²

The Scripture text from Gen 2:7 draws attention to Adam as the first created being and parent of humanity. Adam as the first created being and parent of humanity is well established from the context of Genesis 2 as well as from its presence within early Jewish literature.¹¹³

¹¹⁰ Wilk, “Isaiah in 1 and 2 Corinthians,” 145.

¹¹¹ For an extended discussion on the nature of the resurrection body in 1 Cor 15:44, see Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 1276–81.

¹¹² Garland, *First Corinthians*, 735.

¹¹³ Cf. Philo, *Leg* 1.31; *Abr* 56.

This reference to Adam as the first created being forms part of the backbone of the argument that runs through to 1 Cor 15:49. Adam is referred to as the first man and the man of dust in 1 Cor 15:47–48, which is influenced from the Gen 2:7 text read in context and in relation to early Judaism.

Isaiah 25:8 in 1 Corinthians 15:54

Paul concludes his argument concerning new bodies in 1 Cor 15:51–52 with the mystery of transformation. In a moment in time, the twinkling of an eye, the perishable will put on imperishable and the mortal will put on immortal. At that point in time, Paul declares that two Scripture passages will be fulfilled. The first of these is Isa 25:8, which is quoted in 1 Cor 15:54 and reads, “When the perishable puts on the imperishable, and the mortal puts on immortality, then shall come to pass the saying that is written: ‘Death is swallowed up in victory.’”

The surrounding context of Isaiah 25 and appearances of the text from Isa 25:8 in early Jewish literature anticipate Paul’s use of this text in 1 Cor 15:54 as referring to the end of death. As he writes about inheriting the kingdom of God and obtaining the new immortal body (1 Cor 15:50–53), he envisions this in the future when death must be defeated. In the context of Isaiah 25, the destruction of death is future and certain. In the picture of Isaiah 25, the Lord’s heavenly banquet will take place, and at that time death will be swallowed. Rabbinic literature also interprets Isa 25:8 with reference to the absence of death in the age to come.¹¹⁴

The influence of the context Isaiah 25 can be seen within 1 Corinthians 15. The Lord’s power and authority over the world can be seen in his description as Lord of hosts (Isa 25:6; cf. Isa 24:23b) which has overlap with the idea of inheriting the kingdom of God in 1 Cor 15:50. The sense of victory, thanksgiving, and celebration found in 1 Cor 15:57 is supported by the wiping away of tears and the joy found at the Isaianic banquet (Isa 25:8–9).¹¹⁵ If the Theodotian version

¹¹⁴ Cf. *m. Mo’ed Qat.* 3:9; *Exod. Rab.* 15:21; 30:3; *Deut. Rab.* 2:30; *Lam. Rab.* 1:41; *Eccles. Rab.* 1:7; *b. Pesah* 68a; *b. Ketub.* 30b. Ciampa and Rosner, “1 Corinthians,” 747. Cf. Rev 21:4 which also alludes to the passage of Isa 25:8 at the end of time. Hays, *1 Corinthians*, 275.

¹¹⁵ Wilk, “Isaiah in 1 and 2 Corinthians,” 147.

of Isa 25:8 is used, the aspect of victory is incorporated.¹¹⁶ This then would exert influence in 1 Cor 15:57 where Paul proclaims victory in Christ Jesus and possibly into the Hos 13:14 citation which follows in 1 Cor 15:55.¹¹⁷ By appealing to Isa 25:8, Paul encourages this joyous picture of the future and helps to explain this mystery of God's future plan in Christ.

Hosea 13:14 in 1 Corinthians 15:55

Immediately following the citation of Isa 25:8 in 1 Cor 15:54, Paul cites another Scripture citation in relation to the ending of death. Instead of referring to Isaiah, Paul refers this time to the book of Hosea. The wording of Paul's citation is different from the Hebrew and the Septuagint. The Hebrew reads, "Where, O Death, are your plagues? Where, O Sheol, is your destruction?" The Greek Septuagint states, "Where, O Death, is your punishment? Where, O Hades, is your sting?" Paul records the quotation as, "O death, where is your victory? O death, where is your sting?" Paul's citation changes the Septuagint's "punishment" to "victory" and "Hades" to "death." Also, Paul addresses both questions to death. These changes are likely due to his desire to connect the citations together, addressing death.¹¹⁸

Aspects from the citation of Hos 13:14 exert influence in Paul's surrounding discussion. The Pauline personification of death emerges from its use in Hosea, which reflects on the citation from Isa 25:4 in the verse previously. As in Hosea's context, death will not win. While the power of death is great and seemingly wins the day, death will eventually be the loser. Also, the sense of victory inherent in the citation of Hosea 13 can be found in Paul's exclamation in 1 Cor 15:57, "But thanks be to God, who gives us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ."

As in Hosea's context, the ideas of sin and judgment extend into the surrounding narrative. Much of Hosea 13 concerns Ephraim's idolatry, sin, and resulting judgment. Immediately following the Hos 13:14 citation, Paul then refers to sting and to sin in 1 Cor 15:56 when

¹¹⁶ The Theodotian text reads, "Death has been swallowed in victory." For further explanation of the LXX Isa 25:8 in relation to the quotation found in 1 Cor 15:54, see Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture*, 210–11.

¹¹⁷ Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 1299.

¹¹⁸ Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture*, 211.

he writes, "The sting of death is sin, and the power of sin is the law." The reference to sting seems apparent from the citation of Hos 13:14 that precedes it. The appearance of sin, however, has been puzzling to some.¹¹⁹ Its presence, however, can be attributed to the context of Hosea 13 where sin was so prevalent.

Conclusion

The purpose of this essay was to consider the influence of eighteen generally agreed upon Jewish citations and allusions.¹²⁰ There are eighteen such references which take up approximately four percent of the entire letter.¹²¹ While this may seem to be a rather small percentage of influence within 1 Corinthians, these eighteen references also shed their light generally before and after their appearance. Scholars who have examined these Jewish sources in 1 Corinthians have considered these Scripture texts to function as support, framework, capstone, *Ringkomposition*, and backbone of certain arguments within 1 Corinthians. Many of these Jewish sources fall at key junctures in Paul's discourse. Thus, this study concludes that agreed upon Jewish citations and allusions influence this letter substantially, exerting far more influence than just their presence in four percent of the letter.

My hope is that this data will provide some starting point for considering Paul's identity as expressed in 1 Corinthians. A comparison with agreed upon Greco-Roman as well as Christian ideas that are found in 1 Corinthians could then help resolve primary influences from Paul's life in this letter.

¹¹⁹ Cf. J. Moffatt, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (MNTC; New York: Harper and Brothers, 1938), 268; Fee, *First Corinthians*, 805.

¹²⁰ The amount of Jewish influence within the letter would likely be increased if other passages in 1 Corinthians were examined. Passages such as 1 Cor 4:6 where Paul says that he does not "go beyond what is written," Paul's declaration of Jesus as a "Passover lamb" in 1 Cor 5, or Paul's reference to the created order in 1 Cor 11:8-9 betray Jewish influence but are less agreed upon than the passages examined. For a further examination of many other possible Jewish echoes or themes in 1 Corinthians, see Ciampa and Rosner, "1 Corinthians," 695-752.

¹²¹ There are four hundred thirty-seven verses in 1 Corinthians.

PAUL'S ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE LAW

Panayotis Coutsoumpos
University of Montemorelos, Mexico

1. *Introduction*

The issue of Paul and the Jewish law has captured the attention of many in the scholarly community. Scott Hafemann rightly points out that “Paul’s understanding of the law is currently the most debated topic among Pauline scholars.”¹ Previous to the publication of E. P. Sanders’ book, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*,² a number of interpreters demonstrated a tendency to read Paul and his idea of grace in a legalistic manner.³ The question of the relationship, however, between the Jewish law (or as some interpreters called it the Mosaic Law) and Paul’s attitude towards the law has exercised scholars for the past century.⁴ Paul has been at the center of the church’s debate over the Mosaic Law, and the reasons for the debate are clear.

In the New Testament over 60 percent of the nearly two hundred passages that mention the term “law” νόμος are found in Pauline epistles. Furthermore, assumptions and methodological differences are magnified to such an extent by the church traditions and existential worries that what the apostle Paul said concerning the law is difficult to determine. Others believe that although Paul does not make an explicit

¹ Scott J. Hafemann, “Paul and His Interpreters,” in G. F. Hawthorne *et al.* (eds.), *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1993), 671.

² E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1977), 430–542.

³ A. Andrew Das, *Paul, the Law, and the Covenant* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2001), 1.

⁴ Hans Hübner, *Law in Paul’s Thought* (trans. J. C. Greig; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1984), 1–11. “Did Paul undergo a development in his understanding of the Law? This question is not new. As early as 1850, Albrecht Ritschl had pointed out, in the first edition of his monograph, *Die Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche*, that the two conceptions of the Law in Galatians and Romans were not entirely compatible with each other and did not wholly tally. In Galatians Paul equated elements of the Law with paganism, the governing factor being the dominant concern for the ceremonial ordinances; while the statements in Romans, on the other hand, had a predominantly ethical interest, so that there the ceremonial law appears to be left out of account.”

distinction between the moral and cultic law he nonetheless makes an implicit distinction.⁵ More recently, Paul's contentions regarding the law have produced an intense debate over the nature of Judaism and the law. Some believed that when the apostle Paul mentioned the Jewish law he accurately aimed at the legalistic tendencies of most first-century Jews.

On the other hand, some think also that most of the Jews of Paul's time believed that belonging to the community of God was a result of God's grace.⁶ However, Paul's concern against "works of the law" either misrepresents Judaism or is simply a denial that Gentiles must remain and accept the Jewish law in order to belong to God's people. The mission to the Gentiles (Greeks and pagans) was Paul's main concern and the issue of the obedience to the law (Moses' Law)⁷ created or sparked a reaction on the part of some Jewish converts to Christianity.

It is significant to note that scholarly discussion about Paul's attitude toward the law has its historical roots in the period of the Reformation. Luther went further than simply arguing that the doctrine of justification by faith alone was central in Paul. The German reformer's view sprang from a fundamental pessimism about the ability of human beings to do any kind of good, as well as the accompanying conviction about the necessity for complete reliance on God's mercy,⁸ and not on the obedience of the law.

Before E. P. Sanders questioned the issue of Paul and the law, the interpretation of Luther and his radical view of the difference between gospel and the law was challenged by Ferdinand C. Baur of the Tübingen School in the nineteenth century.⁹ Even W. Wrede, who did not believe that Paul's view of the law was positive, differed with Luther on the issue of the centrality of the notion of justification by faith.

⁵ Brice L. Martin, *Christ and the Law in Paul* (Leiden: Brill, 1989), 33.

⁶ Frank Thielman, *The Law and the New Testament: The Question of Continuity* (New York: Herder & Herder, 1999), 8.

⁷ J. Louis Martyn, "A Law-Observant Mission to the Gentiles: The Background of Galatians," *SJT* 38 (1985): 307–24. "The work of these evangelists, in turn, is said to have sparked a reaction on the part of firmly observant Jewish Christians, who, seeing the growth of the Gentiles mission, sought to require observance of the Law by its converts" (p. 307).

⁸ Veronica Koperski, *What are They Saying about Paul and the Law?* (New York: Paulist Press, 2001), 2.

⁹ For a more detailed presentation of Luther's view, see Francis Watson, *Paul, Judaism and the Gentiles: A Sociological Approach* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 10–12.

We should be careful not to reject Luther's views and his followers too quickly;¹⁰ however, there are some major difficulties with such an interpretation of Paul and especially with the picture of Judaism which comes in view as a result of the gospel preached by Paul.

In this essay I can hardly do justice to the topic, but I propose to analyze briefly the different views on Paul and the law, and at the same time to offer some critique of the matter. I should stress at the outset, however, that I shall not be able to deal at great length with the whole gamut of issues that are related to Paul's attitude towards the law. The crucial difficulty or predicament surely results from the theological beliefs which the apostle Paul seeks to hold together.¹¹ The traditional view tended to read Paul, the messenger of grace, against a background of Jewish legalism.¹² Thus Sanders issues a challenge: either the apostle Paul has misrepresented the Jewish religion of his time or Christian scholars have misunderstood the apostle.¹³ The questions arise: Was Paul's teaching about the law legalistic? Was Paul opposing Jewish legalism? Did the apostle Paul experience a development in his understanding of the law?¹⁴ Is Paul's teaching on the Law consistent?

¹⁰ Thomas R. Schreiner, *The Law and Its Fulfillment: A Pauline Theology of Law* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1993), 16–18. "The work of Wrede, Schweitzer, and others revealed that the Reformation understanding of Paul's view of the law was beginning to be questioned, but most New Testament scholars continued to describe Paul's view of the law in a way that basically would have been acceptable to Luther and Calvin" (p. 16).

¹¹ Questions regarding Paul and the Law, then, and particularly issues about how to figure out Paul's insistence that no one will be justified by the works of the law remain central to the current debates on Paul.

¹² Das, *Paul, the Law, and the Covenant*, 1–11. Weber's view impacted New Testament scholarship from the end of the nineteenth century through the middle of the twentieth century. "Ferdinand Weber's important 1880 work on Judaism propelled this understanding into the twentieth century. According to Weber, an individual Jew's destiny was determined by the weighing of his or her fulfillment of the law over against transgressions, as if on a scale. Those having done more good than bad would be saved, while the rest would perish. Weber did not see God's election of the Israelite nation impacting individual salvation" (p. 1).

¹³ David G. Horrell, *An Introduction to the Study of Paul* (London: T&T Clark, 2006), 93. "Following the publication of Sanders' work there has been quite widespread agreement that much previous New Testament interpretation did indeed misrepresent Judaism, which perhaps bears some responsibility for the anti-Semitism which reached its zenith in the Holocaust. There is now a much greater concern to present the Judaism of Paul's time fairly, and to avoid the naïve assumption that Paul's angry polemic is an unbiased source from which to reconstruct Jewish beliefs and practices."

¹⁴ Seyoon Kim, *Paul and the New Perspective: Second Thoughts on the Origin of Paul's Gospel* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 1–84. He has dedicated almost the entire book to challenging Dunn's position.

2. *Paul and his Jewish Roots*

In order to understand Paul's attitude towards the law, we must understand the Old Testament context, first-century Judaism, Paul's own experience, and his Jewish roots.¹⁵ As a Pharisee, the main focus of Paul's view was the law. After the apostle's experience on the road to Damascus, the law for Paul took an important meaning in the coming of Jesus.¹⁶ However, Paul's view of the law and his entire cultural background expanded during the years he trained in Jerusalem under the supervision of Rabbi Gamaliel, and most probably other Pharisee leaders as well.¹⁷ Surrounded by the community of Pharisees, Paul lived according to the Law (Torah), and it was his zeal for preserving the Law that made him a persecutor of the early Christian church.

Thus, the Jerusalem connection is vital for a proper understanding of Paul's view and theology of the law.¹⁸ In the same way, when the apostle Paul speaks of his "blamelessness" he also mentions that he was: "as to the Law, a Pharisee, as to zeal, a persecutor of the church, as to righteousness which in the Law, blameless" (Phil 3:5–6). As is quite clear, the three phrases "Law," "zeal," and "righteousness" evidently

¹⁵ George E. Ladd, *A Theology of the New Testament* (rev. ed. by D. Hagner; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 538–54. "The heart of Old Testament religion cannot be characterized as legalism, nor was the Law given as the means of achieving a right relationship with God by obedience. On the contrary, the context of the Law was the covenant that preceded and underlay the law, and the covenant was initiated by the gracious act of God" (p. 540).

¹⁶ Brad H. Young, *Paul the Jewish Theologian: A Pharisee among Christians, Jews, and Gentiles* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1997), 27. "Paul's Torah-centered theology was eclipsed with an understanding of the Messiah as the higher purpose of Torah. The great vision of the Hebrew prophets is realized when the Gentiles come into a relationship with the one God of Israel."

¹⁷ Udo Schnelle, *Apostle Paul: His Life and Theology* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005), 64–75. "The origins of the Pharisee movement lie hidden in the darkness. Most scholars have seen its beginning the broader context of the Maccabean revolt (1 Macc. 2:15–28). Many scholars suppose that the common origin of Pharisees and Essenes is found in this general setting, for the Hassidim were obviously characterized by a strict obedience to the law and a vigorous rejection of foreign elements within the Jewish faith" (p. 68).

¹⁸ Schnelle, *Apostle Paul*, 19. "Paul's connection to Jerusalem ran deep into the political organization, the social structure, the religious institutions, and the centers of learning in the city. Paul knew the operation of his place of confinement."

belong together.¹⁹ Paul's theological concept of the law begins with a sure faith in the one God of Israel.

The two main pillars of Judaism were the election of Israel and the giving of the Law. These two concepts are clearly expressed in the majority of Paul's epistles and are part of Paul's own Jewish legacy. The theological belief of the apostle to the Gentiles is rooted in the basic convictions of the Judaism of his time.

All Jewish beliefs, including Paul's Christian beliefs, come from Judaism's roots in monotheism.²⁰ The monotheism of Paul's days was rooted in the strong Jewish belief in the one true God, against the Gentiles' gods, as the true and living God. A normal Jew obeys the law because he held it to represent God's will. For the Jews that embrace Christianity, obedience to God's Law was the most important thing in their life.

Given Paul's Jewish legacy, and especially his own accounts of his pre-Christian past as a zealous Pharisee, one might anticipate that his view about the law comes from or reflects a Palestinian sectarian understanding.²¹ As the unique mark of his life as a former Pharisee, the apostle Paul names his zeal for the tradition of the fathers: "I advanced in Judaism beyond many among my people of the same age, for I was far more zealous for the traditions of my ancestors" (Gal 1:14). Paul the Pharisee never turns his back on these traditions of the fathers.

The main dilemma, however, is explaining Paul's view of the Jewish law and the seemingly confusing emphasis upon both positive and negative things he said about it. A change in Paul's view on the law does not necessarily mean annulling previous beliefs and arguments. As Alan F. Segal observes, "Paul does not forget his Jewish past; rather, he inverts the values of his past in a way that is consonant with his new commitments."²² It is clear that the apostle Paul says that the law should not be cast out, but he also declares that faith rather than law reveals the righteousness of God.

¹⁹ Dieter Lührmann, "Paul and the Pharisaic Tradition," *JNT* 36 (1989): 75–94. "Since the times of the Maccabees zeal meant to fight for the law; righteousness was to live according to the Law" (p. 75).

²⁰ Schnelle, *Apostle Paul*, 70.

²¹ Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *According to Paul: Studies in the Theology of the Apostle* (New York: Paulist Press, 1993), 24.

²² Alan F. Segal, *Paul the Convert: The Apostolate and Apostasy of Saul the Pharisee* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990), 125.

No other Jews in Paul's time, normally, make a distinction between faith and law in the way he does.²³ In Judaism, faith basically precedes everything; there is no need to differentiate between it and law. Obedience to the law is commanded by God, not because it guarantees justification. Since the Reformation to the present time there has been a strong emphasis on the legalistic side of Judaism with respect to the law.²⁴ However, the new emphasis, or what is called the "new perspective"²⁵ under the influence of Sanders and more recently James Dunn,²⁶ contended that the Judaism of Paul's day was not a legalistic religion.

Sanders argued that in spite of centuries of Christian propaganda, Jewish texts of the first century do not regard the law as a way of earning salvation. The Jewish people are the people of the covenant, in which the law is the gift of a gracious God.²⁷ Obedience to God's law is a response to God's favor, not a means of earning it. Paul uses Israel as an illustration—they did not become God's people because of merits earned by obedience to the law, but because of God's free election. The law was given as a means of binding God's people to him through obedience to it. The obedience to the law could not be

²³ Segal, *Paul the Convert*, 128. "Paul distinguishes between these several concepts because he has experienced and learned his Christian commitment, and he now represents a community of faith, the gentile Christian community, in which Jewish ceremonial law is not a significant issue. It is his experience as a Christian that encourages the reformulation of biblical promises."

²⁴ Schreiner, *The Law and Its Fulfillment*, 18.

²⁵ See the criticisms of the new perspective by David A. DeSilva, *An Introduction to the New Testament: Contexts, Methods & Ministry Formation* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2004), 518–19. He mentions three main criticisms: "First, Sanders's characterization of the various Judaism of the first century as 'covenantal nomism,' with emphasis on grace rather than performance of works with a view to earning justification, has come under fire. Second, many scholars take issue with the tendency of some proponents of the new perspective to regard the doctrine of 'justification by faith' not as a core element of Paul's theology but as an argument that Paul developed to explain the specific question of how 'Gentiles can be equally acceptable to God as Jews'. Third, but closely related to the first and second criticism, many scholars react against Dunn's suggestion that 'works of the law' refers specifically to 'boundary markers' that separate Jews from Gentiles."

²⁶ James D. G. Dunn, *The New Perspective on Paul* (rev. ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 1–97. "Sanders' basic point was that Judaism was not obsessed with works righteousness as a way to secure a divine favour previously unknown. On the contrary, Israel's theology of salvation began from the initiative of God and the givenness of God's favour. God had chosen Israel to be his people; he had made his covenant with them" (p. 2).

²⁷ Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 551.

satisfied by a simple legalism, for the law required love for God (Deut 6:5; 10:12) and for neighbor (Lev 19:18).

Furthermore, some scholars deny that the apostle Paul has it in mind to describe the Jewish religion as merits and good work, which could be compared with the Christian religion as the religion of grace.²⁸ Judaism, Dunn argues, never considered the law as a way of earning the favor of God. Paul's disagreement, consequently, is not with Judaism as such but with Jewish Christians²⁹ who insist that Gentile Christians prove their membership in the people of God by demonstrating the traditional boundary markers, specifically, circumcision, food laws and the observance of special days.

It is reasonable to assume that the apostle Paul is not attacking those who think that salvation derives from keeping the law, but those who insist on retaining those aspects of the law that separate Jews from Gentiles. S. Westerholm, for example, argues that one cannot deduce the nature of first-century Judaism merely by reading the epistles of Paul.³⁰ The scope and nature of Judaism of the first century is so exclusive that we need to go beyond Paul. Much of the debate ultimately stems from questions about Paul's own heritage. Is the apostle Paul to be seen as a Hellenized Greek Jew from Tarsus? Or was he a Pharisee trained by Gamaliel in Jerusalem?

Clearly, Paul's conversation about the law in his epistles does not come from an outsider, but from one who understood the beliefs regarding the law which Jews of the time held.³¹ We misunderstand the apostle because we do not understand his Jewish character and identity.³² The

²⁸ Heikki Räisänen, "Paul's Conversion and the Development of his View of the Law," *NTS* 33 (1987): 404–19. See also his 1985 article "Galatians 2:16 and Paul's Break with Judaism," *NTS* 31 (1985): 543–53. "I find myself in basic agreement with Sanders and Dunn regarding the view of Palestinian Judaism as covenantal nomism and the view that the classical Lutheran understanding of Paul is a misunderstanding" (p. 404).

²⁹ James D. G. Dunn, *Jesus, Paul, and the Law: Studies in Mark and Galatians* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1990), 183–206.

³⁰ Stephen Westerholm, *Israel's Law and the Church's Faith: Paul and His Recent Interpreters* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), 93.

³¹ Frank Thielman, *Paul & the Law: A Contextual Approach* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1994), 48. "Prior to his conversion, Paul was devoted to the accurate interpretation and blameless observance of the Mosaic law."

³² W. R. Stegner, "Paul the Jew," in Hawthorne *et al.* (eds.), *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*, 503–11. "Today, however, NT scholarship finds more and more evidence for the Jewishness of Paul's life and thought. Indeed, this change is part of a general movement in Christian scholarship to rediscover the Jewish roots of Christianity.

Judaism of Paul must be the beginning for any serious examination of his writings and his view of the law. Consequently, the Judaism of Jerusalem, rather than the paganism of Tarsus, seems to be the root for Paul's approach to the problem of law.

We should observe that the apostle Paul did not consider or view Christianity as a religion far removed from Judaism. Rather, according to W. D. Davies, Paul saw Christianity "as a form of his ancestral religion or as a further stage of its development, however, new."³³ Paul understood clearly the importance of the law, its teachings and requirements. Obedience to the law was essential to the Jews in Palestine and many Jews in the Diaspora as well.

Although Paul's view of the law in his epistles should be interpreted in light of his own Jewish beliefs, it seems sometimes that the apostle was inconsistent in the way he explains some issues about the law in his writings.

3. *Is Paul's Teaching on the Law Consistent?*

One of the most significant and yet confusing issues in the writings of Paul with regard to his teaching on the law is the matter of consistency. In spite of the vast amount of effort that has been put into the research of this area of Paul's theology, no consensus has been reached. Not only does the apostle use this term to indicate different contexts, but at times he seems to say contradictory things regarding the law.³⁴ Some scholars have found a degree of inconsistency in some of the statements by Paul about the law.

The word "law" (νόμος) has a range of meanings in Paul's letters. For example, it can refer to the Ten Commandments (Rom 7:7), to

Concurrently, Jewish scholarship shows a growing interest in reclaiming the Jewishness of Jesus and Paul" (p. 510).

³³ W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism* (4th ed.; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980), xxxvi.

³⁴ Martin, *Christ and the Law*, 41. "There is no contradiction to say that the law originates with God and express His will, and to say that it is aligned with sin and death. The law could be aligned with sin in the sense that people are under its power; when they receive the law they are unable to obey it, and so are exposed to their sinful condition. The law could be aligned with death in that disobedience to the law brings the sentence of death."

the Pentateuch (Rom 3:21), or even to the complete Old Testament (1 Cor 14:21). That the term law has a broad meaning in Paul should not surprise us.

Besides Sanders' critique of Paul's lack of consistency, H. Räisänen³⁵ argues that Paul's view of the law is full of inconsistencies and even contradictions. The following are some examples of what he believes are contradictions: (1) ἐδόθη in Gal 3:21 shows that God is the law-giver, but at 3:19 the law originates not from God but from the angels.³⁶ (2) In Gal 5:1, Paul says we are set free from the Mosaic Law, yet at 3:13 "the curse of the law" from which we have been redeemed refers to law in a more universal sense. But this universal sense of law contradicts the late arrival of the law in 3:15–20.³⁷

An analysis of this whole issue is beyond the scope of this essay, however, in view of what has been said above, I would like to dispute some of Räisänen's points. (1) Paul does not say that the law was made by the angels but that the law was mediated through angels (Gal 3:19). (2) Additionally, it is not evident that the common sense of the law contradicts the later arrival of the Mosaic Law.³⁸ The apostle Paul recognizes the relation between law and the character of sin in another aspect, but not in mutually limited ways. The apostle is not saying that the law is too weak to stop man's death, but that it is too weak to give man life (Rom 8:3).

Besides with the issue of multiple meanings, there are a number of places in Paul's writings where he seems to be saying contradictory things regarding the law. One of the areas where the apostle seems to contradict himself is when he clearly states that the law is good.³⁹ "So the law is holy, and the commandment is holy and just and good" (Rom 7:12). By contrast, for the apostle the law was always the "law of God" (Rom 7:22). Paul's statement should not surprise us at all because it comes from a man who was raised as a Pharisee (Phil 3:5).

³⁵ Heikki Räisänen, *Paul and the Law* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983), 162–77.

³⁶ Räisänen, *Paul and the Law*, 132.

³⁷ Räisänen, *Paul and the Law*, 21.

³⁸ Martin, *Christ and the Law*, 41–44.

³⁹ Schreiner, *The Law and Its Fulfillment*, 86.

An area in which scholars see a contradiction in Paul's teaching concerning the law (works of the law)⁴⁰ has to include the relationship between the keeping of the law and justification.⁴¹

On the one hand, Paul says that "no human being will be justified in his sight by the works of the law" (Rom 3:20); "a man is not justified by works of the law" (Gal 2:16); and that "if justification were through the law, then Christ died to no purpose" (Gal 2:21; see also Gal 3:11, 23–25; Rom 4:15).

On the other hand, Paul seems to argue that justification and its opposite, condemnation, are based on whether or not one keeps the law. It should be noted that the apostle Paul states that no flesh will be justified before God by the works of the law.⁴² Further, it should be pointed out that Paul's understanding of the law is shaped by the knowledge that God's final will for human beings is their salvation in Jesus Christ. In other words, no human effort will (on the part of Jews or Gentiles) help us to be in a right relationship with God.

Dunn observes, however, that the expression "works of the law" is not to be understood as limited to circumcision, food laws and the Sabbath observance. It is important to note that both Dunn and Sanders make the observation that circumcision, food laws, and the like were distinguished as particular identity markers of Judaism.⁴³ In other words,

⁴⁰ See, for example, James Dunn's article, "Yet Once More—"The Works of the Law": A Response," *JSTNT* 46 (1992): 99–117; *Romans 1–8* (WBC 38A; Waco: Word, 1988), 187–88, 190–94. See also the response by C. E. B. Cranfield, "The Works of the Law' in the Epistle to the Romans," *JSTNT* 43 (1991): 89–101; Das, *Paul, the Law, and the Covenant*, 155–69; Kim, *Paul and the New Perspective*, 57–66; Schreiner, *The Law and Its Fulfillment*, 41–71. For a different approach on the subject, see Paul L. Owen, "The 'Works of the Law' in Romans and Galatians: A New Defense of the Subjective Genitive," *JBL* 126 (2007): 553–77. Owen observes that "a third proposal, which so far has failed to secure much of a following, is to take the genitive phrase ἐργα νόμου in a subjective sense. The phrase would therefore denote the effects of the Law's activity among humankind since the time of the giving of the Law to Israel. Paul is prone to use this expression when the agency of the law in effecting justification is the issue at stake" (p. 101).

⁴¹ Schreiner, *The Law and Its Fulfillment*, 41–65. "Some Pauline texts simply say that righteousness does not come via the law. In these texts the word law is probably synonymous with the phrase *works of the law*. For instance, Galatians 3:11 say "Now that no one is justified by the law in God's sight is evident." Law here is probably shorthand for works of the law, which Paul uses in the previous verse" (p. 41).

⁴² Jouette M. Bassler, *Navigating Paul: An Introduction to Key Theological Concepts* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2007), 13–17.

⁴³ Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 29. "There is good reason to think that, although observing the law was not burdensome to Jews, it appeared onerous and inconvenient to Gentiles. Paul's opponents may have adopted a policy of graduation,

these boundary markers came to be the stumbling blocks for Gentiles. He describes "works of the law" as what the law demanded of Israel as the people of God.⁴⁴

"Under pressure from his critics," Dunn, according to Das, has modified his position: "the phrase 'works of the law' refers to all that the law requires, but the primary focus of the expression is still on those laws that act as national and ethnic boundary markers."⁴⁵ Paul is saying, according to Dunn, that there is a clear distinction between the keeping of the law as a believer and the keeping of the law as an attempt to gain or earn merits.

Since the apostle had no disagreement with the law, Paul's contention against "works of the law" does not concern the issue of justification by obedience to the law, but only Jewish issues of identity that mark the separation between Jews and Gentiles.

With regard to the statement that it is the one who obeys the law who will be justified (Rom 2:13), we have to keep in mind that this comment is made in the context of confirming that Jews are as much in need of God's grace in Christ as are Gentiles. We also have to keep in mind that "works of the law" were not viewed or performed as a way of earning merit or salvation.⁴⁶ Salvation was given to all (Jews and Gentiles) according to Paul through faith in Jesus Christ.

Seen legalistically as a means of earning salvation or as a means of remaining in a saved state, the law can only censure. It seems to be clear that the apostle Paul was not an antinomian; he was not opposed to the law or the commandments of God. Rather, it was his view that as believers walk in the Spirit they keep the commandments of God. Seeking one's own justification by keeping the law can lead only to failure, for no one abides by and does all the things written in the book of the law.

requiring first some of the major commandments (circumcision, food days), a policy which was probably not unique among Jewish missionaries."

⁴⁴ Dunn, "Yet Once More," 100. See also *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids: Eedmans, 1998), 372.

⁴⁵ Das, *Paul, The Law, and the Covenant*, 155.

⁴⁶ Bassler, *Navigating Paul*, 14. "One got into the people of God, he found, purely by grace and lived and remained in the people of God by obedience to the Law. Moreover, obedience itself was sustained by grace: the grace of a forgiving God and divinely instituted means atonement."

4. *Conclusion*

In this essay I have maintained that the apostle Paul was Jewish and that his views about the law came from his Jewish background. He never converted (some scholars agree that he received a commission to be the apostle to the Gentiles) from one religion to another. As we have seen, Paul, the Jewish preacher to the Gentiles, retains the beliefs and religious practices of the Pharisee all his life. Although it seems sometimes that he has a negative approach toward the law, Paul's view of the law was consistent with his Jewish beliefs. For the apostle Paul, the law (Torah) and the prophets reveal the will of God.

It is obvious that Sanders has changed the panorama of Pauline studies on the issue of the law. But it is equally obvious that Sanders' understanding of Paul and the law has not been completely acceptable, even for those who have accepted his ideas. Has Sanders sufficiently accounted for Paul's rejection of the law? Absolutely not, but he has supplied a huge number of arguments against the traditional position on Paul's attitude towards the law. At the same time, it is not clear that those scholars who have come out in opposition to Sanders' position, especially those who restate the traditional position, have overcome the weight of Sanders' views. Despite Sanders' impact, there are some problems that neither Sanders (nor his critics), nor the majority of scholars, have been able to completely resolve, particularly the issues of Paul's apparent misunderstanding, inconsistencies and contradictions about the law.

Paul was clear, however, that it was the grace of God, not "works of the law" or good deeds, that justified the unrighteous. Jews and Gentiles were equally accepted in the sight of God by the obedience of the law through faith. Nevertheless, at the same time, it is clear that Paul's life as a Jew was one of faithful obedience to the Law. Paul himself tells us that he was a committed Jew, a Pharisee who was blameless in his obedience to the letter of the Law (Phil 3:5–6). He was incredible in his zeal, not just for the written law, but also for the oral tradition of the fathers (Gal 1:14).

THE JEWISH RECIPIENTS OF GALATIANS

Bas Van Os

Utrecht University, The Netherlands

Introduction

You see, brother, how many thousands of believers there are among the Jews, and they are all zealous for the law. They have been told about you that you teach all the Jews living among the nations to forsake Moses, and that you tell them not to circumcise their children or observe the customs.

James to Paul in Acts 21:20b–21¹

In his letter to the Galatians, Paul claims for himself the title “apostle to the nations” in the same way that Peter was the “apostle to the circumcised.” Paul claims that he and Barnabas were equal to James, Cephas and John, with each a different mission field (Gal 2:7–9). The author of Acts, on the other hand, claims that Paul’s mission was a dual mission, first to the Jews in a city and then to the non-Jews, who formed harmonious communities. According to Acts 15 and 16, the Diaspora churches and Paul accepted the leadership of the Jerusalem apostles and elders. James stands out as the most senior leader in 15:19–21 and 21:17–26, whereas Peter is the apostle whom God had chosen from the start to bring the gospel to the nations (15:7–9). According to Acts 16:1–3, Paul circumcised Timothy, the son of a Jewish mother, because his Greek father had not done it at the time. The conflict between Paul and Peter in Antioch is not described.

From a historical-critical point of view it seems that the description in Galatians should be preferred. It is a direct witness of the events by one of the participants himself. From a sociological point of view, however, the idea that the movement spread first to Jewish Diaspora communities and then to their non-Jewish neighbours is more plausible.² Therefore,

¹ Translation: NRSV with “nations” for “gentiles.”

² Sociologists like Rodney Stark (*The Rise of Christianity: How the Obscure, Marginal Jesus Movement Became the Dominant Religious Force in the Western World in a Few Centuries* [Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996]) have shown that today few people

neither source should be given absolute preference over the other, but each should be critically analyzed. Clearly, both texts are written in a very different context. Paul's letter to the Galatians is written in the heat of an unfinished debate with James' people and with Peter in Antioch. Paul wants to take away any sense of subordination to James and Peter. The author of Acts on the other hand tries to assure his audience that Paul, who had died some twenty years earlier, was not as extreme as some remembered him, and that Peter and James approved of Paul's work among the nations. Acts presents the compromise formula in ch. 15 as the common ground between them. Most likely it was this compromise formula that the author of Acts saw as the key to integrate the various groups of Jesus' followers in the churches of his own days, both Jewish and gentile. It seems that for most of the first century, gentiles were a minority in most churches.³

So how should we view the composition of the Galatian churches to which Paul addresses his letter? Did these groups consist of uncircumcised gentiles, or should we see them as mixed communities? Most commentators assume the first, because the Galatians seem to belong to the uncircumcised gentiles in Paul's mission field (Gal 2:7–9), previ-

convert as a result of preachers on the streets. Many more people convert because they have a close relationship to people attached to the religion of conversion. Stark also claims that the most likely converts of Jewish followers of Jesus were fellow Jews with whom they closely associated in Diaspora communities. This has since been debated. Many disagree with Stark, and some of the criticism is certainly justified. But I have not seen any evidence against the basic statistical relationship that Stark demonstrated: Christianity arose earlier in cities with a synagogue than it did in cities without a synagogue. Bruce Malina and John Pilch (*Social Science Commentary on the Letters of Paul* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006]) go a step further than Stark (a step too far in my opinion), and argue that there was no mission to the gentiles at all. Like his contemporaries, Paul would have been an ethno-centrist who could only have cared for the Israelites living among them.

³ At the 2006 SBL Annual Meeting in Philadelphia, I presented a demographical model of early Christianity in various scenarios, on the basis of research by others in the fields of conversion and ancient demographics (not yet published). In the early 50s CE, all scenarios show that it is likely that only between 10 and 20% of early Christians were gentiles. In the Diaspora, the percentage of non-Jews in the early 50s CE would have been higher, but even there it is *a priori* likely that most groups of Jesus followers had a significant Jewish presence. Fast growing religious groups do not only recruit new converts, but often also demonstrate a high birth surplus. If migrant Jews were the first to form such groups, then they would have contributed significantly to the "gene pool" of the community. Nevertheless, second- and third-century sources suggest that the majority of believers was of gentile descent. This suggests that the conversion of gentiles was or became more likely than conversion of Jews. In this way, the majority of the churches may have been of gentile descent around the end of the first century.

ously worshipped gods who are not truly gods (4:8), and submitted to circumcision when Jewish or Jewish Christian missionaries visited them in Paul's footsteps (6:12–13).

In this article, I will test the hypothesis that Paul's letter to the Galatians is addressed to a mixed audience of Jews and gentiles. To that end, I will first review the arguments in favour of the consensus reading that only gentiles are addressed. In the second part of the article, I will assess whether and how, in the case of a mixed audience, the rhetorical strategy behind Galatians would have worked for its Jewish recipients.

1. *A Review of the Arguments*

In this section, I will ask the following questions:

- a. Does the letter address uncircumcised gentiles only?
- b. Did the addressees worship gentile gods?
- c. Did Paul's opponents require circumcision of non-Jews?

1.1. *Does the Letter Address Uncircumcised Gentiles Only?*

Anyone reading the letter in an English translation learns that Paul was an apostle to the heathen (KJV) or gentiles (NRSV, NIV).⁴ As Paul was the apostle to the Galatians (1:1), one could conclude that the Galatians were gentiles as well. But we must be careful in our interpretation of words like *Judaïos* and *ethnikos* as these were used in a variety of ways in late antiquity.⁵ The word "nations" may be understood in territorial,

⁴ Galatians 1:16; 2:2, 8, 9 etc.

⁵ Malina and Pilch (*Commentary*, 371–74), for example, argue that these translations are anachronistic and reflect the situation after the Judaic reforms embedded in the Talmud. In the first century, they argue, Israelites would either follow the customs of the Greeks (the dominant culture of the nations among which they had been dispersed) or the customs of cultural reformers in and after the Maccabean restoration in Judea. In the reading of Malina and Pilch, Paul addressed the Galatians as Israelites living among the nations. They also note that 1 Peter addresses the Galatians as (Israelite) "exiles in the Dispersion." They believe that in in-group discussions both words refer to Israelites: one group Hellenized and uncircumcised, and the other group Judaized and circumcised. I disagree with Malina and Pilch when they argue that Paul and also the author of Acts assumed that readers would understand Paul's mission to the nations was only to the Israelites living among the nations (*Commentary*, 7), as their ethnocentrism would

cultural and ethnic ways. When Acts 2 speaks of Jews from every nation, these are god-fearing Jews and proselytes living among the nations. In its territorial sense, the word suggests to Paul's audience that when Peter "came to Antioch," he came to a territory for which Paul carries responsibility.⁶ The word carries cultural connotations when it is used as the opposite of being circumcised in Acts 2:8–9, and when Paul claims that Peter tries to "Judaize" the nations if they would be obliged to follow Jewish customs (2:14). The opposition in 2:15 between those who are Jews by nature (*fusei*)⁷ and those who are sinners from the nations (*ex ethnōn*) is not necessarily a purely ethnic opposition only, as many Jews in the Diaspora may have been uncircumcised.⁸ Paul does not only call himself the apostle to the nations, but also the one who was entrusted with the gospel for the uncircumcised (2:7). It may be that Paul chooses this term to suggest that the requirement that those who are not circumcised should be circumcised, is an infringement on his authority towards these people. The "uncircumcised" consisted primarily of gentiles, but the category may also have included uncircumcised Diaspora Jews and uncircumcised Jewish children. The word "nations" is used in an ethnic, but inclusive, sense in ch. 3. Here, Paul speaks of the salvation of "all the nations," because the promise to Abraham does not discern between Jews and Greeks who are in Christ.

As the apostle to the nations and the uncircumcised, Paul claims authority over the Diaspora churches, over gentile followers and possibly also over uncircumcised Jews in the Diaspora churches. But Paul's

prevent a mission to non-Jews. Such a reading goes against the careful composition of the book of Acts, where a progression is shown in the proclamation of the gospel to the gentiles. The conversion of Cornelius, a gentile living in Palestine, is presented as the point where God proclaims through visions and signs that even the gentiles had been granted salvation (Acts 11:18). It also seems the more natural reading to see in Rom 9:30–31 an opposition between Israelites and gentiles, and not between Judaist and Hellenist Israelites as Malina and Pilch argue (*Commentary*, 268).

⁶ The use of the word "Galatians" in 3:1 may have the same territorial sense.

⁷ This is not equivalent to the "Jews by birth" in the NRSV, if Paul uses the word in a similar way as he uses *ek fuseōs* in Rom 2:27. There he contrasts those "physically uncircumcised" with the circumcision of the flesh that some claimed was the mark of Jew (2:28).

⁸ Malina and Pilch claim that most Jews in the Diaspora did not practice circumcision. Although I cannot see the evidence to back up these claims in full, I do note that *Jub.* 15:33–34 and 1 Macc 1:11–15 prove that many Hellenized Jews did not practice circumcision, or took steps to undo previous circumcision. It took the Maccabean revolution to force a significant number of Hellenized Palestinian Jews to observe the law of circumcision. It may well be that, without such pressure, a significant number of Hellenized Jews in the Diaspora did not practice circumcision in the days of Paul.

self-designation does not mean that the letter was addressed *exclusively* to the nations or to people who were not circumcised. Paul nowhere addresses the Galatians directly as “you nations/gentiles,” or “you, uncircumcised.” He does say that there are zealots who “require you” to be “circumcised” (Gal 6:12), but this phrase does not prove that the entire audience was still uncircumcised—neither does the phrase “(you) who want to be under the Law” (4:21) prove the opposite.

1.2. *Did the Galatians Worship Gentile Gods?*

Most commentators also take Gal 4:8 as proof that the addressees are gentiles:

^{NRS} **Galatians 4:8** Formerly, when you did not know God, you were slaves to those who by nature are not gods.

But who are these gods? In 3:26–29 Paul declared all Galatians to be Abraham’s seed, and heirs according to God’s promise to Abraham. That promise, Paul argues in 3:19–25, came directly from God and takes preference over the Law which came through a mediator, Moses, from the ruling angels.⁹ In this way, Paul can consider the Law as a temporal institution, a *paidagōgos*. For if the Law had come from God, and God is immutable, then the Law too would be eternal. In 4:1–7, Paul describes how in the time before Christ, people were like children, subject to guardians and stewards. The latter are quite possibly the angels that gave the law. Is it possible that Paul refers to these angels when he speaks of gods who are not truly God? This is not unprecedented, as the word *elohim* is used for judges in Exod 21:6 and 22:8, 22:9 and 22:28, and for angelic rulers in Ps 82:2 and 6. The LXX translates the last three instances as *theoi*.

Indeed, when we look at Paul’s argument he says that people were “under the law” before they were baptized (4:5), and that if they become law-observant they turn again, or return, to the service of the *stoicheia* (4:9). The term *stoicheia* of the cosmos has provoked a lot of speculation, but in the text it clearly refers to angels, powers and authorities, that have ordered the festivals, and/or the celestial bodies that regulate the calendar of these Jewish feasts. Likewise, the author of Colossians considers rules regarding eating and drinking, feasts and

⁹ Cf. Acts 7:38, 52–53.

Sabbaths as human philosophy and traditions of men coming from the *stoicheia* of the cosmos and amounting to the “worship of angels” (Col 2:8–23). In Gal 4:3 Paul, a Jew, says that “*we* were under the *stoicheia* of the cosmos.”

Paul’s argument, therefore, is primarily a Jewish argument. But the choice of words is of a more general nature. In this way, gentile listeners can apply the words *mutatis mutandis* to their own situation,¹⁰ whereas Jewish listeners are confronted with the idea that their religion is not principally different from gentile worship and philosophy.

1.3. *Did Paul’s Opponents Require Circumcision of Non-Jews?*

Traditionally the letter to the Galatians is read in function of Acts 15, where certain men from Judea told the followers of Jesus in Antioch that all needed to be circumcised, in order to be saved. In other words: they took the position that only Israel could be saved and that therefore gentiles needed to become Israelites first, before they could be saved by Jesus. In Acts 15, the Jerusalem leadership, however, decides that gentiles do not have to be circumcised. Leaving aside the questions of chronology and historicity,¹¹ I note that in Acts 15 everybody seems to agree that Jews have to be faithful to the Law, and be circumcised. Acts 16 tells us that Paul circumcised Timothy, a son of a Jewish mother and a gentile father. If this episode is historical, we can understand that Paul’s opponents claimed that Paul too accepted the principle of circumcision for Jews.¹² Paul, however, no longer holds this view:

^{NRS} **Galatians 5:11** But my friends, why am I still being persecuted if I am still preaching circumcision?

¹⁰ According to the LXX version of Deut 32:8 God separated the nations in accordance with the number of the angels of God, while Israel was the portion of the (angel of) the Lord himself.

¹¹ As many scholars have noted, if Galatians is later than Acts 15, then it is incomprehensible that Paul does not refer to the decision that Gentiles do not have to be circumcised. Therefore there are two possibilities: (1) the letter to the Galatians was written before the council in Acts 15, or (2) the account in Acts does not reflect actual history. In the reconstruction presented here, neither alternative is necessary.

¹² This would provide a possible explanation for why Paul did not write this letter together with Timothy: mentioning his name could bring his own inconsistency to the mind of the audience. It is also possible that, like Barnabas, Timothy and perhaps other co-workers of Paul thought he was going too far on this subject.

I suggest that the element of persecution, here and in 6:12 (where Paul claims that his opponents act out of fear for persecution), tells us more about the people who had to be circumcised. Roman authorities would not persecute someone for *not* preaching circumcision to gentiles.

Elsewhere, in 2 Cor 11:24, Paul specifies that the Jewish community had punished him five times with the “forty minus one whiplashes,” a technical term that points to the institutionalized punishment for breaking the Law of Moses. But why would a Jewish community punish Paul for not circumcising gentiles? Paula Frederiksen has evaluated several proposals, only to reject them all and come up with a reason that has nothing to do with circumcision.¹³ A Jewish punishment in relation to circumcision is only appropriate if Paul taught *Jews* that they did not have to be circumcised or that they should not circumcise their children. Genesis 17:14 rules that every male child who is not circumcised on the eighth day shall be cut off from his generation. Philo argues that the child cannot be guilty and notes that *other* Jewish interpreters point to the parents as the ones who are guilty of despising the law.¹⁴ The author of Acts reports the accusation of his opponents in Acts 21:17–21: Paul taught the Jews living among the nations not to circumcise their children and not to live according to Jewish custom. Indeed in 1 Cor 7:18 Paul urges the uncircumcised, not specifying whether he is a Jew or a gentile, to remain like he was before his conversion. If we combine Gal 3:27 and 5:2, it seems that Paul argues that the believers in Christ should not be circumcised, nor observe dietary laws or the Jewish calendar because they are already baptized:

^{NRS} **Galatians 3:27** As many of you as were baptized into Christ have clothed yourselves with Christ.²⁸ There is no longer Jew or Greek, there is no longer slave or free, there is no longer male and female; for all of you are one in Christ Jesus.

¹³ She claims that we should not be confused by Paul’s “rhetorical skill,” as the synagogue court could only have punished Paul because the “open dissemination of a Messianic message . . . put the entire Jewish community at risk” (p. 253). I note that her reconstruction may give the possible background of the Chrestus-incident mentioned by Suetonius (*Claud.* 25.4) more than it does for Galatians. See “Judaism, the Circumcision of Gentiles, and Apocalyptic Hope: Another Look at Galatians 1 and 2,” in Mark D. Nanos (ed.), *The Galatians Debate: Contemporary Issues in Rhetorical and Historical Interpretation* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2002), 235–60.

¹⁴ *QG* 3.52.

^{NRS} **Galatians 5:2** Listen! I, Paul, am telling you that if you let yourselves be circumcised, Christ will be of no benefit to you.³ Once again I testify to every man who lets himself be circumcised that he is obliged to obey the entire law.

There is no indication in the text that Paul is thinking of gentiles only. Through, or in, Christ there is no longer a distinction between Jews and gentiles, and both share in the same way in the fellowship with each other and with God. In line with Paul's thought, the author of Ephesians understands Jesus' crucifixion as the abolition of circumcision and other laws, to transform Jews and gentiles into one new man, so that gentiles are no longer "strangers and guests" but "fellow citizens of the saints and household members of God" (Eph 2:11–19). It is possible therefore that the debate between Paul and his opponents was not about the circumcision of gentiles, but about the idea that (Christian) Jews need to be circumcised and need to live in accordance with the Law. For Paul's opponents this may have meant that they could not have table-fellowship with gentiles on an equal basis. For table fellowship, gentiles would have to be subject to certain purity rules and behave as guests, unless of course they were willing to become Jews through circumcision. Paul, on the other hand, may have asked the Jewish members of the community not to adhere to the Law in full and to accept the gentiles as equals. In this way, every member could bring food to the common meals, and a non-Jewish house could also serve as a place of assembly. Yes, that would make them sinners under the Law, but—Paul argues in Gal 2:15–3:14—those who are physically Jews have already accepted the fact that they are sinners to the law, when they sought justification through Christ. Paul may have interpreted the pressure on the Jewish Christians as an indirect violation of the agreement that gentiles did not have to be circumcised or live in accordance with the Law.

2. *The Rhetoric of Galatians*

In answering the first three questions, we found sufficient grounds to at least consider the possibility that Paul is addressing an audience of which Jews were a significant part. Therefore, I will now look at the rhetorical analysis of the letter from this perspective: How would the letter have worked for the Jewish members of the audience, asked by outsiders to live in accordance with the Law?

In the past decades, there have been two approaches. One is to see the letter as a speech. The other approach is to approach the work as an ancient letter.

2.1. *Galatians as Oratory*¹⁵

Even though the letter does not formally belong to any of the genres for which the ancient rhetorical handbooks were written, there is some merit in analyzing the letter as a piece of oratory: the letter was carried to different churches to be read out aloud in the communities, as if Paul was present (cf. 1 Cor 5:3). In the framework of a speech, Gal 1:11–2:14, or part of it, may have functioned as the *narratio*. It consists of three parts:

- **The relationship between the two parties.** Before discussing the situation in Antioch, Paul describes himself as once a zealot for the Jewish Law who persecuted the churches (Gal 1:11–24). In other words: he once was much more zealous than even his opponents of today can hope to be. Those opponents claim the authority of James and Peter, but Paul claims that he is not dependent on them: God himself revealed to him that he would not be saved by his *Ioudaismos*, but by the revelation of the Son of God within him.
- **The point on which they agree.** In the first Antioch incident, described in 2:1–10, Paul sets out what both parties agree on: gentiles can be saved as gentiles and do not have to be circumcised (which would make them Jews). I note that the remark about Titus in Gal 2:2–3 is in line with the decision in Acts 15: the gospel could be proclaimed among the nations and Titus, who was a Greek,¹⁶ did not have to be circumcised.
- **The point on which they disagree.** In the second incident, Gal 2:11–14, Paul describes the point of disagreement: James and his

¹⁵ Some classify the rhetoric as forensic, e.g. H. D. Betz, *Galatians: A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Churches in Galatia* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979). Others deem it deliberative rhetoric, like G. Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984), 146. The structural outline I follow in this section is to a significant extent supported by the majority of authors that I consulted.

¹⁶ This was not *despite* the fact that he was Greek, as many translators interpret the scene (literally the text reads “being Greek”).

community believed that the Jewish Christians should observe purity laws. As these had not been observed in Antioch in that particular instance, his envoys asked the Jews present to withdraw from the meal. Peter, Barnabas and the other Jews accepted that point and withdrew from the table, although they previously participated. Paul, however, opposes them because of his responsibility for the Diaspora churches and his vision of unity of Jews and Greeks in Christ. He confronts Peter and the other Jews with the consequences: If they return to the Law they effectively enforce their Jewish lifestyle on their gentile brethren.

If Galatians 2 functions as the *narratio*, then this suggests that the situation in Galatia is somewhat comparable to Paul's account of the incident in Antioch. As was the case in Antioch, the Jews in Galatia will have to decide how they will respond. Will they accept the yoke of the law, or will they continue in freedom and fellowship with their gentile brethren? It is important to note that neither the men of James, nor Peter and Barnabas, seem to ask anything from the gentile believers. It is Paul who draws the conclusion that the impact of their action is not limited to Jewish believers only. Assuming that gentiles want to maintain fellowship, they will have to accept purity rules too, and if they are not content with the role of guests, they will even have to become Jews through circumcision. Paul draws this conclusion, not Peter or James. In fact, the whole debate in Antioch is only about the behaviour of Jews: how should they respond to the arguments of the Jerusalem delegates?

In his letter, Paul develops his statement to Peter into a mini-speech to all Jews:

^{NRS} **Galatians 2:15** We ourselves are Jews by birth and not Gentile sinners; ¹⁶ yet we know that a person is justified not by the works of the law but through faith in Jesus Christ. And we have come to believe in Christ Jesus, so that we might be justified by faith in Christ, and not by doing the works of the law, because no one will be justified by the works of the law...

Galatians 2:14–3:1 (or part thereof) is often taken as the *propositio* of the letter. In that case, the use of the first person plural would suggest that Paul has Jewish Christians in mind. Of course one could also argue that “we” refers to Peter and Paul, but Paul continues with the first person plural in 3:1–14. Here Christ redeemed “us” (3:13 and 14),

who previously relied on observing the Law (3:10), so that by faith “we” (3:14) might receive the blessing for all the nations that was promised to Abraham (3:8). The language does not exclude gentiles in the audience, but here Paul speaks first of all to Jews.

The proposition is then proven through a series of arguments, which are examples of Jewish argumentation, and best understood as directed to people who know the Jewish Scriptures:

- The first example concerns Paul’s assertion in Galatians 3 that the Law was given by angels and is temporary whereas the promise to Abraham is directly from God and eternal. His argumentation assumes that his audience is familiar with the books of Moses. Paul ventures out into an argumentative minefield in order to show that circumcision, Sabbaths and purity laws were valid until Christ was crucified, but after that no more. He needs to do that only if his aim is to persuade Jewish Christians. The argument he uses is not needed for gentiles, as they were never obliged to be circumcised in the first place. If Paul had wanted to argue that gentiles can be saved without circumcision, he could have applied a much more simple line of reasoning, such as is found in Acts 15.
- The second example concerns the use of the Hagar and Sara typology in Galatians 4. Again Paul assumes that his audience is familiar with the story and able to connect it with a prophecy taken from Isa 54:1. I note that Paul uses this prophecy as proof to support his argument. In other words his point is that his audience belongs to the promised Jerusalem rather than to the present Jerusalem. I also note that the promise in Isa 54:1 is directed towards Jews, urging them to set up camp to the right and the left, because they will inherit the territory of the nations (Isa 54:2–3). Paul does not compare Jews and Christians here (as interpreters have argued since Irenaeus),¹⁷ nor Jewish and gentile Christians (as Justin Martyr argued earlier),¹⁸ but people who live under the old covenant and people who live under the new covenant (Isa 54:10).¹⁹

¹⁷ *Demonstration* 94.

¹⁸ *First Apology* 53.

¹⁹ This is somewhat comparable to Philo’s use of the Hagar and Sarah typology. Philo speaks about those who live under the literal interpretation of the Law, and those who adopt a spiritual reading.

A final point concerns the notion in Isa 54:1 that the children of the new Jerusalem are more numerous than those of the old. As Gal 4:27 uses the prophecy to prove the point that the addressees are children of the new Jerusalem that is free, it would seem that Paul claims that they are already more numerous than those who are children of the earthly Jerusalem that is a slave to the Law. Given the small size of the Christian communities when compared to Judaism as a whole, Paul can only mean that the believers among the nations, Jews and gentiles, who enjoyed freedom in Christ (Gal 2:4), are more numerous than those believers who were zealous for the Law in Jerusalem.

Following the proofs, Paul summarizes the argument against his opponents in the *peroratio* of the letter (Gal 6:12–15):

^{NRS} **Galatians 6:12** It is those who want to make a good showing in the flesh that try to compel you to be circumcised—only that they may not be persecuted for the cross of Christ.¹³ Even the circumcised do not themselves obey the law, but they want you to be circumcised so that they may boast about your flesh.¹⁴ May I never boast of anything except the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by which the world has been crucified to me, and I to the world.¹⁵ For neither circumcision nor uncircumcision is anything; but a new creation is everything!

I note that the objections against the opponents closely match Paul's "speech" to Peter in ch. 2, which of course should be the case if these passages are the *propositio* and the *peroratio*. Like Peter, Paul's opponents did *not* observe the Law in full. They may have consented with the delegates from James that Jews should practice circumcision, observe the Sabbath and observe purity rules. But even those Jewish Christians who do observe the Law have already broken the Law because they worship a crucified man, one who is by definition cursed under the Law (3:10–13). Paul accuses Peter of hypocrisy in 2:13, because he preaches the *same* gospel (and "not another," 1:7)²⁰ but does not act in accordance with it. All know that salvation comes through faith, yet Peter and the other leaders now require Jewish Christians to live in accordance with the Law because they fear that they would suffer persecution from the Jewish community if they would agree that Jewish Christians would not have to practice circumcision. If the opponents are like Peter, then we do not need to introduce new players on the scene, like Jewish outsiders or gentile Judaizers.

²⁰ Cf. 1 Cor 15:1–11.

2.2. *Galatians as an Epistle*

Those who analyze Galatians as an epistle note that there are similarities with letters in which rebuke and request play a role:²¹

- The rebuke is visible in 1:6, where Paul is “astonished” that they are so quickly “deserting” him; it is also found in 3:1: “O foolish Galatians,” in 4:11: “I am afraid that my work for you may have been wasted,” and 4:20: “I am perplexed about you.”
- The key request is made in 4:12:

Galatians 4:12 Become as I [verb?]. For I too [verb] as you, brothers, I beg you.

The fact that one or two verbs need to be provided by the reader has made it possible to suggest various translations and interpretations of this request. I will not add my own variant, but rather ask the question: Whom else could they become as? In the letter to the Galatians the only alternative models for behavior are the delegates of James, Peter, Barnabas, and the other *Ioudaioi* in Antioch. Paul claims that he is a better model for the Galatians to follow because he, unlike Peter and James, is like his primary addressees. Could this be because Paul is a Diaspora Jew while Peter and James are Palestinian Jews?²²

Conclusion and Implications

In the first part of this essay, I argued that the passages interpreted by most commentators as evidence of a gentile audience, are in fact worded such that they include the Jewish members of the audience and Paul himself. I do not mean to say that the letter was not written to gentiles, but rather that its message was aimed at Jewish Christians too. After this, I assessed how the rhetoric of the letter would have worked for these recipients. Whether we approach the work as oratory

²¹ Cf. Nils A. Dahl, “Paul’s letter to the Galatians: Epistolary Genre, Content, and Structure,” in Nanos (ed.), *Debate*, 117–42.

²² G. Walter Hansen, “A Paradigm of the Apocalypse: The Gospel in the Light of Epistolary Analysis,” in Nanos (ed.), *Debate*, 147, believes Paul asks the gentiles to become like him, not because they are like him, but because he, a former Pharisee, *became* a gentile like them. The problem with this interpretation is that it rests on a verb that the translator brings into the text, not on the text itself. The parallel must be found between Paul and his addressees.

or as a letter of rebuke and request, in both cases the situation of the Galatians seems similar to that in Antioch. The question is whether Jewish Christians need to live in accordance with the Law and the effects that that might have on the mission to the gentiles.

It is therefore possible and even likely that the Galatian churches consisted of both Jews and gentiles, as was the case in Antioch. Given the fact that this is also sociologically the more plausible option, I believe that we should favour the hypothesis that the churches in Galatia were mixed communities.

If we accept this conclusion, there are some implications that merit further study. In the first place, the analysis here favours the theory that the Galatian churches are to be found in the south, where we also find several Jewish Diaspora communities (there are, to my knowledge, no clear references to Jews in northern Galatia in the first century).²³ It also favours a dating of the letter in the early 50s CE, as the interpretation presented here allows us to identify the meeting in Gal 2:1–10 with the “council” in Acts 15.²⁴ The incident in Antioch (Gal 2:11–14) may have taken place during the visit implied by Acts 18:22–23.

Secondly, if my analysis is correct, then this touches on the question of who the opponents were of Paul, and not only in Galatia. If Paul wanted Jews and non-Jews to have complete fellowship in Diaspora churches, then this would bring him (and the early Christian movement of which he was a part) in conflict with law-observant Jewish communities, especially if he went as far as to discourage circumcision of their children. In the context of Roman law, such communities could enact certain kinds of punishments. Internally, it would bring Paul in conflict with Jewish followers of Jesus who were zealous for the law, as well as those who preferred accommodation with the Jewish community rather than conflict.

²³ The evidence is sparse. There is one inscription honouring the Most High God, which might be Jewish (but was also common among non-Jews) and might be from the first century. Cf. Emil Schürer, with Geza Vermes, Fergus Millar and Martin Goodman, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.–A.D. 135)*, III.1 (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1985), 34–35. I also note that there is no evidence of Christian churches in northern Galatia before the third century.

²⁴ The problem noted by some scholars with the fact that Paul does not refer to the compromise described in Acts 15 is solved once we accept that James’ missionaries did not require the gentiles to be circumcised. The problem with Acts 15 is that it says nothing about the requirements of Jewish Christians in mixed communities.

UNITY AND DIVERSITY IN PAULINE ESCHATOLOGY

Andrew W. Pitts

McMaster Divinity College, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada

Research on Pauline eschatology over the last hundred years has been dominated by developmental theories that suggest a significant amount of diversity between Paul's earlier and later letters. After reviewing these trends in Pauline eschatology, I point out particular elements of unity and diversity that have been suggested and argue that while we do find *rhetorical diversity* in Paul's expression of his eschatological beliefs, resulting from various contextualizations of these beliefs to unique epistolary situations, a *structural unity* can nevertheless be detected; that is, although we cannot construct a comprehensive Pauline eschatology, we can track Paul's pattern of accessing particular beliefs and see that it is adopted for context-specific rhetorical purposes along what seems to be a coherent eschatological framework organized according to three temporal frames of reference: past, present and future.

1. *Trends in Pauline Eschatology*

Like a number of other significant components of Pauline theology, contemporary approaches to Pauline eschatology are primarily developmental, positing successive stages in Paul's eschatological beliefs either in contradiction or in tension with one another. Hegelian philosophy and several significant enlightenment advances paved the way for a series of developmental perspectives on dogmatics in the eighteenth, nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, seen in the work of Newman and Harnack, for example.¹ As Longenecker notes, "the 1800s was

¹ J. H. Newman, *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine* (Notre Dame: Notre Dame University Press, 1989 [1845]); A. Harnack, *History of Dogma* (trans. N. Buchanan; Boston: Little, Brown, 1889–1902; German original, 1886). On Newman's developmental theory, see N. Lash, *Newman on Development: The Search for an Explanation in History* (Shepherdstown: Patmos Press, 1975). On development in doctrine more generally, see O. Chadwick, *From Bousset to Newman: The Idea of Doctrinal Development* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1957).

a time when ideas of development and progress were ‘in the air.’”² These models were applied to the origin and development of primitive Christian beliefs and tradition by a number of New Testament scholars, especially under the influence of the Tübingen school.³ Auguste Sabatier, however, was the first to apply a developmental scheme to Pauline theology, and Otto Pfleiderer, under the influence of Lüdemann and Baur, initiated the movement toward tracking development in Pauline eschatology.⁴ Pfleiderer argued that Paul’s shift in the structure of his eschatology was the result of his transition into a more Hellenistic mode of thinking as he gained greater exposure to Hellenistic literature in Alexandria.⁵ Pfleiderer was followed to varying degrees by a number of German scholars, including Ernst von Teichmann, Heinrich Holtzmann, Hans Windisch and Bernhard Weiss, to name a few of the more significant figures.⁶ Similar developments also emerged in English-language scholarship, seen, for example, in the work of J. B. Lightfoot, George Gilbert, George Matheson, R. H. Charles, Henry

² R. N. Longenecker, “Is There Development in Paul’s Resurrection Thought?” in R. N. Longenecker (ed.), *Life in the Face of Death: The Resurrection Message of the New Testament* (MNTS; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 171–202; the article used here is repr. in R. N. Longenecker, *Studies in Paul, Exegetical and Theological* (NTM 2; Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2004), 216–47, here 218.

³ See esp. F. C. Baur, *Church History of the First Three Centuries* (2 vols.; trans. R. Menzies; London: Williams and Norgate, 1878–79). On Baur, especially his developmental portrayal of Christian origins, see esp. C. Hodgson, *The Formation of Historical Theology: A Study of Ferdinand Christian Baur* (New York: Harper and Row, 1966). Cf. also H. Harris, *The Tübingen School* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1975).

⁴ A. Sabatier, *The Apostle Paul: A Sketch of the Development of his Doctrine* (trans. A. M. Hellier; London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1891; French original 1870); O. Pfleiderer, *Paulinism: A Contribution to the History of Primitive Christian Theology* (2 vols.; trans. E. Peters; London: Williams and Norgate, 1877; German original 1873). H. Lüdemann, *Die Anthropologie des Apostels Paulus und ihre Stellung innerhalb seiner Heilslehre* (Kiel: Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1872).

⁵ See esp. O. Pfleiderer, *Das Urchristentum, seine Schriften und Lehren in geschichtlichen Zusammenhang* (Berlin: Reimer, 1887), 293–98. I have argued elsewhere, however, that the most adequate chronology for Paul’s life probably best reflects a shift from more Hellenistic structures of thought, gained from Hellenistic education in Tarsus, to a more Jewish emphasis gained from rabbinical training instead of vice versa. See A. W. Pitts, “Hellenistic Schools in Jerusalem and Paul’s Rhetorical Education,” in S. E. Porter (ed.), *Paul’s World* (PAST 4; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 19–50.

⁶ E. Teichmann, *Die paulinischen Vorstellungen Auferstehung und Gericht und ihre Beziehung* (Leipzig: J. C. B. Mohr, 1896); H. J. Holtzmann, *Lehrbuch der neutestamentlichen Theologie* (2 vols.; 2nd ed.; Sammlung theologischer Lehrbücher; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1911), 2:215; B. Weiss, *Lehrbuch der biblischen Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (rev. and exp.; Berlin: Verlag Wilhelm Herts, 1903 [1868]).

Thackeray, D. A. Hayes, Irving Wood and Frank Porter.⁷ C. H. Dodd refers to this era as one in which evolution was the key to understanding in several fields and Pauline literature was read as a collection of documents for “the evolution of Paulinism.”⁸

By the time Dodd wrote, however, scholars had already begun to see that the tendency to locate evolutionary stages in Paul’s thinking “overpressed the evidence in the interests of a neat scheme of development” so that the modern tendency was to “deny that Paul underwent any substantial development.”⁹ Nevertheless, during the 1930s both Dodd and to a lesser degree John Knox¹⁰ played pivotal roles in re-sparking

⁷ J. B. Lightfoot, “The Chronology of St. Paul’s Life and Letters,” in J. B. Lightfoot, *Biblical Essays* (London: Macmillan, 1893) (based upon his lecture notes of 1863), 215–33; G. H. Gilbert, “The Development of Paul’s Beliefs,” *JR* 14 (1892): 266–70; G. Matheson, *The Spiritual Development of St. Paul* (London: Blackwood & Sons, 1891); R. H. Charles, *The Doctrine of a Future Life* (London: A & C Black, 1912 [1899]); H. St. J. Thackeray, *The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought* (London: Macmillan, 1900); D. A. Hayes, “A Study of a Pauline Apocalypse: 1 Thes. 4:13–14,” *JR* 34 (1911): 163–75; I. F. Wood, “Paul’s Eschatology,” *JR* 38 (1911): 79–91; I. F. Wood, “Paul’s Eschatology. II,” *JR* 38 (1911): 159–70; F. C. Porter, “The Place of Apocalyptic Conceptions in the Thought of Paul,” *JBL* 41 (1922): 183–204. For further history and placement of some of these authors, see Longenecker, “Development,” 218–20.

⁸ C. H. Dodd, “The Mind of St. Paul: Change and Development,” *BJRL* 18 (1934): 3–44; in this paper I refer to the repr. of this article, “The Mind of Paul: II,” in Dodd, *New Testament Studies* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1953), 83–128.

⁹ Dodd, “The Mind of Paul: II,” 83.

¹⁰ The role of Knox in developmental schemes for Pauline thought is more foundational and indirect as later scholars depended upon his work in Pauline chronology as the basis for positing evolutionary stages in Paul’s thinking. Knox made two related contributions to the discussion. He was one of the first to emphasize the distinction between Paul’s letters as primary sources and Luke-Acts as a secondary, less authoritative source for ascertaining details concerning Paul’s life. (See J. Knox, “Fourteen Years Later: A Note on Pauline Chronology,” *JR* 16 [1936]: 341–49; J. Knox, “The Pauline Chronology,” *JBL* 58 [1939]: 15–29; J. Knox, *Chapters in a Life of Paul* [New York: Abington, 1950], 47–60. See also P. S. Minear, “The Jerusalem Fund and Pauline Chronology,” *ATHR* 25 [1943]: 389–96; M. J. Suggs, “The Date of Paul’s Macedonian Ministry,” *NovT* 4 [1960]: 60–68. This perspective seems to have been significantly set in motion in contemporary New Testament scholarship by R. Jewett, *A Chronology of Paul’s Life* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979]). Secondly, his chronology for Paul’s life and letters functioned as a significant basis for subsequent work on the development of Pauline thought since it allows for an even longer period of time to transpire than Dodd’s chronology, which attempted to reconcile the material from Paul’s letters with Acts. Hurd is the most obvious example of this. In his work on the development of Paul’s thought, Hurd shows the importance of a chronology that allows for a fair amount of time to pass between Paul’s major literary achievements—as we see especially in Knox’s chronology—for evolutionary theories of Pauline theology. See J. C. Hurd, *The Origin of 1 Corinthians* (New York: Seabury Press, 1965), 3–52; J. C. Hurd, “Pauline Chronology and Pauline Theology,” in W. R. Farmer, C. F. D. Moule and R. R. Niebuhr (eds.), *Christian History and Interpretation: Studies Presented to John Knox* (Cambridge:

an interest in development in Pauline eschatology that has endured among New Testament interpreters up to the present day, probably climaxing in the eighties.¹¹ Albert Schweitzer, through his influence on a number of scholars (including Dodd), set a further trajectory for coupling developmental Pauline eschatology with apocalyptic categories.¹²

Cambridge University Press, 1967), 225–48. C. H. Buck makes similar connections. In his article, “The Collection for the Saints,” *HTR* 34 (1950): 1–29, he builds upon the work of Knox and other chronologies of Paul, which give priority to Paul’s letters over Acts, in his construction of a Pauline chronology based upon events surrounding Paul’s collection for the saints. This chronology then serves as a fundamental basis for Buck’s later developmental construction of Pauline theology with Taylor. C. H. Buck and G. Taylor, *Saint Paul: A Study in the Development of his Thought* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1969).

¹¹ On the development of the apostolic kerygma generally, see C. H. Dodd, *The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments with an Appendix on Eschatology and History* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1980). On development in Paul’s thought (especially eschatology), see C. H. Dodd, “The Mind St. Paul: A Psychological Approach,” *B7JRL* 17 (1933): 3–17; in this essay I refer to the repr. of this article, “The Mind of Paul: I,” in Dodd, *New Testament Studies* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1953), 83–128; Dodd, “The Mind of Paul: II,” 83–128. As I note above, Knox’s contribution to later ideas of development in Paul is primarily foundational and indirect, coming through the influence of his treatments of Pauline chronology, see Knox, *Chapters*, 47–60; Knox, “Fourteen Years Later,” 341–49; Knox, “Pauline Chronology,” 15–29.

¹² See esp. A. Schweitzer, *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle* (trans. W. Montgomery; London: A & C Black, 1953; German original 1930). Of course, Schweitzer’s reading of Paul in this way is part of a larger eschatological project for reading the New Testament that Schweitzer began in the area of historical-Jesus research. See A. Schweitzer, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus: A Critical Study of its Progress from Reimarus to Wrede* (trans. W. Montgomery; New York: Macmillan, 1968; German original 1906); A. Schweitzer, *Psychiatric Study of Jesus* (trans. C. R. Joy; Boston: Beacon, 1948; German original 1911); A. Schweitzer, *The Mystery of the Kingdom of God: The Secret of Jesus’ Messiahship and Passion* (London: A & C Black, 1950; German original 1914). This approach was applied to early Christianity more generally in A. Schweitzer, *The Kingdom of God and Primitive Christianity* (trans. L. A. Garrard; London: Black, 1968; German original 1967). For an analysis of Schweitzer’s approach to Pauline eschatology, see R. B. Matlock, *Unveiling the Apocalyptic Paul: Paul’s Interpreters and the Rhetoric of Criticism* (JSNTSup 127; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 23–71. Matlock provides a helpful summary of the conflict out of which Schweitzer’s thinking emerged: “Schweitzer reacts against a theological climate which had long indulged, as Schweitzer reads it, in the relatively easier solution to the problem of the Hellenization of Christianity (for Schweitzer the central problem of the history of dogma) of assuming in Jesus and especially Paul a mixture of the eschatological and the non-eschatological which well prepared the way for this movement toward ultimate total Hellenization in the Asia Minor theology of the early second century...Paul now stands in the middle of a movement from purely eschatological to purely non-eschatological, and so the question turns on him, and Schweitzer’s short answer is that, as in the case of the preaching of Jesus, one is again confronted with an either/or, so that a purely eschatological or a purely non-eschatological explanation” are the available alternatives. “Schweitzer takes the first alternative, leaving Paul on the side of Jesus and the primitive church and seeing

Dodd's major contribution was his attempt to establish the relationship between Pauline chronology and theology, illustrating a progress in his theology from Jewish apocalyptic to Hellenistic categories of thought and expression.¹³

Hellenization of Christianity as a process wholly subsequent to Paul." Matlock, *Unveiling the Apocalyptic Paul*, 24–25.

¹³ Although Schweitzer opposed the trends toward developmental schemes put forward by Pauline interpreters during his day (see A. Schweitzer, *Paul and his Interpreters: A Critical History* [trans. W. Montgomery; London: A & C Black, 1912; German original 1911], 32), his "eschatological Paul" provides the point of departure for Dodd. Dodd lays the foundations for his study of development in Pauline thought in his analysis of Paul's psychological state in "The Mind of Paul: I," 83–123. In addition to pointing to a number of psychological observations that can be made regarding Paul on the basis of the New Testament data, Dodd draws attention to Paul's development out of a thoroughly Hellenistic background in Tarsus to a Jewish heritage in Jerusalem and his internal (i.e. cognitional) conflict in Romans 7 (Dodd, "The Mind of Paul: I," 68–77). He also makes an inquiry into "the methods and stages of Paul conversion"—although he acknowledges that any such inquiry must be speculative in final analysis (77–79). Paul's numerous psychological developments inevitably impacted his thinking and, according to Dodd, these stages of thought are clearly reflected in his letters: "In his earlier letters (the earliest of which are not less than fifteen years later than his conversion) we find indications that old ways of thought and traits of character in part survived the change, and were only gradually brought captive to the allegiance of Christ" (79). He argues that Paul experienced "a sort of second conversion" when he finally realized his own limitations (as we see in 2 Corinthians 1–9—Dodd adopts a composite theory of 2 Corinthians) that resulted in a notable "change of temper" in his latter letters (81). In "The Mind of Paul: II," 83–128, Dodd makes more explicit applications of his evolution of Pauline psychology to issues of theological development and we see Schweitzer's influence in the way that Paul's early eschatology is framed. Dodd spends a substantial portion of this article attempting to discredit the Ephesian hypothesis, which places the writing of the prison letters, Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, and probably Galatians within three to four years of one another by suggesting an Ephesian imprisonment for the prison letters (on this theory, Paul wrote Philippians in the first Ephesian imprisonment and Colossians, Ephesians and Philemon in the second) (this theory is associated with S. Duncan, *St. Paul's Ephesian Ministry* [London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1929]), in favor of the prevailing Roman hypothesis (on this chronology, cf. C. H. Dodd, *Helps to the Study of the Bible* [London: Oxford, 1932], 195–97), which locates the time of writing for all four letters in Paul's imprisonment at Rome recorded at the end of Acts (Dodd, "The Mind of Paul: II," 83–109. A second alternative to the Roman hypothesis has been proposed as well, the Caesarean hypothesis. On this theory, see L. Johnson, "The Pauline Letters from Caesarea," *ET* 68 [1956–57]: 24–26). This allows Dodd to put some distance between the time of writing for the bulk of Paul's letters so that development in Pauline theology is a bit more plausible. Dodd argues for two areas of development, in particular: "(1) eschatology and the valuation of the natural order and (2) the universality of the Christian religion" (Dodd, "The Mind of Paul: II," 109). For Dodd, four major shifts (if not in thought, at least in emphasis) can be identified in Paul in accordance with the chronology of letters—the pastorals were written by a later Paulinist and, therefore, do not receive attention in Dodd's treatment. Many eschatological elements in 1 and 2 Thessalonians, the earliest Pauline letters

While many subsequent scholars did not subscribe to every point of chronology or development suggested by Dodd and Knox, their work, in conjunction with Schweitzer's "eschatological Paul," served as a catalyst for a number of developmental-apocalyptic approaches to Pauline eschatology from the 1940s to the present as well as a few non-developmental apocalyptic proposals following the track of Schweitzer exclusively. These apocalyptic views include W. L. Knox, Oscar Cullmann, W. D. Davies, John A. T. Robinson, C. E. Faw, Donald Selby, Archibald Hunter, Hans-Joachim Schoeps, Werner Kümmel, Stephen Smalley, Ernst Käsemann, Perrier Benoit, Victor Furnish and now more recently Paul Achtemeier, Jürgen Becker, John Reumann and Udo Schnelle.¹⁴

according to Dodd, reflect a Jewish apocalyptic framework as Schweitzer insisted, with Paul expecting the Advent within his own lifetime as well as that of the majority of his converts (109–10). This belief can also be detected within 1 Corinthians; however, in this letter a subtle second stage in Paul's thinking should be noticed because there seems to be less certainty regarding the number of Christians that will die before the Advent (110). 2 Corinthians paints an entirely different picture and represents a third shift in the structure of Paul's eschatology. By this point, Paul is ready to depart to be with the Lord (2 Cor 5:1–10). Statements regarding the time of the Advent in Romans are equally cautious (111). While the possibility of Paul's death prior to the Advent seems to be a very real possibility in Romans, it is still "nearer now than it was when we became Christians" (Rom 13:11–14). The final shift is located in the eschatology of the prison letters (111–12). Here, it is claimed, not even a "remnant of Paul's earlier impatient expectation" can be found (112). The major shift in Paul's thinking, from 1 and 2 Thessalonians/1 Corinthians and 2 Corinthians/Romans was, according to Dodd, the result of Paul being brought near to death and realizing the possibility of dying before the Advent.

¹⁴ W. L. Knox, *St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1939); O. Cullmann, *Christ and Time: The Primitive Christian Conception of Time and History* (3rd ed.; trans. F. V. Filson; London: SCM Press, 1962; 1st German edition 1942); W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology* (4th ed.; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980; 1st ed. 1948), 285–320; J. A. T. Robinson, *Jesus and his Coming: The Emergence of a Doctrine* (London: SCM Press, 1957), 160; D. J. Selby, "Changing Views in New Testament Eschatology," *HTR* 50 (1957): 21–36, esp. 34–35; C. E. Faw, "Death and Resurrection in Paul's Letters," *JBL* 27 (1959): 291–98; A. M. Hunter, *Paul and his Predecessors* (London: SCM Press, 1961), 98; H.-J. Schoeps, *Paul: The Theology of the Apostle in Light of Jewish Religious History* (trans. H. Knight; London: Lutterworth Press, 1961); S. S. Smalley, "The Delay of the Parousia," *JBL* 83 (1964): 41–54; E. Käsemann, *New Testament Questions of Today* (trans. W. J. Montague; London: SCM Press, 1967), 124–37; W. G. Kümmel, "Futuristic and Realized Eschatology in the Earliest Stages of Christianity," *JR* 43 (1963): 303–14; P. Benoit, "Resurrection: At the End of Time or Immediately after Death?" *Concilium* 10 (1970): 103–14; V. P. Furnish, "Development in Paul's Thought," *JAR* 38 (1970): 289–303; P. J. Achtemeier, "An Apocalyptic Shift in Early Christian Tradition: Reflections on Some Canonical Evidence," *CBQ* 45 (1983): 231–48, here 231–39; J. Becker, *Paul: Apostle to the Gentiles* (trans. O. C. Dean; Louisville: Westminster, 1993), esp. 371–449; J. Reumann, *Variety*

Although evolutionary perspectives seem to dominate, from the beginning scholars have questioned these understandings of Pauline eschatology for a number of reasons. Kennedy, for instance, criticizes the developmental schemes of Pfleiderer, Reuss, Holtzmann, Teichmann, Cone, Clemen and Schmiedel on the basis “that we cannot find that the apostle reached it [a shift from Jewish to Hellenistic eschatology], at least in the clear-cut definite shape in which it is described by the writers to whom we have referred.” Kennedy insists that, “The hypothesis really springs from a literalistic, pedantic interpretation of St Paul’s statements.”¹⁵ Schweitzer, Geerhardus Vos, John Lowe, E. Earle Ellis, A. L. Moore, John Gager, E. P. Sanders, Andrew Lincoln, Ben Meyer, John Gillman, Joseph Plevnik, Richard Longenecker and Paul Woodbridge are representative of a trend in scholarship that continued to argue for a general continuity in Paul’s eschatological beliefs—at least what can be ascribed to Paul on the basis of the sources the respective authors accept as authentic.¹⁶ These responses are usually put forward on the basis of the unlikelihood of development given Paul’s theological “maturity” by the time he began to write and the relatively short amount of time between his extant literary achievements—even longer chronologies like Knox’s still only posit around fifteen years between all of the letters—on the one hand, and exegesis reflecting the occasional

and *Unity in New Testament Thought* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 71–128; U. Schnelle, *Apostle Paul: His Life and Theology* (trans. M. E. Boring; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2005), 248–51, 577–97.

¹⁵ H. A. A. Kennedy, *St. Paul’s Conceptions of the Last Things* (New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 1904), 263.

¹⁶ Schweitzer, *Paul and his Interpreters*, 32; G. Vos, “Alleged Development in Paul’s Teaching on the Resurrection,” *PTR* (1929): 193–226 repr. in G. Vos, *The Pauline Eschatology* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1930), 173–205; J. Lowe, “An Examination of Attempts to Detect Developments in St. Paul’s Theology,” *JTS* 42 (1941): 129–42; E. E. Ellis, *Paul and His Recent Interpreters* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1961), 35–48; A. L. Moore, *The Parousia in the New Testament* (NovTSup 13; Leiden: Brill, 1966), 108–25; J. G. Gager, “Functional Diversity in Paul’s Use of End-Time Language,” *JBL* 89 (1970): 325–37; E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (London: SCM Press, 1977), 442–523; A. T. Lincoln, *Paradise Now and Not Yet: Studies in the Role of the Heavenly Dimension of Paul’s Thought with Special Reference to his Eschatology* (SNTSMS 43; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 181–84; B. F. Meyer, “Did Paul’s View of the Resurrection Undergo Development?” *TS* 47 (1986): 7–18 repr. in B. F. Meyer, *Critical Realism and The New Testament* (Allison Park: Pickwick, 1989), 100–28; J. Gillman, “A Thematic Comparison: 1 Cor 15:50–57 and 2 Cor 5:1–5,” *JBL* 107 (1988): 439–54; J. Plevnik, *Paul and the Parousia: An Exegetical and Theological Investigation* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1997); Longenecker, “Development,” 223–49; P. Woodbridge, “Did Paul Change His Mind? An Examination of Some Aspects of Pauline Eschatology,” *Themelios* 28 (2003): 5–18.

nature of Paul's letters on the other.¹⁷ Many of these critics, however, continue to perpetuate the apocalyptic Paul initiated by Schweitzer.¹⁸ Sanders' "participationist eschatology," for example, follows Schweitzer in both placing a Jewish eschatological framework at the center of Pauline thought and not positing significant development in Paul's eschatological beliefs—though Sanders criticizes Schweitzer for the tidiness of his scheme and for not being critical or detailed enough in his use of Jewish sources.¹⁹

¹⁷ Longenecker suggests six difficulties that emerge in association with positing development in Paul's thought. His reasoning is typical: "1. That all of Paul's extant letters, however identified and whenever dated, fall within a relatively brief period of time during his later adult life (roughly speaking, somewhere between eight to fifteen years) when he was extensively engaged in ministry and when his thought might reasonably be supposed to have reached maturity; 2. That the extent of the Pauline corpus is debated, with seven letters commonly accepted but the Pastoral Epistles usually set aside and 2 Thessalonians, Colossians, and Ephesians often questioned; 3. That a relative chronology between the letters—in certain cases, also within the letters (e.g., within 2 Corinthians; perhaps also within Philippians and between 1 and 2 Thessalonians)—is a frequent matter of dispute; 4. That the pastoral and polemical nature of much of what Paul writes in his letters requires interpreters to treat his statements more circumstantially than systematically, both as regards their subject matter and as regards their manner of argumentation; 5. That an argument from silence, which has been used frequently in support of various developmental theories, is notoriously insecure; and, 6. That the paradoxical nature of Christian truth makes it exceedingly difficult to classify Paul's thought, either in whole or in part, according to any schema of successive stages of development." Longenecker, "Development," 224–25.

¹⁸ But cf. R. N. Longenecker, "The Nature of Paul's Early Eschatology," *NTS* 31 (1985): 859–95 repr. in R. N. Longenecker, *Studies in Paul, Exegetical and Theological* (NTM 2; Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2004), 179–93. Longenecker argues that while the form of Paul's early eschatology, as represented in 1 and 2 Thessalonians, is clearly apocalyptic, the content draws from a "functional Christology" rather than a Jewish apocalyptic framework.

¹⁹ Sanders, *Paul*, 442–523; Schweitzer, *Mysticism of Paul*, 52–100. Sanders acknowledges his debt to Schweitzer in several places (e.g. *Paul*, 448). Of course, since Bultmann, there has been a tendency to distinguish between eschatological and apocalyptic literature so that Sanders' treatment is naturally more nuanced than what we find in Schweitzer along these lines. On terminology, including relevant bibliography, see Gager, "Functional Diversity," 325–27. Gager proposes that such distinctions are unhelpful for assessing function, in any case, when evaluating the relevant imagery and terminology as opposed to content. He prefers instead the more general notion of "end-time language" as a suitable category for analyzing the function of Paul's end-times statements.

2. *Unity in Pauline Eschatology*

As a result of the focus on development in Paul's eschatology during most of the last century, the issue of unity has been significantly neglected by Pauline scholars. Even interpreters who posit a fairly high level of unity in Paul's eschatological beliefs typically set about their project as a reaction to developmental schemes rather than attempting the more constructive task of formulating a structure for Paul's eschatological beliefs. Nevertheless, a few words on how unity is discussed in recent research on Pauline eschatology will be instructive.

Most interpreters are willing to allow for a significant level of unity in Paul's eschatology expressed in his early writings, especially 1 Thessalonians and 1 Corinthians. Those who argue for diversity in Paul's eschatological thinking usually construe Paul's early eschatology along futurist lines while highlighting a more realized perception in the later Pauline letters (so many of the scholars mentioned above)—although subtle changes in Paul's thought or changes in emphasis are often noted between the early letters.²⁰ As for scholars who insist on preserving a significant amount of continuity in Paul's eschatological beliefs, some form of futuristic, thorough-going (i.e. consistent) or realized eschatology is argued for throughout the Pauline corpus²¹ or

²⁰ Kümmel provides a good concise example of exactly this line of thinking. See Kümmel, "Futuristic and Realized Eschatology," 303–14. Another example is found in Selby, who posits five periods of eschatological development in primitive Christian tradition: pre-A, A, B, C and D. Pre-A refers to the history of Jewish eschatological development. Much of the eschatological tradition in the Gospels fits into periods A and B whereas Pauline material is spread over periods B and C and the pastorals are probably relegated to period D with the Johanne literature (excluding the apocalypse), Hebrews and James. Selby, "Changing Ideas," 21–36, esp. 33–36 on Paul.

²¹ The majority of scholars that argue for a coherent Pauline eschatology suggest futurism in some form. For those who argue for a coherent futurist Pauline eschatology, see for example Moore, *Parousia*, 109–25; Gillman, "Thematic Comparison," 439–54; Plevnik, *Paul and the Parousia*. A number of theologians point to futurist and realized dimensions in a unified Pauline eschatology. See, for example, Ellis, *Paul*, 33; Lincoln, *Paradise Now and Not Yet*, 181–84. Schweitzer, the originator of thorough-going eschatology, articulates the view that Paul continued the eschatology of Jesus' eschatology as the inauguration of the Messianic era, awaiting the climactic full entrance of Jesus into his kingdom, and providing an interim ethics suitable until Jesus arrives. His system was unified in significant respects and Schweitzer argued that Hellenistic elements did not provide a major foundation for Pauline theology, but were only detectable in later Christian tradition as Hellenization gained force and was ultimately allowed by Paul's mysticism. See Schweitzer, *Mysticism*, 1–100, 293–375. The most notable proposal for a coherent realized eschatology is found in Vos, *The Pauline Eschatology*, 1–41.

Pauline authorship of the latter letters (esp. Colossians and Ephesians) is denied, attributing the eschatological shift in the Pauline tradition to the theology of later Paulinists. The latter strategy allows for a somewhat coherent Pauline theology in the sense that the letters supposed to actually be from Paul's hand present a fairly unified eschatology. Achtemeier, for example, suggests a unified futurist perspective for what seems to him to be the authentic Pauline corpus (1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Philemon, Romans, 1 Thessalonians)²² while noting a realized understanding among the so-called deuterio-Pauline letters (Colossians, Ephesians, the Pastorals)—interestingly, the often debated evidence from 2 Thessalonians is not considered.²³ So much for unity among Pauline beliefs, what about individual elements of diversity?

A more recent proposal for a coherent realized eschatology is H. Giesen, "Eschatology in Philippians," in S. E. Porter (ed.), *Paul and His Theology* (PAST 3; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 217–82, here esp. 269–72. On the obvious tension created by 1 Thessalonians 4 for this view, Giesen says: "[Paul] solved the problem of the Thessalonians by his statement that the dead ones will not have a disadvantage at the parousia. He is not at all sure that the parousia is at hand, and because of this he leaves its date open and requests the Thessalonians to be ready at any time (cf. 1 Thess 5:1–11)." Giesen, "Eschatology," 269–70.

²² Philemon and 2 Thessalonians are not discussed.

²³ Achtemeier, "Apocalyptic Shift," 231–39. For this perspective, see also J. Beker, *Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in Life and Thought* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980), 160–63; Reumann, *Variety and Unity*, 105–28. Reumann's remarks are typical: "Usually issues about genuineness have to do with style and content, and where they fit into Paul's career as missionary. At least, the six exhibit development in his views or variations from his usual emphases. They thus create problems in discussing a unified Pauline theology. The fluctuations are especially great in eschatology, ranging from fervent apocalypticism in 2 Thessalonians to a timeless emphasis in Ephesians on the church which, as Christ's body (1:23), replaces earlier emphasis on Jesus' coming." Reumann, *Variety and Unity*, 105. So also Lohse: "Formerly, when scholars tried to understand these epistles [2 Thess, Col, Eph, the Pastorals] as authentic documents written by Paul himself, they were forced to think of changes in the apostle's theology and to see these texts as coming from Paul after he had grown old. On this view, Paul had to reformulate some central theological topics, and give new expression to what he had said earlier in other ways. But attempts at describing the theology of the whole Corpus Paulinum made it more and more evident that such changes of thought took place, not within Paul's lifetime but later, as theologians who had learned from him tried to restate his message in ways they thought he might have done to address the late-first century Christian situation. Hence we may now affirm that there are only seven authentic Pauline letters: 1 Thessalonians, Galatians, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Philippians, Philemon and Romans." E. Lohse, "Changes of Thought in Pauline Theology? Some Reflections on Paul's Ethical Teaching in the Context of His Theology," in E. H. Lovering and J. L. Sumney (eds.), *Theology and Ethics in Paul and his Interpreters: Essays in Honor of Victor Paul Furnish* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1996), 146–60, here 149. Cf. also C.K. Barrett, *Paul: An Introduction to His Thought* (Louisville: Westminster, 1994), 143–61; J. Ziesler, *Pauline Christianity* (rev. ed.; OBS; Oxford: Oxford University Press,

3. *Diversity in Pauline Eschatology*

A number of individual elements of diversity in Paul's eschatological thinking have been noted by scholars who have articulated developmental approaches to Paul's eschatology. Before proposing a unified account of Paul's eschatology with diverse emphases, it will be helpful to review the areas of tension that have been suggested by Paul's previous interpreters. These include shifts in Paul's thinking concerning (1) the sources for his eschatological categories, (2) the time of the parousia, (3) the intermediate state, (4) the resurrection body and (5) the nature of his theological framework. It should be noted that (1) and (2)–(5) play distinct roles in the argument for diversity. Shift (1) provides a historical or diachronic explanation for the synchronic data observed in shifts (2)–(5)—I will raise this point again below. Some of these issues have been alluded to above, but this section will make these elements of discontinuity more explicit and seek to briefly highlight their historical-exegetical basis.

3.1. *Sources for Eschatological Categories*

Paul's use of sources in the formation of his earlier and later eschatological frameworks has dominated the discussion from the beginning²⁴ and provides the primary contextual basis for explaining shifts in Paul's thinking. It is argued that Paul's early eschatology (esp. 1 and 2 Thessalonians [if 2 Thessalonians is authentic] and to a lesser degree 1 Corinthians)²⁵ reflects a Jewish apocalyptic framework drawn from Paul's pre-Christian theology as a Pharisee while his later eschatology seems to borrow from Hellenistic categories. Dodd, for instance, claims

1990), 130–32. This raises the difficult issue of the use of sources in constructing a "Pauline theology." On this important question, see G. B. Stevens, *The Pauline Theology* (New York: Scribner, 1892), 75–95.

²⁴ Cf. Pfleiderer, *Urchristentum*, 293–98.

²⁵ But Hurd (*Origins*, 229–33) and now Mearns have argued that 1 Corinthians reflects Paul's early eschatology in a way parallel to that of the Thessalonian correspondence. Mearns suggests that Paul's eschatology in 1 Thessalonians reflects a change as a result of the death of believers in Thessalonica, thus accounting for realized and futurist elements in 1 Thessalonians 4 and 5:1–10. Regarding 1 Corinthians, Mearns suggests that Hurd's proposal is on track, but needs key revisions regarding the Corinthians' perspective. C. L. Mearns, "Early Eschatological Development in Paul: The Evidence of I and II Thessalonians," *NTS* 27 (1981): 137–57; C. L. Mearns, "Early Eschatological Development in Paul: The Evidence of 1 Corinthians," *J&NT* 22 (1984): 19–35.

that “It seems clear that Paul started with eschatological beliefs of the type best represented by such Jewish writings as the Book of Enoch, the Apocalypse of Baruch and the Apocalypse of Ezra (II Esdras), especially the last-named.”²⁶ Accordingly, a number of scholars draw attention to the use of Hellenistic categories in Paul’s later letters. Knox’s treatment of 2 Cor 5:1–10 is standard. He suggests that Paul’s perception of the body as a burden from which he desires to be released is drawn from Hellenistic notions represented in Wis 9:15 in its portrayal of the body in the Pythagorean terminology of σκήνος: φθαρτὸν γὰρ σῶμα βαρύνει ψυχὴν, καὶ βρίθει τὸ γεῶδες σκήνος νοῦν πολυφροντίδα (see also Plato, *Phaed.* 81C). Similarly, he argues that Paul’s emphasis on the spirit as a possession of the believer and his understanding of the believer’s life in terms of pilgrimage have affinities with Hellenistic thought.²⁷ The so called deutero-Pauline letters, especially Ephesians, Colossians and the Pastorals, are often said to express a realized Gnostic eschatology in contrast to the futurist perspective of the early letters erected as a polemic against proto-Gnosticism in the primitive church.²⁸

3.2. *Time of the Parousia*

The most extensively discussed evolutionary development in Paul’s eschatology surrounds his beliefs regarding the time of the parousia. The tendency here is to note the movement from the impression that Paul gives that he will be alive at the parousia in his early eschatology (1 and 2 Thessalonians) to an increasing awareness that he may die before the parousia (1 Corinthians, Romans) to a completely realized eschatology (esp. Colossians and Ephesians). The major tension here for all scholars, since many deny that Colossians and Ephesians are Pauline, is the apparent shift between the eschatology of 1 Thessalonians/1 Corinthians and 2 Cor 5:1–10. Schnelle, for example, commenting on these passages, argues: “Differently from 1 Thess 4:13–18 and 1 Cor 15:51–52, in 2 Cor 5:1–10 the apostle for the first time reckons with the possibility of his own death before the parousia of the Lord.”

²⁶ Dodd, “The Mind of Paul: II,” 109.

²⁷ Knox, *St. Paul*, 137–41. For additional Hellenistic influences, see Schnelle, *Paul*, 249; H. Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1924), 163.

²⁸ E.g. Achtemeier, “Apocalyptic Shift,” 238. For further bibliography and analysis of this view, see M. L. Peel, “Gnostic Eschatology and the New Testament,” *NovT* 12 (1970), 141–65, here 148–49.

“Utilizing traditional materials” in 5:1, he suggests, “Paul speaks of his present life as an earthly tent, and after it is destroyed there stands ready for him in heaven a building from God, a house not made by hands. By καταλυθῆναι (be destroyed) the apostle means his own death before the parousia, and because he now considers this a real possibility, he longs to be ‘further clothed’ with the ‘heavenly dwelling’ (5:2).”²⁹ He concludes that for Paul, “5:1–10 is the evidence that *the acute expectation of the near end has been relaxed*” (emphasis his).³⁰

3.3. *Intermediate State*

The doctrine of an intermediate state in 2 Cor 5:1–10 is also said to be a Hellenistic anthropological development away from Paul’s early Jewish eschatology. These interpreters argue that Paul’s understanding of the intermediate state in 1 Corinthians 15 is vague and even dark whereas in 2 Cor 5:1–10 it is represented in a very positive light as a union with Christ. This view has enjoyed popularity mostly in German scholarship.³¹ Hoffman has provided an extensive survey of this literature, but he denies that such arguments can be sustained.³²

3.4. *Resurrection Body*

Again, a tension exists between 1 Cor 15:50–57 and 2 Cor 5:1–10. When will the believer receive their resurrection body: at death or at the parousia? As Bruce observes, “No significant shift in perspective is involved in 1 Corinthians: ‘we shall not all die, but we shall all be changed,’ for at the parousia ‘the dead will rise immortal and we [the living also] shall be changed.’”³³ But, “when we come to 2 Corinthians...we are conscious of a change of perspective on Paul’s part.” Bruce insists that in 2 Cor 5:1–10, “Without waiting for the parousia, Paul begins by stating his assurance that ‘if the earthly frame that houses us

²⁹ Schnelle, *Paul*, 249.

³⁰ Schnelle, *Paul*, 251.

³¹ But see Stevens, *Pauline Theology*, 358; Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*, 318.

³² See P. Hoffman, *Die Toten in Christus: Eine Religionsgeschichtliche und exegetische Untersuchung zur paulinischen Eschatologie* (3rd ed.; NTAbh 2; Münster: Aschendorff, 1978), 4–20.

³³ F. F. Bruce, *Paul: Apostle of the Heart Set Free* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977), 309–10.

today should be demolished, we have a building from God, a house not made by human hands, eternal, and in heaven' (2 Cor 5:1)."³⁴

3.5. *Theological Framework*

Some scholars have suggested that there is a shift in Paul's theological framework as well: from apocalyptic eschatological (esp. 1 Corinthians, 1 Thessalonians) to christological and ecclesiological theological structures as the basis for ethical injunctions (esp. Ephesians and Colossians). As Lohse claims, in Ephesians and Colossians, as well as in the pastorals, "Eschatology was no longer emphasized." In these letters, "A doctrine of the church was formulated in which Christianity was seen as the worldwide body of Christ, embracing its members wherever they were. Former Jews and Gentiles were united in Christ."³⁵ Similarly, regarding Pauline ethical content, Dodd, assuming Pauline authorship (unlike Lohse) for Colossians and Ephesians, expresses that "If the thought of Paul did not change or develop, then it is impossible to attribute Ephesians to him; but it is only a little less impossible to attribute Colossians to him, for the decisive difference lies between 1 Corinthians and Colossians, not between Colossians and Ephesians. If we are prepared to recognize a development, then the teaching of Ephesians represents on this side the climax of that development."³⁶

4. *Rhetorical Diversity and Structural Unity in Pauline Eschatology*

As our discussion has revealed so far, several ways of reconciling the theology of Paul's early letters with that expressed in his later letters have been proposed. These almost inevitably lead to offering alternative exegeses to the relevant passages, usually those from Paul's later letters, emphasizing the occasional nature of Paul's letters and the short period of time that seems to have transpired between the writing of the letters. Here, however, I want to take a different approach. First, I want to make a general criticism of the claim that Paul's thought moves from Jewish

³⁴ Bruce, *Paul*, 311. On this view, see also Charles, *Doctrine*, 453; Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*, 318–19; M. J. Harris, "2 Corinthians 5:1–10: A Watershed in Pauline Eschatology," *TynBul* 22 (1971): 32–57.

³⁵ Lohse, "Changes of Thought," 148.

³⁶ Dodd, "The Mind of Paul: II," 117.

apocalyptic categories to more Hellenistic ones, ultimately constituting a movement from futuristic to more realized eschatology. Secondly, instead of focusing directly upon detailed exegesis of individual passages and attempting to relieve tension at the local level of text, I attempt to trace a non-sequential development that emerged somewhat atomistically as the polemical epistolary situation in Pauline church-communities called for varying responses at the global level of corpus. In no one letter or set of letters was Paul endeavoring to provide a systematic portrayal of his view of end-times; nevertheless, in my view, it seems that his beliefs throughout his writings can be brought together into a loosely organized coherent picture. These two suggestions, then—a historical critique and a proposal for a coherent Pauline eschatology—serve both a deconstructive and constructive purpose. The first point criticizes the historical-explanatory basis for developmental theories. It approaches the evidence diachronically—thus addressing shift (1) above. The second point is positive, but also has critical advantages. In the positive task of formulating a coherent picture of Pauline eschatology, developmental schemes are undermined at the synchronic level to the degree that such a picture proves to be persuasive—thus addressing shifts (2)–(5).

4.1. *From a Jewish to a Hellenistic Eschatological Structure?*

In a very real sense, the argument based upon Pauline chronology, that as Paul drifted farther from his Jewish heritage and became more and more exposed to the categories of Hellenistic thought, his eschatological categories shifted, is historically outdated. As a result of the research of scholars like Hengel, Lieberman and a number of others, it is now generally accepted that Jerusalem and much of rabbinic Judaism was extremely affected by Hellenism, as Jerusalem was under direct Hellenistic rule for three centuries.³⁷ To insist that Paul only became exposed

³⁷ See esp. M. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period* (trans. J. Bowden; London: SCM Press, 1974); M. Hengel, *The 'Hellenization' of Judaea in the First Century after Christ* (trans. J. Bowden; London: Trinity, 1989); S. Lieberman, *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine: Studies in Literary Transmission, Beliefs and Manners of Palestine in the 1 Century B.C.E.–IV Century C.E.* (TSJ TSA 18; New York: J TSA, 1950); S. Lieberman, *Greek in Jewish Palestine: Studies in the Life and Manners of Jewish Palestine in the II–IV Centuries C.E.* (2nd ed.; New York: Feldheim, 1965). On the impact of Hellenism on Jewish apocalyptic forms, see Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 210–18; J. J. Collins, "Jewish Apocalyptic against its Hellenistic Near Eastern Environment," *BASOR* 220 (1975): 27–36; J. J. Collins, "Cosmos and Salvation: Jewish Wisdom and Apocalyptic in the Hellenistic Age," *HR* 17 (1977): 121–42; J. J. Collins, "Jewish

to Hellenistic categories of thought in his later days is to operate from the now naïve assumption that a strict dichotomy can be maintained between Palestinian and Hellenistic Judaism. Secondly, it is questionable whether this progression accurately represents the chronology of Paul's life. I have argued elsewhere that the most suitable chronology for the pre-Christian Paul situates him in Tarsus where he likely received a Greek education in a Hellenistic liberal school.³⁸ On this chronology, Paul would have had significant exposure to Hellenistic literature early on. Thirdly, as Lincoln has shown, there are very clear elements of Jewish apocalyptic forms in Paul's early and later writings (esp. 2 Corinthians, Ephesians and Colossians).³⁹ Fourthly, while several scholars draw attention to the antithetical "dualistic" structure of 2 Cor 5:1–10 as derivative of Hellenistic categories,⁴⁰ it should be kept in mind that much of 1 Thessalonians is structured according to similar antithetical principles drawn from Hellenistic literary categories. Malherbe has argued extensively that such structures (as well as 1 Thessalonians as a whole) reflect influence from Hellenistic moral philosophy, especially Stoicism.⁴¹ Similar structures can be detected in epistolary paraenesis. For instance, P.Oxy. XLII 3069.11–13 and 1 Thess 2:3–4 are structurally similar:

Apocalyptic," *Semeia* 14: *Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre* (1979): 21–59; cf. also A. Y. Collins, "Early Christian Apocalyptic," *Semeia* 14: *Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre* (1979): 61–121. The work of Barr and others in showing the fallacy of positing different modes of thought for Jews and Greeks may also be relevant in some cases. See J. Barr, *The Semantics of Biblical Language* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1961).

³⁸ Pitts, "Hellenistic Schools," 19–50.

³⁹ Lincoln, *Paradise Now and Not Yet*, 169–70.

⁴⁰ E.g. D. E. Aune, "Anthropological Duality in the Eschatology of 2 Cor 4:16–5:10," in T. Engberg-Pedersen (ed.), *Paul Beyond the Judaism/Hellenism Divide* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001), 215–39; Schnelle, *Paul*, 250–51.

⁴¹ A. J. Malherbe, "Hellenistic Moralists and the New Testament," in Wolfgang Haase and Hildegard Temporini (eds.), *ANRW* 26.1, Part 2: *Principat* (Religion [Vorkonstantinisches Christentum: Neues Testament]; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1992), 267–333, here 292; A. J. Malherbe, "Exhortation in 1 Thessalonians," *NovT* 25 (1983): 238–56, here 241. See also A. J. Malherbe, *Paul and 1 Thessalonians: The Philosophic Tradition of Pastoral Care* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989).

P.Oxy. XLII.3069.11–13

ἄξιον οὖν ἐστὶν ἐπαινεῖν ἑαυτοὺς
οὐκ ὅτι ποιοῦμεν ταῦτο
ἀλλὰ ὅτι μὴ ἐξαγομέθα ὑφ’
ἑαυτῶν

1 Thessalonians 2:3–4

ἡ γὰρ παράκλησις ἡμῶν
οὐκ ἐκ πλάνης
οὐδὲ ἐξ ἀκαθαρσίας
οὐδὲ ἐν δόλῳ,
ἀλλὰ καθὼς δεδοκιμάσμεθα ὑπὸ τοῦ
θεοῦ πιστευθῆναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον,
οὕτως λαλοῦμεν,
οὐχ ὡς ἀνθρώποις ἀρέσκοντες
ἀλλὰ θεῷ τῷ δοκιμάζοντι τὰς καρδίας
ἡμῶν.

Malherbe points to the influence of Hellenistic philosophy on Paul’s thinking in his use of imitation and knowing motifs as well as *philosophronesis*.⁴² These too find a correlate in epistolary paraenesis. In both epistolary and philosophical associations, we may note continuity in the use of Hellenistic structures in Paul’s expression of his thought between his earliest letter, 1 Thessalonians, and the later 2 Corinthians so that development in this respect is hardly convincing. Jewish and Hellenistic conceptual categories seem to be utilized in both letters, as the above chronology and historical evidence suggests. A shift from a strictly Jewish to a more Hellenistic mode of thinking is not readily detectable. Fifthly, Still has shown futuristic elements to be present at least in Colossians and Kümmel has convincingly highlighted realized elements in the early letters.⁴³ I would suggest further that language implying futurism is present in Ephesians as well, especially in the hope and inheritance terminology employed in chs. 1 and 2. Therefore, there seem to be more streams of continuity, both in the historical, literary and conceptual frameworks in use and in eschatological content, than

⁴² Malherbe, “Hellenistic Moralists,” 267–333; Malherbe, “Moral Exhortation,” 238–56.

⁴³ T. D. Still, “Eschatology in Colossians,” *NTS* 50 (2004): 125–38; Kümmel, “Futuristic and Realized Eschatology,” 310–11. Kümmel states, “even in his early letters Paul is not only an unambiguous witness for the imminent parousia of Christ (1 Thess 1:9–10; 4:13ff.) and a witness that salvation from this evil age has already come to pass for the Christian (Gal. 1:4); he also appropriated both of these statements of faith, and we see from the tradition embodied in Rom. 1:4 and in 1 Cor. 11:26 and 16:22, Paul systematized these juxtaposed statements of faith through the idea of the interlocking character of the dying age and the new age that had already begun, but he always held fast both to the conviction that the eschatological fulfillment had already begun and to the hope that salvation would be fully completed (Phil. 1:23; 3:20–21; 4:5).”

is typically supposed. These arguments, taken together, constitute a powerful objection to the historical supposition of an evolution toward Hellenistic eschatological categories in Paul's letters. This considerably weakens the historical or *diachronic* dimension of the argument for development in Paul. But beyond this historical objection, can the tensions in Paul's statements be brought together into a coherent picture? Can a more suitable explanation be offered at the *synchronic* level, which is able to explain the available data in a convincing way?

4.2. *Rhetorical Diversity in Paul's Eschatological Language*

It seems that it can. But first, at the risk of circumventing the implied order of the discussion, I want to clear the ground a bit by further considering the question of diversity. I think that a number of issues account for much of the diversity we find in Paul. It seems that the traditional arguments for Paul's maturity by the time he began to write, the short amount of time between his major literary achievements, and the occasional-polemical situations to which his letters respond have significant merit and should be seriously weighed in the discussion of unity and diversity in Paul's thought. Further, the major historical explanation for accounting for the nature of Paul's development in thought has been called into question in my above analysis. And I think that Gager and Gillman have successfully shown that many of the tensions noted by scholars result from overly literal readings that fail to grasp the significance of Paul's language within particular contexts.⁴⁴ Therefore, Sanders seems right to insist on speaking of "developments in *presentation* and *argumentation*" rather than shifts in thought.⁴⁵

It also appears to me that much of the work concerned with tracking developments in Paul's end-times beliefs proceeds from the assumption that, at least in his early letters, apocalyptic eschatology provided the essential framework from which Paul wrote and thought.⁴⁶ This falsely

⁴⁴ Gager, "Functional Diversity," 325–37; Gillman, "Thematic Comparison," 439–54.

⁴⁵ Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 432 n9.

⁴⁶ This is primarily due to Schweitzer's insistence on mysticism in Paul and later Käsemann's portrayal of Paul's "enthusiasm" for eschatology. See Schweitzer, *Mysticism*, 101–395 (among others, Schweitzer is followed by A. Wikenhauser, *Pauline Mysticism: Christ in the Mystical Thinking of St. Paul* [Freiburg: Herder, 1960]); E. Käsemann, "The Beginnings of Christian Theology," *JThC* 6 (1969): 17–46; E. Käsemann, "On the Topic of Primitive Christian Apocalyptic," *JThC* 6 (1969): 99–133. Matlock has serviced us in tracing apocalypticism as central to Paul's thinking in Schweitzer, Cull-

assumes a primarily theological-philosophical rather than a utilitarian purpose for Pauline epistolary literature. The form of Paul's letter mitigates against this theoretical reading of his literature. His letters do not take the literary form of the letter-essay designed to expound theoretical and technical topics, but take the form of something like an occasional private letter (with some literary qualities) intended to address particular issues within the communities to which he wrote. So at the level of literary form, this assumption is clearly questionable, but Gager has shown that it does not hold up in terms of content either.⁴⁷ Paul seems to have accessed specific aspects of his broader eschatological structure in the service of particular applications and exhortations related to the communities to which he wrote. Paul's retrieval of theological beliefs from his cognitive (theological) schemas was rhetorical not systematically eschatological, only emerging in structural isolation at points in his letters where they served his larger rhetorical-epistolary agenda. Therefore, we will certainly expect rhetorical diversity in Paul's theological language, but can a structural unity be detected? Clearly, a comprehensive and detailed eschatological scheme can not be formulated based on the limited epistolary materials available. The situations that Paul addressed simply did not ask all of the questions of the systematician. But can we detect *structural* unity? In other words, can we observe in Paul consistent access of individual beliefs from what appears to be a unified eschatological structure? We do not have cognitive or literary access to Paul's entire eschatological scheme and the development that may or may not have occurred, but can we identify in his extant letters retrieval of particular beliefs from a single unified eschatological structure?

4.3. *Structural Unity in Pauline Eschatology*

I think that we can. Thus far, it seems that scholars noted above and several others have made considerable progress in providing reasons for functional and rhetorical diversity in Paul's eschatological language. But

mann and Käsemann. See Matlock, *Unveiling the Apocalyptic Paul*, 23–316. This project has been carried forward in a very thorough way in number of other works, including J. Munck, *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind* (trans. F. Clarke; London: SCM Press, 1959); Schoeps, *Paul*; H. M. Shires, *The Eschatology of Paul in Light of Modern Scholarship* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1966); J. Becker, *Paul's Apocalyptic Gospel: The Coming Triumph of God* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982).

⁴⁷ Gager, "Functional Diversity," 325–37.

while many scholars have contributed to our awareness of factors that may constrain theological expression resulting in rhetorical diversity, at least at the functional-contextual level, very little attention has been given to the larger structure of Paul's eschatological beliefs. Having devoted considerable energies to identifying the factors that result in Paul's diversity of expression, it is now appropriate to turn to the question of Paul's unity of thought. Put another way, previous research has focused on the negative question of how we may account for threads of diversity in Paul's letters and language, but more consideration remains to be given to the positive question concerning the level of unity in Paul's thought. At most, particular conceptions have been noted (e.g. Paul's view of the resurrection, immortality, the parousia, etc.), but few attempts have been made toward situating Paul's eschatological beliefs in relation to one another. Research on Pauline eschatology since Dodd has been either in essential agreement with him in finding diversity between Paul's early and later letters (whether some of the later letters were by Paul or a Paulinist) or they have reacted to this trend by attempting to identify conditions that account for diversity or by arguing for particular interpretations for a set of texts said to be in tension with one another. Consequently, the positive task of formulating a larger structure for Pauline eschatology or at least Paul's retrieval of beliefs from such a structure has been neglected. I hope, therefore, to make some initiatory remarks in this direction aimed at getting this more constructive project underway.

As noted above, I do not hope to provide an intricate systematic display of Paul's entire eschatological scheme. Instead, I want to take on the more modest task of arguing not for the details of such a scheme, but that a unified structure was in place and that in Paul's letters we see him synchronically access various points of this structure in order to serve his rhetorical purposes. My ambition then is to point to places in Paul's letters where his eschatological structure is accessed and to suggest a possible organization for these beliefs and their relations to one another. These relations can be detected by the temporal frames of reference that Paul uses to express specific beliefs. Through the use of temporal deictic markers and lexis Paul situates particular events on a chronological spectrum in terms of past, present and future events that can be tracked throughout his letters. This creates a broad relational structure that can be traced theologically.

The foundation of Paul's eschatology seems to be based in a number of theologically significant events that transpired in Paul's *past* and

for the most part seem to be transmitted through primitive traditional material. Achtemeier has suggested that readers may understand continuity in Paul's thought, if they begin with the "generative center of that theology, namely the resurrection of Jesus by God's power, and if one then proceeds to see how the implications of that generative center account for other theological positions Paul has taken."⁴⁸ While I am skeptical at this point about locating a "center" in Paul's theology,⁴⁹ at least as concerns eschatology, Jesus' resurrection seems to function as the temporal starting point if not the conceptual foundation of this element of Paul's thinking and it seems appropriate as Achtemeier suggests to position Paul's (eschatological) beliefs in relation to this fundamental event. This connection is established directly in 1 Cor 15:20 where the risen Christ is called the "first fruit" (ἀπαρχή) of those who have died. Ἀπαρχή has a deictic function, situating this programmatic past, yet eschatologically significant, event temporally prior to Paul. This relation, between Christ's and the believer's resurrection, is borne out throughout Paul's writings. As Harris observes, "One assumption that underlies New Testament teaching about Christ and his people is the integral relation between his resurrection and their past and future resurrection."⁵⁰ The Spirit, according to Paul, has been given as a guarantee or deposit (ἄρραβών) of the believer's eschatological resurrection, which Christ has inaugurated through his own resurrection (2 Cor 1:22; 5:5; Eph 1:12–14). Paul's thinking here may incorporate primitive traditional material (cf. John 14:16–17; 16:13; cf. also Ignatius, *Eph.* 15:3) into his uniquely eschatological framework. The statement in 2 Cor 5:5 provides the clearest expression of this dimension of Paul's thinking. The context is certainly that of resurrection. As many have noted, it bears discernable similarities with the resurrection account in 1 Corinthians 15: the opposition of heavenly and earthly bodies signaled by an introductory formula, the use of clothing imagery, reference to

⁴⁸ P. J. Achtemeier, "The Continuing Quest for Coherence in St. Paul: An Experiment in Thought," in E. H. Lovering and J. L. Sumney (eds.), *Theology and Ethics in Paul and his Interpreters: Essays in Honor of Victor Paul Furnish* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1996), 132–45, here 145.

⁴⁹ For a recent survey of various proposals for a center to Paul's theology and related issues in Pauline theology, see S. E. Porter, "Is There a Center to Paul's Thought? An Introduction to the Study of Paul and his Theology," in S. E. Porter (ed.), *Paul and His Theology* (PAST 3; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 1–19.

⁵⁰ M. J. Harris, *Raised Immortal: Resurrection and Immortality in the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 107.

the fulfillment of Isa 25:8 and the basis of the theological motif in the fulfillment of Scripture.⁵¹ As Gillman notes, the progression of 2 Cor 5:1–10 seems interpretive and expansive upon 1 Corinthians 15, but with the incorporation of more intricate metaphorical language.⁵² It is noteworthy in this respect that Paul mentions the Spirit as a deposit for the coming resurrection in 2 Corinthians 5, further explaining the basis for the surety of the hope in the resurrection. This notion is further developed in Rom 8:9–26. In Rom 8:11 Paul explains the inner-workings of his thinking on this issue, grounding his rationality in the fact that since believers are now indwelt by the same Spirit that raised Christ from the dead they can be assured that God, “who raised Christ from the dead will also give life to [their] mortal bodies through his Spirit who dwells in [them].” This notion has considerable continuity with the view expressed in 1 Thess 4:14: “For if we believe that God raised Jesus from the dead, we also believe that God will bring with Jesus those who have fallen asleep as Christians.” As in Ephesians, in Romans the Spirit has the eschatological purpose of confirming the believer’s status as a child and therefore as an heir of God (8:16–17). Similarly, the Spirit grounds the hope of the glory of God (Rom 5:1, 5). It was central to Paul’s thinking, furthermore, that the Spirit had been given both to Jews and to Gentiles as they constituted the new people of God and that the Spirit provides the single medium by which both Jews and Gentiles could approach God through Christ (Eph 2:18, 22).⁵³ Therefore, Plevnik’s contention that the eschatological hope is, for Paul, based upon “the Christ-event of the past, on God’s saving deed through Jesus Christ (1 Thess 4:14; 2 Cor 4:14)” does not directly consider the clear pneumatological dimensions in Paul’s ground for the believer’s hope nor is Christ’s resurrection as the first fruits central enough.⁵⁴ It seems, then, that as Paul accesses his larger eschatological structure at places where his rhetorical situation calls for the exposition of the relationship of Christ’s resurrection to the believer’s, the basis of the eschatological hope and its pneumatological and christological guarantee, he is referring to a fairly consistent structure based in key

⁵¹ E.g. Gillman, “Thematic Comparison,” 448–54, esp. 450–51.

⁵² Gillman, “Thematic Comparison,” 454.

⁵³ See F. Philip, *The Origins of Pauline Pneumatology: The Eschatological Bestowal of the Spirit upon Gentiles in Judaism and in the Early Development of Paul’s Theology* (WUNT 2.194; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005).

⁵⁴ Plevnik, *Paul and the Parousia*, 205.

past-time events from his earliest letter (1 Thessalonians) to his later literary achievements (2 Corinthians, Romans, Ephesians).

The next window into Paul's eschatological structure moves from a past-time perspective to a collection of beliefs that emerge in his letters revealing his perspective on eschatological realities in operation "now." These involve the state of those who have fallen asleep in Christ and the operation of the power of lawlessness and the restrainer as well as various dimensions of fellowship with Christ. All three of the significant passages addressing the believer's resurrection also comment in a significant way upon death and two of the three employ the language of "sleep" (κοιμάομαι) (in 1 Thessalonians and 1 Corinthians) to describe death. In 1 Thess 4:13, Paul acknowledges that those who have fallen asleep in Christ will not "precede" or "go before" (φθάνω) those who are alive at Christ's coming. Although not explicit, some form of intermediate state—for lack of a better term—seems to be implied by the language, at least for those who have died in Christ. In this state, all that can be said is that believers do not have a somatic existence, at least not in the sense that they will when they receive their resurrection bodies. 1 Cor 15:37–44 also seems to indicate an intermediate state, but like 1 Thessalonians offers no help with filling out the details in this respect. In 2 Cor 5:3 Paul says that we are not fully clothed while we wait for our resurrection bodies, but we are not naked either. There is extremely strong external evidence for reading ἐνδυσάμενοι instead of ἐκλυσάμενοι or ἐκδυσάμενοι here,⁵⁵ which makes the decision for ἐκδυσάμενοι on the basis of internal evidence by the *UBSGNT* editors quite puzzling.⁵⁶ We may also note their

⁵⁵ \mathfrak{P}^{46} \aleph B C Ψ D² 33 0243 1739 1881 \mathfrak{M} lat syr cop and Clement all read ἐνδυσάμενοι against ἐκδυσάμενοι (D^{*c} it^a, ^{ic} Marcion Tertullian Speculum) and ἐκλυσάμενοι (F G).

⁵⁶ Metzger rationalizes the committee's decision for the Nestle-Aland text as follows: "It is difficult to decide between ἐνδυσάμενοι and ἐκδυσάμενοι. On the one hand, from the standpoint of external attestation the former reading is to be preferred. On the other hand, internal considerations, in the opinion of a majority of the Committee, decisively favor the latter reading, for with ἐνδυσάμενοι the apostle's statement is banal and even tautologous, whereas with ἐκδυσάμενοι it is characteristically vivid and paradoxical ('inasmuch as we, though unclothed, shall not be found naked'). The reading ἐκλυσάμενοι probably arose through palaeographical confusion when EKA- was taken as EKA-." B. M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (4th ed.; Stuttgart: German Bible Society, 1994), 511. However, this reasoning is based upon perceived style and theological concerns, a valid criterion, but nevertheless far more subjective than allowing the external evidence to speak with the louder voice. The external evidence should be preferred here. See also M. J. Harris, *2 Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 367.

“textual optimism” here in assigning a D rating to this decision in the 3rd edition and a C rating in the 4th edition.⁵⁷ ἐνδυσάμενοι is also the harder reading.⁵⁸ Therefore, ἐνδυσάμενοι is clearly the preferred reading. We will not be unclothed, therefore, but given some kind of further clothing during the time we wait for our resurrection bodies (2 Cor 5:4). And during this time, the believer is said to be “with (πρὸς) the Lord” (2 Cor 5:8) and “with (σὺν) Christ” (Phil 1:23). Although the dead believer does not seem to be conscious to the world—he or she is asleep in the language of 1 Corinthians and 1 Thessalonians 4–5—these verses may entail that Paul believed in some form of conscious fellowship with Christ during the intermediate state. It is more likely the case, however, that Paul understood the believer’s fellowship with Christ at the point of death in terms of sense-perception. The intermediate state, on this understanding, is not a conscious state, but while time elapses on earth, from the believer’s temporal sense-perceptive vantage point, as soon as he or she dies, they are in the presence of the Lord. In a more spiritual sense, they are also with the Lord and protected by his Spirit as they await their resurrection bodies. They sleep in the presence of Christ, as Cullmann argued.⁵⁹ In either case, the fellowship seems to be something more intimate than the positional fellowship experienced through participation in Christ’s resurrection that the believer is said to have immediately (1 Thess 5:10; Gal 2:19; Rom 6:3–11; Col 2:12; 3:1–4; Eph 2:5–7). It is often suggested that in Col 3:1–4 and Eph 2:5–7 Paul presents a more realized eschatological perspective; however, it should be noted that both passages have both a realized and a futuristic dimension. They acknowledge present participation in Christ, but at the same time speak of “when Christ appears” (Col 3:4) and “the ages to come” (Eph 2:7) so that these passages can hardly be said to represent a movement to a strictly realized eschatology. We even see the so-called “realized” participationist perspective in 1 Thessalonians. In 5:10 Paul says “whether we are awake or asleep” we “live with him.” A final aspect of Paul’s eschatological beliefs present from his “now” perspective concerns the power of lawlessness and the

⁵⁷ On textual optimism, see K. D. Clarke, *Textual Optimism: A Critique of the United Bible Societies’ Greek New Testament* (JSNTSup 138; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997).

⁵⁸ See Harris, *2 Corinthians*, 268.

⁵⁹ O. Cullmann, *Immortality of the Soul or Resurrection of the Dead* (London: Epworth, 1958), 48–57.

restrainer. In the eschatologically rich second letter to the Thessalonians, Paul shifts the perspective to the eschatological now through the use of the deictic markers καὶ νῦν in 2:6 and ἤδη/ἄρτι in 2:7. The power of lawlessness is already (ἤδη) at work until the one who now (ἄρτι) restrains it is removed. Therefore, as Paul accessed his beliefs regarding his eschatological present, the evidence we have seems to suggest that he referred to a unified structure from his earlier to his later letters, which included some kind of intermediate state with a heightened level of fellowship with Christ (in addition to present participation) while dead believers await their resurrection bodies and the reign of the power of lawless until the restrainer is removed at some point in the future. While particular realized aspects of Paul's eschatology are especially prominent in his later letters, these expressions are coupled with a futuristic dimension as well. Accordingly, in 1 Thessalonians, Paul's earliest letter, there is an emphasis on futuristic aspects, but not to the neglect of realized dimensions that show up in his later letters. Unique epistolary situations account for this rhetorical diversity in the expression of Paul's beliefs by consistent reference throughout his letters to what appears to be a unified eschatological structure.

The final window into Paul's eschatology that his letters provide us involves various references to future eschatological realities. Concerning the future, Paul speaks of a parousia, inaugurated by the removal of the restrainer, a rebellion and the revelation of the man of lawlessness, terminating with the resurrection of believers and the destruction of the man of lawlessness followed by the establishment of a kingdom. Temporal and chronological insight into Paul's eschatological framework is given in 2 Thess 2:3 where Paul responds to false teaching that claimed that the parousia had already come by asserting that the rebellion must come first (the deictic marker πρῶτον is employed) and the lawless one must be revealed, neither of which had happened yet. Later in the passage Paul says that when the lawless one is revealed, the restrainer will be removed (2:8). These events, therefore, seem to initiate the sequence of realities associated with the parousia. According to 1 Thess 4:13–18, the parousia consists of a resurrection of the dead in Christ first who meet the Lord in the air followed by a meeting in the air for those who are alive in Christ. In 1 Cor 15:23, both of these resurrections seem to be treated together: Christ was raised and then (the deictic marker ἔπειτα projecting a future reality should be noted) at the parousia “those who belong to Christ” (οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ) will be raised. This phrase nicely incorporates both groups mentioned

in 1 Thessalonians. Phil 3:19–20 fills out the picture a little more by stating explicitly that believers' bodies will be transformed at the coming of Christ. This reality is further confirmed in Col 3:4 where it is expressed that, when Christ comes, believers will appear with him in glory. The glorification of believers who are alive at Christ's coming is only implied in 1 Thess 4:17 so these texts make an important contribution. Interestingly, Philippians and Colossians are often supposed to present a thoroughly realized eschatology,⁶⁰ but these passages evidence clear futuristic expectations, underscoring an eschatological continuity with earlier Pauline literature. 1 Cor 15:24 asserts that the establishment of a kingdom precedes the resurrection of those who belong to Christ (the temporal reference is indicated by εἶτα τὸ τέλος). Like Jesus, however, Paul presents the kingdom as both realized (1 Thess 2:12; Rom 14:17; 1 Cor 4:20; Col 1:13; 4:11) and future (1 Cor 6:9–10; 15:24–25; 15:50; Gal 5:21; Eph 5:5) in his earlier and later letters, but resurrection seems more central to Paul's eschatological thought as a whole. It is not clear at exactly what point in Paul's temporal schema the "elect number of Gentiles" (τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν) will be saved and God will turn and bring revival among Israel (Rom 11:25–27), but it should probably be placed either at the parousia (if Paul reads Isa 59:30 [cited in Rom 11:26] as the second Advent) or at the establishment of the kingdom. These seem to be the major lines of thought that can be observed regarding the structure of the future dimension of Paul's eschatology.

A number of things remain unclear, however, in the depiction of end-times events that we have extracted from Paul's letters. His exact beliefs on the nature of the intermediate state remain vague. It is unclear how long the parousia will last or the temporal order of the resurrections. A more general resurrection of the unjust cannot be found in Paul's writings either. Although Paul seems quite expectant of the parousia in 1 Thess 4:13–17, this probably results from the paraenetic function that the passage serves. And 5:1–10, through the implementation of traditional material, seems to be interpretive of the passage marked by 4:13–17, clearing up any misconception that Paul may have been certain that he would survive until the parousia. So Paul's eschatology probably did not deal in terms of particular times or individuals, but

⁶⁰ On Philippians, see esp. Giesen, "Eschatology in Philippians," 217–82. On realized eschatology in Colossians, see Still, "Eschatology in Colossians," 127.

large scale communal events (each major eschatological progression involves a corporate entity). And while a comprehensive Pauline eschatology does not seem possible with the available data, it does seem that we can detect several threads of unity in Paul's eschatological beliefs that seem to suggest that Paul was accessing a consistent eschatological structure, reflected in his early and later letters, for particular rhetorical purposes. Although these events receive expression in isolation from the larger structure, through Paul's use of deictic makers we may discern broad temporal relations between Paul's beliefs. There was for Paul an eschatological past, present and future and I have argued that, though diverse in rhetorical expression, a structural unity (as defined above) can be tracked in each of these phases of Paul's eschatological framework.

5. *Conclusions*

While most research on Pauline eschatology has been concerned with tracing developments in Paul's end-times beliefs or attempting to reconcile tensions between individual Pauline passages dealing with eschatology, I have sought to refocus the discussion upon unity in Paul's eschatology. I have argued that, while unique epistolary situations constrain the expression of Paul's eschatological beliefs, resulting in what I have called rhetorical diversity, we are still able to observe Paul accessing what seems to be a consistent eschatological framework organized broadly in terms of past, present and future relations. We are able to detect a general structural unity.

LOOKING AT THE METAPHOR OF CHRIST'S BODY IN 1 CORINTHIANS 12¹

Timothy L. Carter
London School of Theology, UK

Introduction

In 1 Corinthians 12, Paul draws an analogy between the members of a physical body and the church, which also has many members, but nevertheless constitutes the single Body of Christ. He sets out the basis for this correspondence between the physical body and Christ in v. 12:

For just as the body is one and has many members, and all the members of the body, though many, are one body, so also is the Christ.

There is an ongoing debate as to whether Paul's words, οὗτος καὶ ὁ Χριστός, introduce the notion of the body of Christ as a metaphor for the church,² or whether Paul here is making an ontological statement to the effect that the church is the earthly body of the risen Lord. Robinson is wary of using the term "metaphor" with reference to the body of Christ because Christians "are in literal fact the risen organism of Christ's person in all its concrete reality."³ Käsemann, too, denies that Paul was simply using a beautiful metaphor: "the exalted Christ really has an earthly body, and believers with their whole being are actually incorporated into it and have therefore to behave accordingly."⁴

¹ Earlier drafts of this paper were presented at New Testament Seminars in the London School of Theology and at the University of Oxford; I am grateful to members of both groups for their comments.

² So E. Best, *One Body in Christ: A Study of the Relationship of the Church to Christ in the Epistles of the Apostle Paul* (London: SPCK, 1955); D. E. H. Whiteley, *The Theology of St. Paul* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1964), 192–97; R. H. Gundry, *Sōma in Biblical Theology: With Emphasis on Pauline Anthropology* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 228–30.

³ J. Robinson, *The Body: A Study in Pauline Theology* (London: SCM Press, 1952), 51; cf. A. Wikenhauser, *Die Kirche als der mystische Leib Christi nach dem Apostel Paulus* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1937), 88–102.

⁴ E. Käsemann, "The Theological Problem Presented by the Motif of the Body of Christ," in *Perspectives on Paul* (London: SCM Press, 1971), 102–21; cf. 104; cf. H. Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975), 212–13.

On the other hand, there is no denying that the metaphor of the body politic was well-known in the ancient world, the best-known example being the tale of Menenius Agrippa,⁵ in which the members of the body conspire together to withhold food from the stomach, because they are fed up with the stomach taking from them all the time and apparently giving nothing back. When the hand refuses to pass food to the mouth and the mouth refuses to open to accept it and the teeth refuse to chew the food so that it can be digested, the effect on the body is that all the members become weak and exhausted, not having realised that the stomach played its vital part in processing the food it received to invigorate the blood. Agrippa's tale was designed to show the masses that the ruling classes, who appeared to be taking from them all the time, were in fact essential to the wellbeing of society, and the telling of this tale averted a revolt.

Mitchell draws attention to parallels in ancient political writings and concludes that, in 1 Corinthians 12, Paul reworks a common political metaphor and applies it to the church in Corinth.⁶ Yet, although there is no denying that the metaphor of the body politic was commonly used in the ancient world, that in itself does not conclusively demonstrate that Paul's language is metaphorical in 1 Corinthians 12: on the basis of an analysis of the metaphor in Stoic writings, Lee concludes that,

Paul moves beyond the use of analogy of the body as a way of describing the function of believers to a statement of the Corinthians' identity as the body of their Lord.⁷

However, the ensuing verses point away from reading v. 12c as an ontological statement: the metaphorical reading is to be preferred because it is the visual image of the body that is developed in vv. 14–26.⁸ As Perriman puts it,

⁵ Livy 2.32; Epictetus, *Diatr.* 2.10.4–5.

⁶ M. M. Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1991), 157–64.

⁷ M. V. Lee, *Paul, the Stoics and the Body of Christ* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 130; cf. R. Jewett, *Paul's Anthropological Terms: A Study of their Use in Conflict Settings* (Leiden: Brill, 1971), 271–72: "... whereas the Hellenistic diatribe used the body as a metaphor to depict the interrelatedness of society, Paul breaks through the limitations of metaphor to the actual identification of a group in society—the church—as the body (1 Cor 12:27)."

⁸ Cf. C. Wolff, *Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther* (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1996), 307, where he argues that Paul presents his readers with "eine

The church is not *identified* with a body at all, whether *a* body of Christ or *the* body of Christ: the point is rather that the church, in its practical experience of the diversity of the charismata, may be *described* as a body.⁹

Paul offers a basis for regarding Christ in this way in v. 13 by referring to the experience of the Spirit common to Jews and Greeks, slaves and free,¹⁰ but this verse is not the conclusion to his discussion, and here again his language is analogical rather than ontological. Everyone drinks water and all Christians were baptised in it, but Paul here applies this language to the Spirit. The common experience of Spirit reception, which undergirds the ensuing portrait of Christ as a physical body,¹¹ is expressed by means of the physical images of bodily immersion and drinking.¹² The passage is metaphorical through and through.¹³

Metaphor draws on a perceived similarity between two objects so that one is referred to in terms of the other, but it is not as if metaphor merely functions as a poor substitute for a more literal way of

durchgehend *bildliche* Vorstellung der Gemeinde as 'Leib'"; cf. E. J. Schnabel, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther* (Wuppertal: R. Brockhaus, 2006), 724–28. If Paul is developing a metaphor here, it is not necessary to speculate as to the possible precursors to his view of the church as Christ's body, as surveyed in G. L. O. R. Yorke, *The Church as the Body of Christ in the Pauline Corpus: A Re-examination* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1991), 1–7; Schnabel, *Brief*, 723–24.

⁹ A. Perriman, *Church and Body in 1 Corinthians: A Study in Exegesis and the Poetics of Argumentation* (unpublished PhD thesis, Brunel University, 1998), 212; cf. the conclusion of Yorke, that the human *σῶμα*, rather than Christ's personal *σῶμα*, is used as the *tertium comparationis* for the church as *σῶμα* (*Church as the Body of Christ*, 124).

¹⁰ Cf. J. D. G. Dunn, *Jesus and the Spirit: A Study of the Religious and Charismatic Experience of Jesus and the First Christians as Reflected in the New Testament* (London: SCM Press, 1975), 261–2: "The Corinthians knew they were members of the one body because the metaphors of being 'baptized in one Spirit' and of being 'drenched in one Spirit' were living realities in their common experience and memory ('all')."

¹¹ So R. Kirchhoff, *Die Sünde gegen den eigenen Leib* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994), 156, n. 204.

¹² Pliny the Elder testifies to the common association of bathing in, and drinking of, water as he discusses the popularity of hydrotherapy, and criticises those who boast of how long they can endure sitting in sulphur waters and of how much water they can drink: *Natural History* 31.32.60–61. According to J. Murphy-O'Connor, *St. Paul's Corinth: Texts and Archaeology* (Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1983), 29–32, Corinth was well-supplied with bathing facilities. When Corinth was rebuilt on Caesar's instructions after 44 BCE, bathing facilities would have been installed, not just as an essential feature of a self-respecting town, but also as a source of hydrotherapy for any sick or wounded soldiers among the veterans who populated the newly built city; cf. R. Jackson, "Waters and Spas in the Classical World," in *The Medical History of Waters and Spas, Medical History Supplement* 10 (1990), ed. R. Porter, 1–13.

¹³ Cf. G. D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 605.

speaking; metaphor involves “seeing, experiencing and intellectualising one thing in the light of another.”¹⁴ Consequently, one should beware of underestimating the power of metaphor to communicate profound truths about reality.¹⁵ In the (translated) words of Paul Ricoeur, “the symbol gives rise to thought”;¹⁶ the symbol opens up the possibility of a creative interpretation, a new way of seeing or understanding the world, which both respects the original enigma of the symbol and also brings out and seeks to express its meaning systematically:

the first, patent meaning analogically intends a second meaning which is not given otherwise than in the first...the symbolic meaning is constituted in and through the literal meaning, which brings about the analogy by giving the analogue.¹⁷

A word will derive a metaphorical meaning from the context in which it is used, and that metaphorical meaning may well have more valency than its literal equivalent: “all the connotations which are suitable must be attributed: the poem means all that it can mean.”¹⁸

The classical study of metaphor is found in Book 3 of Aristotle’s *Rhetoric*, where he argues that,

Metaphor, moreover, gives style clearness, charm, and distinction as nothing else can: and it is not a thing whose use can be taught by one man to another. Metaphors, like epithets, must be fitting, which means that they must fairly correspond to the thing signified: failing this, their inappropriateness will be conspicuous: the want of harmony between two things is emphasized by their being placed side by side.¹⁹

Whereas strange words are puzzling and ordinary words convey what is already known, “it is from metaphor that we can best get hold of

¹⁴ P. Avis, *God and the Creative Imagination: Metaphor, Symbol and Myth in Religion and Theology* (London: Routledge, 1999), 97.

¹⁵ So M. Black, “Metaphor,” in *Models and Metaphors: Studies in Language and Philosophy* (New York: Cornell University Press, 1962), 25–47; “More about Metaphor,” in A. Ortony (ed.), *Metaphor and Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), 19–43; cf. also A. Perriman, “‘His body, which is the church...’ Coming to terms with Metaphor,” *EvQ* 62 (1990): 123–42.

¹⁶ P. Ricoeur, *The Conflict of Interpretations* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1974), 288, 299.

¹⁷ Ricoeur, *Conflict*, 290; cf. *The Rule of Metaphor: Multi-disciplinary Studies of the Creation of Meaning in Language* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1978).

¹⁸ P. Ricoeur, “Metaphor and the Central Problem of Hermeneutics,” in J. B. Thompson (ed.), *Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences: Essays on Language, Action and Interpretation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 165–81; cf. 176.

¹⁹ Aristotle, *Rhet.* 3.2 1405a.

something fresh,"²⁰ particularly if the words used serve to conjure up the appropriate scene before our eyes.

And that is precisely what Paul does as he conjures up the visual image of different parts of the body interacting with each other. He starts in v. 14, as he points out that a body is not made up of one member, but of many and he goes on to portray some parts of the body denying their membership of the body because they differ from other parts (vv. 15–16). Such talk makes no sense: if the whole body were an eye, how would it hear? If the whole body were an ear, how would it smell anything (v. 17)? As it is, God has arranged the different members in the body as he chose, so that there are many parts, yet one body (vv. 18–20). These last verses summarise what has gone before and suggest that what is true of the physical body is true of the church as the Body of Christ, but Paul continues to use the language of metaphor to make this point.

After the introductory statement of v. 14, this section can be structured as follows:

- | | | | |
|----|----------------------|----------------------------------|-------------|
| 1a | Erroneous statement: | If the foot should say... | (vv. 15–16) |
| 1b | Refutation: | If the whole body were an eye... | (v. 17) |
| 1c | God's arrangement: | But as it is... | (vv. 18–20) |

In v. 21, members of the body speak again, this time discounting other parts as dispensable. Paul rules out such a scenario as impossible:

On the contrary, those parts of the body which seem to be weaker are indispensable, and on those parts of the body we think less honourable we bestow the greater honour, and our unpresentable parts are treated with greater modesty, which our presentable parts do not require (vv. 22–24a).

Once again, the metaphorical language of the body is used in vv. 24b–26 to suggest an application to the church:

But God has so composed the body, giving greater honour to the parts that lacked it, that there may be no division in the body, but that the members may have the same care for one another. If one member suffers, all suffer together; if one member is honoured, all rejoice together.

²⁰ Aristotle, *Rhet.* 3.10 1410b. Avis (*God and the Creative Imagination*, 98) therefore seems to do Aristotle an injustice in making him the source of the view that sees metaphor as merely ornamental.

The structure of this section thus corresponds to that of the first:²¹

2a	Erroneous statement:	The eye cannot say...	(v. 21)
2b	Refutation:	On the contrary...	(vv. 22–24a)
2c	God's arrangement	But God has so composed...	(vv. 24b–26)

Once again, Paul continues to work within the metaphor of the body to make his concluding point, but his summary initially focuses on the parts of the body that lack honour: they are to be honoured, rather than despised by the rest of the body. The focus then widens as he declares that the result is that there should be no division in the body (v. 25a). No part can be written off; on the contrary, every part has the same concern for every other part, sympathising with its suffering or rejoicing in its glory (v. 26). In v. 27, Paul then applies the metaphor directly to the church, as he declares, “Now you are the body of Christ and individually members of it” (cf. 12:12) and goes on to list the various gifts that God has placed within the church (v. 28), making the point that not all have the same gift (vv. 29–30).

This conclusion is by no means a detailed, point for point application of the metaphor. Does Paul “close down” the metaphor at this point? If so, are the foregoing details included simply to lend colour to the point Paul is trying to make? Or do these details open up the metaphor to a high degree of implicative elaboration?²² Is this metaphor purely illustrative, or does it have the capacity to illuminate its audience? If metaphors derive meaning from their context, does the context of 1 Corinthians suggest possible meanings for these details of the metaphor? It is this latter possibility that this paper will explore by means of an attempt to reflect critically and imaginatively on the details of the second part of Paul's metaphor, where he refers to the weaker parts of the body being indispensable, the less honourable parts being treated with more honour and the unpresentable parts being treated with greater modesty (vv. 22–24a). What might Paul's audience in Corinth have perceived and understood as they visualised Paul's verbal portrait of the body's weak, less honourable and unpresentable members within their own specific context?

In the course of this project, it must be borne in mind that our perception of the human body is culturally conditioned. Paul, a Jew with

²¹ Cf. Schnabel, *Brief*, 726.

²² Is the body of Christ what Black would describe as a “resonant” metaphor? (“More about Metaphors,” 25).

Roman citizenship, was writing to a Greek congregation in a city of the Roman Empire in the first century CE. Common perceptions of the body that the original author and audience could take for granted are no longer immediately apparent to us as twenty-first-century readers. If we simply view Paul's metaphor through the frame of our own western, post-modern perception of the body, we may fail to capture his perspective and we may miss features of the metaphor which would have engaged the attention of the Corinthian congregation. Hence the aim of this paper is to lend depth to Paul's metaphor by asking how his audience might have pictured stronger and weaker, honourable and less honourable, presentable and unpresentable members of the body, and to explore whether picturing the members of the body in this way might have had the potential to generate meaning within the specific context of 1 Corinthians.

"The Parts of the Body that Seem to be Weaker are Indispensable"
(1 Corinthians 12:22)

The majority of commentators argue that reference to the weaker members of the physical body refers to the internal organs, which are essential to the body's survival. Damage to the heart, lungs, liver and brain can be fatal and the body cannot live without these organs. For that reason, they are all tucked away inside the body in positions of relative safety, where they can be protected and kept safe from harm.

The verdict is not unanimous, however: according to Martin, the "necessary member" is a euphemistic reference to the penis, and the reference is therefore to the low status of those members of the church who were perceived as being weaker, in the sense of being of inferior social status.²³ However, as Martin himself acknowledges, Paul uses the plural ἀναγκαῖα referring to "necessary members," and he cannot cite examples of the adjective being used in the plural with reference to the penis. Furthermore, if the necessary member is the penis, this damages the point Paul is trying to get across: the apostle is trying to build up those members of the body which are deemed weaker by saying that they are actually necessary and indispensable. Martin's reading of the text, however, results in the weaker members of the

²³ D. B. Martin, *The Corinthian Body* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 95, 269, nn. 22–23, citing Artemidorus, *Dream Handbook* 1.45, 79, 80.

body being described as a penis—which is hardly the rhetorical effect Paul is seeking to achieve!

Martin follows prevailing opinion in seeing “weaker” as a term that primarily denotes social standing or status.²⁴ However, “weaker” also has a physiological frame of reference, and to ignore this is to short-circuit the metaphor. If the physical body has “weaker members” then the term needs to be understood firstly in terms of its physiological meaning and then secondarily in terms of its metaphorical meaning, as applied to the social body of the church.²⁵ Galen’s commentary on Hippocrates’ *On the Nature of Man* indicates that the question as to which members of the physical body should be identified as weak was a live issue at the time. Hippocrates, “the father of medicine,” practised at the start of the fourth century BCE and attributed the cause of physical disease to an imbalance of the four humours of blood, phlegm, yellow and black bile within the body. Treatment consisted of trying to rectify that balance, either by blood-letting, if an excess of blood was diagnosed as the cause, or by induced vomiting to get rid of phlegm.²⁶ Hydrotherapy countered the dry effects of bile: cold water would rectify the hot and dry effects of the corrosive yellow bile, while hot water would be prescribed for an excess of black bile, which was thought to be cold and dry. Over the following two centuries, his writings were incorporated within the “Hippocratic Corpus,” upon which Galen wrote his commentary in the latter half of the second century CE (cf. table 1). Hippocrates’ writings thus still provided the basis for much medical practice in Paul’s day and Galen, a Greek physician who practised in Rome, provides evidence of how these writings were subsequently interpreted.²⁷

²⁴ This is testimony to the seminal influence of the essay on this subject by G. Theissen, “The Strong and the Weak: A Sociological Analysis of a Theological Quarrel,” in *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1982), 121–43. The social dimension of these terms is undeniable: that they have a physiological frame of reference is less frequently recognised.

²⁵ Metaphor “is something brought off by the imaginative employment of words and sentences and depends entirely on the ordinary meaning of those words and hence on the ordinary meanings of the sentences they comprise”: D. Davidson, “What Metaphors Mean,” *Critical Inquiry* 5 (1978): 31–47.

²⁶ Galen endorsed the recommendation that once a month one should induce vomiting after eating to clear all the phlegm from the stomach (*On the Usefulness of the Parts of the Body* 5.4).

²⁷ The Hippocratic writings were used, not just by Galen, but his teachers and his immediate medical circle: W. D. Smith, *The Hippocratic Tradition* (London: Cornell University Press, 1979), 175. How much of the Hippocratic corpus goes back to

Table 1: Galen's view of the four humours²⁸

Humour	Source	Season	Characteristics	Associated element	Personality type
blood	heart	spring	hot & moist	air	sanguine
yellow bile	liver	summer	hot & dry	fire	choleric
black bile	spleen	autumn	cold & dry	earth	melancholic
phlegm	brain	winter	cold & moist	water	phlegmatic

In the first volume of his commentary, Galen argues that Hippocrates is the author of *On the Nature of Man*, but in the second volume he comments on passages that he regards as spurious,²⁹ inserted between Hippocrates' work and Polybus's *Regimen of Health* when these were published together.³⁰ The passage that is relevant to 1 Corinthians 12 comes from this second book:³¹

Ὅκόσα δὲ τῶν νοσημάτων γίνεται ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος τῶν μελέων τοῦ ἰσχυροτάτου, ταῦτα δεινότητά ἐστι. καὶ γὰρ ἦν αὐτοῦ μένη ἔνθα ἂν ἄρξηται, ἀνάγκη τοῦ ἰσχυροτάτου τῶν μελέων πονευομένου πᾶν τὸ σῶμα ὀχλέεσθαι. καὶ ἦν ἐπὶ τῶν ἀσθενεστέρων τι ἀφίκηται ἀπὸ τοῦ ἰσχυροτάτου, χαλεπαὶ αἱ ἀπολύσεις γίνονται. ὁκόσα δ' ἂν ἀπὸ τῶν ἀσθενεστέρων ἐπὶ τὰ ἰσχυρότερα ἔλθῃ, εὐλυτώτερα ἐστὶν· ὑπὸ γὰρ τῆς ἰσχύος ἀποκλείζεται ῥῆϊδίως τὰ ἐπιρρέοντα.³²

Whatever diseases arise from the strongest members of the body are the most to be feared. For if the disease remains in the place where it began, it is necessarily the case that, as the strongest member suffers, the entire

Hippocrates is debatable and in any case outside the scope of this paper: V. Nutton, "The Fatal Embrace: Galen and the History of Ancient Medicine," *Science in Context* 18 (2005): 111–21.

²⁸ R. E. Siegel, *Galen's System of Physiology and Medicine: An Analysis of his Doctrines and Observations on Bloodflow, Respiration, Humors and Internal Diseases* (Basel: Karger, 1968), 218.

²⁹ Though Galen may dismiss as inauthentic those passages with which he does not agree: G. E. R. Lloyd, "Galen on Hellenistics and Hippocrateans: Contemporary Battles and Past Authorities," *Sudhoff's Archiv* 32 (1989): 125–43; V. Nutton, *Ancient Medicine* (London: Routledge, 2004), 221.

³⁰ Galen, *On Hippocrates' On the Nature of Man* 2.108–9.

³¹ Galen, *Hippocratis de Nature Hominis Liber et Galeni in Eum Commentarius II*, 128, in K.-G. Kühn (ed.), *Galen Opera Omnia* (Leipzig, 1821–33), 15.108–109. The text is available online at http://www.bium.univ-paris5.fr/histmed/medica/galien_va.htm.

³² The English translation of this passage, available online at <http://www.medicina-antiqua.org.uk/Medant/GNatHom1.htm>, leaves a lot to be desired: by incorrectly transposing "weaker" and "stronger" in the penultimate sentence of the citation, it renders the passage unintelligible.

body is disturbed. And if the disease should come to one of the weaker parts from the stronger, it is difficult to expel. But whatever disease goes from the weaker to the stronger is more easily released. For the flux is released by the strength.³³

According to the Hippocratic writings, some parts of the physical body were stronger and others weaker. In the ensuing discussion, Galen relates the strength or weakness of varying parts of the body to their ability to draw, hold, alter or separate the natural humours in the body. That part of the body is strong which has the separating power to transfer an abundance of humours into some weaker part. As far as Galen is concerned, what is weak or strong in the body may vary from person to person: gout is a sign of having weak feet, arthritis a sign of having weak joints, while those who suffer from headaches have a weak head. Thus disease-working humours move from the strong parts of the body that can most easily reject them into other parts, until they finally settle in the weakest part of the body, which cannot then send them anywhere else. If this weakest part is the intestines, the stomach, the bladder or the uterus, the offending cause may leave the body through excretion.³⁴

Although he dutifully comments on the passage, however, Galen is not persuaded by it, pointing out that the whole issue was a matter for debate:

Since “stronger” part and “weaker” part are not spoken and thought of simply, but in many different ways, it is not possible to evaluate this passage nor to know whether it is true or false. But it is possible to say one thing with reference to this passage, and with reference to all the others written about things which are often said and thought ambiguously: that their account is so confused and inarticulate, that no one in the audience is helped by it.³⁵

Galen’s own view is that strong parts of the body expel excess humours into successively weaker parts of the body until the humours either settle in the weakest part or are expelled. He therefore queries how the Hippocratic writer can refer to humours moving from weak to strong

³³ Galen observes that ἀποκλείζεται is interpreted variously as “locked out,” “shut out” or “curdled.” Galen favours “released,” claiming that the strong part can cook and alter the offending humour and then release it.

³⁴ Cf. Galen, *On the Natural Faculties* 3.13.187–195.

³⁵ Galen, *On Hippocrates’ On the Nature of Man* 134–135; Kühn, 128.

parts of the body, since, on Galen's understanding, the strong part would simply be able to repel the humour back into the weaker part.³⁶

The Hippocratic text, however, appears to have a different understanding of how strong parts of the body function.³⁷ The citation in question appears to work on the basis that the stronger parts have the power, not simply to pass on excess humours to the weaker parts of the body, but to draw excess humours from the weaker parts, to neutralise and release them.³⁸ That makes sense of the last claim that humours that originate in the weaker parts of the body are most easily dealt with by being passed onto the stronger parts: rather than just sending the humours back into the weaker part as Galen thought, the stronger parts draw the offending humours away from the weaker parts to deal with them.³⁹ If, on the other hand, the strong parts of the body that have this neutralising or purgative function are themselves damaged by humours, that would explain why such a condition is more serious, since the damaged strong part cannot neutralise the humour, but can only retain it or pass it onto some weaker part, whence it cannot then be expelled.

Hippocrates himself does not discuss the question as to which parts of the body are essential: that is a separate question which became a matter for subsequent debate. According to Galen, some argued that the strongest parts of the body were also the most essential, possibly because the Hippocratic text indicated that diseases which originated in the strongest parts of the body were the most serious, but Galen disagrees:

τινὲς δὲ τὰ κυριώτατα μάλιστα φασιν εἰρῆσθαι νῦν ἰσχυρότατα, ψευδῆ ποιοῦντες τὸν λόγον. ἀπὸ γὰρ τῶν κυριωτέρων μορίων εἰς ἀκυρότερα

³⁶ Galen, *On Hippocrates' On the Nature of Man* 135; Kühn, 129.

³⁷ Galen should by no means be accepted as being the final authority in such matters: cf. Nutton, "Fatal Embrace," 119.

³⁸ Hippocrates observes that the most effective way of sucking liquid into the mouth is to draw it up through a tube and on this basis he suggests that those parts of the body which are most effective at drawing and sucking in juices from other parts of the body will have this same shape of being hollow with a tapered entrance, namely the bladder and the head and the uterus in a woman (*On Ancient Medicine* 22). Though Hippocrates does not make this point, it is worth noting that all these also have the capacity for expelling unwanted substances from the body in the form of urine, vomit and blood respectively.

³⁹ Galen attributes this function to the spleen, which draws into itself thick and earthy humours which would cause damage if carried into other parts of the body: *On the Natural Faculties* 2.9.138.

μεθιστάσθαι τοὺς λυπούντας χυμούς, οὐκ ἀπὸ ἀκρωτάτων εἰς τὰ κυριώτατα βέλτιον ἐστὶ. πολλάκις ὁ ἤδη τεθεάμεθα τῶν ἐπὶ τὰ κῶλα φερομένων χυμῶν ἐν ἀρθρίτισί τε καὶ ποδάγραις ἀποκρουσθέντων ἐκεῖθεν, εἴτ' ἐπὶ τι κύριον ἐλθόντων, ἀποθανόντα τὸν ἄνθρωπον, εἶναι τε μίαν ἐλπίδα σωτηρίας, ἐὰν δυνηθῶμεν αὐτῇ ἐπὶ τὸ κῶλον αὐτοὺς ἀντισπᾶσαι.⁴⁰

Some now say that the most essential⁴¹ parts are the strongest, but their argument is false. For it is better if the offending humours move from the most essential parts to the non-essential, not from the non-essential to the most essential. For in arthritis and gout we have already observed the effect of humours being carried into the legs, and being repelled from there; but if on the other hand they go into some essential part, the person will die; the one chance of recovery is if we could draw the humours back into the leg.

According to the Hippocratic writer, it was better if humours moved from the weaker to the stronger parts of the body. However, this makes no sense if the stronger parts are the most essential, since, as Galen points out, the movement of humours into some essential part of the body can easily prove fatal. If the Hippocratic writer is correct in saying that it is better for humours to move from the weaker to the stronger parts of the body, it follows that the stronger parts of the body cannot be the most essential.

Intriguingly, in 1 Corinthians 12, Paul propounds the view that it is the weaker parts of the body that are the most essential; thus, like Galen after him, Paul clearly did not think that the strong parts of the body were essential.⁴² However, that does not mean that Paul and Galen would have been of one mind on this issue: although Galen denies that the essential parts of the body are strong, it does not necessarily follow that he thought the essential parts were therefore weak. However, it is perfectly possible that there were those who did hold this view, given that Galen clearly indicates that the matter was the subject of some debate. As far as Galen was concerned, the essential parts of the body

⁴⁰ Galen, *On the Natural Faculties* 135; Kühn, 129–30.

⁴¹ The adjective κύριος can mean “strong, authoritative, valid, ruling”; then “principal, essential” (BAGD, 458). The potentially fatal consequences of the humours entering such a part of the body validate the choice of “essential” as the correct translation here. Because of the inappropriate connotations of lordship, it is hardly surprising that Paul himself preferred ἀναγκαῖος when writing of the “essential” parts of the body.

⁴² If Luke was a doctor, could he have been the source of Paul’s claim in 1 Cor 12:22?

Table 2: The essential parts of the body according to Galen

Essential part	spirit	controlling	characteristic
liver	natural	nutrition	concupiscible
heart	vital	passion	irascible
brain	animal	sensation; motion	rational

were the liver, the heart and the brain,⁴³ each of which was the seat of a different spirit within the body and responsible for different functions (see table 2). Yet it is clear from Galen's example of the danger of humours going into some essential part of the body that he did not see those essential parts as having the inherent strength to expel or deal with the humours: relatively speaking, then, the essential parts of the body could be seen as being weaker.

What are the implications of this for Paul's use of the weaker members of the body as a metaphor? The first point to make is that the language of "strong" and "weak" parts of the body were established terms in the Hippocratic vocabulary of physiology. Paul's choice of the term "weaker" may well have been congenial to his discussion of social problems in Corinth, but it was a term rooted in contemporary understanding of how the body functioned, even though there was evidently some debate as to its meaning.

While this reconstruction is based on a single passage from Galen, the importance of the Hippocratic writings for understanding the physiology of Paul's day is undeniable. Even though there is no way of establishing whether Paul drew directly on these Hippocratic ideas in 1 Corinthians 12, the constellation of weaker and stronger and essential members of the body indicates the relevance of the Hippocratic writings for interpreting Paul, and any light that can be cast on the meaning of Paul's language in its Graeco-Roman context is preferable to merely projecting twenty-first century assumptions onto the apostle.

The second point to note is that Galen's discussion furnishes us with two different perspectives on how the strong members of the body relate to the weak. According to Galen, the strong members simply get rid of excess humours by pushing them onto the weaker members of the body, with a potentially fatal outcome, if the weakest member of the

⁴³ M. T. May, *Galen On the Usefulness of the Parts of the Body* (2 vols.; New York: Cornell University Press, 1968), 1:44–45.

body also happened to be essential. In the Hippocratic model, the strong members are not just concerned with passing on unwanted humours to other parts of the body. On the contrary, the strong members have the power to draw excess humours from the vulnerable, weaker members of the body and neutralise the humours before releasing them. Here, the strong members, in effect, ensure the survival of the body by protecting the weaker, essential members from the harmful humours.

The implications of this for the application of the metaphor to the church are enormous: in the church, as in the physical body, it is the function of the strong members to protect the weak members and so ensure the body's survival. If the strong look out only for their own interests and fail to protect the weak, that can have disastrous consequences for the body, which only survives if the strong care for the weak, because the weak members are essential.

In the context of 1 Corinthians, Paul's reference to weaker members calls to mind his discussion of idolatry in ch. 8, where he warns the strong that exercising their right to eat meat in an idol's temple could become a stumbling block to the weak, whose conscience will not permit them to do this. Should a weaker sister or brother be led by the example of the strong into sin by eating idol meat against the dictates of their own conscience, that would result in their destruction. That is a clear case of the strong members looking out for their own interests in disregard for the weak, with potentially destructive consequences for the social body of the church. The strong need to love the weak, who need to be protected: where the church fails to care for and protect the weak and vulnerable, it effectively ceases to live as the Body of Christ.

“On those Parts of the Body we Think less Honourable we Bestow the Greater Honour” (1 Corinthians 12:23a)

What parts of the physical body have the greater honour bestowed upon them, though they are deemed less honourable? On the basis that the verb *περιτίθημι* (“bestow” in v. 23a) is used for putting on clothes (so, e.g., Matt 27:28; Gen 27:16), it has been argued that the less honourable parts of the body are those which are customarily clothed and so are honoured in the process:

Those less honourable members are the arm, the throat, the breast, the belly, the legs, all the parts of the body on which the cares of the toilet are lavished.⁴⁴

However, as Robertson and Plummer observe, the verb περιτίθημι is used metaphorically for wives bestowing honour on their husbands in Est 1:20 or ascribing honour to oneself in Prov 12:9.⁴⁵ What is bestowed in these verses is honour, not clothing, and in 1 Cor 12:23 the verb is also used with reference to the bestowing of honour, rather than clothes. While the idea of clothing may be congenial to the image of the body Paul employs, Paul does not use the verb with that sense here. It is flawed reasoning to suggest that because περιτίθημι means "clothe" elsewhere it must do so here and that this then holds the key to understanding what is meant by the less honourable members of the body.

Martin argues that the less honourable members are the gastric organs, notably the stomach,⁴⁶ while others follow Chrysostom in identifying the less honourable members with the unseemly members and seeing a reference to the sexual organs here: "what in us is esteemed less honourable than our genital members?"⁴⁷ Such unnecessary duplication is possible: Paul may, after all, have had the genitals in mind and employed a double euphemism out of a desire to avoid being explicit. It would also be true to say that greater honour is bestowed on these parts of the body by seeking to ensure that they are clothed, even if

⁴⁴ F. Godet, *Commentary on St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians* (2 vols.; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1893), 2:216; cf. L. Morris, *The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians: An Introduction and Commentary* (London: Tyndale, 1958), 176–77; H.-D. Wendland, *Die Briefe an die Korinther* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962), 97; J. Weiss, *Der erste Korintherbrief* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970), 306; H. Lietzmann, *An die Korinther* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1969), 63; W. F. Orr and J. A. Walther, *1 Corinthians* (New York: Doubleday, 1976), 286; W. Schrage, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther* (3 vols.; Benziger: Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1991–99), 3:226.

⁴⁵ A. Robertson and A. Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1911), 275. Cf. Philo, *On the Eternity of the World* 41: "But it is consistent with the character of, and becoming to God to give form to what is shapeless, and to invest what is most ugly with admirable beauty." Thiselton argues for the translation "invest": *1 Corinthians*, 1008.

⁴⁶ R. P. Martin, *The Spirit and the Congregation: Studies in 1 Corinthians 12–15* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984), 28.

⁴⁷ So F. W. Groscheide, *Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (London: Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 1954), 296; F. Fisher, *Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians* (Waco: Word, 1975), 204; G. D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 613; D. A. Carson, *Showing the Spirit: A Theological Exposition of 1 Corinthians 12–14* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 49.

the rest of the body can be exposed without shame. Yet this merely anticipates the same idea which is repeated in vv. 23b–24 as Paul refers to the concern to render seemly the unseemly parts of the body.

However, Ambrosiaster, the fourth-century commentator on Paul's letters, suggested that the less honourable parts of the body were the feet:

Because our feet are lowly and lacking in dignity we adorn them with shoes... Likewise some of the brothers who are poor and unseemly in their dress are nevertheless not without grace, because they are members of our body... Though they may look contemptible, they are most to be honoured because they usually lead a cleaner life.⁴⁸

Why should the feet be considered less honourable? Quite simply because they are the lowest part of the body. While it has been argued that height and abasement are universally recognised bodily symbols of honour and dishonour,⁴⁹ in our relatively egalitarian socio-cultural context, we are desensitised to the way in which the head, as the highest part of the body, symbolises honour, whereas the feet, as the lowest part, symbolise dishonour. Chrysostom makes this point when he asks, "What is meaner than the foot? What is more honourable than the head?"⁵⁰ Indeed, the use of such terms as "base," "humble" and its cognates, "inferior" and "low-down" in English is evidence that our own vocabulary of dishonour either expresses or is originally derived from this spatial metaphor.

Paul himself, in 1 Cor 15:25, 27, uses feet as a symbol of debasement as he interprets Ps 110:1 with reference to God putting all Christ's enemies under his feet and putting all things in subjection under him. In Rom 16:20, Paul declares that the God of peace will shortly bruise Satan under the feet of his readers. To be under someone's feet is a sign of subjection, not because the foot itself is a symbol of power,⁵¹ but because to be under someone's foot is to be in the absolute lowest place, the place of degradation, abasement and dishonour. Hence, when

⁴⁸ Ambrosiaster, *Commentary on Paul's Epistles*, in G. Bray (ed.), *Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture* (Downers Grove: IVP, 1999), 7:217.

⁴⁹ Cf. G. Lakoff and M. Johnson, *Metaphors we Live by* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980), 16.

⁵⁰ Chrysostom, *Homilies on 1 Corinthians* 31:1.

⁵¹ As is argued by K. Weiss, "πούς," in G. Kittel (ed.), *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (10 vols.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–76), 6:626; cf. 624–31; R. Bergmeier, "πούς, ποδός, ὁ," in H. Balz and G. Schneider (eds.), *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament* (3 vols.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990–93), 2:143.

Paul is searching in 1 Cor 12:21 for an example of how no part of the body is indispensable, he denies that the head can say to the feet, "I have no need of you": this is the exalted, most honourable part of the body disowning the lowest, more inferior part. Similarly, in v. 15, the foot, because it is not a hand, wonders whether it still belongs to the body; the lower part expresses a sense of inferiority to the higher part. It would have confused the spatial metaphor altogether to have envisaged the hand feeling as if it did not belong to the body because it was not a foot. The feet are the lowest and therefore the least honourable part of the body.⁵²

But how then are the feet singled out for especial honour in comparison to the other parts of the body? This is where, in the words of Aristotle, the metaphor conjures up a scene before our eyes. How does the body gain access to the feet, either to wash the feet or to put on shoes? Generally speaking, either the whole body bows down to gain access to the feet, or else the kneeling position is assumed: both bowing down and kneeling are positions of physical debasement, assumed in order to honour the greater personage before whom one bows or kneels: thus, in kneeling or bowing down to put in shoes, the whole physical body pays honour to the lowest part of the body, namely the feet. Chrysostom develops this theme:

...often when a thorn has pierced the heel, the whole body feels it and becomes concerned. The back bends over, the abdomen and legs join in, the hands, running forwards like bodyguards and servants, remove the thorn, the head bows down, the eyes look on with great concern. As a result, even if the foot is at a disadvantage because it cannot raise itself up, it is made equal by the lowering of the head and enjoys equal honour.⁵³

Of course, it was not always necessary for the whole body to bow or kneel down to gain access to the feet. In a society where bodily elevation symbolises honour, an important person would not suffer the debasement of bending over to put on or remove shoes, or wash one's own

⁵² Cf. Fee, *1 Corinthians*, 612: "Both the direction and content of what is said imply a view 'from above,' where those who consider themselves at the top of the 'hierarchy' of persons in the community suggest that they can get along without some others, who do not have their allegedly superior rank."

⁵³ Chrysostom, *Homilies on 1 Corinthians* 31.1, in J. L. Kovacs (ed.), *1 Corinthians, Interpreted by Early Christian Commentators* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 209.

feet: those tasks would be done by a menial slave. In a Jewish context, Jesus' assumption of the role of the slave who washes his disciples' feet is well known (John 13:1–11). In a Roman setting, Plutarch also records the devotion of Favorsus to Pompey:

Favorus, seeing that Pompey, for lack of servants, was beginning to take off his own shoes, ran to him and took off his shoes for him and helped him to anoint himself. And from time to time he continued to give Pompey such ministry and service as slaves give their masters, even down to the washing of his feet.⁵⁴

This is a clear picture of honour being paid to the inferior parts of the body: whereas one might wash one's own hands without a second thought, it was unthinkable that a great man should remove his own shoes or wash his own feet: such a task was assigned to a slave. Thus, inasmuch as the feet were washed by a slave, greater honour is paid to the most inferior part of the physical body.

Paul's point is that what happens naturally in the physical body is also what happens in the Body of Christ. Thus the metaphor has illocutionary force. The indicative of the metaphor points to the imperative of its application: all members of Christ's body must join together in honouring those with the least honour, a point Paul explicitly makes in v. 24. If slaves must be honoured by those who are free (12:13), then traditional social stratification is radically subverted within the Body of Christ.

Our Unseemly Parts Have Greater Seemliness

By common consensus, Paul is referring to the sexual organs in v. 23b, where he states that the unseemly parts of the body have greater seemliness.⁵⁵ Paul here is again setting the picture before the eyes: the

⁵⁴ Plutarch, *Pompey* 73 (1.658d); cf. *Joseph and Aseneth* 7.1; 13.15; *T. Abraham* 3.9; H. Strack and P. Billerbeck (eds.), *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament* (4 vols.; Munich: Beck, 1926–28), 557.

⁵⁵ In his *Reply to Faustus the Manichaean* 29, Augustine makes exegetical capital out of this point in his observation that, "The licentious and intemperate use of those members is disgraceful, but not the members themselves: for they are preserved in purity not only by the unmarried, but also by wedded fathers and mothers of holy life, in whose case the natural appetite, as serving not lust, but an intelligent purpose in the production of children, is in no way disgraceful."

body depicted is properly clothed, not naked. It was not unusual for men to participate in sporting events in the nude⁵⁶ and this would no doubt have been a feature of the Isthmian games hosted by Corinth. Furthermore, Cicero provides us with evidence that male nudity could be associated with licentious behaviour at Roman banquets.⁵⁷ However, nakedness was perceived as shameful in a Jewish context: in the LXX, nakedness is an expression of poverty and vulnerability (Tob 1:16; 4:16; Job 22:6; 24:7,10; 31:19; Isa 58:7; Ezek 18:7, 16),⁵⁸ while to be stripped of clothing is to be exposed to public shame and humiliation (Prov 23:31; Hos 2:3; Amos 4:3; Mic 1:8; Isa 20:2–4; 32:11; Ezek 16:7–8, 39; 23:29; Dan 4:31).⁵⁹ Those who are defeated in battle are stripped naked (2 Chron 28:15; Amos 2:16; 2 Macc 11:12). To expose one's own nakedness was particularly shameful: Josephus records how, during the feast of unleavened bread, a Roman soldier provoked a riot by indecently (ἀσχημόνως) exposing his backside to the Jews and making a rude noise in keeping with his posture.⁶⁰

Christians tended to share Jewish misgivings about nudity: in the New Testament, nakedness may be a sign of poverty or vulnerability (Matt 25:36, 38, 43, 44; Jas 2:15; Rev 3:17; cf. Heb 4:13), or a sign of shame or humiliation (Acts 19:16; Rev 16:15; 17:16). As Ambrose was later to observe, "If these parts are exposed to view by chance, modesty is violated, but if on purpose it is reckoned utter shamelessness."⁶¹

In picturing the metaphor, then, there is no doubt as to which parts of the body Paul refers to here: it is precisely those parts which cannot and should not be seen. But at the level of the application to the church, what might Paul have had in mind? His earlier references to weaker and less honourable members apply equally well to the picture of the physical body and the application to the church as a social body. Yet which group, if any, might be identified as "unseemly" and would

⁵⁶ Plutarch, *Alex.* 15.4; Josephus, *Ant.* 12.241; 15.270; 16.137; Pausanias 1.44.1.

⁵⁷ Cicero, *Pis.* 10.22; *Deiot.* 9.26; *Verr.* 3.9.23; *Flac.* 21.51.

⁵⁸ Cf. 2 *En.* 9:1–4; 42:8; *T. Zebulun* 7:1; *T. Jacob* 2:23; 7:25.

⁵⁹ Cf. the shame of Noah in *Jub.* 7:7–9; Josephus, *Ant.* 1.140; Philo, *Leg.* 2.16.60–62.

⁶⁰ *War* 2.224.

⁶¹ *Books on the Duties of the Clergy* 1.18. By contrast, Clement of Alexandria was not at all coy about male nakedness: *Paedagogus* 2.11; 3.3.17, 25; Nicetas, Bishop of Heraclea, *Catena on Job* 1.

they accept the identification, given the association with genitalia in the metaphor?

There may have been members in the church who would have perceived themselves as being relatively weak or lacking in honour and have been encouraged by Paul's claim that in the Body of Christ they are essential and worthy of special honour, but it is unlikely that they would welcome the suggestion that they were also the "unseemly" sexual organs. Indeed, the suggestion would have been rhetorically disastrous. Are there other possibilities?

ἀσχήμων can mean "misshapen" or "ugly": might Paul have been referring to members of the congregation who were perhaps crippled or deformed or who otherwise lacked the physical beauty associated with nobility?⁶² Yet there is nothing in the context of 1 Corinthians to suggest this meaning for the metaphor.

Paul uses the noun ἀσχημοσύνη specifically with reference to sexual misconduct in Rom 1:27 as he cites the "shameless acts" that homosexual men commit with each other. The verb, ἀσχημονέω, is used with possible sexual connotations in 1 Cor 7:36: εἰ δέ τις ἀσχημονεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν παρθένον αὐτοῦ νομίζει, ἐὰν ᾗ ὑπέρακμος καὶ οὕτως ὀφείλει γίνεσθαι...γαμείτωσαν. If ὑπέρακμος here refers either to the strong sexual drive of the fiancé or the nubile qualities of the virgin,⁶³ Paul's counsel to marry serves to prevent the shameful sexual misconduct that might ensue through a lack of self-control if the couple fail in the attempt to follow his advice and refrain from marriage in order to be sexually pure (εὐσχημον, 7:35) before the Lord. An allusion to this context in 12:23–24 is strongly suggested by the parallel use of the ἀσχήμονα/εὐσχήμονα contrast in these verses.

Seen in this light, Paul's reference to unseemly members of the body having greater seemliness would indicate that, within the Body of Christ, there is no place for sexual misconduct, since the presence of such behaviour would be to expose the body to shame. The reference could therefore be an allusion to those within the fellowship who had intercourse with prostitutes (6:12–20), or even the man who had a relationship with his step mother (5:1–13). In the latter case, Paul recommends expulsion from the fellowship, which conflicts with the thrust of 12:12–31, where he argues that all members are an integral

⁶² So Martin, *Corinthian Body*, 95.

⁶³ Cf. Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 593–98.

part of the body: no part is dispensable. But Paul's image is of a body that is not only united, but also clothed: there is nothing unseemly about this body. Thus Paul may have said that the unseemly members of the body have greater seemliness precisely in order to make the point that sexual immorality has no place in the social body. In this way, he may offer some tacit justification for his earlier demand for the expulsion of the sexually immoral man, whose refusal to repent was exposing the body to shame and disgrace.

The meaning of ἀσχήμονα extends beyond a sexual frame of reference, however. If ὑπέρακμος in 7:36 denotes a woman who is getting past her prime,⁶⁴ who would be rendered socially vulnerable if she did not marry, then the sexual connotations of Paul's language in 12:23–24 recede into the background. Instead, Paul may be referring to what is appropriate in the context of worship. In 1 Cor 13:5, Paul says that love does not behave in an unseemly way⁶⁵ (οὐκ ἀσχημονεῖ), while in 14:40 he urges that everything should be done decently (εὐσχημόνως) and in order. Paul's concern is about the right use of spiritual gifts, but a possible allusion can be detected as well to the need to discern the body so as to celebrate the Lord's Supper in a worthy manner (11:29): the wealthier members of the church need to wait for others to arrive so that the Supper can rightly be celebrated together (11:33). Unseemly behaviour in worship has no place within the seemly Body of Christ.

Interpreting ἀσχήμονα with reference either to sexual conduct or to inappropriate behaviour in worship focuses attention on immoral behaviour that is out of place within the body. If such sexually immoral behaviour or the inappropriate behaviour at worship is exercised by the high status members of the fellowship, then their behaviour belies their high status. Rather than being honourable members of the body, they are the genitalia, the unpresentable members, whose dishonourable behaviour requires attention from the rest of the body which the presentable members do not require (v. 24a).

Once again, within the specific context of 1 Corinthians, the indicative of the metaphor subverts the accepted social distinctions and furnishes the illocutionary imperative of the application: since the unseemly members of Christ's body have greater seemliness, all members of the

⁶⁴ Cf. NIV: "if she is getting on in years."

⁶⁵ The sexual dimension comes to the fore when these words are used in the context of a wedding, but that was not Paul's original focus.

church must take steps to ensure that unseemly behaviour is not tolerated, even among the apparently more honourable members.

Admittedly, seeing a reference here to the leaders rather than to those who are weak and dishonourable takes the interpretation of the metaphor in an unexpected direction. Yet Paul himself makes a distinction between the unseemly members and the others: whereas those who are weak or less honourable are only *considered* to be such, presumably by the leaders of the church (vv. 22–23a), the unseemly members are declared unseemly without qualification (v. 23b). Furthermore this debasement of the leaders is as socially subversive as Paul's emphasis on the vital role played by the weaker members and the honour paid to those who lack it: the focus remains on the wellbeing of the body as a whole.

The overall effect remains that, as Paul says in v. 25, the members have the same care for one another. The weaker members need protecting by the strong; the less honourable members are honoured by the rest of the body while the “honourable” and the unseemly members also receive attention in their turn: as the whole physical body moves to clothe the unseemly parts and render them seemly, correspondingly, the whole social body joins together to put a stop to the unseemly behaviour of the honourable members, which is exposing the body to shame. All three facets of the metaphor are thus equally subversive of social distinctions within the Body of Christ: the weak are protected; those lacking honour are given it, while those who perceive themselves as honourable also receive attention, not on account of their honour, but on account of their unseemly behaviour which must be rendered seemly.

Conclusion

This paper represents an endeavour to take seriously the ancient Jewish and Graeco-Roman setting of the metaphor of the Body of Christ in 1 Cor 12:22–25. Rather than glossing over the metaphor by reducing it to the level of Paul's explicit application, an attempt has been made to allow the metaphor to speak for itself and reveal fresh meaning from the text. Time has been taken to visualise the metaphor, to set it before the eyes, to identify the weaker, less honourable and unseemly members of the physical body and to ponder why it is that they are essential, or receive more honour, or have greater seemliness. Each facet of the metaphor has been explored within the socio-cultural context of

Paul's world: the contrast between weak and strong has been analysed in the light of Hippocrates' and Galen's physiology; the honour paid to the feet illuminated by the ancient practice of foot washing, while the vision of the seemingly body is set against the Jewish view that nakedness was shameful. The metaphor of the physical body is applied to the social body of the church with illocutionary force, as Paul moves from indicative to imperative: what is true at the level of the metaphor of the Body of Christ must be realised within the church, if the church is to be the Body of Christ. The metaphor subverts social distinctions because such distinctions have no place within the Body of Christ. Within the church, the weak must be protected, the less honourable must be given greater honour and unseemly behaviour must be rendered seemly, no matter how honourable or powerful the perpetrator of such behaviour might be.

But the potential for meaning is not exhausted yet. As Paul moves into the list of gifts in v. 28, the order in which he ranks them is important. First in rank come the apostles, despised by the leaders in the church; in last place come tongues, so highly prized by the leaders in the church: the theme of social subversion continues. In 1 Cor 4:10, Paul acknowledges that the apostles are foolish, weak and held in disrepute; in 4:11 he mentions being naked alongside being hungry and thirsty, buffeted and homeless. As an apostle, Paul himself is included within the purview of the metaphor: he is one of the weak, whose presence is essential to the body; though he is socially inferior, he qualifies for a place of special honour within the body of Christ; though he has gone naked, his lifestyle is acceptable to God. In this way, at a secondary level, the metaphor also has the potential to counter the low opinion that some in Corinth have of Paul and his apostleship.

Within the context of 1 Corinthians, the metaphor can be seen to have multiple valency. Understanding how the metaphor works within its original context opens up the possibility for it to speak to us as post-modern readers,⁶⁶ and to challenge our assumptions about church and church leadership, as it did the audience of Paul's day.

⁶⁶ Cf. Black, "More about Metaphor," 66: "A metaphor-theme is available for repeated use, adaptation, and modification by a variety of speakers or thinkers in any number of specific occasions."

PAUL AND THE PAGANS

Craig A. Evans

Acadia Divinity College, Wolfville, N.S., Canada

Commentators have identified in Paul's letters a great number of quotations of, allusions to, and parallels with pagan writings.¹ Of course, Paul often quotes and alludes to the Jewish scriptures and other Jewish writings.² Moreover, there are many formal parallels to Jewish literature and diction, of which the apostle was not always conscious. There is no question that Jewish sources are for Paul his primary source material. But the apostle does make significant usage of non-Jewish sources also. Depending on how one defines "parallels," one can identify several hundred.³

Below I list more than two hundred parallels with pagan literature. In a few cases we have formal quotations. In other cases we have allusions

¹ In addition to commentaries on Paul's letters, one may find convenient listings of parallels in C. T. Ramage, *Scripture Parallels in Ancient Classics* (London: A & C Black, 1878), 261–347; E. B. Howell, "St. Paul and the Greek World," *Greece & Rome* 2nd series 11 (1964): 7–29; M. E. Boring, K. Berger, and C. Colpe, *Hellenistic Commentary to the New Testament* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1995), 335–508; G. Strecker and U. Schnelle, *Neuer Weltstein: Texte zum Neuen Testament aus Griechentum und Hellenismus*, vol. 2, parts 1 and 2 (Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1996); J. D. Charles, "Pagan Sources in the New Testament," in C. A. Evans and S. E. Porter (eds.), *Dictionary of New Testament Background* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 2000), 756–63, esp. 761–62.

² O. Michel, *Paulus und seine Bibel* (BFCT 2/18; Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1929); E. E. Ellis, *Paul's Use of the Old Testament* (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1957; repr. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1981); A. T. Hanson, *Studies in Paul's Technique and Theology* (London: SPCK; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974); D.-A. Koch, *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums: Untersuchungen zur Verwendung und zum Verständnis der Schrift bei Paulus* (BHT 69; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1986); D. M. Smith, "The Pauline Literature," in D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson (eds.), *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture. Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 265–91; R. B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1989); C. A. Evans and J. A. Sanders (eds.), *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel* (JSNTSup 83; SSEJC 1; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993); R. Liebers, "Wie geschrieben steht": *Studien zu einer besonderen Art frühchristlichen Schriftbezuges* (Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1993), 241–67; J. R. Wagner, *Heralds of Good News: Isaiah and Paul "in Concert" in the Letter to the Romans* (NovTSup 101; Leiden: Brill, 2002).

³ For some 600 potential parallels to Paul's letters, including the relevant portions in the book of Acts, see C. A. Evans, *Ancient Texts for New Testament Studies: A Guide to the Background Literature* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2005), 376–95.

and in most cases we have at most parallels that probably reflect no more than the way educated people spoke Greek. Some of the parallels are not literary at all, but concern geographical or scientific matters. The parallels, which include a number of inscriptions, are as follows:

- Rom 1:19–21 Ps.-Aristotle, *On the Cosmos* 399B
 Rom 1:19 Cicero, *Nat. d.* 1.17; 2.4; idem, *Tusc.* 1.13; Seneca, *Ep.* 117.5
 Rom 1:20 Diodorus Siculus 12.84
 Rom 1:22 Plato, *Leg.* 732A
 Rom 1:26–27 Plato, *Leg.* 836ABC; Philo, *Spec. Leg.* 3.37–39; Ps.-Lucian, *Affairs of the Heart* 19–20
 Rom 1:29–31 Seneca, *Ben.* 1.10.4
 Rom 1:20 Plato, *Phaedr.* 247C
 Rom 2:1 Tacitus, *Hist.* 3.25
 Rom 2:4 Plutarch, *Mor.* 551DE: “On the Delays of Divine Vengeance” 6
 Rom 2:5 Euripides, *Ion* 923; Plautus, *Mercator* 56
 Rom 2:10 Aelian, *Var. hist.* 12.59
 Rom 2:14–15 Xenophon, *Mem.* 4.4; Sophocles, *Oed. Tyr.* 863; Aristotle, *Rhet.* 1.15.3–8; idem, *Eth. Nic.* 4.8.8–10; idem, *Pol.* 3.8.2
 Rom 2:15 Seneca, *Ep.* 3.28.10
 Rom 2:17–24 Plutarch, *Mor.* 88D–89B: “How to Profit by One’s Enemies” 4–5; Seneca, *Ira* 2.28.5–8
 Rom 3:13 Ovid, *Am.* 1.8.104
 Rom 3:20 Seneca, *Ira* 2.281–4
 Rom 3:21–24 Plutarch, *Mor.* 321B–324D: “On the Fortune of the Romans” 9–11; *Corpus Hermeticum* 13.9–10
 Rom 3:23 Seneca, *Ben.* 1.10.3; Diogenes Laertius 1.88
 Rom 5:1–11 Apuleius, *Metam.* 11.2, 24–25
 Rom 5:1–10 Plutarch, *Them.* 28.1–2
 Rom 5:3–4 Homer, *Od.* 5.222; Publilius Syrus, *Sent.* 149
 Rom 5:7 Aristotle, *Eth. Nic.* 8.9
 Rom 5:12–21 *Corpus Hermeticum* 1.12–15
 Rom 6:1–10 Apuleius, *Metam.* 11.21–24; Ps.-Plutarch, *Cons. Apoll.* 13; Firmicus Maternus, *Err. pref. rel.* 22.1–3; Prudentius, *Peristephanon* §10
 Rom 6:7 Sophocles, *Frag.* 940; Cicero, *Tusc.* 1.74; *IG* 2534; *EG* 463.2; *SEG* 612.4

- Rom 6:12–23 Dio Chrysostom, *Or.* 14.17–18; Plutarch, *Mor.* 166CDE: “On Superstition” 4; idem, *Mor.* 125BC: “Advice about Keeping Well” 7
- Rom 6:12 Cicero, *Off.* 1.29; Horace, *Ep.* 1.18.98; idem, *Sat.* 2.7.93; Seneca, *Ep.* 123.3
- Rom 6:23 Archilochus, Frag. 57
- Rom 7:2–3 Gaius, *Inst.* 1.63
- Rom 7:7–23 Ovid, *Am.* 3.4.17
- Rom 7:14–17 Euripides, *Hipp.* 379; Xenophon, *Cyrop.* 6.1.21; Ovid, *Am.* 2.4.7; Plutarch, *Mor.* 566A: “On the Delays of Divine Vengeance” 27
- Rom 7:15 Epictetus, *Diatr.* 2.26.1, 4; Seneca, *Ep.* 51.13
- Rom 7:19–21 Epictetus, *Diatr.* 2.26.1, 4; Seneca, *Ep.* 51.13
- Rom 7:22–23 Plato, *Phaed.* 83D; idem, *Resp.* 588D–589B; *Corpus Hermeticum* 13.7
- Rom 7:24 Epictetus, *Diatr.* 1.3.5; 1.4.23; idem, *Ench.* 26
- Rom 8:2 Plutarch, *Cat. min.* 65; Ps.-Cicero, *Rhetorica ad Herennium* 4.17
- Rom 8:10 *Corpus Hermeticum* 1.15
- Rom 8:16 Seneca, *Prov.* 1.5
- Rom 8:28 Plato, *Resp.* 612E
- Rom 9:3 Plutarch, *Ant.* 44.2–5
- Rom 9:19 Hesiod, *Op.* 105; Aeschylus, *Pers.* 93; Oenomaus, *apud* Eusebius, *Praep. Ev.* 6.7.36
- Rom 11:34 Xenophon, *Oec.* 2.5; Hesiod, *Op.* 483; idem, Frag. (*apud* Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 5.14); Solon, Frag. 149 (*apud* Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 5.14); Cicero, *Nat. de* 1.22
- Rom 11:36 Marcus Aurelius 4.23
- Rom 12:1 Epictetus, *Diatr.* 1.16.20–21; *Corpus Hermeticum* 1.30–32; 13.18; Isocrates, *Nic.* 6
- Rom 12:3 Aurelius Victor, *De Caesaribus: Aurelius* 35
- Rom 12:4–5 Seneca, *Ep.* 95.52
- Rom 12:11 Crates, *Ep.* 4
- Rom 12:15–16 Seneca, *Ag.* 664; idem, *Ep.* 103.3; Pliny the Younger, *Ep.* 8.16; Curtius Rufus Quintus 4.10.21
- Rom 12:17 Aelian, *Var. hist.* 12.49; Marcus Aurelius 4.44
- Rom 12:18 Seneca, *Ben.* 7.31.1; idem, *Ira* 2.34.5
- Rom 12:19 Seneca, *Ira* 2.32.2–3; Plutarch, *Mor.* 551C: “On the Delays of Divine Vengeance” 5

- Rom 12:20 Sophocles, *Aj.* 660; idem, *Oed. Col.* 1189; Diogenes Laertius 1.91
- Rom 13:1–2 Ammianus Marcellinus 19.12; Dio Chrysostom, *Or.* 1.45
- Rom 13:4 Tacitus, *Hist.* 3.68; Dio Cassius, *Roman History* 42.27; Plutarch, *Num.* 6.2; Philostratus, *Vit. soph.* 1.25.3; P.Mich. 577.7–8
- Rom 13:7 Cicero, *Fin.* 5.23
- Rom 13:11 Xenophon, *Anab.* 1.3.11
- Rom 13:12 Homer, *Il.* 10.251
- Rom 14:19 Cicero, *Off.* 1.41
- Rom 15:13 Xenophon, *Hell.* 3.4.18
- Rom 16:27 Plato, *Phaedr.* 278D; Stobaeus, *Ecl.* 2.279
-
- 1 Cor 1:18–25 Plato, *Apol.* 20D, 23A
- 1 Cor 1:26–31 Celsus, *True Doctrine* (*apud* Origen, *Cels.* 3.44, 59, 64)
- 1 Cor 2:4 Plato, *Apol.* 17C; Polybius 2.56; Maximus of Tyre, *Or.* 15
- 1 Cor 2:9 Plato, *Phaedr.* 247C; Empedocles, *Frag.* 1.2
- 1 Cor 2:10 Seneca, *De Otio* 5.6; idem, *Nat.* 6.5
- 1 Cor 2:11 Seneca, *Nat. Quaest.* praef. 1; Stobaeus, *Ecl.* 1.94; Maximus of Tyre, *Or.* 1.13
- 1 Cor 2:14 Plato, *Tim.* 40DE; Posidonius, *apud* Galen, *On the Opinions of Hippocrates and Plato* 4.7; Seneca, *Nat.* praef. 1; Stobaeus, *Ecl.* 1.94; Maximus of Tyre, *Or.* 1.13
- 1 Cor 3:10 Aristotle, *Eth. nic.* 6.7
- 1 Cor 3:13–15 Oracle of Hystaspes, *apud* Lactantius, *Inst.* 7.21.3–6; Florus 2.2.22
- 1 Cor 3:16–17 Epictetus, *Diatr.* 2.8.9–14
- 1 Cor 3:16 Epictetus, *Diatr.* 1.14.12–14; Marcus Aurelius 5.27
- 1 Cor 6:1–11 Epictetus, *Diatr.* 3.22.55–56; Musonius Rufus 10.15–23
- 1 Cor 6:9 Plato, *Leg.* 841DE; Martial, *Epigrams* 1.90; Seneca, *Ep.* 95.23–24; Sextus Empiricus, *Pyr.* 3.198–200
- 1 Cor 6:12 Plutarch, *Mor.* 236BC: “Various Sayings of Spartans to Fame Unknown” 65; Epictetus, *Disc.* 4.4.1
- 1 Cor 6:15–20 Strabo, *Geogr.* 8.20–23
- 1 Cor 6:19–20 Epictetus, *Diatr.* 2.8.9–14
- 1 Cor 7:1 Diogenes, *Ep.* 47; *SIG* 982
- 1 Cor 7:2 Plato, *Apol.* 21E–22A; *Phaedr.* 97C–D; *Resp.* 476C–D
- 1 Cor 7:3 Tacitus, *Agr.* 6
- 1 Cor 7:7 Pindar, *Nem.* 1.36; idem, *Ol.* 9.160; Virgil, *Ecl.* 8.63

- 1 Cor 7:11 Valerius Maximus 2.1.3
- 1 Cor 7:12–16 Plutarch, *Mor.* 140D: “Advice to Bride and Groom” 19
- 1 Cor 7:21–23 Crates, *Ep.* 34
- 1 Cor 7:29–31 Epictetus, *Disc.* 2.16.28; 3.24.4–5, 59–60; Plato, *Symp.* 211A
- 1 Cor 7:32–35 Epictetus, *Diatr.* 3.22.69–71
- 1 Cor 8:4 Plutarch, *Mor.* 420AB: “On the Obsolescence of Oracles” 19
- 1 Cor 8:6 *Orphic Frag.* 6.10, *apud* Plutarch, *Mor.* 436D: “On the Obsolescence of Oracles” 48; Diogenes Laertius 7.1.135–36; Maximus of Tyre, *Or.* 8.6
- 1 Cor 8:7–13 Galen, *On the Opinions of Hippocrates and Plato* 4.6.1–2; Horace, *Sat.* 1.9.60–72
- 1 Cor 8:10 P.Oxy. 110
- 1 Cor 9:10 Seneca, *Ep.* 13.16
- 1 Cor 9:13–23 Plutarch, *Mor.* 613F–614A: “Table Talk” 1.1.3
- 1 Cor 9:25 Plato, *Leg.* 647D; Publilius Syrus, *Sent.* 295
- 1 Cor 10:23–33 Galen, *On the Opinions of Hippocrates and Plato* 4.6.1–2; Horace, *Sat.* 1.9.60–72
- 1 Cor 10:23 Plutarch, *Mor.* 236BC: “Various Sayings of Spartans to Fame Unknown” 65; Epictetus, *Diatr.* 4.4.1
- 1 Cor 11:1 Cicero, *Fam.* 1.7; Pliny the Younger, *Pan.* 45.6
- 1 Cor 11:3 *Corpus Hermeticum* 11.15
- 1 Cor 11:4–16 Plutarch, *Mor.* 266C–267C: “Roman Questions” 10–14
- 1 Cor 11:14 Epictetus, *Diatr.* 1.16.10–14
- 1 Cor 11:17–34 Plutarch, *Mor.* 226F–227A: “Sayings of Spartans: Lycurgus” 6–7; Lucian, *Sat.* 3.32
- 1 Cor 11:26 Homer, *Il.* 24.305
- 1 Cor 11:27–29 Epictetus, *Diatr.* 3.21.14
- 1 Cor 12:6 Plato, *Resp.* 596B–C
- 1 Cor 12:12–27 Plato, *Resp.* 510; Livy 2.32.9–12; Seneca, *Ira* 2.31.7; Marcus Aurelius 12.35–36
- 1 Cor 13:1–13 Plato, *Symp.* 197A–E
- 1 Cor 13:2–4 Plato, *Resp.* 505A–B
- 1 Cor 13:9–12 Plutarch, *Mor.* 5D: “The Education of Children” 8
- 1 Cor 13:11 Aristotle, *Eth. nic.* 10.2
- 1 Cor 13:12 Cicero, *Fin.* 5.15

- 1 Cor 13:13 Virgil, *Ecl.* 10.69; Pliny the Younger, *Ep.* 4.19
 1 Cor 14:34 Aeschylus, *Sept.* 230–32; Democritus, Frag. 110–11, 274; Sophocles, *Aj.* 292–93; Euripides, *Heracl.* 474–77; Plutarch, *Mor.* 142CD: “Advice to Bride and Groom” 31–32; *Phoen.* 198–201; *Daughters of Troy* 651–56
 1 Cor 15:18 Sophocles, Frag. 837; Pindar, Frag. 121; *EG* 101; 236.8; 459.7–8; 646; 720; *SEG* 571.3–4; *CE* 185.2; 1495; 1170.14; 2071.2
 1 Cor 15:22 Seneca, *Ep.* 99.8
 1 Cor 15:28 *Corpus Hermeticum* 13.2
 1 Cor 15:33 Menander, *Thais* 218; Theognis, *Elegi* 305; Aeschylus, *Sept.* 605; *MAMA* VIII.569; Seneca, *Ira* 3.8.1–2; idem, *Ep.* 7.7; Diodorus Siculus 12.12; Plutarch, *Mor.* 4A: “Education of Children” 6; *Anth. Lat.* 1.13
 1 Cor 15:35–54 Euripides, Frag. 839

 2 Cor 1:3–11 *BGU* 423
 2 Cor 2:14 *BGU* 1061; Seneca, *Ben.* 2.11.1; Plutarch, *Ant.* 84; Dio Cassius, *Roman History* 6
 2 Cor 3:3 Thucydides 2.43.2
 2 Cor 4:2 Epictetus, *Diatr.* 3.22.13–15
 2 Cor 4:4 *Corpus Hermeticum* 7:2–3
 2 Cor 4:5 Dio Chrysostom, *Or.* 13.11–12
 2 Cor 4:6 *Corpus Hermeticum* 7.2–3; Cicero, *Tusc.* 1.26; Seneca, *Ep.* 44.2
 2 Cor 4:8 Epictetus, *Diatr.* 2.24.24
 2 Cor 4:10–12 Plato, *Phaedr.* 66DE, 67E
 2 Cor 4:16 Seneca, *Ep.* 24.19–20
 2 Cor 4:17 Seneca, *Tranq.* 16.4
 2 Cor 4:18 Plato, *Phaed.* 79A–C; idem, *Resp.* 529B
 2 Cor 5:1–8 Ps.-Plato, *Axiochus* 365E–366A
 2 Cor 5:1 Plato, *Resp.* 592A–B
 2 Cor 5:2–4 *Corpus Hermeticum* 10.17–18
 2 Cor 5:3 *Corpus Hermeticum* 1.24–26
 2 Cor 5:10 Plato, *Phaedr.* 249AB; idem, *Crit.* 54B; idem, *Gorg.* 526B; Virgil, *Aen.* 6.540, 566
 2 Cor 5:17 Polybius 4.2.4–5
 2 Cor 6:10 Crates, *Ep.* 7
 2 Cor 7:3 Euripides, *Orest.* 307; Horace, *Carm.* 3.9.24
 2 Cor 7:4 Epictetus, *Disc.* 2.16.42

- 2 Cor 8:9 Plutarch, *Mor.* 374CD: "Isis and Osiris" 57
 2 Cor 9:7 Publilius Syrus, *Sent.* 326; Seneca, *Ben.* 2.1.3
 2 Cor 9:15 Xenophon, *Mem.* 4.2
 2 Cor 10:4 Epictetus, *Diatr.* 3.24.34
 2 Cor 11:14 Publilius Syrus, *Sent.* 403
 2 Cor 11:26 Cicero, *Acad.* 2.8
 2 Cor 12:10 Epictetus, *Diatr.* 1.6.40
- Gal 1:1 Plato, *Ion* 534E; Epictetus, *Diatr.* 1.6.40
 Gal 1:4 Epictetus, *Diatr.* 1.9.7
 Gal 1:10 Epictetus, *Ench.* 23
 Gal 2:13 Epictetus, *Diatr.* 2.9.19–22
 Gal 2:19 *Pythagorean Sentences* 30
 Gal 3:22 Polybius 3.63.3–4
 Gal 3:24 Xenophon, *Lac.* 3.1
 Gal 3:28 Plato, *Symp.* 189DE; idem, *Lysis* 210B; Aristotle, *Pol.* 1.2.3; Diogenes Laertius 1.33
 Gal 4:1–2 Plato, *Lysis* 208C; Justinian, *Inst.* 1.22
 Gal 5:15 Plutarch, *Mor.* 1124DE: "Reply to Colotes" 30
 Gal 5:16 Plato, *Phaed.* 80A
 Gal 5:17 Plato, *Phaedr.* 237DE; Cicero, *Tusc.* 4.5
 Gal 5:19–23 *Corpus Men.* 9.3–4; Diogenes Laertius 7.87–103
 Gal 5:24 Lucian, *Men.* 4
 Gal 6:3 Plato, *Apol.* 21E–22A; *Phaed.* 97C–D; *Resp.* 476C–D
 Gal 6:4 Seneca, *Ep.* 81.17
 Gal 6:7 Euripides, *Hec.* 331, 903; Callimachus, *Ceres* 137
- Eph 1:5 Cicero, *Acad.* 1.7; Seneca, *Ep.* 77.10; 101.7
 Eph 2:14–17 Plutarch, *Mor.* 329A–C: "On the Fortune or the Virtue of Alexander" 6
 Eph 2:14 *OGIS* 598
 Eph 3:14 Aeschylus, *Ag.* 922
 Eph 3:16–17 Plato, *Resp.* 589A
 Eph 3:16 Tacitus, *Ann.* 3.54
 Eph 3:20 Juvenal, *Sat.* 10.346
 Eph 4:2 Plutarch, *Mor.* 90EF: "How to Profit by One's Enemies" 9
 Eph 4:14 Oppian, *Halieut.* 3.501
 Eph 4:18 Plutarch, *Art.* 28.3
 Eph 4:29 Publilius Syrus, *Sent.* 665
 Eph 5:20 Epictetus, *Diatr.* 1.16.16; 4.7.9

- Eph 5:27 Plautus, *Pers.* 4.4.6
 Eph 6:1–2 Valerius Maximus 4.1.2
- Phil 1:21 Plato, *Apol.* 40CD; Sophocles, *Antig.* 461
 Phil 1:23 Seneca, *Ep.* 65.16–18
 Phil 1:24 Seneca, *Ep.* 98.15, 17; 104.4
 Phil 2:6–11 *Corpus Hermeticum* 1.12–15
 Phil 2:8–9 Seneca, *Ep.* 13.14; 67.9
 Phil 3:12–13 Epictetus, *Diatr.* 4.12.19
 Phil 3:19 Plato, *Resp.* 586A, 621C
 Phil 3:20 Plato, *Resp.* 592A–B
 Phil 4:4 Aeschylus, *Eum.* 1014–15
 Phil 4:6 Valerius Maximus 1.1; 7.2
 Phil 4:11–13 Vettius Valens, *Anth.* 5.9.2
 Phil 4:11 Xenophon, *Mem.* 3.2; Aristotle, *Eth. eud.* 1.7; Seneca, *Tranq.* 10.4
 Phil 4:18 Epictetus, *Diatr.* 3.24.2–3, 17
- Col 1:15–16 Plato, *Tim.* 28C
 Col 1:17 Seneca, *Ep.* 76.17
 Col 1:18 Orphic Hymn, *apud* Eusebius, *Praep. Ev.* 3.9.2
 Col 1:26 Plato, *Tim.* 92E
 Col 2:14 Plutarch, *Mor.* 499D: “Whether Vice is Sufficient to Cause Unhappiness” 3; Philo, *Post.* 61; Seneca, *Vit. beat.* 19.3
- Col 2:18 Aristophanes, *Nub.* 225
 Col 3:1 Plato, *Resp.* 621C
 Col 3:2 Euripides, *Cycl.* 210
 Col 3:16 *Corpus Hermeticum* 13.15
 Col 3:18–4:1 Aristotle, *Pol.* 1.2.1–4; P.Oxy. 744
- 1 Thess 2:5–6 Aelius Aristides, *Or.* 4
 1 Thess 2:5 Tacitus, *Hist.* 1.15
 1 Thess 2:15 Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.5
 1 Thess 4:6 Diogenes, *Ep.* 45
 1 Thess 4:9 Homer, *Il.* 24.304–308
 1 Thess 4:11 Seneca, *Brev. Vit.* 19.3; *idem*, *Ep.* 72.12
 1 Thess 4:13–18 P.Oxy. 115
 1 Thess 4:13 *CIG* 1973; Ammianus Marcellinus 25.3
 1 Thess 5:18 Seneca, *Ben.* 2.31.3

1 Tim 1:10	Maximus of Tyre, <i>Or.</i> 16.3
1 Tim 1:17	Diogenes Laertius 10.123
1 Tim 2:1–2	Aelius Aristides, <i>Or.</i> 46.42; Livy 3.7; Seneca, <i>Ep.</i> 73.1; Pliny the Younger, <i>Pan.</i> 1.45.5; 1.67.3
1 Tim 3:4–5	Isocrates, <i>Demon.</i> 35
1 Tim 3:4	Homer, <i>Od.</i> 9.114; Aristotle, <i>Eth. eud.</i> 10.9; idem, <i>Pol.</i> 1.4
1 Tim 3:16	Virgil, <i>Ecl.</i> 4.15–17
1 Tim 4:2	Plato, <i>Gorg.</i> 313C
1 Tim 5:1	Juvenal, <i>Sat.</i> 13.54; Valerius Maximus 2.1.9
1 Tim 5:18	Homer, <i>Od.</i> 14.58; Euripides, <i>Rhes.</i> 161
1 Tim 6:3	Maximus of Tyre, <i>Or.</i> 16.3
1 Tim 6:7	Propertius 4.4.13
1 Tim 6:8	Lucan, <i>Pharsalia</i> 4.377
1 Tim 6:10	Plato, <i>Leg.</i> 743A; Stobaeus, <i>Ecl.</i> 3.417
1 Tim 6:15	Homer, <i>Od.</i> 5.7; Aeschylus, <i>Supp.</i> 524
1 Tim 6:16	Seneca, <i>Nat. Quaest.</i> 7.30
2 Tim 2:7	Pindar, Frag. (<i>apud</i> Strabo, <i>Geogr.</i> 6.2.8)
2 Tim 2:22	Valerius Maximus 6.1
2 Tim 3:2	Aristotle, <i>Eth. eud.</i> 9.8
2 Tim 3:5	Livy 39.16
2 Tim 3:8–9	Numenius of Apamea, <i>apud</i> Eusebius, <i>Praep. Ev.</i> 9.8; Pliny the Elder, <i>Nat. hist.</i> 30.2.11
2 Tim 4:3	Maximus of Tyre, <i>Or.</i> 16.3
Titus 1:9	Maximus of Tyre, <i>Or.</i> 16.3
Titus 1:12	Callimachus, <i>Zeus</i> 8; Epimenides, <i>De Oraculis</i> ; Leonidas, <i>Anth. Pal.</i> 3.369; Polybius 6.47
Titus 2:1–8	Maximus of Tyre, <i>Or.</i> 16.3
Titus 2:5	Euripides, <i>Orest.</i> 108; Theocritus, <i>Id.</i> 28.14
Titus 2:6	Homer, <i>Il.</i> 3.108
Titus 2:9–10	Publilius Syrus, <i>Sent.</i> 707
Titus 2:12	Aristobulus frag. 4:8
Titus 3:2	Justinian, <i>Inst.</i> 12.1, 9
Philemon	P.Colon. 7921

The list grows longer if we include the speeches and sermons attributed to Paul in Acts, as well as narrative comments and comments made to or in the presence of Paul:

- Acts 14:11–13 Ovid, *Metam.* 8.610–700; Catullus 64.385; Heliodorus, *Aeth.* 3
- Acts 14:17 Herodotus 3.117
- Acts 16:9 Strabo, *Geogr.* 4.1.4
- Acts 16:17 *SEG* 1355, 1356 (*NewDocs* 1.25–29); *OGIS* 96 (*NewDocs* 4.201); *IGA* 2.116 (*NewDocs* 3.121)
- Acts 16:21 Cicero, *Nat. d.* 3.2.5
- Acts 16:26 Euripides, *Bacch.* 443–49
- Acts 17:21 Homer, *Od.* 1.351; Thucydides 3.38.5; Demosthenes, 1 *Philip.* 1.10; Pindar, *Ol.* 9.72; Pliny the Younger, *Ep.* 8.18; Lucian, *Cal.* 21
- Acts 17:22–31 Cleanthes, *Hymn to Zeus*; Apuleius, *Metam.* 11.4
- Acts 17:22 Sophocles, *Oed. Col.* 260; Polybius 6.56; Pausanias 1.17.1
- Acts 17:23 Aeschylus, *Eum.* 690–92; Pausanias 1.1.4; Cicero, *Tusc.* 1.16; Diogenes Laertius 1.110; Philostratus, *Vit. Apoll.* 6.3.5
- Acts 17:24 Plato, *Phaed.* 97C; idem, *Tim.* 28C; Horace, *Carl.* 1.12–13
- Acts 17:25 Cicero, *Rosc. Amer.* 45; Seneca, *Ep.* 95.47
- Acts 17:27 Plato, *Phaed.* 99B
- Acts 17:28 Aratus, *Phaen.* 5 (cf. Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 5.14); Cleanthes, *Hymn to Zeus* 3; Aristobulus, frag. 4 (*apud* Eusebius, *Praep. Ev.* 13.12.6–7)
- Acts 17:32 Aeschylus, *Eum.* 647–48; Lucian, *Peregr.* 13
- Acts 19:34 Achilles Tatius 8.9
- Acts 21:39 Euripides, *Ion* 8
- Acts 23:9 Euripides, *Bacch.* 325; Pindar, *Pyth.* 2.162
- Acts 26:14 Aeschylus, *Ag.* 1623–24; *ibid.*, *Prom.* 323; Pindar, *Pyth.* 2.94–96, 161; Euripides, *Bacch.* 794–95; idem, *Iph. Taur.* 1395–96; Terence, *Phorm.* 1.2.27
- Acts 26:18 Plato, *Resp.* 518C
- Acts 26:24 Euripides, *Bacch.* 325–26
- Acts 28:4 Hesiod, *Op.* 256; Sophocles, *Oed. Col.* 1377; Arrian, *Anab.* 4.9

Besides allusions and parallels to specific texts, Paul makes use of a number of Greco-Roman terms and expressions that were current in his day. Political and legal language is especially interesting. One thinks of βῆμα (“judgment seat,” “tribunal,” or “court”), as in Paul’s assertion

that “we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ [ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ βήματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ], so that each one may receive good or evil, according to what he has done in the body” (2 Cor 5:10; cf. Rom 14:10). In Corinth Paul is brought before the judgment seat of Gallio, pro-consul of Achaia (Acts 18:12–17 οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι τῷ Παύλῳ καὶ ἡγαγον αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸ βῆμα),⁴ and he later appears before the judgment seat of Festus, procurator of Judea, at Caesarea Maritima (Acts 25:6, 10, 17). This official use of βῆμα is attested in Greek literature and inscriptions (e.g., Thucydides 2.34.8; Epictetus, *Diatr.* 4.10.21; P.Oxy. 37.1.3 [AD 49] “at the judgment seat”; P.Tebt. 316.11 [AD 99] “the deed issued by the court”; P.Lond. 358.19 [AD 150] “at the most sacred judgment seat of the governor”; P.Oxy. 237.5.13 [AD 186] “before the judgment seat he was silent”; cf. Matt 27:19 and John 19:13, where Pilate sits “upon the judgment seat”; Acts 12:21, where Agrippa I sits “upon the judgment seat”; Justin, *I Apol.* 1.69 “to accuse the Christians before the judgment seat [πρὸ βήματος]”).⁵

Legal language is also found in Col 2:14 “having canceled the bond which stood against us with its legal demands; this he set aside, nailing it to the cross” (ἐξαλείψας τὸ καθ’ ἡμῶν χειρόγραφον τοῖς δόγμασιν ὃ ἦν ὑπεναντίον ἡμῖν, καὶ αὐτὸ ἤρκεν ἐκ τοῦ μέσου προσηλώσας αὐτὸ τῷ σταυρῷ). χειρόγραφον (“written by hand” or “signature”) in a legal context means “bond,” “certificate of debt,” or “note.” Examples are again found in Greek literature and papyri (Polybius 30.8.4; *Life of Aesop* 122; P.Oxy. 745.2 [AD 1] “on behalf of whom you drew up a bond”; P.Oxy. 269.2.7 [AD 57] “exact from him his bond”; BGU 300.12 [AD 148] “let this bond written by me in duplicate be valid”).⁶ Paul completes his thought in Col 2:15. Not only has the bond been cancelled, the very authorities that might once have had the power to imprison or execute God’s people are now themselves disarmed and publicly disgraced.⁷

⁴ On the excavation of Corinth and the βῆμα, see O. Broneer, “Corinth: Center of Paul’s Missionary Work in Greece,” *BA* 14/4 (1951): 78–96.

⁵ A. M. Schneider, “Bema,” *RAC* 2 (1954): 129; B. Schaller, “βῆμα,” *EDNT* 1 (1990): 216. βῆμα occurs several times in the *Acts of Pilate*, all in reference to the judgment seat on which Pilate sits (cf. 1:2, 7; 2:1; 9:3, 5).

⁶ See also *T. Job* 11:11: “And I, without delay, would bring forth their note [τὸ χειρόγραφον] and read it, crowning the transaction as cancelled....” Righteous Job is depicted as forgiving the debts of the poor: χειρόγραφον only means “receipt” in Tob 5:3; 9:5.

⁷ For further discussion of Col 2:14–15, see P. T. O’Brien, *Colossians, Philemon* (WBC 44; Waco: Word, 1982), 124–29; P. Pokorný, *Colossians: A Commentary* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1991), 137–42; J. D. G. Dunn, *The Epistle to the Colossians and to Philemon*

δόγμα also possesses a legal or political nuance, especially in Roman usage (e.g., Luke 2:1 “a decree went out from Caesar Augustus [δόγμα παρὰ Καίσαρος Αὐγούστου]”; Acts 17:7 “against the decrees of Caesar [ἀπέναντι τῶν δογμάτων Καίσαρος]”; *Sib. Or.* 8:45 “decrees of senate [δόγματα συγκλήτου]”; Josephus, *Ant.* 14.188 “the decrees of the Romans [τὰ ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων δόγματα]”; 14.189 “the decrees made both by the senate and by Julius Caesar [ὑπὸ τε τῆς συγκλήτου δόγματα καὶ Ἰουλίου Καίσαρος]”; 14.221, 388; 15.196; Diogenes Laertius 3.33.52 to “publish a decree”).⁸ In view of the fact that δόγμα is sometimes used in reference to Jewish laws (cf. 3 Macc 1:3 “Dositheus, called the son of Drimulus, by birth a Jew, afterward a renegade from the laws and observances of his country [τὰ νόμιμα καὶ τῶν πατρίων δογμάτων]”; 4 Macc 10:2 “I was brought up in the same tenets [ἐπὶ τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἀνετράφην δόγμασιν]”), we may have in Col 2:14 a conscious double meaning (cf. Eph 2:15 “abolishing in his flesh the law of commandments in ordinances [τὸν νόμον τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασιν]”).

In Galatians Paul speaks of the Jewish law functioning as a “custodian” or “guardian” (παιδαγωγός) until the coming of the Messiah (Gal 3:24–25).⁹ In the Greco-Roman world of Paul’s day custodians were assigned the task of protecting the legal and financial interests of minors (e.g., Herodotus 8.75; Plutarch, *Mor.* 4A–B; Diogenes Laertius 3.92).¹⁰ Josephus uses the word in this sense: “But now Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, took some of the most noble of the Jews that were children, and the kinsmen of Zedekiah their king, such as were remarkable for their beauty of their bodies and comeliness of their countenances, and delivered them into the hands of custodians [παιδαγωγοῖς], and to the improvement to be made by them” (*Ant.* 10.186); “...so he made this to be the omen, that the government should be left to him who should

(NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 164–70; B. Witherington, *The Letters to Philemon, the Colossians, and the Ephesians: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on the Captivity Epistles* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 158–60.

⁸ G. Kittel, “δόγμα, δογματίζω,” *TDNT* 2:230–32.

⁹ For discussion of Gal 3:24–25, see J. B. Lightfoot, *The Epistle of St. Paul to the Galatians* (rev. ed.; London: Macmillan, 1879), 148–49; H. D. Betz, *Galatians* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979), 177–80; R. N. Longenecker, *Galatians* (WBC 41; Dallas: Word, 1990), 146–49; J. D. G. Dunn, *The Epistle to the Galatians* (BNTC; London: A & C Black, 1993), 198–200.

¹⁰ Education of the minor was sometimes part of the duty of the custodian. But παιδαγωγός and διδάσκαλος were not one and the same, even if their duties sometimes overlapped. This point is emphasized by Lightfoot, *Galatians*, 148–49, where Plato, *Lysis* 208C is cited. For more on the function of the παιδαγωγός, see Philo, *Det.* 145; *Her.* 295; *Legat.* 26–27, 53; *Migr.* 116; *Sacr.* 51; *Spec. Leg.* 2.233.

come to him first the next day. When he had thus resolved within himself, he sent to his grandson's custodian [τὸν παιδαγωγόν], and ordered him to bring the child to him early in the morning, as supposing that God would permit him to be made emperor" (18.212; cf. 20.183 "Burrhus, who was Nero's custodian [παιδαγωγός], and secretary for his Greek epistles"). As in the case of Paul's usage, in the pagan world the law could be seen as a παιδαγωγός (cf. Plutarch, *Mor.* 645B–C).¹¹

In his letters Paul uses vocabulary current in Greco-Roman ethics and philosophy. Oft-cited in this connection is the apostle's declaration in Phil 4:11 "Not that I complain of want; for I have learned, in whatever state I am, to be content [αὐτάρκης]" (cf. 2 Cor 9:8 "that you may always have enough [αὐτάρκειαν] of everything"; 1 Tim 6:6 "There is great gain in godliness with contentment [αὐταρκείας]"). The claim of self-sufficiency is a favorite theme of Cynics and Stoics (cf. Polybius 6.48.7; Epictetus, *Diatr.* 1.6.14; 3.13.6–7; Diogenes Laertius 2.24; 10.130; Sextus 98; Marcus Antoninus 1.16.2: "sufficient in everything [τὸ αὐταρκες ἐν παντί]").¹²

Another important word in this connection is ἐγκράτεια ("self-control"; cf. Gal 5:22–23 "love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness, self-control"; Acts 24:25 "And as he argued about justice and self-control and future judgment, Felix was alarmed") and its adjectival form ἐγκρατής (Titus 1:8 "hospitable, a lover of goodness, master of himself, upright, holy, and self-controlled"). Hellenized Jewish philosophy was fond of this virtue (cf. *Let. Aris.* 278; Sir 18:29; 19:6; 26:15; Wis 8:21; *T. Naph.* 8:8; 4 Macc 5:34; Ps.-Phocylides 145; Philo, *Virt.* 180; Aristobulus, frag. 4:6 "For it is agreed upon by all the philosophers... The entire construction of our Law is arranged with a view toward piety, justice, self-control [εὐσεβείας τέτακται καὶ δικαιοσύνης καὶ ἐγκρατείας], and all other good things that are in keeping with the truth"). The meaning of the terminology took shape in Greek ethical philosophy (cf. Ps.-Plato, *Def.* 415D; Aristotle, *Eth. eud.* 2.7; idem, *Eth. nic.*

¹¹ For further discussion of Paul and law in the Roman Empire, see A. N. Sherwin-White, *Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament: The Sarum Lectures 1960–61* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1963); J. P. Sampley, *Pauline Partnership in Christ: Christian Community and Commitment in Light of Roman Law* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980); H. Tajra, *The Trial of St. Paul* (WUNT 2/35; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1989); H. Omerzu, *Der Prozeß des Paulus: Eine exegetische und rechtshistorische Untersuchung der Apostelgeschichte* (BZNW 115; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2002).

¹² G. Kittel, "ἄρκειω, κ.τ.λ.," *TDNT* 1:464–67. On Phil 4:11 and αὐτάρκης in Cynic thought, see R. P. Martin and G. F. Hawthorne, *Philippians* (WBC 43; revised edition; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2004), 263–64.

7.1–11; Polybius 10.19.7; Demosthenes; Diogenes Laertius 7.92; Epictetus, *Diatr.* 2.20.13; Lucian, *Anach.* 9–10).¹³

Paul's employment of athletic metaphors parallels usage in contemporary philosophy and ethics. The apostle exhorts the Corinthian congregation to run the race, so as to win the prize (1 Cor 9:24–27):¹⁴

²⁴Do you not know that in a race [ἐν σταδίῳ] all the runners run, but only one receives the prize [τὸ βραβεῖον]? So run that you may obtain it.

²⁵Every athlete [ὁ ἀγωνιζόμενος] exercises self-control in all things. They do it to receive a perishable wreath [στέφανον], but we an imperishable.

²⁶Well, I do not run aimlessly, I do not box [πυκτεύω] as one beating the air; ²⁷but I pommel my body and subdue it, lest after preaching to others I myself should be disqualified.

Several of the cities visited by Paul boasted facilities for public athletic events. These cities included, among others, Caesarea Maritima, Philippi, Athens, Ephesus, and Corinth.¹⁵ The biennial Isthmian Games (ὁ Ἰσθμικὸς ἀγών) were held at Corinth and drew large crowds (Strabo, *Geogr.* 8.6.20; Livy 33.32.1; Plutarch, *Quaest. conv.* 5.3.1–3; 8.4.1; Pausanias 2.2).¹⁶ Dio Chrysostom describes the games (*Or.* 8.6–14; 9.10–22). He mentions running and boxing among the athletic events (8.12). Because Paul lived in Corinth for 18 months (Acts 18:11), the games may well have taken place during his time of residence.¹⁷ Paul's

¹³ W. Grundmann, “ἐγκρατεία, κ.τ.λ.,” *TDNT* 2:339–42.

¹⁴ V. C. Pfitzner, *Paul and the Agon Motif: Traditional Athletic Imagery in the Pauline Literature* (NovTSup 16; Leiden: Brill, 1967); R. Garrison, “Paul's Use of the Athlete Metaphor in 1 Corinthians 9,” in *The Graeco-Roman Context of Early Christian Literature* (JSNTSup 137; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 95–104; E. Krentz, “Paul, Games, and the Military,” in J. P. Sampley (ed.), *Paul in the Greco-Roman World: A Handbook* (Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 2003), 344–83. For commentary on 1 Cor 9:24–27, see A. T. Robertson and A. Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1911; 2nd ed., 1914), 192–95; C. K. Barrett, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (HNTC; New York: Harper & Row, 1968), 216–18; H. Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975), 161–63.

¹⁵ Caesarea Maritima (Acts 18:22; 21:8–14), Philippi (Acts 16:12–40), Athens (Acts 17:15–34), Ephesus (Acts 18:19–21; 19:1–41), and Corinth (Acts 18:1–17). For a recent and very helpful assessment of the hippodrome and stadium at Caesarea Maritima and what types of games were held in these facilities, see J. Patrich, “Herod's Hippodrome-Stadium at Caesarea and the Games conducted therein,” in L. V. Rutgers (ed.), *What Athens has to do with Jerusalem: Essays on Classical, Jewish, and Early Christian Art and Archaeology in Honor of Gideon Foerster* (Interdisciplinary Studies in Ancient Culture and Religion 1; Leuven: Peeters, 2002), 29–68.

¹⁶ The major games were Nemcan, Pythian, Isthmian, and Olympian (cf. Epictetus 3.4.11).

¹⁷ O. Broneer, “The Apostle Paul and the Isthmian Games,” *BA* 25/1 (1962): 2–31; J. Murphy-O'Connor, *St. Paul's Corinth: Texts and Archaeology* (Wilmington, Del: Michael

analogy would have been readily understood and appreciated by the Corinthian Christians. Moreover, because athletic analogies were commonplace in the teachings and writings of philosophers and ethicists (e.g., Epictetus, *Diatr.* 1.18.21–23; 1.24.1–2; 2.18.27–29; 3.4.11; 3.10.8; 4.4.30–31; Plutarch, *Mor.* 593E), Paul’s language would have been all the more intelligible.

Major athletic events took place in the stadium (Latin: *stadium*; Greek: *στάδιον*).¹⁸ The ruins of several of these structures from the time of Paul still stand. Of course, *στάδιον* also means “race” (as in the distance one must run), which is Paul’s meaning in 1 Cor 9:24. Accordingly, Greek writers of antiquity spoke of “running a race” (*ἀγωνίζεσθαι στάδιον*) and “winning a race” (*στάδιον νικᾶν*). The rigors of training are frequently mentioned, and philosophers and ethicists compare the training and suffering to the struggle to attain virtue (cf. Virgil, *Aen.* 5.375–377, where the boxer “spars right and left, and lashes the air with blows”; Epictetus, *Diatr.* 3.4.11 “Whom, then, do I wish to win the victory? The victor”; Seneca, *Ep.* 78.16 “What blows do athletes receive...let us also win the way to victory in all our struggles—for the reward is not a garland or a palm...but rather virtue, steadfastness of soul, and a peace that is won for all time”; Lucian, *Athletics* 13, where the competitors hope to gain “an olive branch when they have won... But tell me, do all the contestants get them? Not by any means; only one among them all, the victor”).

Paul’s athletic analogy includes running (*τρέχω*) and boxing (*πυκτεύω*). The apostle declares that he does not run “aimlessly” (*ἀδήλως*) and he does not punch wildly, “as if beating the air” (*ὥς οὐκ ἄερα δέρων*). Paul’s point is that whether in practice or in actual competition, every move is taken with care, as in the case of the athlete, who runs on the course, striving for the finish line, or the boxer, whose every punch hits its mark. Running was the most common sport in the athletic contests

Glazier, 1983), 14–17; J. McRay, *Archaeology and the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1991), 317–19; idem, *Paul: His Life and Teaching* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003), 164–73. For a concise summary and assessment of the pertinent materials, see C. S. Keener, *1–2 Corinthians* (NCBC; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 81–82.

¹⁸ *στάδιον* usually refers to distance (cf. 2 Macc 11:5 “about five stadia”; 12:29 “they hastened to Scythopolis, which is six hundred stadia from Jerusalem”; Philo, *Flacc.* 92 “ten stadia”; Matt 14:24 “many stadia”; John 6:19 “twenty-five or thirty stadia”; 11:18 “about fifteen stadia”; Rev 14:20 “one thousand six hundred stadia”). A *στάδιον* is 600 Greek feet (or 606 English feet), or about one eighth of a mile. Many Christians, among them Polycarp, were martyred in a stadium (*Mart. Pol.* 6:2; 8:3; 9:1–2; 12:1).

(Herodotus 7.619.47–49; 9.33.2; Euripides, *El.* 883–84; Plutarch, *Mor.* 179D).¹⁹ Boxing, as well as wrestling, was among the favorites (Xenophon, *Anab.* 4.8.25–28 “a stadium race for boys [ἡγωνίζοντο δὲ παῖδες μὲν στάδιον] . . . wrestling and boxing [πάλην δὲ καὶ πυγμὴν]”; Euripides, *Cycl.* 229; Plato, *Gorg.* 456D; Cicero, *Brut.* 69.243).²⁰

The language of games and athletics is ἀγών (originally meaning a “gathering” of people, later a contest or game), ἀγωνία, ἀγωνίζεσθαι, and still more cognates.²¹ As do the Greek and Latin ethicists Paul applies this language to the struggles of Christian life. Just as the athlete in training “exercises self-control” (ἐγκρατεύεται), so must the Corinthian Christians exercise self-control and so avoid the many excesses and lapses that plague this congregation.²²

Paul describes his discipline as “pommeling” and “subduing” his body (ὑποπιάζω μου τὸ σῶμα καὶ δουλαγωγῶ). He maintains this discipline, lest he himself become “disqualified” (ἀδόκιμος). To be “pommeled” is to be struck under the eye and given a black eye (cf. Lucian, *Athletics* 13 “defiling their great bodies with sand and black eyes to gain possession of an apple and an olive branch”). No athlete wishes to be disqualified and disgraced. A second-century Christian author puts it well: “Let us run in the straight course, the heavenly contest, and let many of us come to enter it and compete, that we may also be crowned. And if we cannot all be crowned, let us at least come close to it. We must realize that if one who competes in the earthly contest is caught cheating, he is flogged, disqualified, and thrown out of the stadium” (2 *Clem.* 7:3–4).²³

The winner of an athletic contest receives a wreath or crown, which can be expressed with the noun στέφανος or the verb στεφανόω.²⁴ An

¹⁹ O. Bauernfeind, “τρέχω, κ.τ.λ.,” *TDNT* 8:226–35.

²⁰ K. L. Schmidt, “πυγμή, πυκτεύω,” *TDNT* 6:915–17.

²¹ E. Stauffer, “ἀγών, κ.τ.λ.,” *TDNT* 1:134–40. LSJ lists some fifteen terms from this word group.

²² Paul’s reference to self-control probably harks back to 1 Cor 7:9 (“But if they cannot exercise self-control, they should marry”). In speaking of the athlete’s need to maintain self-control Plato also refers to controlling sexual urges (*Leg.* 839E–840C).

²³ For an argument that 2 *Clement* was composed in Corinth and that 7:1–4 primarily has in view the Isthmian Games, see J. B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers: Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp* (5 vols.; London: Macmillan, 1889–90), part one, vol. 2, 198–99, 223–24.

²⁴ W. Grundmann, “στέφανος, στεφανόω,” *TDNT* 7:615–36. The crown is the “prize” (τὸ βραβεῖον) of which Paul speaks, awarded by the umpire (βραβεύς, βραβευτής). See

olive branch was commonly used (cf. Pausanias 5.15.3, in reference to the Olympic Games; Pindar, *Ol.* 5.18), but crowns were made from other plants and materials, such as grass, flowers, oak leaves, ears of grain, ivy, laurel, and celery. Paul's reference to athletes who compete for a "perishable crown" (φθαρτὸν στέφανον) may well envision the wreath made of the leafy part of celery, already wilting, when presented to winners of the Isthmian Games.²⁵ The point of Paul's comparison is that if an athlete is willing to undergo long, difficult, painful training, simply to win a perishable wreath, how much more should Christians be willing to discipline themselves, to win a reward that is imperishable (ἄφθαρτον).²⁶ This "imperishable" wreath anticipates the vigorous defence of the resurrection, in which the believer is promised to be clothed with an imperishable body: "For the trumpet will sound, and the dead will be raised imperishable [ἄφθαρτοι], and we shall be changed."²⁷ For this perishable nature must put on the imperishable, and this mortal nature must put on immortality [τὸ φθαρτὸν τοῦτο ἐνδύσασθαι ἀφθαρσίαν καὶ τὸ θνητὸν τοῦτο ἐνδύσασθαι ἀθανασίαν]" (1 Cor 15:52b–53).²⁷

Athletic imagery appears elsewhere in the Pauline corpus. The Thessalonian Christians constitute Paul's "crown of boasting" (στέφανος καυχήσεως) at the time of the parousia of the Lord Jesus (1 Thess 2:19).²⁸ Paul applies this imagery to himself in Phil 3:13–14:

E. Stauffer, "βραβεύω, βραβεῖον," *TDNT* 1:637–39. For examples of verb or noun in the context of sport, see *CIG* 3674; *PSI* 126.20; Menander, *Mon.* 653.

²⁵ On the wreaths awarded victors in the Isthmian Games, see O. Broneer, "The Isthmian Victory Crown," *AJA* 66 (1962): 259–63. Wreaths at the Isthmian Games were usually made from green pine leaves, but sometimes celery was used, as may have been in the case in the mid-first century, when Paul was in Corinth.

²⁶ Epictetus expresses a similar sentiment: "At Olympia nobody wants anything else, but you feel content with having received an Olympic crown [ἐστεφανώσθαι Ὀλύμπια]" (*Diatr.* 3.24.52). Diogenes the Cynic mocked the athletes, viewing their efforts to gain victory crowns as pointless (*apud* Dio Chrysostom, *Or.* 9.10–22). He suggests crowning horses and goats, who at least can eat the wreaths! Diogenes is said to have visited the Isthmian Games.

²⁷ As is convincingly argued by Garrison, *The Greco-Roman Context*, 101–104.

²⁸ At which time the Lord Jesus takes his seat upon the βῆμα and dispenses judgment (cf. 2 Cor 5:10; Rom 14:10). The βῆμα served a variety of purposes. It was a raised seat or platform (permanent or temporary), on which officials sat to hold hearings or pass judgment, or rhetors or politicians sat for making speeches. One should also note the interesting epitaph: "The synagogue of the Jews honored Tation, daughter of Straton, son of Empedon, with a golden crown [στεφάνῳ] and the privilege of sitting in the seat of honor [προεδρίῃ]" (*CIf* 738 [third century]).

¹³Brethren, I do not consider that I have made it my own; but one thing I do, forgetting what lies behind and straining forward to what lies ahead,
¹⁴I press on toward the goal [κατὰ σκοπὸν] for the prize [τὸ βραβεῖον] of the upward call of God in Christ Jesus.

Paul's use of σκοπός here probably has in mind the finish line, towards which runners race (as implied by his language of "what lies behind" and "straining forward to what lies ahead"). σκοπός can also refer to the target towards which soldiers and contestants aim their arrows and javelins (Homer, *Od.* 22.6; Pindar, *Nem.* 6.27; Plato, *Theaet.* 194A). If the contestant hits the target, he receives the prize. The metaphorical use of σκοπός as "goal in life" is also attested in the philosophers (e.g., Plato, *Gorg.* 507D; idem, *Resp.* 519C; Aristotle, *Pol.* 5.10; Polybius 7.8.9).

In 1 Tim 4:10 the Pauline author explains that it is "to this end we toil and strive [κοπιῶμεν καὶ ἀγωνίζομεθα], because we have our hope set on the living God, who is the Savior of all." The athletic association of ἀγωνίζεσθαι has already been noted, but κοπιῶ may also have this nuance (as also in Phil 2:16; Col 1:29), even if it is not a technical term. Similar connotations may obtain in 1 Tim 6:12, where the author enjoins: "Fight the good fight of the faith" (ἀγωνίζου τὸν καλὸν ἀγῶνα τῆς πίστεως). What is rendered here "fight" could just as easily be rendered "strive" or "compete."

Contemporary Jewish writers were familiar with the Greek games²⁹ and made use of its terminology in reference to self-discipline and martyrdom. The author of 4 Maccabees describes the suffering of righteous Eleazar and the mother and her seven sons in terms of the Greek games (4 Macc 17:11–16):

¹¹Truly the contest [ἀγών] in which they were engaged was divine, ¹²for on that day virtue [ἀρετή] gave the awards and tested them for their endurance. The prize [τὸ νίκος] was immortality in endless life. ¹³Eleazar was the first contestant [προηγωνίζετο], the mother of the seven sons entered the competition [ἐνήθλει], and the brothers contended [ἡγωνίζοντο]. ¹⁴The tyrant was the antagonist [ἀντηγωνίζετο], and the world and the human race were the spectators. ¹⁵Reverence for God was victor [ἐνίκη] and gave the crown to its own athletes [τοὺς ἐαυτῆς ἀθλητὰς στεφανοῦσα].

²⁹ J. Schwartz, "Jew and non-Jew in the Roman Period in Light of their Play, Games, and Leisure-Time Activities," in J. H. Ellens *et al.* (eds.), *God's Word for our World. II. Theological and Cultural Studies in Honor of Simon John de Vries* (JSOTSup 389; London and New York: T&T Clark, 2004), 128–40.

¹⁶Who did not admire the athletes [ἀθλητὰς] of the divine legislation?
Who were not amazed?

Elsewhere the author of 4 Maccabees makes use of the imagery and terminology of the games, especially ἀγών in the sense of contest or struggle (11:20 “O contest befitting holiness, in which so many of us brothers have been summoned to an arena of sufferings for religion”; 13:15; 15:29 “who carried away the prize of the contest”; 16:16 “noble is the contest... Fight zealously for our ancestral law”).³⁰

Philo also employs the images of games (*Cher.* 80; *Det.* 2; *Migr.* 133 “if, imitating good runners, you finish the course of life without stumbling or error, you will deservedly obtain the crown and worthy prize of victory when you have arrived at your desired end”; *Opif.* 78; *Spec. Leg.* 2.246 “in the case of those who have gained the victory in the gymnastic games, in the stadium, or the double race, or the long straight course, or in the contest of boxing, or in the pancratium,³¹ to attempt to crown only the legs and arms of the conquerors, and to let the whole of their bodies remain unhonoured”; *Contempl.* 42 “men who gain victories in the Olympic Games, when perfectly sober in the arenas, and having all the Greeks for spectators do by day, exerting all their skill for the purpose of gaining victory and the crown”; *Agr.* 112, 119). Of one of Philo’s analogies Paul would have especially approved (*Prob.* 26):

I have before now seen among the competitors in the pancratium, at the public games, one man inflicting all kinds of blows both with his hands and feet, all of them with great accuracy of aim and omitting nothing which could conduce to victory, and yet after a time fainting and desponding, and at last quitting the arena without the crown of victory; and the other who has received all his blows, being thoroughly hardened with great firmness of flesh, and being tough and unyielding, and filled with the true spirit of an athlete, and invigorated throughout his whole body, being like so much iron or stone, not at all yielding to the blows inflicted by the other; at last, by the endurance and resolution of his spirit, defeating the power of his adversary so as to obtain a complete victory.

³⁰ For further discussion, see D. A. deSilva, “The Noble Contest: Honor, Shame, and the Rhetorical Strategy of 4 Maccabees,” *JSP* 13 (1995): 31–57; J. W. van Henten, “A Jewish Epitaph in a Literary Text: 4 Macc 17:8–10,” in J. W. van Henten and P. W. van der Horst (eds.), *Studies in Early Jewish Epigraphy* (AGJU 21; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 44–69.

³¹ The pancratium (παγκράτιον) was a sport in which wrestling and boxing were combined. Only biting and gouging were prohibited.

Similarly, in the much embellished pseudepigraphal version, the long-suffering Job, likened to a boxer, is promised the crown of victory (*Job* 4:7–11):

⁷And I will again return you to your possessions, and it will be paid back to you double, ⁸that you may know that the Lord is impartial, paying back good things to each one who obeys; ⁹and he will be raised up in the resurrection. ¹⁰For you will be like a sparring athlete [ὡς ἀθλητῆς πυκτεύων], enduring pain and receiving the crown [τὸν στέφανον]. ¹¹Then you will know that the Lord is just and true and strong, giving strength to his chosen ones.

The crowning of Job restores to him the crown that earlier had been taken away, as narrated in the older Hebrew version of the book (i.e., *Job* 19:9). Elsewhere in Jewish wisdom crown imagery is employed (*Prov* 14:18, 24; 16:31; *Song* 3:11; *Wis* 4:2; 5:16; *Sir* 1:11, 18; 6:31).

In short, Paul's athletic imagery in 1 Corinthians 9 and elsewhere reflects the Greek games, especially those held at Corinth, games not only well known in the eastern Roman Empire, but well known to the Jewish people also. Paul's imagery testifies to the depth to which Hellenistic culture had penetrated the Jewish world. Paul's employment of the imagery also reveals his awareness of how this imagery was employed by his competitors, the Greek philosophers, sophists, and ethicists.

Interpreters of Paul have compared his conscious employment of and apparent unconscious allusions to Greek ideas and literature at many other points.³² The architects of Greek philosophy—Plato

³² For a selection of studies that speak to the general topic of Paul and Greco-Roman philosophy, see M. Pohlenz, *Vom Zorne Gottes: Eine Studie über den Einfluß der griechischen Philosophie auf das alte Christentum* (FRLANT 12; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1909); A. J. Malherbe, *Paul and the Popular Philosophers* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989); D. Balch and W. Meeks (eds.), *Greeks, Romans, and Christians: Essays in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990); T. Engberg-Pedersen (ed.), *Paul in His Hellenistic Context* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995); G. E. Sterling, "Hellenistic Philosophy and the New Testament," in S. E. Porter (ed.), *Handbook to Exegesis of the New Testament* (NTTS 25; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 313–58; B. W. Winter, *Philo and Paul among the Sophists* (SNTSMS 96; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997); repr. as *Philo and Paul among the Sophists: Alexandrian and Corinthian Responses to a Julio-Claudian Movement* (2nd ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002); E. Krentz, "Logos or Sophia: The Pauline Use of the Ancient Dispute between Rhetoric and Philosophy," in J. T. Fitzgerald, T. H. Olbricht, and L. M. White (eds.), *Early Christianity and Classical Culture: Comparative Studies in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe* (NovTSup 110; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 277–90; F. E. Brenk, "'We are of his race.' Paul and the Philosophy of his Time," in *With Unperfumed Voice: Studies in Plutarch, in Greek Literature, Religion and Philosophy, and in the New Testament Background* (Potsdamer altertumswissenschaftliche Beiträge 21; Stuttgart: Steiner, 2007) 402–40.

and Aristotle—have been mined for insights into Paul's concepts.³³ Paul's language and thought have been compared to Stoicism, ranging from ethics to cosmology.³⁴ Seneca—Stoic, advisor to Nero, and

³³ For studies on Plato, see J. W. Lake, *Plato, Philo, and Paul: or the Pagan Conception of a "Divine Logos" Shewn to have been the Basis of the Christian Dogma of the Deity of Christ* (London: T. Scott, 1874); P. de Lacy, "Plato and the Intellectual Life of the Second Century A.D.," in G. W. Bowersock (ed.), *Approaches to the Second Sophistic: Papers Presented at the 105th Annual Meeting of the American Philological Association* (University Park, Pa.: American Philological Association, 1974), 4–10; H. D. Betz, "Humanisierung des Menschen: Delphi, Plato, Paulus," in *Hellenismus und Urchristentum* (Gesammelte Aufsätze 1; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1990), 120–34; W. Burkert, "Towards Plato and Paul: The 'inner' Human Being," in A. Y. Collins (ed.), *Ancient and Modern Perspectives on the Bible and Culture: Essays in Honor of Hans Dieter Betz* (SBL Homage 22; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998), 59–82; M. Gawlina, "Paulus und Plato: Prosopon gegen Idea," *ThPh* 80 (2005): 17–30; J. Strijdom, "On Social Justice: Comparing Paul with Plato, Aristotle and the Stoics," *HTS* 63 (2007): 19–48. For studies on Aristotle, see T. H. Olbricht, "An Aristotelian Rhetorical Analysis of 1 Thessalonians," in Balch and Meeks (eds.), *Greeks, Romans, and Christians*, 216–36; D. Jasper, "In the sermon which I have just completed, wherever I said Aristotle, I meant Saint Paul," in M. Warner (ed.), *The Bible as Rhetoric: Studies in Biblical Persuasion and Credibility* (Warwick Studies in Philosophy and Literature; London and New York: Routledge, 1990), 133–52; W. E. Arnal, "Aristotle and the Jewish God: A Response to A. P. Bos," in W. E. Helleman (ed.), *Hellenization Revisited: Shaping a Christian Response within the Greco-Roman World* (Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1994), 23–28; A. P. Bos, "Philo of Alexandria: A Platonist in the Image and Likeness of Aristotle," *Studia Philonica Annual* 10 (1998): 66–86.

³⁴ M. Pohlenz, "Paulus und die Stoa," *ZNW* 42 (1949): 69–104; R. G. Tanner, "S. Paul and Stoic Physics," in E. A. Livingstone (ed.), *Studia Evangelica*, VII: *Papers presented to the 5th International Congress on Biblical Studies held at Oxford, 1973* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1982), 481–90; H. C. Kee, "Pauline Eschatology: Relationships with Apocalyptic and Stoic Thought," in E. Grässer and O. Merk (eds.), *Glaube und Eschatologie: Festschrift für Werner Georg Kümmel zum 80. Geburtstag* (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1985), 135–58; T. Paige, "Stoicism, ἐλευθερία and Community at Corinth," in M. J. Wilkins and T. Paige (eds.), *Worship, Theology and Ministry in the Early Church: Essays in Honor of Ralph P. Martin* (JSNTSup 87; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992), 180–93; J. W. Martens, "Romans 2.14–16: A Stoic Reading," *NTS* 40 (1994): 55–67; T. Engberg-Pedersen, "Stoicism in Philippians," in Engberg-Pedersen (ed.), *Paul in His Hellenistic Context*, 256–90; H. Hübner, "Das ganze und das eine Gesetz: Zum Problemkreis Paulus und die Stoa," in A. Labahn and M. Labahn (eds.), *Biblische Theologie als Hermeneutik: Gesammelte Aufsätze* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995), 9–26; G. Dautzenberg, "Die Freiheit bei Paulus und in der Stoa," *ThQ* 176 (1996): 65–76; I. J. Jolivet, Jr., "Stoic Philosophy and Jewish Scripture in the Argument from the Letter and Intent of the Law in Romans," in *Society of Biblical Literature 1999 Seminar Papers* (SBLSP 38; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1999): 448–71; T. Engberg-Pedersen, *Paul and the Stoics* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000); N. Hyldahl, "Troels Engberg-Pedersen: 'Paul and the Stoics'," *DTT* 63 (2000): 267–80; D. E. Fredrickson, "Ephesians and Stoic Physics," *Word and World* 22 (2002): 144–54; J. L. Martyn, "De-Apocalypticizing Paul: An Essay Focused on Paul and the Stoics by Troels Engberg-Pedersen," *JSNT* 86 (2002): 61–102; P. F. Esler, "Paul and Stoicism: Romans 12 as a Test Case," *NTS* 50 (2004): 106–24; T. Engberg-Pedersen, "The Relationship with Others: Similarities and Differences between Paul and Stoicism," *ZNW* 96 (2005): 35–60; M. V. Lee, *Paul, the Stoics, and the Body of Christ* (SNTSMS 137; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,

contemporary of Paul—has been a favorite for comparisons.³⁵ Paul's rhetoric at places has been viewed as opposing and sometimes mimicking Cynicism.³⁶ In places interpreters have detected engagement with Epicurean thought.³⁷ Indeed, Paul's Areopagus speech in Acts 17 has received attention.³⁸ Most of Paul's letters have been analyzed in the light of Hellenistic rhetoric.³⁹

Early Christian writers, especially the apologists (such as Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Athenagoras, Theophilus), appealed to the great Greek thinkers. Plato is referred to dozens of times in the early Christian apologists (e.g., Justin Martyr, 2 *Apol.* 12: "For I myself, too, when I was delighting in the doctrines of Plato [τοῖς Πλάτωνος χαίρων διδάγμασι]..."). Aristotle is mentioned a few times (usually as an authority who taught things that anticipated the later and fuller revelation in Christ). There are about one dozen references to Socrates (same appeal, as in the case

2006); R. M. Thorsteinsson, "Paul and Roman Stoicism: Romans 12 and Contemporary Stoic Ethics," *JST* 29 (2006): 139–61.

³⁵ J. N. Sevenster, *Paul and Seneca* (NovTSup 4; Leiden: Brill, 1961); H.-J. Klauck, "'Der Gott in dir' (Ep 41,1): Autonomie des Gewissens bei Seneca und Paulus," in *Alle Welt und neuer Glaube: Beiträge zur Religionsgeschichte, Forschungsgeschichte und Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (NTOA 29; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994), 1–31; G. K. Barr, "Contrasts in Scale and Genre in the Letters of Paul and Seneca," *IBSt* 18 (1996): 16–25; R. Penna, "La questione della dispositio rhetorica nella lettera di Paolo ai Romani: Confronto con la lettera 7 di Platone e la lettera 95 di Seneca," *Bib* 84 (2003): 61–88; P. Hartog, "'Not even among the pagans' (1 Cor 5:1): Paul and Seneca on Incest," in J. Fotopoulos (ed.), *The New Testament and Early Christian Literature in Greco-Roman Context: Studies in Honor of David E. Aune* (NovTSup 122; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 51–64; F. E. Brenk, "Deum... comitari: Rhetoric and Progress in Virtue in Seneca and Paul," in *With Unperfumed Voice*, 441–69.

³⁶ T. W. Martin, *By Philosophy and Empty Deceit: Colossians as Response to a Cynic Critique* (JSNTSup 118; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996); F. G. Downing, *Cynics, Paul, and the Pauline Churches: Cynics and Christian Origins* (London: Routledge, 1998).

³⁷ N. W. De Witt, *St. Paul and Epicurus* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1954); B. Fiore, "Passion in Paul and Plutarch: 1 Corinthians 5–6 and the Polemic against Epicureans," in Balch and Meeks (eds.), *Greeks, Romans and Christians*, 135–43; G. Tomlin, "Christians and Epicureans in 1 Corinthians," *JST* 68 (1997): 51–72.

³⁸ D. L. Balch, "The Areopagus Speech: An Appeal to the Stoic Historian Posidonius against Later Stoics and the Epicureans," in Balch and Meeks (eds.), *Greeks, Romans and Christians*, 52–79; J. H. Neyrey, "Acts 17, Epicureans, and Theodicy: A Study in Stereotypes," in Balch and Meeks (eds.), *Greeks, Romans and Christians*, 118–34; D. Dormeyer, "Weisheit und Philosophie in der Apostelgeschichte (Apg 6,1–8,1a und 17,16–34)," in M. Fassnacht et al. (eds.), *Die Weisheit—Ursprünge und Rezeption: Festschrift für Karl Löning zum 65. Geburtstag* (NTAbh 44; Münster: Aschendorff, 2003), 155–84.

³⁹ For a detailed analysis of the letter to the Galatians, see H. D. Betz, *Galatians* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979). For an overview of the entire subject, see S. E. Porter, "Paul of Tarsus and His Letters," in Porter (ed.), *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B.C.–A.D. 400* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 533–85.

of Aristotle), another dozen references or so to Pythagoras (some positive, some not), about ten references to Epicurus (mostly unfavorable), four to Cynics, which of course are not positive, plus three references to Diogenes, one to Zeno, and one or two to Cleanthes.

The engagement of early Christian writers with major Greco-Roman philosophers and ethicists in large measure continues a tradition developed in the earliest apostolic writers and apologists, preeminent among whom is Paul. Paul made use of philosophical idiom and imagery to advance his apologetic and to communicate his ideas, especially when addressing non-Jewish converts. His quotations of and allusions to Greco-Roman literature established a precedent followed by the church's major theologians.⁴⁰

⁴⁰ On this and related points, see W. Kinzig, "The Greek Christian Writers," and P. E. Satterthwaite, "The Latin Church Fathers," in Porter (ed.), *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period*, 633–70, and 671–94, respectively.

PAUL AND THE GYMNASIARCHS: TWO APPROACHES TO PASTORAL FORMATION IN ANTIQUITY

James R. Harrison
Wesley Institute, Sydney, Australia

During the last decade the study of leadership in Paul's house churches has emerged as a growth industry. Before then the approach of New Testament scholars was theological,¹ sociological,² opponents-based,³ or church-centered.⁴ Only recently has the examination of Paul's understanding of leadership in its eastern Mediterranean context become widespread. The organization of the polis, household, synagogue and association has been analyzed for similarities to early Christian leadership structures,⁵ as has the Graeco-Roman reciprocity system for its

¹ H. Doohan, *Leadership in Paul* (Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1984). This article has profited from the responses of scholars at the SBL 2005 Annual Meeting, Philadelphia, USA (Nov. 19–22, 2005) and at the *Twin Cities NT Trial Balloon Society*, Minnesota, USA (April 4 2006).

² J. H. Schutz, *Paul and the Anatomy of Apostolic Authority* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975); B. Holmberg, *Paul and Power: The Structure of Authority in the Primitive Churches as Reflected in the Pauline Epistles* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980); G. Theissen, *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity: Essays on Corinth* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982); E. A. Castelli, *Imitating Paul: A Discourse of Power* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1991). See, too, P. F. Esler's discussion of sociological models in relation to Romans (*Conflict and Identity in Romans: The Social Setting of Paul's Letter* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003]), 33–39.

³ D. Georgi, *The Opponents of Paul in Second Corinthians* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987 [1964]).

⁴ A. L. Chapple, *Local Leadership in the Pauline Churches: Theological and Social Factors in Its Development. A Study Based on 1 Thessalonians, 1 Corinthians and Philippians* (unpublished PhD thesis, Durham University, 1984).

⁵ J. N. Collins, *Diakonia: Re-interpreting the Ancient Sources* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990); J. T. Burtchaell, *From Synagogue to Church: Public Services and Offices in the Earliest Christian Communities* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992); A. D. Clarke, *Secular and Christian Leadership in Corinth: A Socio-Historical and Exegetical Study of 1 Corinthians 1–6* (Leiden: Brill, 1993); *idem*, *Serve the Community of the Church: Christians as Leaders and Ministers* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000); S. J. Joubert, "Managing the Household: Paul as *Paterfamilias* of the Christian Household Group in Corinth," in P. F. Esler (ed.), *Modelling Early Christianity: Social-Scientific Studies of the New Testament in Its Context* (London: Routledge, 1995), 213–23; J. S. Kloppenborg and S. G. Wilson (eds.), *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World* (London: Routledge, 1996); R. A. Ascough, *Paul's Thessalonian Associations* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003).

impact upon patron-client relations in Paul's house-churches.⁶ Epicurean psychagogy has also been profitably investigated for the light it throws on Paul's adaptability in ministering to the factionalized Corinthian house churches.⁷ Consequently, we are better placed to appreciate the competing styles of leadership and group behavior that Paul was forced to confront at Corinth. Whereas scholarship previously concentrated on the literary evidence, the recent focus on the documentary, numismatic and archaeological evidence has ensured a more balanced approach to ancient leadership ideals and structures than previously.

Insufficient attention has been paid to the educational context of ancient leadership theory and practice.⁸ The main interest of scholars in this regard has been the disagreement between Paul and the Corinthians as to whether rhetorical eloquence—the chief educational instrument of antiquity—was an indicator of apostolic status, power and wisdom.⁹ But New Testament scholars have overlooked the important role of the ancient gymnasium in shaping young men as civic leaders. This oversight is perhaps explained by the negative attitude of 1 and 2 Maccabees towards the Jerusalem gymnasium and by the scarcity of “gymnasium” terminology in the New Testament (γυμνάζω: 1 Tim 4:7; γυμνασία: 1 Tim 4:8).

Recently, R. S. Dutch has argued that the Greek gymnasium was the primary venue for the education of elite Christians in Corinth. Dutch helpfully analyses the role of the gymnasium personnel (i.e. the *gymnasiarchos*) and its students (the *neoi* and *epheboi*) but, disappointingly, does not bring Paul's pastoral theology into dialogue with the ethical

⁶ J. K. Chow, *Patronage and Power: A Study of Social Networks in Corinth* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992); B. W. Winter, *Seek the Welfare of the City* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994); S. Joubert, *Paul as Benefactor: Reciprocity, Strategy and Theological Reflection in Paul's Collection* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000); J. R. Harrison, *Paul's Language of Grace in Its Graeco-Roman Context* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003); Z. A. Crook, *Reconceptualising Conversion: Patronage, Loyalty, and Conversion in the Religions of the Ancient Mediterranean* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2004); G. W. Griffith, *Abounding in Generosity: A Study of Charis in 2 Corinthians 8–9* (unpublished PhD thesis, Durham University, 2005).

⁷ C. E. Glad, *Paul and Philodemus: Adaptability in Epicurean and Early Christian Psychagogy* (Leiden: Brill, 1995).

⁸ Note, however, the two articles cited in n.13 below.

⁹ S. M. Pogoloff, *Logos and Sophia: The Rhetorical Situation of 1 Corinthians* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992); D. Litfin, *St. Paul's Theology of Proclamation: 1 Corinthians 1–4 and Greco-Roman Rhetoric* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994); B. W. Winter, *Philo and Paul among the Sophists* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997); B. K. Peterson, *Eloquence and the Proclamation of the Gospel in Corinth* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998).

ideals of the gymnasium.¹⁰ Instead, like many Corinthian interpreters before him, Dutch travels over well-worn exegetical ground in describing how Paul's self-presentation (e.g. 1 Cor 1:20; 3:1–4; 3:5–9; 4:6; 4:21; 7:17–24; 9:24–27) was polemically slanted at the educated elite opposing his ministry. The equally important task of cultural *synkrisis* ("comparison") is thereby bypassed.¹¹ Consequently, we fail to appreciate that the differences between Paul's gospel and the surrounding Graeco-Roman culture are just as revealing as the "parallels" posited by the *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule*.

In sum, New Testament scholars have not realized that the pastoral role attributed to the gymnasiarchs in the honorific inscriptions constitutes important background for studies of pastoral leadership in Paul. The gymnasiarchal inscriptions highlight the commitment of the gymnasiarchs to ancestral honor and high ethical standards, as well as the obligations of the reciprocity system. There are important echoes of Pauline concerns here that warrant investigation.

Additionally, several fragmentary inscriptions preserve ethical maxims, belonging to the Delphic Canon, which were taught to students in the eastern Mediterranean gymnasia.¹² What would have been Paul's attitude to these lofty ethical ideals? To what extent might Paul have endorsed or critiqued this theology of civic virtue? What do his disagreements with the gymnasium curriculum reveal about the personal and social dynamics of his gospel? We are presented with the opportunity to break out of the institutional approach to leadership studies characterizing New Testament scholarship over the last decade. What is required by way of supplement to the fine work accomplished so far is a study of *leaders* from the documentary and literary evidence.¹³

¹⁰ R. S. Dutch, *The Educated Elite in 1 Corinthians: Education and Community Conflict in Graeco-Roman Context* (London: T&T Clark, 2005), 95–167.

¹¹ The establishment of the Walter de Gruyter series, edited by D. B. Martin and L. L. Welborn, entitled *Synkrisis: Invitations to Early Christianity in Greco-Roman Culture*, will address this deficit in New Testament scholarship.

¹² For the inscriptions, see E. A. Judge, "Ancient Beginnings of the Ancient World," in T. W. Hillard *et al.* (eds.), *Ancient History in a Modern University. Volume II: Early Christianity, Late Antiquity, and Beyond* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 468–82, esp. 473–80.

¹³ For two examples of the approach I am advocating, see E. A. Judge, "The Teacher as Moral Exemplar in Paul and in the Inscriptions of Ephesus," in D. Peterson and J. Prior (eds.), *In the Fulness of Time: Biblical Studies in Honour of Archbishop Donald Robinson* (Homebush West: Lancer, 1992), 185–201; R. Saunders, "Attalus, Paul and PAIDEIA: The Contribution of *I. Eph. 202* to Pauline Studies," in Hillard *et al.* (eds.), *Ancient History*, 175–83.

Only then will we avoid the danger of talking about ancient leadership ideals in abstraction.¹⁴

This article explores how the educational ideals of eastern Mediterranean gymnasia, as articulated in the honorific inscriptions, were expressed in the civic leadership and ethical behavior of the *gymnasiarchoi*. The article demonstrates that Paul's cruciform gospel sought to transform the leaders of his house churches in order that they might act as ambassadors of divine reconciliation within the body of Christ and also within the network of client-patron relationships constituting Graeco-Roman society. Paul's gospel relativized hierarchies of merit and gender; it pinpricked a culture of self-sufficiency and fatalism; it redefined the operation of reciprocity—the lubricant of social relations in antiquity—in light of the divine love revealed in the cross. In this process of redefinition, wherever possible, Paul endorsed what was compatible with the gospel of grace, but deepened its application and redirected its rationale.

We turn to an overview of education in antiquity, with special emphasis on the gymnasium and the access that Paul would have had to its *paideia*.

1. *What Contact Would Paul Have Had with the Gymnasium?*

In the classical age the education of youth was the preserve of the land-owning elite.¹⁵ The class bias of early Greek education had been

¹⁴ Graeco-Roman writers speak of leadership idealistically and concretely. Examples of idealistic presentations are found in the kingship treatises of Dio Chrysostom (*Or.* 1–4, 56, 62) and the Pythagorean *Περὶ βασιλείας* literature (Diotogenes, Ps.-Ecphantus, Sthenidas). For discussion, see E. R. Goodenough, "The Political Philosophy of Hellenistic Kingship," *YCS* 1 (1928): 55–102; L. Delatte, *Les traités de la royauté d'Ecphante, Diotogène et Sthénidas* (Liège: Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège, 1942); B. Blumenfeld, *The Political Paul: Justice, Democracy and Kingship in a Hellenistic Framework* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001) 189–274. For concrete presentations in the *exempla*, see Augustus's *Res Gestae*, Valerius Maximus's *Memorable Doings and Sayings*, the anonymous *Deeds of Famous Men*, and the comparisons of Greek and Roman leaders in the introductions to Plutarch's *Lives*.

¹⁵ On Graeco-Roman and Jewish education, see W. Jaeger, *Paideia: The Ideals of Greek Culture* (3 vols.; Oxford: Blackwell, 1946); H.-I. Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity* (London: Sheed and Ward, 1956); W. Barclay, *Educational Ideals in the Ancient World* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974 [1959]); J. T. Townsend, "Ancient Education in the Time of the Early Roman Empire," in S. Benko and J. J. O'Rourke (eds.), *The Catacombs and the Colosseum: The Roman Empire as the Setting of Early Christianity* (London: Oliphants, 1972), 139–63; M. L. Clarke, *Higher Education in the Ancient World* (Albuquerque: University of

reinforced by the aristocratic world-view of Homer. Although Homer venerated the battle-hardened noble in his poetry, he softened his portrait of the military hero by depicting his warriors as skilled musicians. This Homeric blend of aesthetic grace and military prowess characterized the aristocratic educational systems of the classical city-states. Even militaristic Sparta trained boys in music, reading, and writing, as much as in athletics and in the maneuvers of the hoplite phalanx.

But it was the Athenian system of education that provided the blueprint for the Hellenistic age. In classical Athens, education was private, fee-paying, and non-compulsory. The head teacher was a freeman, helped by assistant masters who were freemen or slaves. As regards curricula, there were three branches of elementary education: letters (reading, writing, arithmetic), athletics (gymnastics, games, deportment) and music (lyre-playing, lyric poetry). Beyond this lay the professional schools of law and medicine, rhetoric and philosophy, as well as the courses offered by itinerant sophists. During the fourth century BC Athens saw the establishment of Isocrates' school of rhetoric, Plato's Academy, Aristotle's Lyceum, and the Stoic and Epicurean schools of Zeno and Epicurus.

However, the Hellenistic education system progressively lost the aristocratic bias of the classical period as it focused on the needs of the common person. Public schools were established at Miletus, Teos, Rhodes and Delphi through the endowments of benefactors.¹⁶ Although the trend towards free public education continued into the Roman empire, the creation of new elementary schools mostly lay in the hands of city councils, local benefactors, and parents with the means to pay.

New Mexico Press, 1971); S. F. Bonner, *Education in Ancient Rome: From the Elder Cato to the Younger Pliny* (London: Methuen, 1977); J. L. Crenshaw, *Education in Ancient Israel: Across the Deadening Silence* (New York: Doubleday, 1998).

¹⁶ For decrees founding schools at Miletus (*SIG*³ 577: 200/199 BC) and Teos (*SIG*³ 578: II cent. BC), see M. M. Austin, *The Hellenistic World from Alexander to the Roman Conquest: A Selection of Ancient Sources in Translation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), §§119–120. For a Delphic decree honoring Attalos III for establishing an educational endowment (*SIG*³ 672: 160/159 BC), see Austin, *Hellenistic World*, §206. A fragmentary Ephesian decree (I. Eph. V 1618) honors a benefactor for “having given the prizes to the musicians and to the athletes at his own expense,” as well as “having given the columns to the city for the old gymnasium”. Theophrastus’s will provided his garden, covered walk and buildings for the study of philosophy (Diogenes Laertius 5.52.3). The will of Epicurus (Diogenes Laertius 10.16–18) specified regarding the Epicurean school: “I entrust the school in the garden in perpetuity to those who are its members” so that the “successors in philosophy... [might] live and pursue philosophy therein.”

In regard to higher education, Athens continued to be the provider *par excellence*, but the beneficence of the emperors increasingly eclipsed competitors. Vespasian, for example, endowed a chair of literature and rhetoric at Rome, to which was appointed the incomparable Roman rhetorician Quintilian.¹⁷

Throughout the eastern Mediterranean, Greek public education was conducted in the gymnasia, the *palaestrae* (the wrestling schools) and temples devoted to the Muses (the Museum). Visiting teachers also rented private quarters, as Paul did at Rome (Acts 28:16, 30), or hired a guild hall like that of Tyrannus in first-century Ephesus (Acts 19:9).¹⁸ In the case of the Jewish world, itinerant teachers such as Paul would have used the local synagogue (Acts 13:14–51; 14:1–6; 17:1–9, 10–15, 17; 18:1–12, 19; cf. Luke 4:16–28). But some Jews, including the Therapeutae of Egypt and the Covenanters of Qumran, lived with their teacher(s) in exclusivist communities of faith in remote locations. Others joined the local Pharisaic table fellowships or attached themselves to wilderness figures such as John the Baptist or Bannus, the mentor of Josephus.

Because most cities had built at least one gymnasium, the gymnasium remained the most famous and popular educational institution in antiquity.¹⁹ Hellenistic gymnasia not only offered physical education but also literature, philosophy and music. There were clear-cut educational age groups. The first seven years of a Greek boy's life was spent under the

¹⁷ For Vespasian's edict (AD 74) on physicians' and teachers' privileges, see A. C. Johnson *et al.* (eds.), *Ancient Roman Statutes* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1961), §185. In AD 93/94 Domitian intervened to prevent the abuse of the provisions of Vespasian's patronage by unscrupulous entrepreneurs (*ibid.*, §199). For Domitian's patronage of the philosopher Terentius Maximus, see Pliny, *Ep.* 10.58.5. See also the letter of Plotina (*ibid.*, §238: AD 121), widow of Trajan, to Hadrian regarding a successor to the presidency of the Epicurean school.

¹⁸ On the nature of Tyrannus's hall in Acts 19:9, see A. J. Malherbe, *Social Aspects of Early Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983), 89–91.

¹⁹ In the entire Hellenic area, we know of gymnasia existing in approximately 140 localities (J. Oehler, "Gymnasiarch," *RE* VII [1912]: 2005–2008). For evidence regarding the subjects taught, see the Teos decree (n.16 above). For the workings of a gymnasium, see S. G. Miller, *Arete: Greek Sports from Ancient Sources* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1991), §126 (*SEG* XXVII 261). On the gymnasium, see J. Delorme, *Le Gymnase: Étude sur les monuments consacrés à l'éducation en Grèce* (Paris: Éditions E. de Boccard, 1960); O. Tzachou-Alexandri, "The Gymnasium: An Institution for Athletic and Education," in *idem* (ed.), *Mind and Body: Athletic Contests in Antiquity* (Athens: Ministry of Culture, The National Hellenic Committee I.C.O.M., 1989); D. Vanhove, "Le gymnase," in *idem*, *Le sport dans la Grèce antique: Du jeu à la compétition* (Bruxelles: Universiteit Gent, 1992), 57–75.

tutelage of his mother. Young boys, known as *paides* (“boys”), learned the rudiments at elementary school under the care of male teachers up to fourteen. The sons of well-off families, called *epheboi* (“adolescents”), were sent to the gymnasia from fifteen to seventeen. Students over eighteen were called *neoi* (“youths”). There were two years of compulsory military service called the *ephebeia* (“manhood”). Its aim was to usher the *ephebos* into the citizenship and to ensure a military reserve for the state. But by the end of the second century BC, it also included study of the humanities.

The pastoral and administrative role of the chief official at the gymnasium is worth highlighting. The *gymnasiarchos* (“leader of the gymnasium”) supervised the training of gymnasium members, directed the operations of its teaching staff, and acted as a benefactor for the gymnasium (e.g. by supplying olive oil, providing prizes, paying teachers, and providing heating fuel for the hot baths).²⁰ The *gymnasiarchos* was regularly honored in public inscriptions and embodied the Graeco-Roman ideal of civic leadership. Paul may have seen many such inscriptions erected in honor of gymnasium officials during his missionary travels throughout the eastern Mediterranean, or heard the same honors being proclaimed by a herald at a nearby prominent site.²¹ In addition to the gymnasiarchal inscriptions, Paul may have noticed the ethical maxims of the seven sages—the Delphic canon being an important part of ephebic curriculum—inscribed on a *stele* at the local gymnasium or *palaestra*. He may have even listened to similar maxims expounded in the sermons of the popular philosophers at the market

²⁰ For gymnasiarchal benefactions, see I. Eph. V 1618 (n. 16 above); F. W. Danker, *Benefactor: Epigraphic Study of a Graeco-Roman and New Testament Semantic Field* [St. Louis: Clayton Publishing House, 1982], §17 [*Michel* 327: 133/120 BC]; A. R. Hands, *Charities and Social Aid in Greece and Rome* (London and Southampton: Thames and Hudson, 1968), §D54 (MDAI [A] 1907, 278), §D55 (*OGIS* 339), §D56 (*SIG*³ 714: 100 BC), §D57 (*IG* XII 9[235]), §D58 (*IG* XII 9[1916]). On gymnasiarchal responsibilities, see the Teos decree (n. 16 above).

²¹ Menas (Danker, *Benefactor*, §17) not only had his honorific decree inscribed and erected in the gymnasium, but his honors were to be proclaimed upon his annual crowning at the games. The gymnasiarch Boulagoras (J. Pouilloux, *Choix d'inscriptions Grecques: Textes, traductions et notes* [Paris: Société d'édition Les Belles Lettres, 1960], §3 [*SEG* I 366:243/242 BC]) had his honors proclaimed during the tragedies of the Dionysia, in addition to the decree being inscribed on a *stele* and erected in the sanctuary of Hera. For the proclamation of the crowns awarded ephebes at multiple sites, see Miller, *Arete*, §126 (*SEG* XXVII 261: before 167 BC). For the erection of the decree on a *stele* in multiple sites, see Austin, *Hellenistic World*, §119.

place, or heard them in conversations with interested inquirers or in interactions with his converts.

It is not inconceivable that Paul encountered *gymnasiarchoi* or visited a gymnasium, even though there were strict regulations as to who might enter a gymnasium.²² Although some Jews had scruples about Hellenism and the idolatry of the gymnasium,²³ Philo assumes a gymnasium education for upper class Alexandrian Jews and praises its educational outcomes.²⁴ Inscriptional and papyrus evidence reveals

²² Aeschines (*Tim.* 12) cites a law setting out the strict regulations of entry into the gymnasium. On the exclusivist ethos of ancient gymnasia, see §2.5 below; cf. S. G. Miller, *Ancient Greek Athletics* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2004), 189. The Greek *palaestrae* may have been easier for “outsiders” to enter without prohibition if Socrates’ experience is representative (Plato, *Lysias* 203a–211a). Aristophanes (*Pax* 762–764) notes a character “hanging around *palaestrae* trying to seduce boys.”

²³ L. H. Feldman (*Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World* [Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993], 480 n. 69) cites *Abod. Zar.* 18b, which lambastes Jews for visiting the stadia where naked athletic contests took place. Such attitudes would have been transported to the training institution responsible for the athletes. The authors of 1 and 2 Maccabees (1 Macc 1:11–15; 2 Macc 4:7–14) inveigh against the Hellenism of the high-priest Jason and his supporters who had set up a gymnasium at the foot of the citadel in Jerusalem (175 BC). Significantly, we do not hear of any popular revolt against Jason’s reform. Either the majority supported Jason’s Hellenistic reform at Jerusalem or in the view of many Jews the presence of the gymnasium in the holy city did not compromise Jewish covenantal identity. On the Maccabean sources, see L. L. Grabbe, *Judaism from Cyrus to Hadrian* (London: SCM Press, 1992), 277–84, esp. 280ff. However, the fact that the gymnasia were dedicated to various pagan deities, such as Hermes and Heracles, probably caused more rigorous Jews to view any Diaspora Jew undertaking an ephebic education as violators of the first and second commandments (Exod 20:3–6). The Miletus decree (*SIG³* 577 [200/199 BC]: n. 16 above) stipulates that frankincense be burned to Hermes, the Muses, and Apollo, along with the presentation of prayers for the election of worthy officials. On fines being consecrated to Hermes, Heracles and the Muses, see *SIG³* 578 (200/199 BC: n. 16 above). On sacrifices being offered to Hermes and/or Heracles, see Hands, *Charities*, §D55–§D57. For the cult of the goddess Roma and the athletic games at Miletus, see R. K. Sherk, *Rome and the Greek East to the Death of Augustus* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), §41 (I. Milet I 7:130 BC). In the case of the gymnasium in Jerusalem, there is no evidence that the institution was ever dedicated to Hermes or any other pagan deity (Grabbe, *Judaism*, 278–79). As Grabbe states (*Judaism*, 279), the silence of the author of 2 Maccabees indicates that “neither nude exercise nor any pagan ceremonies were connected with Jason’s gymnasium.” Finally, the *palaestrae* (wrestling schools) were also dedicated to pagan divinities. A terracotta panel in the British museum (Brownley Collection GR 1805.7–3.390 BM Cat. *Terracottas* D632: Roman provenance, made in Italy, I cent. AD) is instructive in this regard. On the right side of the panel, a victorious boxer—whose left fist and forearm is bound with a boxing thong—holds a palm branch and a winner’s ribbon. To the right of the panel, a bust of Hermes, patron god of the wrestlers, stands prominently on a pillar. For Cicero’s comments on the figures of Hermes in the *palaestrae* and gymnasia, see Cicero, *Att.* 1.8–10.

²⁴ See Feldman’s discussion of Philo’s evidence (*Jew*, 57–59). Also, A. Mendelson, *Secular Education in Philo of Alexandria* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College, 1982). Note

that Jewish young men of the Diaspora received ephebic training at the gymnasium²⁵ Not surprisingly Herod the Great, the Hellenist and benefactor, built gymnasia in Ptolemais, Tripolis, and Damascus. Paul as a Jew could not have escaped the pervasive influence of the gymnasium. Moreover, the apostle displays familiarity with the athletic ideal of the Greeks (1 Cor 9:24–27; cf. 1 Tim 4:7–8) and the honors it bestowed (1 Cor 9:25b; cf. 2 Tim 2:5), as was the case with many other first-century Jews.²⁶

The honorific inscriptions of the gymnasium confronted Paul with leadership models of the highest civic merit. But while the ethical ideals of the athletic associations sometimes coincided with those of the apostle, more often than not they radically diverged. What were the consequences of this for Paul as a master builder of communities of faith (1 Cor 3:10)? Surely Paul would have considered how the personal and social transformation effected by the gospel of Christ differed from the transformation effected by the *paideia* (“education”) of the

P. Borgen’s comment (“‘Yes’, ‘No’, ‘How Far?’: The Participation of Jews and Christians in Pagan Cults,” in T. Engberg-Pedersen [ed.], *Paul in His Hellenistic Context* [Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994], 41): “Philo’s writings even betray such an expert knowledge of Greek sports that he himself was active in athletics during his youth.”

²⁵ For Jewish ephebic names and/or patronymics among the lists of gymnasium graduates at Cyrene, Iasos and Coronea, see M. H. Williams, *The Jews among the Greeks and Romans: A Sourcebook* (London: Duckworth, 1998), V.1, 2, 21–23. For an inscription, used as a seat marker in the *palaestra* at Hypaepa, mentioning an association of Jewish young men (νεώτεροι), see Williams, *Jews*, V.24. In a papyrus (7–4 BC: Williams, *Jews*, V.3), the Alexandrian Jew Helenos speaks of his having received, “as far as my father’s means allowed, the appropriate education,” presumably at his father’s “ancestral gymnasium.” But, given that Paul characterizes his childhood upbringing as being “a Hebrew of Hebrews” (Phil 3:5; 2 Cor 11:22; Acts 21:40; 22:2; 26:14), Paul’s parents did not envisage an ephebic education for their son (cf. Acts 22:3; 26:4; Gal 1:14). If Acts 22:3 (cf. 23:16) is historically correct, Paul was brought up as a child in Jerusalem (ἀνατεθραμμένος δὲ ἐν τῇ πόλει ταύτῃ) at the feet of Gamaliel. For further discussion of Diaspora Jews’ gymnasium education, see Dutch, *Educated Elite*, 95–167.

²⁶ See V. Pfitzner, *Paul and the Agon Motif* (Leiden: Brill, 1967); H. A. Harris, *Greek Athletics and the Jews* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1967); R. Garrison, “Paul’s Use of the Athlete Metaphor in 1 Corinthians 9,” in *idem*, *The Graeco-Roman Context of Early Christian Literature* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 95–104; N. C. Croy, *Endurance in Suffering: Hebrews 12:1–13 in Its Rhetorical, Religious, and Philosophical Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 40–58. On Jewish athletic ideals in 4 Maccabees, see D. A. deSilva, “The Noble Contest: Honor, Shame, and the Rhetorical Strategy of 4 Maccabees,” *JNT* 13 (1995): 31–57. C. Toussaint comments regarding Paul’s use of athletic imagery (*L’Hellénisme et l’apôtre Paul* [Paris: Émile Nourry, 1921], 202): “Paul n’a pas eu besoin d’aller aux jeux olympiques, lors de son séjour à Corinthe, pour prendre ses comparaisons: il avait eu depuis longtemps, à Tarse, de pareils spectacles.” Presumably, Paul would have seen gymnsiarchal inscriptions—which embraced a range of leadership ideals, ethics and honors—at Tarsus as well.

gymnasium—or, for that matter, from the practices of the first-century associations more generally.²⁷

In the next section, we discuss the inscriptional portrait of the *gymnasiarchos*. How does Paul respond to the aristocracy of civic merit promoted by the local gymnasia, in so far as his letters touch on areas of common concern? Our aim is to gauge to what degree and in what manner Paul differentiated the transformation of his house church leaders from the character formation offered to the young men of the Hellenistic gymnasia.²⁸ Such a comparison provides insight into the collisions and convergences between early Christian ideals of leadership and those of the late Hellenistic and early imperial city-states.

Admittedly, there remains a gulf between the civic context of the honorific inscriptions and the household context of Paul's letters, not to mention the different rhetorical function of each corpus.²⁹ The polis ensured that the higher moral training for boys of citizen class culminated in the education offered at the gymnasium and *palaestra*. But the rituals of patronage and friendship characterizing the urban elite—with which the gymnasiarch was familiar—trickled down to the local associations and immigrant cults through local benefactors. Paul's house churches, dependent on the generosity of patron-householders, linked themselves into the similar bonds of reciprocity and moral discourse animating the civic leadership of the polis. This line of social continuity (patronage, friendship, affiliation) makes comparison of the two different sets of documentary traditions profitable, especially where the same vocabulary appears in similar contexts.

²⁷ See J. R. Harrison, "Paul's House Churches and the Cultic Associations," *RTR* 58/1 (1999): 31–47.

²⁸ Whereas the *gymnasiarchos* oversaw the transition of the adolescent male body from immaturity to maturity in the civic life of the polis, Paul oversaw the transition of the local "body" of believers, transformed from glory to glory, towards their eschatological maturity in Christ (Rom 12:4–5; 1 Cor 12:12–13; 2 Cor 3:18; Eph 4:11–16; Phil 3:20–4:1). On the "body" in Paul in first-century context, see W. A. Meeks, *The Origins of Christian Morality: The First Two Centuries* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1993), 130–35. The excellent discussion of D. B. Martin (*The Corinthian Body* [New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1995], 25–28) on the upper-class ideology of the male "body" concentrates on Galen's evidence. Martin's discussion could be profitably expanded by a study of the gymnasiarchal inscriptions (§2.a below) on the formation of the bodies of the *epheboi* and *neoi*.

²⁹ I am indebted to the excellent exposition of Meeks, *Origins*, 37–51.

2. Paul and the Ancient Ideals of Civic Leadership

The role of the ancient gymnasiarch has been little studied by classical scholars.³⁰ Consequently, the pastoral role of the gymnasiarch has not fired the interest of New Testament scholars for the light it might throw on Paul as pastor and mentor. The philosophical traditions of pastoral care have been extensively studied in this regard, but not the gymnasiarchal epigraphic evidence.³¹ What portrait of the gymnasiarch emerges from the honorific inscriptions?³² What ideals, ethics and honors form the basis of his pastoral role? What type of community did he seek to build?³³ And how do the communities of the gymnasia compare with the communities of faith that Paul established across the eastern Mediterranean basin? A series of themes emerging from the inscriptions structures our discussion.

2.1. Motivations of the Gymnasiarch

The honorific inscriptions praise the motivation of the gymnasiarchs in upholding and surpassing ancestral honor, as well as bringing glory

³⁰ See Oehler, "Gymnasiarch," 1969–2004; B. A. van Groningen, *Les gymnasiarques des métropoles de l'Égypte Romaine* (Groningen: Noordhoff, 1924); C. A. Forbes, *NEOI: A Contribution to the Study of Greek Associations* (Middletown: American Philological Association, 1933), 21–33; Delorme, *Gymnase*, Index s.v. "Gymnasiarque;" P. J. Sijpesteijn, *Liste de gymnasiarques des métropoles de l'Égypte romaine* (Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 1967); A. J. S. Spawforth, "Gymnasiarch," in S. Hornblower and A. J. S. Spawforth (eds.), *The Oxford Classical Dictionary* (3rd ed.; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 659; A. Evangelos, "Educational Athletic Institutions in Thrace during the Hellenistic and Roman Periods," *ASSH Bulletin* 27 (1997): 15–20; Dutch, *Educated Elite*, 111–17.

³¹ For discussion, see A. J. Malherbe, *Paul and the Thessalonians: The Philosophic Tradition of Pastoral Care* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987); *idem*, *Paul and the Popular Philosophers* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989); Glad, *Paul*.

³² Limited visual evidence exists relating to the *gymnasiarchoi*. A red-figure kylix (Miller, *Athletics*, 187 fig. 272: 480 BC) shows a *gymnasiarchos* supervising an aulos player and aulos singer, and a student performing recitation or spelling. For a useful list of gymnasiarchs (313 in total) in the inscriptions and papyri, see Van Groningen, *Gymnasiarques*, 12–27. This list needs to be supplemented with new gymnasiarchal inscriptions published in *SEG* since Groningen's work.

³³ The magisterial work of Van Groningen on the gymnasiarchs adopts a "functional" approach in describing the role of the gymnasiarchs within the gymnasium (*Gymnasiarques*, 46–116) and in relation to other municipal bodies and subordinate officials (*Gymnasiarques*, 116–30). However, due to the task-focused nature of Groningen's discussion, we do not gauge the *ethos* underlying the educational and pastoral formation of the *paides* implemented by the gymnasiarchs. My discussion below, focusing on the *ethos* of gymnasiarchal inscriptions and the curriculum of the Delphic canon, is intended to amplify Groningen's discussion at this juncture.

to the fatherland. Mantidoros of Eretria was said to have conducted his magistracy “worthily both of himself and of his forefathers,” whereas Q. Flavius Lapianus shows “unparalleled generosity and munificence...going beyond the generous gifts of his forefathers.”³⁴ Menas encouraged the continuance of the cultural contributions of the Sestos gymnasium in order to “bring renown to his home city.”³⁵ The inscription also states that he “aims to acquire for himself and his family imperishable glory.”³⁶

Clearly, ancestral honor was a dominant concern for those who aspired to excel in civic leadership in the first century. What role did ancestral honor play in the apostle Paul’s thought? Did it motivate the early believers in the same way as it did the eulogistic culture around them?

Paul’s attitude to Jewish ancestral honor is different to the civic eulogies of the gymnasiarchal inscriptions.³⁷ Paul does not reject the substantial privileges resulting from his Jewish ancestry (Rom 9:4–5 [cf. 3:1–2]; 11:1, 28b; Phil 3:4b–6). But, in contrast to his Jewish contemporaries, Paul claims that his former pursuit of Jewish ancestral tradition—in which he sought to outstrip his competitors in a way reminiscent of the honorific inscriptions (Gal 1:14)—was based on misguided zeal rather than on true knowledge of God (Rom 10:2). In Paul’s “post-Damascus” perspective,³⁸ such a quest supplanted Christ’s honor as soteriological Benefactor (Phil 2:9–11), misguidedly replacing it with law-keeping and boundary maintenance (Rom 10:3–4; 2 Cor 11:21b–23a; Phil 3:7–11). Indeed, to focus on ancestral privilege at the expense of the divine

³⁴ Hands, *Charities*, §D46 (AD 250).

³⁵ Danker, *Benefactor*, §17 (*Michel* 327: 133/120 BC).

³⁶ The results of the beneficence of Straton of Pergamum (Hands, *Charities*, §D46) is “everlasting praise from those he has benefited, and for them...the most valuable renewal of those things which are advantageous to life.”

³⁷ See J. R. Harrison, “Excels Ancestral Honours,” *New Docs* 9 (2002): 20–21.

³⁸ In using the term “post-Damascus perspective,” I disagree with scholars who, in a polarized way, speak of Paul as being either prophetically “called” or undergoing the equivalent of a modern “psychological” conversion. In the first-century context, the evidence more points to Paul experiencing a Jewish prophetic call (Gal 1:15a: cf. Jer 1:5; Isa 49:1, 6), while also being the undeserving recipient of an extraordinary act of divine patronage that ensued in his commitment to a cruciform Benefactor (Gal 1:15b; cf. 2:20b). See Harrison, *Paul’s Language*, 277–78. For an excellent critique of modern “psychological” approaches to Paul’s conversion, see Crook, *Conversion*, 13–52. Crook argues soundly that anachronistic psychological approaches should be abandoned in favor of the patronal and benefaction paradigms of the first century if we are to understand properly Paul’s change in loyalty commitment.

promise was to misconstrue the nature of covenantal grace: it was originally displayed to Abraham and his ancestors and had now found its fulfillment in Christ (Rom 9:6b–18; 10:4; cf. 4:1–5, 13–14; 9:10). Hence Paul parodies the Graeco-Roman and Jewish boasting conventions of his day—including its preoccupation with ancestral merit—in order to destroy the claims of the intruding apostles at Corinth who had boasted of their Abrahamic descent, among other qualifications (2 Cor 11:22–12:10).³⁹

In sum, Jewish ancestry was advantageous and an occasion of praise to God, but only in so far that it directed its possessor through faith to the seed of Abraham, Jesus Christ (Rom 9:5; Gal 3:15–18). In contrast to his culture, there remains in Paul a reserve towards ancestral merit that was absent from the gymnasiarchal inscriptions. Unlike Menas of Sestos, Paul reserves “imperishable glory” for Christ and for those who labour in His service (1 Cor 2:7–8; 2 Cor 3:18; 4:4, 6; 8:23; Phil 3:20–21; 1 Thess 2:20).

2.2. *The Pastoral Attitude of the Gymnasiarch and His Role as Benefactor*

Another important feature of the inscriptional portrait of the gymnasiarch is the way that he cares for and develops the *epheboi* and *neoi*. Perhaps one of the most moving tributes paid to a gymnasiarch is the Ephesian inscription of the gymnasiarch Mithres:

[...] he was not neglectful, not in the case of the y[oung men] [of their...] and good bearing, treating them with respect, [and...] with understatement and moderation, in all respects arranging his life-style in this place, and he gave attention also to the quality of the young men, both guiding them in training and, as for love of effort both in body and soul, making much of it for the sake of the reputation of the young men being fostered both in word and deed as befitted both the place's existing inherited dignity and fame.⁴⁰

Another example is Straton of Pergamum. Upon entering his office as gymnasiarch, he “sacrificed a steer given by himself, praying to all the gods for the safety of the people and for their unity of heart.”⁴¹ Again,

³⁹ For discussion, see J. R. Harrison, “In Quest of the Third Heaven: Paul and His Apocalyptic Imitators,” *VC* 58/1 (2004): 24–55.

⁴⁰ I. Eph. I 6 (II cent. BC).

⁴¹ Hands, *Charities*, §D54. The gymnasiarch Zosimos of Priene (I. Priene 112) “has not displayed the fruitless return of honour” characteristic of the benefactor who

the educational and pastoral impact of Menas of Sestos upon young men is summed up in this manner:

he not only shared his sacrificial offerings with the young men but through his personal dedication he impressed upon the young men the importance of cultivating discipline and tolerance of hardship, with the result that, being thus engaged in a competition for manliness, the personalities of the younger men are directed in the development of their character towards the goal of merit.⁴²

From these examples one gains a keen sense of the comprehensive pastoral care that the young boys experienced under the gymnasiarchs. There are motifs here with which Paul would have surely agreed—the convergence of word and deed in personal transformation being a conspicuous example, as well as the centrality of unity.⁴³ But there are significant differences as well.

First, Paul's prayers for his converts express both the pastoral out-working of the gospel and his personal knowledge of the situation that his converts are facing.⁴⁴ They do not involve cultic approaches to the deity for favor and security, as is the case with the inscription of Straton of Pergamum, cited above, but are dynamic expressions of the Spirit at work in the body of Christ (Rom 8:15, 23, 26–28; Eph 6:18–19). Secondly, whereas there is a strong masculine tone to the gymnasiarchal pastoral role, Paul employs maternal and paternal images in depicting his pastoral concern for his converts (Gal 4:19; 1 Thess 2:7, 11). Thirdly, over against gymnasiarchal culture, a competition for “manliness” is not the aim for Paul: rather it is the formation of the crucified and risen Christ in the church.⁴⁵

maintains beneficence to the fatherland only while there are people still in need. Rather “(his) beneficence was bestowed towards the people for eternal fame.”

⁴² Danker, *Benefactor*, §17.

⁴³ Rom 13:11–14; Gal 2:14; Eph 2:8–10; 4:15–16; 4:22–24; Phil 1:9–11; 4:8–9; Col 1:9–12; 2:6–8; 3:9–10, 16–17; 1 Thess 1:3–7; 2:8; 2 Thess 2:16–17; 3:6–7, 9–10. On unity, see P. J. Achtemeier, *The Quest for Unity in the New Testament Church* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987); D. L. Peterlin, *Paul's Letter to the Philippians in the Light of Disunity in the Church* (Leiden: Brill, 1995).

⁴⁴ See G. P. Wiles, *Paul's Intercessory Prayers: The Significance of the Intercessory Prayer Passages in the Letters of Paul* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974).

⁴⁵ Rom 8:29; 2 Cor 3:18; Gal 4:19; Eph 1:11–12; 2:6; 20–21; 4:15–16; Phil 3:8–10, 20–21; Col 1:27–28; 2:19; 3:1–2, 11.

Informative, too, are the descriptions of the role of gymnasiarchs as benefactors.⁴⁶ A Pergamene inscription unites the ethical merit of the gymnasiarch with his generosity towards the gymnasium: “not only was he exceedingly thoughtful in supplying many things for the upkeep of the gymnasium, he was also a man of surprising tact and sagacity.”⁴⁷ In the world-view of the inscriptions, the gymnasiarch’s beneficence expresses his conspicuous virtue as a citizen. Whereas civic virtue in the inscriptions is usually static, the fragmentary decree of Amphipolis portrays the justice of the gymnasiarch Philippus as exceeding conventional expectations:

Since Philippus, son of . . . , on being elected gymnasiarch, tried to make the magistracy more conspicuous by his integrity and zeal, . . . And in general he acted justly beyond our expectations, holding the leadership of the *neoi* and the charge of the gymnasium. For the first three months he supplied the oil at his own expense and furthermore, in a noble and magnificent spirit, he gave to the *neoi*, for oil all the money which was apportioned him from the public treasury.⁴⁸

Paradoxically, in contrast to the illustrious Philippus, Paul holds up a dishonored and impoverished benefactor as the model for apostolic ministry (2 Cor 8:9; cf. 6:16b) and for those who, like the Macedonian churches, had stretched well beyond their ability as benefactors (2 Cor 8:9; cf. 8:1–3 [cf. Mark 12:41–44]).⁴⁹ We are witnessing here a dismantling of the inscriptional icons of civic virtue and their replacement by a cruciform Servant-Benefactor (2 Cor 13:4; Phil 2:5–8), notwithstanding the fact that Paul’s portrait of Christ in 2 Cor 8:9 rhetorically functions as a paradoxical counterpart to the inscriptional vignettes of beneficence.⁵⁰

Furthermore, a series of geographically, racially and socially diverse communities of faith are being encouraged to assume corporately the mantle of the Servant-Benefactor and thereby increase the thanksgiving given to God (2 Cor 9:10–11, 15; cf. 4:15). In the new communities of faith, believers are no longer reduced to a suppliant position before

⁴⁶ See the discussion of Forbes, *NEOI*, 26–27.

⁴⁷ *Ath. Mitt.* 33 (1908); 376ff., No. 1. Cited by Forbes, *NEOI*, 24.

⁴⁸ *Jh. Österr.* I (1898); 180ff. Cited by Forbes, *NEOI*, 23.

⁴⁹ For discussion, see Harrison, *Paul’s Language*, 250–56.

⁵⁰ The inscriptions sometimes provide miniature portraits of beneficence, including the sketch of Epigone’s generosity (cf. Hands, *Charities*, §D13) which is framed by the larger inscription in honor of her husband-benefactor, Euphrosynus.

powerful civic benefactors, as in the world of the honorific inscriptions. Rather the return of gratitude is now redirected towards God. Prayer for one's benefactors, therefore, as well as longing in Christian love for them, are the appropriate responses of the grateful recipient (2 Cor 9:14).

2.3. *The Ethics of the Gymnasiarch*

Much could be said regarding the range of virtues (e.g. "love of fame and righteousness" [I. Eph. I 6]; "merit and goodwill";⁵¹ etc.) attributed to the gymnasiarchs in the honorific inscriptions. Such eulogies are consonant with the inscriptions erected to civic benefactors throughout the eastern Mediterranean basin. The virtues mentioned are little more than stereotyped circumlocutions for the benefactor's donations.⁵² What we are looking for is the atypical description that says something striking about the ethical stance of the gymnasiarch. Consider, for instance, the comments of I. Eph. I 6 regarding Mithres:

and for the remaining gymnasium affairs he took care, hating the bad and loving the good, in nothing neglectful of what relates to honour and fame for the sake of establishing as worth of memory and praise the preference he shows for the best.⁵³

Another captivating vignette is found in the decree honouring Zosimos of Priene. He is described as one who strives for "eternal fame,"

rashly seeking after his own pleasure in nothing, and understanding that merit alone returns the greatest fruits and favours to those who treasure virtue in honour before foreigners and citizens.⁵⁴

Finally, an insight into the corporate ethics of the gymnasiarchs can be gleaned from their oath of office, preserved for us on a large marble stele in Verroia in Macedonia. The words of the oath are as follows:

⁵¹ Danker, *Benefactor*, §17.

⁵² Note the pithy comment of Judge ("Teacher," 187): "money has purchased merit."

⁵³ A Pergamene inscription (*Ath. Mitt.* 33 [1908]: 380, No. 2) speaks of the gymnasiarch Agias: "and thinking his watchful presence in the gymnasium most desirable, he never neglected anything in his oversight of the discipline of the *epheboi* and *neoi*; with an austere loathing for evil, he made provision for the observance of good behaviour around the gymnasium."

⁵⁴ I. Priene 112 (84 BC).

I swear by [...] and by Heracles and by Hermes that I will be a *gymnasiarchos* in accordance with the gymnasiarchal law; and that I will do anything and everything not covered by the law in the most just manner I can; and I will not do special favours for my friends nor unjust injuries to my enemies; and from existing revenues for the young neither will I myself steal, nor will I allow anyone else to steal in any way that I might know or discover. I am true to my oath, may all be well with me; if not, may the opposite be my fate.⁵⁵

There are echoes of Pauline sentiments in the ethics of the gymnasiarchal inscriptions. For example, Paul counsels believers to “hate what is evil, hold fast to what is good” (Rom 12:9; cf. 12:21; cf. 1 Thess 5:21). Believers should not please themselves or look only to their own interests (Rom 15:1b; 1 Cor 10:24, 33; Phil 2:4). Indeed, to show favoritism overlooks the impartiality of God (Rom 2:11). Retaliation and revenge are excluded (Rom 12:17–21; 1 Thess 5:15; Col 3:35). Paul takes seriously the truthfulness of his oaths in front of God (2 Cor 1:17–20, 23; 11:30–33). Finally, the thief should no longer steal, but work and use his spare money for the benefaction of the poor (Eph 4:28).

In all of this, Paul endorses commonplaces of Graeco-Roman and Jewish ethics without comment (Rom 12:17b; Phil 4:8). But there is a different dynamic behind Paul’s exhortations. Paul’s commonplaces are expressions of the new way of the Spirit who conforms believers to Christ in a way surpassing the righteous demands of the law (Rom 7:6; 8:4–5, 28–29). This transformed ethical life is tangible proof that believers are living under the reign of grace and are participating in the new creation.

2.4. *The Honours Accorded to the Gymnasiarch*

The return of honor to benefactors such as the gymnasiarchs ensured the operation of the Graeco-Roman reciprocity system.⁵⁶ It maintained the aristocracy of civic merit that was the preserve of benefactors and

⁵⁵ Miller, *Arete*, §126. As regards ethics, note the fines regarding the wrong use of money in the gymnasium (Austin, *Hellenistic World*, §120). The inscriptions sometimes contrast the integrity and competence of gymnasium officials (Pouilloux, *Choix*, §3): “and, elected director of the gymnasium by the people according to the law, on account of the deficiency of the gymnasiarch, (Boulagoras) supervised the good-conduct of the ephebes and the youths fairly and nobly.”

⁵⁶ One of the reasons for the city Sestos honoring the benefactor Menas (Danker, *Benefactor*, §17) is “in order that all might know that Sestos is hospitable to men of exceptional character and ability, especially those who from their earliest youth have

the worthy. It provided the motivation for benefactors to continue their beneficence towards the gymnasium and for new benefactors to compete for the same civic honors with gifts to the city.⁵⁷ Two brief examples will suffice.⁵⁸ For his generosity to the gymnasium of Sestos, the gymnasiarch Menas was to receive annually at the games a gold crown from the *epheboi* and *neoi*, front seating at the games for himself and his descendants, and the erection of a bronze statue of himself.⁵⁹ In the case of the Ephesian gymnasiarch Mithres, a statue was set up in his honor in the gymnasium so that it would encourage everyone “to become emulators of good deeds.”⁶⁰

We have seen how the honors of gymnasiarchs were prominently listed for the emulation of posterity. Paul, too, upholds a principle of christocentric emulation that is transferred to the apostles and co-workers in the gospel (Rom 15:7–9; 1 Cor 11:1; 2 Cor 8:1–5, 9 [cf. 6:10];

shown themselves devoted to the common good and have given priority to the winning of a glorious reputation.”

⁵⁷ The benefactor Menas (Danker, *Benefactor*, §17) is honored “(so) that also all others, as they see the People bestowing honours on exceptional men, might emulate the noblest qualities and be moved to virtue, to the end that the common good might be advanced as all aim ever to win a reputation for doing something beneficial for our home city.”

⁵⁸ This article does not explore in depth the honors rendered to the imperial rulers by gymnasiarchs in local gymnasia. Adrustus, the gymnasiarch of Lapethus in Cyprus, set up in his gymnasium a cult statue of Tiberius “from his own monies for his own god (i.e. Tiberius)” (OGIS 583 [I cent. AD], trans. B. W. Jones and R. D. Milns, *The Use of Documentary Evidence in the Study of Roman Imperial History* [Sydney: Sydney University, 1984], §74). A first-century AD inscription from Arnaea honors Lallia as “priestess of the Emperor’s cult and gymnasiarch” (see below §3.e. n. 95). The original Hellenistic maxims of the Delphic canon, discussed in §§3.a–3.e, might have been pastorally redeployed by the gymnasiarchs to teach the boys to honor appropriately the Julio-Claudian ruler-benefactors—and the Roman gods more generally—in the first century (e.g. Stobaeus, *Eclogae* III 1.173: Sosiades No. 3 [“Worship the gods”]; Sosiades No. 59 [“Honour benefactions”]; Sosiades No. 65 [“Honour the good ones”]; I. Kyzikos II 2 Col. 2 No. 20 [“Worship divinity”]). On Paul’s subtle response to the imperial rulers—simultaneously honoring (Rom 13:7b) and demoting them (13:1b, 2a, 4a, 4b, 6b; cf. 1 Cor 8:4–6)—see J. R. Harrison, *Paul and the Imperial Authorities at Thessalonica and Rome* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, forthcoming, 2009), Ch. 7.

⁵⁹ Danker, *Benefactor*, §17. For further examples of the crowning of gymnasiarchs and ephebes, see I. Priene 114 (84 BC); Hands, *Charities*, §D56; Austin, *Hellenistic World*, §117. For the erection of an honorific statue, see I. Eph. I 6 (II cent. BC).

⁶⁰ I. Eph. I 6 (II cent. BC). On emulation, see Judge, “Teacher.” An inscription from Kyme (R. A. Kearsley, “A Civic Benefactor of the First Century in Asia Minor,” *New Docs* 7 [1994]: 233–41) notes how Kleanax’s provision of *paideia* for his son Sarapion encouraged the boy to become a civic benefactor like his father: “(Kleanax) took thought for the boy’s education in letters, and provided for the people a man worthy of his family, Sarapion (by name), and a protector and helper, one who has in many ways has already displayed zeal toward the city through his own manly deeds.”

Gal 6:17; Eph 5:1–2; Phil 2:4–5; 3:17; 1 Thess 1:6–7; 2:14; 2 Thess 3:7).⁶¹ He gives honor to those whose service is worthy of special honor (e.g. Rom 16:1–23; 1 Cor 16:10; 2 Cor 8:16–24; Phil 3:19–30; Col 4:7–17). Paul's use of honor terminology is too widespread to claim that he subverts first-century honorific culture, notwithstanding the fact that he democratizes the allocation of honor (Rom 12:10b) and extends it to the base of the social pyramid (1 Cor 12:24).

But what was Paul's attitude to the coronal honoring of illustrious men?⁶² Paul and the early believers reject these coronal honors or formulate them differently in a bold re-definition of civic honor. First, Paul postponed the allocation of crowns until the eschaton (1 Cor 9:25; Phil 4:1; 1 Thess 2:19; cf. 2 Tim 2:5; 4:8; Jas 1:12; 1 Peter 5:4; Rev 2:10; 3:11), though both Paul and 1 Peter recognize the possibility of Christian benefactors receiving honors (including crowns) from the ruling authorities (Rom 13:3b; cf. 13:7b; 1 Pet 2:14–16).⁶³ Secondly, there was little interest in the wide variety of Hellenistic crown-types or the other civic honors. In this respect, Paul dismissed the Isthmian coronal honors as “fading” (φθαρτός: 1 Cor 9:25). Thirdly, Paul and the early believers viewed the crowning ritual as a corporate experience. While the *demos* of a Hellenistic city-state did occasionally crown another city-state (I. Assos 8; Demosthenes, *Cor.* 92–93), usually the ritual was reserved for members of the civic elite or local dignitaries such as the gymnasiarch. Only the decrees of the local associations—which aped the honorific conventions of the Hellenistic city-states—extended their titles, awards and privileges down the social ladder. As noted, Paul and the early believers democratized the coronal honor and postponed its conferral to the eschaton.

Moreover, in crowning the *ekklesia* at the eschaton, Paul claims that God had inverted social hierarchy and status (1 Cor 1:26–29; cf. Matt 19:28–30; Luke 14:7–11). The apostle's portrait of Christ—the unrequited Benefactor requited by God—underscores this reversal. Christ, the infinitely rich Benefactor reduced to destitute slave status (Phil

⁶¹ For general discussion, see Judge, “Teacher.” On Paul's exhortatory use of positive and negative models, see Ben Witherington III, *Friendship and Finances in Philippi: The Letter of Paul to the Philippians* (Valley Forge: Trinity Press International, 1994), 19–20.

⁶² For discussion, see J. R. Harrison, “A Share in All the Sacrifices,” *New Docs* 9 (2002): 1–3; *idem*, “The Fading Crown: Divine Honour and the Early Christians,” *JTS* 54/2 (2003): 493–529.

⁶³ B. W. Winter, *Seek the Welfare of the City: Christians as Benefactors and Citizens* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 25–40.

2:7–8; 2 Cor 8:9), had suffered profound dishonor (1 Cor 1:23; 2 Cor 13:4a; Gal 3:13b). But exalted by God's intervention, He became the focal point of divine honor (Phil 2:9–11; Rom 1:4; cf. Eph 1:20–21). In the heavenly court, however, God remains the object of all adoration and honor: so, at the eschaton, Christ is made subject to His Father so that God may be all in all (1 Cor 15:28). Thus, in democratizing the crowning ritual and redirecting honor towards Christ and supremely to God, Paul was engaging in a critique of the Graeco-Roman honor system, at least in its coronal expression.

2.5. *The Exclusivist Ethos of Gymnasiarchal Law*

Finally, an intriguing insight into the exclusivist ethos of the gymnasium and its personnel is found in the Macedonia gymnasiarchal law at Verroia:

Concerning those who are not to enter the gymnasium. No slave is to disrobe in the gymnasium, not any freedman, not their sons, nor cripples (ἀπάλαιστρος), nor homosexuals (ἡται[ρ]ευκός: literally, “one who has prostituted himself”), nor those engaged in commerce (τῶν ἀγοραῖαι τέχνη κεκρημένων: literally, “using a marketplace skill”), nor drunkards, nor madmen. If the *gymnasiarchos* knowingly allows any of the aforementioned to be oiled, or continues to allow them after having received a report of them, he is to be penalised 1,000 drachmas.⁶⁴

What is Paul's attitude to the maintenance of group boundaries? His stance is more complex than the exclusivism of the ancient gymnasia. While Paul sets clear group boundaries for the members of his house churches (e.g. 1 Cor 5:1–13; 6:9–11; 10:14–22; Gal 1:8–10; 2 Cor 6:14–7:1), he is socially and ethically more radical than the conservative legislators of the gymnasia. He resists exclusivism of all kinds—whether

⁶⁴ Miller, *Arete*, §126. Austin (*Hellenistic World*, §118) translates “cripples” (ἀπάλαιστρος [L.S]: “not trained in the *palaestra*,” “awkward”) more literally as “if he has not been to the wrestling-school.” In the view of T. K. Hubbard (ed.), *Homosexuality in Greece and Rome* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003), 85 n. 102, ἀπάλαιστρος is “of uncertain meaning, but probably refers to those who are qualified to enter the gymnasium in other respects, but do not attend due to a lack of physical fitness.” Hubbard transliterates ἀπάλαιστρος, not attempting an English translation. Perhaps ἀπάλαιστρος was a “catch-all” term intended to disqualify a range of physically deficient people from entering the wrestling school and gymnasium. It excluded those who did not have the requisite wrestling training and/or fitness. It also disqualified from wrestling those who were now physically disabled—presumably due to a competition injury or an accident.

it was the elevation of rhetoric and pneumatic gifts over the “ordinary” *charismata*,⁶⁵ judgmental attitudes over food and calendar laws,⁶⁶ ethnic and gender bias,⁶⁷ or socially divisive actions.⁶⁸ Paul calls upon the believing wife or husband to live in peace with the unbelieving spouse (1 Cor 7:12–16); he seeks to restore an offending church leader to his community of faith (2 Cor 2:5–11; 7:12). What removes exclusivism from the church is the loving acceptance of the other person in light of the cross (Rom 14:15; 15:7; 1 Cor 8:11–12) and the unity of the Spirit arising from justification by faith (Rom 3:27–31; 1 Cor 3:16–17; Gal 3:28; 6:15; Col 3:11).

What is intriguing is the way that Paul relativises the social stigma attached to many of the despised groups listed in the gymnasiarchal law at Verroia. The master-slave hierarchy is inverted because of the new relationship of brotherhood established in Christ (1 Cor 7:22; Gal 3:28; Phlm 15–16). Drunkenness is condemned (Rom 13:13; 1 Cor 5:11; 6:10; Gal 5:21; Eph 5:18), but only as one vice among others. The gymnasiarchal law forbids the presence of homosexuals, probably because the gymnasium, if unsupervised, provided opportunities for pederasty.⁶⁹ But, in Paul’s view, while homosexual sin is forbidden (Rom 1:24–28; 1 Cor 6:9–11), former homosexuals could experience the transforming newness of the resurrection life in the body of Christ in the same way as other believers (1 Cor 6:12).⁷⁰ While Paul never mentions

⁶⁵ 1 Cor 1:12–13; 3:4–9, 16–22; 4:6, 14–20; 2 Cor 10:10; 11:6.

⁶⁶ Rom 14:3–4, 10, 13, 19; 1 Cor 8:1–13; 10:23–11:1; Gal 2:11–14.

⁶⁷ Rom 11:18; Gal 3:28; 6:15; Eph 2:11–22; Col 3:11.

⁶⁸ 1 Cor 11:17–22.

⁶⁹ See Miller, *Athletics*, 189–93; D. Vanhove, “Gymnase,” 72–74; cf. K. J. Dover, *Greek Homosexuality* (London: Duckworth, 1978). Note the law cited by Aeschines (*In Tim.* 12): “The superintendents (οἱ γυμνασιάρχαι) of the gymnasium shall under no conditions allow anyone who has reached the age of manhood to enter the contests of Hermes together with the boys. A gymnasiarch who does permit this and fails to keep such a person out of the gymnasium, shall be liable to the penalties prescribed for the seduction of free-born youth.”

⁷⁰ Paul’s terminology for same-sex relations differs from the gymnasiarchal law of Verroia in Macedonia (n. 63 above). Whereas the Verroian law refers to the exclusion of male prostitutes (ἡται[ρ]εύκως) from the gymnasium, Paul excludes unrepentant μαλακοί and ἀρσενοκοῖται from God’s eschatological Kingdom (1 Cor 6:9). Like several other Jewish writers (e.g. Josephus [*Ag. Ap.* 2.273: παρὰ φύσιν]; Philo [*Spec. Leg.* 3.39; *Abt.* 133–136: παρὰ φύσιν]; *T. Naph.* 3.3–4: ἐντήλλαξε τάξιν φύσεως), Paul speaks against the “unnaturalness” of same-sex relations (Rom 1:26: μετήλλαξαν τὴν φύσικην χρήσιν εἰς τὴν παρὰ φύσιν; 1:27: ἀφέντες τὴν φύσικην χρήσιν τῆς θηλείας), in contrast to the “naturalness” of married relations in Jewish thought (e.g. Gen 1:27–28; 2:24; Josephus, *Ag. Ap.* 2.199: κατὰ φύσιν). For Graeco-Roman sources on male prostitution and the relation of sexuality to “nature,” see Hubbard (ed.), *Homosexuality*, s.v. Index

explicitly the physically disabled (if ἀπάλαιοι is correctly translated as “cripples”), they are subsumed under the rubric of Christ’s power being displayed in weakness (1 Cor 1:18–29; 4:10–13; 2 Cor 4:7–12;

“Prostitution,” “Nature.” Several scholars have recently challenged this “Jewish” reading of Paul regarding sexual relations. In their view, the traditional approach above does not address the issue of same sex relations with historical and exegetical integrity because it is fraught with modern misconceptions about the construction of ancient sexuality. First, D. B. Martin (“*Arsenokoitēs* and *Malakos*: Meanings and Consequences,” in R. L. Brawley [ed.], *Biblical Ethics and Homosexuality* [Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1996], 117–36) proposes that ancient constructions of sexuality are vastly different to modern sexist ideology. He argues that μαλακοί refers to those who are “effeminate,” whereas in the vice lists ἀρσενικοῦται denotes only economically exploitive sex. However, “effeminacy” was a feature of some Graeco-Roman constructions of homosexuality (Hubbard [ed.], *Homosexuality*, §7.18, §8.20, §9.12 [cf. §3.10, §3.23]) and, from a Jewish viewpoint, it included the penetration of passive partners (Philo, *Spec. Leg.* 3.37–42; *Abr.* 135–136; cf. *Sib. Or.* 3.185–188, 595–600, 760–764). Contrary to Martin (“*Arsenokoitēs*,” 119), Paul, as a first-century Jew, probably derived the compound ἀρσενικοῖτης from the separate use of the words ἄρσιν and κοίτης condemning homosexuality in Lev 18:22 and 20:13. The Levitical holiness code is the most obvious referent for Paul’s use of the compound here, especially given that in Romans Paul also reapplies the LXX Levitical language for various types of sexual impurity between people of the opposite sex (ἀκάθαρτος: LXX Lev 15:24; ἀκαθαρσία: LXX 20:21) to sexual impurity between people of the same sex (ἀκαθαρσία: Rom 1:24). Secondly, D. L. Balch (“Romans 1:24–27, Science, and Homosexuality,” *CurTM* 25/6 [1998]: 433–40) claims that Paul only condemns *compulsive* same-sex relations, in a manner similar to the psychological portraits of sexual addiction in the medical treatises (i.e. Ps.-Aristotle, *Problemata*; Soranus, *Gynecology*). However, this distinction overlooks Paul’s link of same-sex relations with his condemnation of idolatry and its inversion of inviolable creation boundaries (Rom 1:19–23, 25; cf. vv. 24, 26), a connection also made in the Jewish literature (e.g. Wis 14:12, 26–27; *T. Naph.* 3.2–4; Ps.-Phocylides 3, 8; *Jub.* 20:6–8; 22:22; *T. Jacob* 7.20; Josephus, *Ag. Ap.* 2:273–275). Thirdly, D. B. Martin (“Heterosexism and the Interpretation of Romans 1:18–32,” *BibInt* 3 [1995]: 332–55) argues that in Romans 1 homosexual intercourse is not a symptom of a “Fall” from a pristine creation (Gen 1–3) but is more a symptom of Gentile idolatry and polytheism. S. K. Stowers (*A Rereading of Romans: Justice, Jews, and Cultures* [New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1994], 122–25) also proposes that Paul’s rhetoric in Rom 1:18–32 originates in the widespread “decline of civilization” accounts in which unnatural behaviour and the loss of reason is a common motif. For Paul, however, same-sex relations blur the inviolable distinction between “male” and “female” that God established at the creation (Rom 1:26–27 [v. 26: αἱ θήλειαι αὐτῶν; v. 27: οἱ ἄρσενες]; cf. LXX Gen 1:27: ἄρσεν καὶ θήλυ), in the same way that idolatry and polytheism blur God’s own separation from his creation (Gen 1–2; Rom 1:21–23, 25; cf. vv. 24, 26). As P. F. Esler notes regarding Rom 1:21ff. (*Conflict and Identity in Romans: The Social Setting of Paul’s Letter* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003] 149), “Paul is not concerned with the invention of idolatry for its own sake, although he does explain how it came about (1:21–23), nor does he put forward some diachronic narrative of decline.” Instead, Paul portrays the manifestation of God’s wrath (Rom 1:18) towards all human sinfulness against the backdrop of creation which not only reflects the invisible qualities of its Creator (Rom 1:20) but which also possesses inviolable boundaries that must not be violated by human beings (1:21–23, 26b, 27a).

6:8–10; 11:16–12.10; 13:4).⁷¹ As far as the despised trades, Paul did not balk at socially stepping down to work with his hands as a slavish artisan (2 Cor 11:7; 1 Thess 2:9; cf. 4:1–11; 2 Thess 3:7–8).⁷²

We turn to a discussion of the maxims from the Delphic canon found in the ancient gymnasia. What would Paul have made of their ethical agenda in the pastoral and social formation of the *epheboi*?

3. *Paul and the Ethical Ideals of the Gymnasium*

We have drawn attention to the fact that the study of ethics was an important part of the curriculum of the late Hellenistic gymnasia. Sosiades' collection of the maxims of the famous seven sages—cited *in extenso* by Stobaeus (Σωσιάδου τῶν ἐπὶ σοφῶν ὑοθήκαι, from Stobaeus, *Ecl.* III 1.173)—was the foundational ethical curriculum taught to the *epheboi* in the Greek East. Sosiades is unknown to us, but his collection of the maxims of the seven sages is found in the fifth-century AD anthology of Stobaeus. These maxims, better known to us as the Delphic canon, had been inscribed at Delphi for all to see (Plato, *Prot.* 343A–B; *Charm.* 165A; *Hipparch.* 229A; Plutarch, *Mor.* 385D–E).

Many of the Delphic maxims have been found inscribed—with minor variations—at the gymnasium (?) at Miletopolis in the Hellespont (I. Kyzikos II 2 col. 1 [IV–III cent. BC]). Another version of the Delphic canon has been found at the gymnasium of the ephebes at Thera (*IG XII*[3] 1020: IV cent. BC), though the Therean version is more fragmentary. Thus the ethics of the Delphic canon had spread throughout the eastern Mediterranean gymnasia. The widespread dissemination of the Delphic maxims and the meticulous care taken in their transmission

⁷¹ L. L. Welborn (*Paul, the Fool of Christ: A Study of 1 Corinthians 1–4 in the Comic-Philosophic Tradition* [London and New York: T. & T. Clark, 2005], 142–47) argues that “aesthetic disdain, uniting the weak and deformed with the crucified,” belonged to the gallows humor of the cross. In the comic mimes, the socially inferior and the physically defective (often slaves and the poor) are regularly threatened with crucifixion. But, in Paul’s thought, weakness and deformity becomes a locus for the demonstration of God’s cruciform power and wisdom (1 Cor 1:18–19, 25; 2 Cor 13:4; cf. 2 Cor 8:9a; Phil 2:7).

⁷² R. F. Hock, *The Social Context of Paul’s Ministry* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980), *passim*; E. A. Judge, “The Social Identity of the First Christians: A Question of Method in Religious History,” *JRH* 11 (1980–81): 213–14.

can be gauged from their presence at Egypt (P.Ath.Univ. inv. 2782 [I/II cent. AD]) and at Ai-Khanum on the Oxus (Afghanistan).⁷³

We will now compare the ethical curriculum of the gymnasia of Miletopolis and Thera with the ethical exhortations of Paul to his house churches. How would Paul have viewed the pastoral formation sponsored by the ancient gymnasium?

3.1. *Methodological Problems in Comparing the Delphic Canon with Paul*

Before we compare the maxims of the Delphic canon with the writings of Paul, several methodological problems must be aired.

First, what significance do we attach to the presence of well-known semantic domains in the Delphic canon but which are absent from Paul's letters? Has the domain failed to capture Paul's interest or is the apostle avoiding it for some reason?⁷⁴ Does Paul resort to another semantic domain in order to express the same idea? If so, why? Does the domain retain nuances about which Paul is uneasy? It is difficult to answer definitively these questions. But an understanding of how Paul's semantic domains intersected with the ethical vocabulary of his day illuminates his approach to leadership formation.

Secondly, where there is an overlap of a semantic domain between Paul and the Delphic canon, the exegetical context of Paul's writings must be respected. Only then can we be sure that Paul is endorsing an ethical commonplace. The distinctiveness of Paul's gospel must not be blurred at the expense of semantic overlaps.

Thirdly, in discussing the presence or absence of a semantic domain, the stance of Paul and the Delphic canon on various social issues should be examined within a spectrum of documentary and literary evidence.

⁷³ On Egypt, see A.N. Oikonomides, "The Lost Delphic Inscription with the Commandments of the Seven and *P. Univ. Athen* 2782," *ŽPE* 37 (1980): 179–83. In the case of Ai-Khanum, the Delphic maxims were inscribed on a third-century BC stele erected by Clearchus (of Soli?) in the sanctuary of Cineas, the founder of the city. In the epigram on the front base of the stele, Clearchus says that the maxims on the stele came from a copy that he had *personally* transcribed while at Delphi. See L. Robert, "De Delphes a l'Oxus: Inscriptions grecques nouvelles de la Bactriane," *Comptes Rendues de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres* (1968): 416–57; l'Institut Fernand Courby, *Nouveau choix d'inscriptions grecques* (Paris: Société d'édition Les Belles Lettres, 1971), §37. I am indebted to Judge ("Ancient Beginnings," 468–82), for these references.

⁷⁴ For example, the maxim "flee hatred" (I. Kyzikos II 2 Col. 2 No. 28) is not used at all in Paul. Paul's advises believers to flee immorality (1 Cor 6:18) and idolatry (1 Cor 10:14).

Then we will avoid the twin dangers of overstating the historical evidence or indulging in historical abstraction.

Fourthly, the Delphic canon places the sages' maxims in the agonistic context of the ancient gymnasium. In the inscriptions of Miletopolis and Thera, the singular form of the imperative is always used. The focus of the sages is on the self-knowledge of the individual ("Know yourself:" *IG XII 3.1020 4*). The overwhelming concern of Delphic ethics is self-interest ("Look after yourself:" *I. Kyzikos II 2 Col. 2 No. 4*; "Look after your own things:" *I. Kyzikos II 2 Col. 1 No. 20*; "Use your advantage:" *I. Kyzikos II 2 Col. 1 No. 25*), self-control ("Nothing to excess:" *IG XII 3.1020 No. 3*), and self-protection ("Avoid commitment: you'll pay for it:" *IG XII 3.1020 No. 1*).⁷⁵ Social attitudes are canvassed only in so far as they impinge on the individual's maintenance of harmonious relationships with others. The social agenda of the sages is intended to enable individuals to establish self-sufficiency and to preserve concord when faced with social collisions.

Paul's ethical exhortations, by contrast, are embedded in rhetorically complex and highly argumentative epistles intended to be read out aloud to local communities of faith (*Col 4:16*; *1 Thess 5:27*). The frequent use of the plural imperative underscores Paul's intention that his house churches experience communal transformation in Christ, whether they were confronting external cultural pressures (*Rom 12:1–2*) or dealing with self-centered behavior inside the house churches (*Rom 13:9–10*; *15:7–9*; *1 Cor 10:33–11:1*; *Phil 2:3–5*; *Gal 5:14*; *6:2*). We can speak more definitively about the social context of Paul's ethical teaching than we can about the sages' teaching.

Fifthly, our task of penetrating the social world of the Delphic maxims is made doubly difficult by the fact that "for all their apparent simplicity, or because of it, their meaning lay wide open to interpretation."⁷⁶ A clear translation of some of the maxims is problematical. We cannot discern the organizational principle behind Sodiades' canon, assuming that it had one.⁷⁷ Also the stele of Miletopolis includes elements not found in the canon of Sodiades (*I. Kyzikos II 2 Col. 1 Nos. 3, 4, 5*; *I.*

⁷⁵ Judge, "Ancient Beginnings," 476.

⁷⁶ Judge, "Ancient Beginnings," 474.

⁷⁷ Over against Delphic canon, Paul's careful placement of select ethical traditions contributes rhetorically, contextually, and theologically to his overall argument. Note Paul's use of the Jesus tradition in *Romans 12–15* (M. Thompson, *Clothed with Christ: The Example and Teaching of Jesus in Romans 12:1–15:13* [Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991]).

Kyzikos II 2 Col. 2 Nos. 18, 19, 20), even though the stele probably carried the entire 147 maxims of Sosiades' collection.⁷⁸ Moreover, as E. A. Judge notes,⁷⁹ I. Kyzikos II 2 marginally varies Sosiades' order. The stele at Thera (*IG XII 3.1020*) is too fragmentary to draw any firm conclusion regarding its handling of the Delphic traditions. Whatever we make of these differences, the difficulty of comparing the Delphic canon to Paul's ethical exhortations should be obvious. In many respects, the ethical commands of Jesus, found in different Synoptic contexts, provide a more congenial corpus for comparison with the Delphic canon than the epistles of Paul.

Notwithstanding, a comparison of the Delphic gymnasium curriculum with Paul's ethical teaching of his houses churches, while tentative in its conclusions, enables us to situate Paul's ethical ideals of leadership in the context of the late Hellenistic gymnasium.

3.2. *Differences between Paul and the Delphic Canon*

Many of the Delphic maxims are sharply polarized to Paul's theological viewpoint. Two Delphic maxims (I. Kyzikos II 2 Col. 1 Nos. 6 ["Allow for chance"], 7 ["Honour providence"]) assert that life should be lived out reverently before the hypostasized deities, Tyche and Pronoia, who control human affairs. Paul, however, proposes that believers cannot be separated from the love of the crucified, risen and reigning Christ (Rom 8:31–39; cf. Ephes 1:19–21; 2.6), no matter what their circumstances might be (contra: I. Kyzikos II 2 Col. 2 No. 17 ["Fear what controls you"]).

There are other collisions between the Delphic canon and Paul's theology. Oath-taking for Paul is a mark of his apostolic truthfulness before God (2 Cor 1:17–20, 23; 11:30–33), whereas a maxim from Miletropolis asserts that oath-taking is to be avoided (I. Kyzikos II 2 Col. 1 No. 8 ["Use no oath"]; cf. Matt 5:33–37). Conversely, the Delphic insistence that secrets be kept hidden (I. Kyzikos II 2 Col. 2 No. 16 ["Keep secrets hidden"]) does not square with Paul's sense of openness before God and others (Rom 2:16; 16:25; 1 Cor 14:25; Eph 5:12–13), or with the apocalyptic unveiling of all things in Christ (1 Cor 3:7–10; 10:11; Eph 3:3, 6). A maxim urging the cultivation of nobility (I. Kyzikos II 2 Col. 1 No. 17 ["Cultivate nobility/the family"])

⁷⁸ Judge, "Ancient Beginnings," 475.

⁷⁹ Judge, "Ancient Beginnings," 475.

sits uneasily with Paul's portrait of the social inversion accomplished through the cross (1 Cor 1:26–29). The (Stoic?) admonition to “toil gloriously” (I. Kyzikos II 2 Col. 2 No. 7; cf. I. Kyzikos II 2 Col. 1 No. 11 [“Pursue glory”]) and to persevere to the end (I. Kyzikos II 2 Col. 2 No. 1 [“Go through with it, unflinchingly”]) does not approximate the experience of weakness and power and of death and life in the ministry of the apostles (2 Cor 4:7–12; 6:4–10; 11:21–12:10; 13:4). The same could be said about the injunction “Don’t boast in strength” (I. Kyzikos II 2 Col. 2 No. 23). It does not capture the social humiliation of Paul boasting in his weaknesses (2 Cor 11:30; 12:9b–10).

Further examples are easily multiplied. Being “sociable” and “approachable” (I. Kyzikos II 2 Col. 1 No. 19; I. Kyzikos II 2 Col. 2 No. 5) or practicing consensus (I. Kyzikos II 2 Col. 2 No. 14 [“Pursue/practice consensus”]) is far removed from the Spirit-endowed *κοινωνία* (“fellowship”) uniting converts. Although being “well spoken” was important in ephebic culture (I. Kyzikos II 2 Col. 1 No. 23; I. Kyzikos II 2 Col. 2 No. 26), Paul dismisses the importance of rhetorical eloquence (1 Cor 1:20; 2:3–5; 4:20; 2 Cor 10:10–11; 11:6; 1 Thess 2:5). Neither does the Delphic idea of acting promptly (I. Kyzikos II 2 Col. 2 No. 12), accepting one’s opportunity (I. Kyzikos II 2 Col. 2 No. 21) or deliberating in time (I. Kyzikos II 2 Col. 2 No. 11) capture the eschatological “now” of Paul’s gospel (Rom 5:6; 13:11; 1 Cor 7:29; 10:11b; 2 Cor 6:2; Gal 4:4; Eph 5:16; Col 4:5). Even the Delphic acceptance of “old age” (I. Kyzikos II 2 Col. 2 No. 24) obscures Paul’s eschatological orientation. According to Paul, God is daily renewing the believer’s inner nature in preparation for the “eternal weight of glory beyond all comparison” at the resurrection age (Rom 13:11; 2 Cor 3:17–18; cf. 5:8; Phil 1:21).

Finally, in place of Delphic knowledge of self (*IG* XII 3.1020 No. 4 [“Know/recognize yourself”]), Paul emphasizes how the knowledge of God, founded upon the crucified and risen Christ, is mediated through his Spirit and evidenced in our love for the weak (Rom 8:26–27; Phil 3:10; 1 Cor 8:2; Eph 1:18). The Delphic injunction to “get wealth justly” (I. Kyzikos II 2 Col. 2 No. 30) also runs counter to Paul’s theology of the incarnation. The apostle exhorts his converts to concentrate more on the divestment of wealth than its acquisition (2 Cor 8:1–5, 9). Indeed, Christ’s poverty (2 Cor 8:9) serves as a paradigm for apostolic ministry generally (2 Cor 6:10; cf. 11:27; Phil 4:12).⁸⁰

⁸⁰ See Harrison, *Paul’s Language*, 250–56.

In sum, there is a significant divide between the understanding of leadership evinced by the ancient gymnasia and Paul's early house churches. The result of character formation envisaged in each case was fundamentally different.

3.3. *Commonplaces between Paul and the Delphic Canon*

There are several Pauline commonplaces that have affinities with the ethics of the Delphic canon. Nonetheless, we must be sensitive to the distinctive emphases of the gospel that drive Paul's ethical exhortation. They illustrate Paul's ethics of leadership, in both their social and ecclesiastical dimensions. A series of examples will establish the point.

First, the maxim "Reply at the right time" (I. Kyzikos II 2 Col. 2 No. 6) echoes Paul's sentiments regarding well-timed gracious speech (Col 4:5–6). However, the redemptive role which proper conduct and speech plays in persuading unbelievers lifts Paul's exhortation to a different level. Paul's aim was to transfer the unbeliever to Christ's inclusive community through the gracious example of transformed believers (Col 4:7–17).

Secondly, Paul speaks of fixing one's sight on what is unseen (2 Cor 4:18), whereas a Delphic maxim directs "Control your eye" (I. Kyzikos II 2 Col. 2 No. 9; cf. Matt 5:27–30). There is only a surface similarity here. Paul more emphasizes the divine enlightenment of the eyes of the believer's heart (Eph 1:18; Gal 3:1) and the responsibility to do right in the sight of the Lord before everyone (Rom 12:17; 2 Cor 8:21). This interaction of divine transformation and the believer's responsibility unveils the apostle's understanding of moral accountability in leadership.

Thirdly, Paul's emphasis on repentance is echoed in the Delphic canon ([ἀ]μαρτῶν μετανόει: I. Kyzikos II 2 Col. 2 No. 8 ["If you err, turn back"]), though the Delphic version does not carry Paul's God-centered focus (e.g. Rom 2:4; 2 Cor 7:9, 10; 12:21; 2 Tim 2:25). The same difference in focus, though more christologically centered in this case, marks off Delphic perseverance in faith (I. Kyzikos II 2 Col. 2 No. 29 ["Don't (give up?) trusting"]) from Paul's understanding of perseverance in faith (1 Cor 1:4–9; Phil 1:6 [cf. 2:12–13]).

Fourthly, the Delphic insistence upon breaking up enmities or a quarrel (I. Kyzikos II 2 Col. 2 No. 22; cf. I. Kyzikos II 2 Col. 1 No. 16 ["Hold off your enemies"]) finds profound theological expression in Paul when he explains how God has extinguished the hostility of Jew

and Gentile through the cross (Eph 2:14). Moreover, Paul draws upon the Jesus tradition to underscore love of the enemy and the principle of non-retaliation (Rom 12:14–15, 19–21; cf. Matt 5:38–48; cf. I. Kyzikos II 2 Col. 2 No. 13 [“Metē out justice”]). In the Delphic canon there is no sense of a divinely transformed community that will break down social divisions through the reconciliation of antagonists.

These contrasts are boldly drawn, given our methodological cautions aired above. Undoubtedly, there were elements of Delphic ethics that Paul could wholeheartedly endorse or modify. For example, the Delphic maxim to “hold to training” (I. Kyzikos II 2 Col. 1 No. 10) is affirmed, though somewhat differently understood by Paul. He limits *paideia* to the parental oversight of children (Eph 6.4; cf. I. Kyzikos II 2 Col. 1 No. 25 [“Train your sons”]) and, if the Pastorals are Pauline, to the supervisory role of the Scriptures (2 Tim 3:16). Moreover, Paul deems virtue as praiseworthy (Phil 4:8) in a manner reminiscent of the Delphic canon (I. Kyzikos II 2 Col. 1 No. 12 [“Praise virtue”]). Avoidance of evil (I. Kyzikos II 2 Col. 1 No. 18 [“Keep way from evil”]; cf. Rom 12:9, 21; 1 Thess 5:21), hatred of arrogance (I. Kyzikos II 2 Col. 1 No. 22 [“Hate arrogance”]; cf. Rom 12:10b, 16b), and faithfulness to agreements (I. Kyzikos II 2 Col. 2 No. 31 [“(Stick by) agreements”]; cf. 2 Cor 1:17–23) are also consonant with Paul’s ethical concerns.

But while there are ethical commonplaces in Paul and the Delphic canon, Paul formulates their outworking corporately rather than individually. He focuses on the reconciliation wielded by God through the cross in the believing community; it creates sensitivity and receptivity towards the outsider; it creates a sense of accountability for group behavior; and it eliminates deep-seated social, racial and gender barriers.

3.4. *Case Study on the Reciprocity System: Paul and the Delphic Canon*

Of considerable interest is the way that Paul omits semantic domains central to the Delphic canon and to the smooth operation of Graeco-Roman society. One such domain involves the ethos of “friendship,” signified by the presence of *φιλ*-compounds. Attention to the duties of friendship (*φιλία*) is a constant refrain throughout the Delphic canon (I. Kyzikos II 2 Col. 1 Nos. 1 [“Help your friends”], 9 [“Love friendship”], 15 [“Goodwill for friends”], 21 [“Favor a friend”]; I. Kyzikos II 2 Col. 2 Nos. 2 [“Look kindly on all”], 10 [“Guard friendship”]), undoubtedly because it forms a central part of the Graeco-Roman reciprocity system.

Paul rarely uses φίλ-comounds of human love and avoids them entirely in regards to divine love.⁸¹ Paul's overwhelming preference for ἀγάπη ("love"), ἀγαπητός ("beloved") and ἀγαπᾶν ("to love") is probably explained by the fact that the apostle wishes to differentiate God's love and its outworking from the operations of the Graeco-Roman reciprocity system (Rom 4:4–5; 11:5–6, 35; 13:6–10; 1 Cor 4:7). In this regard, C. Spicq observes—though he overstates the evidence—that “friendship is properly used only of a relationship between equals.”⁸² While this is true in most cases, Aristotle observes that there was the possibility of friendship between those who were not equals (parents and children, husbands and wives, rulers and subjects).⁸³ But the friendship was proportionate to their status and not necessarily permanent. Therefore, as a description of divine and human love, ἀγάπη was better suited to relationships involving parties of different status (inferiors/superiors). It allowed Paul to speak of enduring human relationships founded on divine love, which, in contrast to the status-riddled operation of φιλία, did not calculate in advance the reciprocal benefits to each party.

Two examples will throw extra light on our argument. The Delphic canon at Miletopolis underscores the difference in world-view between the sages and Paul in the exhortation “love friendship” (I. Kyzikos II 2 Col. 1 No. 9: [φ]ιλίαν ἀγάπα). By contrast, Paul—or the pseudonymous author of Colossians and Ephesians—uses the imperative ἀγαπᾶτε two times (Eph 5:25a; Col 3:19a). In each case the husband is to love his wife self-sacrificially with no expectation of return (Eph 5:25b; Col. 3:19b). Similarly, even the harmless “Good-will for friends” (I. Kyzikos II 2 Col. 1 No. 15 [φίλους εὐνόει) stands in contrast to Paul. If Ephesians is deemed an authentic Pauline epistle, the apostle advises slaves to render their service “with a good will as to the Lord (μετ’ εὐνοίας δουλεύοντες) and not to men” (Eph 6:7). Human reciprocity should not be the motivation behind the slave’s service to his earthly master, but rather his relationship to the heavenly exalted Lord. Even if Ephesians is not Pauline, the pseudonymous interpreter of the apostle understood his thought well.

By contrast, the maxim “Respect/pity supplicants” (I. Kyzikos II 2 Col. 1 No. 24: ἱκέτας ἐλέει) might be construed as an acknowledgement

⁸¹ E. A. Judge, “Moral Terms in the Eulogistic Tradition,” *New Docs* 2 (1982): 106.

⁸² C. Spicq, ἀγάπη, in *Theological Lexicon of the New Testament Vol. 1* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1999), 10–11.

⁸³ P. Atkinson, *Friendship and the Body of Christ* (Croydon: SPCK, 2004), 19.

on the part of the Delphic ethical tradition that respect should be extended to those who, unlike φίλοι (“friends”), are not social equals. However, I would argue that the Delphic imperative (ἐλέει [“pity”]) does not uphold the positive social worth of the recipients of mercy. This is well illustrated by the famous inscription of the Roman ruler, Nero. Speaking of his (short-lived) decision to liberate Greece from Roman provincial rule (AD 67), Nero explains the reasons for his unprecedented act of generosity:

Would that Greece were still at its peak as I grant you this gift, in order that more people might enjoy this favour of mine (μου τῆς χάριτος) . . . At present it is not out of pity (οὐ δι’ ἔλεον) for you but out of good-will (ἀλλὰ δι’ εὖνοιαν) that I bestow this benefaction, and I give it in exchange (ἀμείβομαι) to your gods, whose forethought on land and sea I have always experienced, because they granted me the opportunity of conferring such benefits. Other leaders have liberated cities, [only Nero] a province.⁸⁴

According to Nero, pity is only accorded to undeserving social inferiors, but this is decidedly not the case as far as the Greeks. Rather Nero displays good will towards the Greeks because their gods have cared for him, making Greece worthy of the return of imperial favor. The return of good-will (εὖνοια) for favor received (μου τῆς χάριτος) is the decisive characteristic of grace in antiquity, over against the different understanding of mercy (human and divine) in Second Temple Judaism and in early Christianity.⁸⁵ For Paul, divine mercy is extended to human beings (Rom 9:15–16, 18, 23; 11:30–12; 12:1; 15:9; 1 Cor 7:25; 2 Cor 4:1; Eph 2:4; Phil 2:27) and from person to person (Rom 12:8; Gal 6:16) precisely because God is merciful.

Finally, another domain illustrating the ethos of reciprocity is the language of grace, although it is minimally used in the Delphic canon at Miletopolis. Several maxims have come down to us in Sosiades’ collection (Stobaeus, *Ecl.* III.1.173) that employ the language of grace to underscore the importance of munificence: φίλωι χαρίζου (“Favor a friend:” *ibid.* III.1.175 [37]); ἔχων χαρίζου (“Do a favour

⁸⁴ *SIG*³ 814.

⁸⁵ On mercy, see B. F. Harris (“The Idea of Mercy and Its Graeco-Roman Context”) and E. A. Judge (“The Quest for Mercy in Late Antiquity”) in P. T. O’Brien and D. G. Peterson (eds.), *God Who is Rich in Mercy: Essays Presented to D. B. Knox* (Homebush West: Lancer, 1986), 89–105 and 107–121 respectively; D. Konstan, *Pity Transformed* (London: Duckworth, 2001). For further ancient sources, see Harrison, *Paul’s Language*, 286 n. 275.

when you can:" *ibid.* III.1.175 [45]); χάριν ἐκτέλει ("Return a favor:" *ibid.* III.1.175 [75]); χαρίζου ἀβλάβως ("Favor without harming:" *ibid.* III.1.175 [136]). Only two instances are found on the gymnasium (?) stele at Miletopolis (I. Kyzikos II 2 Col. 1 No. 14: "Return a favor" [χάριν ἀπόδος]; I. Kyzikos II 2 Col. 1 No. 21: "Favor a friend" [φίλῳ χαρίζου]) and there is no grace language preserved at Thera. While there is clear evidence that Paul does endorse reciprocity in certain contexts,⁸⁶ his understanding of divine grace is unilateral in its origin, founded on God's loving initiative, and engaging reciprocally a response of gratitude from his dependants. Paul redefines the dynamics of the Graeco-Roman reciprocity system in terms of love rather than indebtedness (Rom 13:8–10).

3.5. Case Study of the Ephesian Household Codes: Paul and the Delphic Canon

Finally, we come to a central tenet of the ancient household codes, distilled with disarming simplicity in I. Kyzikos II 2 Col. 2 No. 3: "Rule your wife" (γυναικὸς ἄρχ[ε]). Unfortunately, the brevity of the Delphic canon's formulation of the role of the *paterfamilias* militates against any detailed appreciation of its household ethics.⁸⁷ I will briefly examine Paul's household codes against the backdrop of the Graeco-Roman literature, funerary epigrams, and honorific inscriptions touching on the role of each spouse in marriage.⁸⁸

⁸⁶ See Harrison, *Paul's Language*, 324–32.

⁸⁷ On ancient household codes, see M. Dibelius, *An die Kolosser Epheser an Philemon* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1953), 43–50, 93–96; J. E. Crouch, *The Origin and Intention of the Colossian Haustafel* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1972); D. L. Balch, *Let Wives Be Submissive: The Domestic Code in I Peter* (Chico: Scholars, 1981); *idem*, "Household Codes," in D. E. Aune (ed.), *Graeco-Roman Literature and the New Testament* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988), 25–50; D. C. Verner, *The Household of God: The Social World of the Pastoral Epistles* (Chico: Scholars Press, 1981); E. A. Judge, "A Woman's Behaviour," *New Docs* 6 (1992): 18–23; E. Best, "The Haustafel in Ephesians (Eph 5:22–6.9)," in *Essays on Ephesians* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997), 189–203; A. R. Bever, *Sharing in the Inheritance: Identity and the Moral Life in Colossians* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003), 225–54; H. W. Hoehner, *Ephesians: An Exegetical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 720–29; R. W. Gehring, *House Church and Mission: The Importance of Household Structures in Early Christianity* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2004 [2000]), 229–60.

⁸⁸ If Ephesians, over against Colossians, is not an authentic Pauline epistle, then Paul's household code in Colossians is less distinctive in its first-century Graeco-Roman context because of Colossians' strong ethos of subordination as opposed to the more christologically focused mutual subordination of Ephesians.

First, the Graeco-Roman literature embraces a spread of positions regarding female submission within the household, ranging from Aristotle's hierarchical rule of the *paterfamilias* within the household,⁸⁹ to a communion of common advantage,⁹⁰ to female submission as a strategy of tolerating her husband's faults,⁹¹ and, finally, to non-hierarchical relationships within the household.⁹² In respect of the Delphic canon, the social stance of the gymnasium at Miletopolis on household relationships (I. Kyzikos II 2 Col. 2 No. 3) was probably that of Aristotle. By contrast, Paul's statements of theological principle (Gal 3:28; 1 Cor 11:11–12) and mutuality (1 Cor 7:1–5) lean more towards the "feminism" of Hierocles and Musonius Rufus than the hierarchical thought of Aristotle. A few examples will suffice. Paul's addition of the phrase, "as is fitting in the Lord," in Col 3:18 spells out the boundaries of a wife's submission to her husband as much as it provides its theological rationale.⁹³ In contrast to the Delphic canon (γυναικὸς ἄρχ[ε]), Paul commands husbands to love their wives (ἀγαπάτε τὰς γυναῖκας: Col 3:19a; Eph 5:25a, 33b).⁹⁴ Paul's telling addition to the love command in

⁸⁹ Aristotle, *Pol.* 1260a 9–14; *Eth. nic.* VIII 1160b–1161a; Arius Didymus, *Epitome of Aristotle* 145.5–18; 149.5–8; Philo, *Spec. Leg.* 3.169–171; Philo, *Hypoth.* 7.3.5; Josephus, *Ag. Ap.* 2.199; *Gen. Mid.* 3.12. While Plutarch approves partnership in the household (*Mor.* 140D), he does not endorse "autonomous" women either. See L. Foxhall, "Foreign Powers: Plutarch and Discourses of Domination in Roman Greece," in S. B. Pomeroy (ed.), *Plutarch's Advice to the Bride and Groom and A Consolation to His Wife: English Translation, Commentary, Interpretative Essays, and Bibliography* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 138–50, esp. 145–47. Diogenes, *Ep.* 47 (A. J. Malherbe, *The Cynic Epistles* [Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1977]) speaks out against marriage *per se*.

⁹⁰ Callicratidas, *On the Felicity of Families* (K. S. Guthrie, *The Pythagorean Sourcebook and Library* [Grand Rapids: Phanes, 1987], 235–37); Xenophon, *Oec.* 7.17–19.

⁹¹ Perictyone, *On the Harmony of a Woman* (Guthrie, *Pythagorean Sourcebook*, 239–41); Theano, *Letter to Nicosrate* (I. M. Plant [ed.], *Women Writers of Ancient Greece and Rome: An Anthology* [London: Equinox, 2004], §15).

⁹² Musonius Rufus, *Or.* 13 A; Hierocles, *On Duties* ("On Marriage," 4.22.21–24: A. J. Malherbe, *Moral Exhortation: A Greco-Roman Sourcebook* [Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986], 100–104); Pliny, *Ep.* 4.19.17ff. See W. Klassen, "Musonius Rufus, Jesus and Paul: Three First-Century Feminists," in P. Richardson and J. C. Hurd (eds.), *From Jesus to Paul: Studies in Honour of Francis Wright Beare* (Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1984) 185–206.

⁹³ D. M. Hay (*Colossians* [Nashville: Abingdon, 2000], 143) notes: "'In the Lord' suggests not only motive but also limitation: the wife's ultimate 'lord' is not her husband." On the radical nature of Paul's thought in Colossians, see Gehring, *House Church*, 236–38. On submission traditions in the Pastorals, see B. W. Winter, *Roman Wives, Roman Widows: The Appearance of New Women and the Pauline Community* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003).

⁹⁴ Gehring (*House Church*, 234 n. 24) notes that the "love" command is not unique, being present in select Graeco-Roman literature.

each case (Col 3:19b ["do not be harsh with them"]; Eph 5:25b ["just as Christ loved the church and gave himself up for her"]) redefines the role of the *paterfamilias* and undermines the Neopythagorean expectation that the wife should submissively tolerate the husband's faults (e.g. Perictyone, *On the Harmony of a Woman*; Theano, *Letter to Nicistrate*).

Secondly, the funerary epigrams and honorific inscriptions, "primarily discuss women as housewives, with little interest in their characters."⁹⁵ The woman is defined in relation to her husband and forbears as far as her virtues, including her role of submission. Because of the focus of our study on gymnasiarchs, we cite a first-century AD inscription honoring a female gymnasiarch who acted as a benefactor on behalf of Arneae:

The people of Arneae and vicinity, to Lalla daughter of Timarchus son of Diotimus, their fellow citizen, wife of Diotimus son of Vassus; priestess of the Emperor's cult and gymnasiarch out of her resources, honoured five times, chaste, cultivated, devoted to her husband and a model of all virtue, surpassing in every respect. She has glorified her ancestor's virtues with the example of her own character. [Erected] in recognition of her virtue and good will.⁹⁶

For Paul, however, the role of the husband and wife is defined in relation to the risen Christ. Thus Paul gives the household codes a cruciform focus (Col 3:18; Eph 5:23b, 25–27, 29b). Moreover, the role of the husband and wife is of *equal* interest to Paul in comparison to the one-sided approach of the contemporary household codes.⁹⁷ The self-sacrificing role of the husband—over against patriarchal privilege—is especially highlighted in Ephesians.

Thirdly, the ancient literary and documentary sources comment on how the gods establish a harmonious household as the wife submits to

⁹⁵ R. Hawley, "Practising What You Preach: Plutarch's Sources and Treatment," in Pomeroy (ed.), *Plutarch's Advice*, 116–17.

⁹⁶ M. R. Lefkowitz and M. B. Fant (eds.), *Women's Life in Greece and Rome: A Source Book in Translation* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1982), §159. For similar inscriptions and funerary epigrams, see Lefkowitz and Fant (eds.), *Women's Life*, §§137–139, §143, §161, §175; Hands, *Charities*, §D.13, §D.39; Austin, *Hellenistic World*, §204; G. H. R. Horsley, "A More Than Perfect Wife," *New Docs* 3 (1983): 33–36; *idem*, "A Women's Virtues," *New Docs* 3 (1983): 40–43; *CIJ* II 772; I. Eph. III 683A; R. Lattimore, *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1962), 275–80, 291–300. On chaste living in the Pythagorean tradition according to Melissa, see Plant (ed.), *Women Writers*, §19.

⁹⁷ Hoehner, *Ephesians*, 724; Bevere, *Sharing*, 232, 234.

the divine order and to the *paterfamilias*. Maximus of Tyre speaks of divine reason regulating sexual love in marriage:

This is the sacred institution of the gods who preside over nuptials, over kindred, and the procreation of children...the human race...is gifted by (the) Divinity with reason, as that which is equivalent to every other possession. To this (the) Divinity also subjected amatory appetite, as a horse to the bridle, as a bow to the archer, as a ship to the helm, as an instrument to the artificer.⁹⁸

Plutarch says that a married woman should recognize and worship only her husband's household gods, steering away from strange cults and foreign superstitions.⁹⁹ Perictione's *On the Harmony of Women* underscores the importance of correct worship on the wife's part,¹⁰⁰ as does the *laudatio* "Turiae" ("reverence [for the gods] without superstition").¹⁰¹

Significantly for the Ephesian context, an inscription of the consul Severus speaks of the goddess Harmonia, daughter of Aphrodite and Ares (Hesiod, *Theog.* 937), blessing his marriage with happiness:

...a model of every kind of virtue, a man who saved the city, eminent among the Greeks, princeps of the Italians, the dear father of the famous Quadratus, for whom Harmonia built a royal chamber for a happy married life...¹⁰²

Hierocles provides a late Stoic perspective on the divine ordering of the household:

...the beauty of a household consists in the yoking together of a husband and wife who are united to each other by fate, are consecrated to the gods who preside over weddings, births, and houses, agree with each other and have all things in common, including their bodies, or their souls, and who exercise appropriate rule over the household and servants, take care in the rearing of their children, and pay an attention to the necessities of life which is neither intense nor slack, but moderate and fitting.¹⁰³

⁹⁸ Maximus of Tyre, *Or.* 10.

⁹⁹ Plutarch, *Mor.* 140D.

¹⁰⁰ Plant (ed.), *Women Writers*.

¹⁰¹ Horsley, "More Than Perfect Wife," 33–36. See also Xenophon, *Oec.* 7.8: "Did your wife sacrifice along with you and offer the same prayers?"

¹⁰² I. Eph. V 1539.

¹⁰³ Hierocles, *On Duties*. "On Marriage" (4.502; Malherbe, *Moral Exhortation*, 100–104). Musonius Rufus (*Or.* 14.9–17) posits that the deity created both sexes with "a strong desire for association and union with the other." Coupled with Musonius's Stoic monotheism, however, is the traditional polytheistic superintendence of marriage by the "great gods" (Hera, Eros and Aphrodite: Musonius Rufus, *Or.* 14.20–32).

Finally, Xenophon addresses the wife regarding the divine intent of marriage in this manner:

Wife, the gods seems to have shown much discernment in yoking together female and male, as we call them, so that the couple might constitute a partnership that is most beneficial to both of them. First of all, so that the various species of living creatures may not become extinct, this pair sleeps together for the purpose of procreation. Then this pairing provides offspring to support the partners in their own age, at least in the case of human beings.¹⁰⁴

New Testament scholars need to be reminded of the religious dimension of marriage in antiquity, if the aforementioned evidence is representative.¹⁰⁵ The husband's hierarchical rule over his wife extended to cultic affairs, touching their sexual life and procreation of children as much as the division of labour within the household.¹⁰⁶ If Paul (or the pseudonymous author) recycled materials from Colossians for his letter to the Ephesians,¹⁰⁷ he expands upon the household codes, infusing the idea of the mutual submission of husband and wife (Eph 5:21, 22, 24, 25, 33) with a theology of the Spirit (5:18b),¹⁰⁸ the cross (5:24b, 25–27, 29b; cf. Mark 10:35–45), the Lordship of Christ over the church (5:23–24, 25–27, 30, 32; cf. 18b–20), and the creation narrative (5:31 [Gen 2:24]). Submission for each partner is motivated by reverence for Christ (Eph 5:21b). The wife submits to the husband as unto Christ (5:22) and the husband loves and serves the wife as Christ unto her (5:25).¹⁰⁹

Did Paul feel that his teaching in Colossians had not gone far enough, given his strong emphasis on unity and mutuality elsewhere (Rom 10:12;

¹⁰⁴ Xenophon, *Oec.* 7.18–19. Note the divine design of women for indoor work and men for outdoor work (7.22). Verner (*Household of God*, 66), referring to an inscription (OGIS 308 [II cent. BC]; cf. Polybius 22.20), points to the piety and concord of Queen Apollonius Eusebes in her family life.

¹⁰⁵ See the excellent discussion of Balch, *Let Wives Be Submissive*, 88–90.

¹⁰⁶ Note L. Goesler's comment ("*Advice to the Bride and Groom: Plutarch Gives a Detailed Account of His Views on Marriage*," in Pomeroy [ed.], *Plutarch's Advice*, 103): "Harmony between the married couple reaches its highest form in agreement about religious matters."

¹⁰⁷ For discussion, see J. D. G. Dunn, *The Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 36–37. On the five critical options regarding the relationship of Colossians to Ephesians, see Best, "Haustafel," 190.

¹⁰⁸ On the dependence of the participle ὑποτασσόμενοι (Eph 5.21) upon the verb πληροῦσθε (5.18b), see Hoehner, *Ephesians*, 720; Gehring, *Home Church*, 244.

¹⁰⁹ On submission in Colossians and Ephesians, see Gehring, *Home Church*, 234–35, 238, 244.

Gal 3:28; 1 Cor 7:1–5; 11:11–12; 12:13; Col 3:11)? His teaching in Ephesians represents a theological revision of the Colossian household codes, which, though relevant to their social setting, had not unfolded sufficiently the redemptive significance of Christ's death for household relations. Paul would have been aware that the Neopythagorean theology of harmony, hierarchical in the ancient literature,¹¹⁰ and embraced in some honorific inscriptions,¹¹¹ expressed the divine ideal for marriage in antiquity. Even the late Stoicism of Hierocles, though more consensual in its model of household relations, consecrates marriage to the gods. Paul's theological response in Eph 5:18–33 provided the household with a redemptive, christological, and ecclesiastical framework that would transform the hierarchical relationship between the paterfamilias and his wife. Not only was Paul enhancing the church's unity (Eph 2:11–3:13; 4:1–6) in the household code (Eph 5:21–6.9) with a view to a Roman world intolerant of foreign cults,¹¹² he was also challenging the curriculum of the eastern Mediterranean gymnasia and demoting the Graeco-Roman gods from their privileged position as guardians of the household and its social relations.

4. Conclusion

This article has argued that Paul would still have been exposed to gymnasiarchal culture even if, as was the likelihood, he did not have the ephebic education of other first-century Jews. The inscriptions of the gymnasiarchs alerted the apostle to the pastoral and social values they held dear. Paul may have heard their honorific decrees heralded in prominent public places, or have listened to the popular philosophers preaching in the open air the maxims of the Delphic canon, the ethical curriculum of the gymnasia spanning Greece to Afghanistan. At the very least, some of Paul's Gentile converts probably asked him questions about the integration of their new faith with their ephebic past.

¹¹⁰ Goesler ("Goesler," 101) observes: "Everything proceeds in harmonious unison and by mutual agreement between the married couple—but the husband is always the leader and the one who makes the decisions." For a fine inscriptional example of harmony between the husband (Euphrosynus) and wife (Epigone), see Hands, *Chari- ties*, §D.13.

¹¹¹ See nn. 96, 102, 110 above.

¹¹² Hoehner, *Ephesians*, 727. See Balch, "Romans 1.24–27," 28; *idem*, *Let Wives Be Submissive*, *passim*.

Regarding the values of the gymnasiarchal inscriptions, Paul's thought converges with the gymnasiarchs on many important issues of benefaction culture. But while Paul acknowledges the centrality of ancestral tradition, he exposes the futility of its boasting. His pastoral approach to those under his care is (not unexpectedly) less masculine in its tenor than the gymnasiarchs, preferring to explain his pastoral technique with maternal and paternal images. Benefaction, for Paul, paradoxically revolved around an impoverished and dishonoured benefactor as opposed to the icons of civic virtue lauded by the gymnasium. Significant echoes of Pauline ethics are found in the gymnasiarchal inscriptions, but these ethical commonplaces are sharply differentiated by the dynamic of the Spirit in the believer's life. Paul agrees with the *gymnasiarchoi* as to the importance of returning honour to human beings and to God, but he dismisses the coronal awards of athletes as "fading" and postpones the believer's crowning to the eschaton. The exclusivist ethos of the gymnasiarchal law at Verroia also stands in contrast to the inclusiveness of Paul's house churches.

There were also areas of overlap and divergence between Paul and the maxims of the Delphic canon. Whereas the Delphic canon teaches self-sufficiency through individual self-control, Paul inculcates in his communities the sufficiency of Christ through inter-dependent members of his body ministering to each other. Paul's understanding of grace differed from the Delphic canon in that it upended reciprocity rituals, divesting them of their hierarchical status, and pinpricking the expectation of commensurate return. Paul also challenges the "ruling" role traditionally attributed to the *paterfamilias* in the Delphic canon, presenting a cruciform alternative that would bring about harmony in the household in a radically different way to late Stoic and Neopythagorean thought.

A new pastoral dynamic, founded on the crucified and risen Christ, had emerged for the *epheboi* to consider as an alternate route of honour and self-control. The honouring of the weak in the body of Christ supplanted the agonistic world of civic honour and the selflessness of the Servant-Benefactor was to inform all social relationships, whether in the polis or in the household. Another pathway of ethical transformation had begun, moving from Jerusalem to Rome, and beyond.

THE *POLYTHEIST* IDENTITY OF THE “WEAK,” AND PAUL’S
STRATEGY TO “GAIN” THEM: A NEW READING OF
1 CORINTHIANS 8:1–11:1

Mark D. Nanos

Rockhurst University, Kansas City, Missouri, USA

When it comes to identifying those Paul describes as ἄσθενής in 1 Corinthians 8—usually translated “weak”—there are many interpretations on offer. But when it comes to the question of their identity as Christ-believers, there is only one.¹ That they are Christ-believers is apparently so obvious that interpreters often proceed without discussion. However, I propose that the consensus is likely mistaken, that the ἄσθεναί are “polytheists” who do not believe in the message of good in Jesus Christ that Paul proclaims, and in which his recipients believe. From Paul’s perspective, the Corinthians need to recognize that the ἄσθεναί are also ἄδελφοί (brothers/sisters) on behalf of whom Christ died. They should thus be sincerely concerned with the harmful impact that their proposed eating of idol food as if merely ordinary food would have upon these “unbelievers.”

I will employ the translation “impaired” to refer to the ἄσθενής.² Impaired highlights that they are being objectified by Paul (if not already

¹ The terms “Christian” and “Christianity” are anachronistic for discussion of Paul, who did not employ them, and also not helpful, because they suggest a developed institutional identity independent of Judaism. The term “polytheist” is adopted to denote those who are neither Jews nor Christ-believers, even though some Greco-Roman philosophers might not be helpfully described as polytheists either, but continued reference to them as “non-Christ-believing-non-Jews,” or something similar, is cumbersome. “Greeks” is misleading, since most Jews and Christ-believers are likely also Greeks in Corinth, and a similar problem applies to using Romans; “idolaters” could be confusing, because many interpreters understand the Corinthians to be Christ-believers who are still in some sense idolaters; “pagan” is anachronistic, although it could have also been adopted, with similar caveats.

I am grateful for the suggestions made to earlier versions of this essay by Andy Johnson, William E. Mendus, Dieter Mitternacht, Loren Rosson, and Magnus Zetterholm.

² Cf. Stanley K. Stowers, “Paul on the Use and Abuse of Reason,” in David L. Balch *et al.* (eds.), *Greeks, Romans, and Christians: Essays in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990), 253–86, for discussion of the sense of “sick,” including in philosophical discourse.

by his audience as well) to be *unable* to function in the way that he expects of those with properly working sensibilities, lacking the proper sense of what is true about the divine. For Paul writes that the *συνείδησις*, that is, the “consciousness,” “awareness,” “sensibilities,” or “sense of what is right” of these ones is impaired.³ This aspect of their state of being makes less sense for the modifier “weak.” If the impaired eat idol food, it is their “sensibilities,” rather than themselves, which will become “soiled” (8:7) and “wounded” (v. 12).⁴ The impaired ones are described as those without “the knowledge” Paul’s addressees share, namely, that there is no such thing as an idol in the world, and that God is one (vv. 1, 4, 7), or the different roles of God the Father and Jesus Christ (v. 6). It is the impaired ones’ sense of what is right that is ironically “strengthened” to continue to perceive things incorrectly (v. 10), to continue without the knowledge that could keep them from destroying themselves (vv. 7, 11).

In contrast to the impaired ones, Paul addresses those in Corinth with *γνῶσις* (“knowledge”) that idols are meaningless, and that there is no God but the One (8:4), as well as the roles of God the Father and Jesus Christ (v. 6), whom I will refer to as “the knowledgeable.”

Paul’s terms for these people or groups do not precisely express oppositional categories. The ones with “knowledge” or “wisdom” (specifically, about idols and gods being meaningless) are contrasted with

³ These examples reflect translation equivalents regularly offered for *συνείδησις*; see Maurer, *TDNT* 7.897–918; Robert Jewett, *Paul’s Anthropological Terms: A Study of Their Use in Conflict Settings* (AGJU 10; Leiden: Brill, 1971), 402–46; Richard A. Horsley, “Consciousness and Freedom among the Corinthians: 1 Corinthians 8–10,” *CBQ* 40 (1978): 581–89; Paul W. Gooch, “‘Conscience’ in 1 Corinthians 8 and 10,” *NTS* 33 (1987): 244–54; Peter J. Tomson, *Paul and the Jewish Law: Halakha in the Letters of the Apostle to the Gentiles* (CRINT; Assen and Minneapolis: Van Gorcum and Fortress, 1990), 208–15; Anthony C. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids and Carlisle: Eerdmans and Paternoster, 2000), 640–44, offers a recent overview of research history. The translation of *συνείδησις* is generally now distinguished from modern notions of “conscience” as in a moral compass, and it is noted that the knowledgeable are not urged to act according to their conscience. The point here is that the impaired have a sense of what is right that Paul calls the knowledgeable ones, with their own different sense of what is right, to consider.

⁴ Note the subtle change of language between v. 7 and v. 10. In v. 10 it is not the *συνείδησις* but the person who is described to be *ἀσθενοῦς*, based on agreement with the masculine participle, while in v. 7, where the issue of defiling/soiling (*μολύνεται*) arises, and v. 12, where the issue is wounding (*τύπτοντες*), it is the *συνείδησις* that is described as *ἀσθενής*. Grammatically observed, but to different conclusions, see Jewett, *Anthropological Terms*, 422–24; Alex T. Cheung, *Idol Food in Corinth: Jewish Background and Pauline Legacy* (JSNTSup 176; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 132–33.

those without this knowledge or wisdom (ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐν πᾶσιν ἡ γνῶσις), the ignorant, one might say, although Paul does not use precisely that term for them. Instead, once he has explained in v. 7 that for those who lack knowledge it is their “sense of what is right” (συνείδησις) that is ἀσθενής, he continues to refer to them as the impaired ones. The opposite of the identifications “weak” or “impaired ones” would logically be to “the strong” or “healthy ones,” and indeed many interpreters refer to the ones with knowledge as the strong. But apart from referring to them having “power (ἐξουσία)” (actually to “that power of yours [ἡ ἐξουσία ὑμῶν αὐτῇ],” which carries a sarcastically dismissive tone),⁵ Paul does not use “strong” or “powerful” to refer to their state. Thus to refer to the weak versus the strong implies a different contrast than the one Paul articulates. The contrast he draws has the *knowledgeable* on one side, the *impaired* on the other. That uneven comparison is useful to keep in view. And while he addresses his instructions to the knowledgeable, it is less clear that he addresses the impaired, that they are even part of the encoded or the actual audience Paul envisages will hear the letter read; rather, he writes *about* the impaired, and the impact of the behavior of the knowledgeable upon them.⁶ In addition, Paul seems to employ “knowledgeable ones” with an ironic edge, even to be sarcastic, since they do not exhibit appropriate knowledge of what Paul esteems to be the most important concepts and values, like love over rights, which he spells out to them. His parent-like ironic response to the questions they apparently raised to him about eating idol food implied if not outright stated disagreement. It reflects his perception, at least his posture, that they think they know more than Paul does

⁵ Joop Smit, *About the Idol Offerings': Rhetoric, Social Context, and Theology of Paul's Discourse in First Corinthians 8:1–11:1* (Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 27; Leuven: Peeters, 2000), 88–89.

⁶ Jewett, *Anthropological Terms*, 426–27, among others, argues that 10:25 refers to the impaired. But John C. Brunt, “Love, Freedom, and Moral Responsibility: The Contribution of 1 Cor. 8–10 to an Understanding of Paul's Ethical Thinking,” in Kent Harold Richards (ed.), *Society of Biblical Literature 1981 Seminar Papers* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1981), 29 n. 12, observes that Paul can instead “be telling those with knowledge that they do not need to worry or ask questions in the meat market context.” That is the case, all the more, if the knowledgeable do not eat idol food, but have enquired about whether they can. If the impaired are simply the polytheist idolaters of Corinth, then they will be impacted by the consequences of the behavior of the knowledgeable if the knowledgeable heed Paul's letter, as well as if they do not. But Paul's language does not require that the impaired are being addressed, or even among the knowledgeable when they meet to hear this letter read. The constant third person references to them suggest that they are not.

about the matters at hand. To call them knowledgeable in the midst of an instruction that signals what they fail to perceive, cuts with an ironic edge calculated to put them in their place.

Probable objections to the idea that Paul's message in these chapters primarily addresses issues across a Christ-believing/polytheist line instead of inter-Christian factionalism, and to the notion that Paul would write of polytheist idolaters as "brothers/sisters" of the Corinthians addressed, will be discussed after the prevailing views, and a new proposal based upon the issues arising in the text itself, have been presented.

The Prevailing Views for the Identity of the Impaired

The "impaired" are generally perceived to be Christ-believers insecure about the implications of their newly found faith.⁷ They are unable to eat food dedicated to idols as if religiously meaningless, having been "until now accustomed to eating idol food as if [sanctified] to idols (τῇ συνηθείᾳ ἕως ἄρτι τοῦ εἰδώλου ὡς εἰδωλόθυτον ἐσθίουσιν)" (8:7). If they were to see the knowledgeable ones "reclining at an idol's temple," they might "be strengthened to eat food sacrificed to idols" (8:10), against their own sense of what is right, which has not yet adjusted to Christ-believing ideals.⁸

Whether described as coming to Christ-faith as Greek or Roman polytheists, or as Jews, the impaired have supposedly retained some measure of their former sensibilities that inhibits them from expe-

⁷ Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, "Freedom or the Ghetto: 1 Cor viii, 1-13; x, 23-xi, 1," *RB* 85 (1978): 561-62, writes clearly what most uphold, variously stated: "The Strong assumed that the subjective world of all believers was the same simply because all subscribed to the same objective truth. Their abstract logic did not allow for the time-lag between intellectual acceptance of truth and its emotional assimilation. For some this interval was very short, but not for all. . . . Some had not shaken off the emotional attitude towards idols that had dominated their previous existence. In hidden corners of their hearts they still thought of them as possessing power and were afraid to come anywhere near their orbit"; 568: "Their instinctive revulsion against eating idol-meat was understandable insofar as they had not succeeded in fully interiorizing the fact that idols were nothing"; 569: "The instinctive reaction of the Weak could be overcome only as a by-product of their growth towards Christian maturity"; 573: "Through fear the Weak would have forced the community into a self-imposed ghetto."

⁸ The majority view is that the impaired have eaten idol food and suffered pangs of guilt thereafter. That is critical, e.g., to the reading of Murphy-O'Connor, "Freedom," 555-56.

riencing fully the ideal of freedom in Christ. In the case of former Greek or Roman idolaters, they retain the sense that participating in the rites and food associated with idols constitutes religious—i.e., idolatrous—behavior, and thus sense that it is right to avoid it now that they are Christ-believers.⁹ In the case of Jews who have come to faith in Christ, the problem is supposed to be that they mistakenly retain the Torah-based notion that they must avoid anything associated with idolatry,¹⁰ including food.¹¹

Some interpreters suggest that the label ἁσθενής is an indication of their low socio-economic standing.¹² They are unaccustomed to

⁹ This view can be traced back at least to Chrysostom, who nevertheless maintained that a Christian should not participate in these rites or eat this food, but not because of the infirmity that arises from fear of idols; see Homily 20 on First Corinthians (Philip Schaff [ed.], *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church. First Series. Vol. XII. Saint Chrysostom: Homilies on the Epistles of Paul to the Corinthians* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978], 111, 114–15).

¹⁰ Paradoxically, in Scripture idols are trivialized as not gods and meaningless and yet proscribed as demonic and dangerous for those in covenant with the One God (e.g., compare Deut 32:21 with vv. 16–17; Isa 8:19 and 19:3 with chs. 40 and 44; cf. Wis 13–16; see also Ps 106:36–39; *1 Enoch* 19; *Jub.* 11:4–6); other gods and lords are implicitly recognized to exist, albeit to be lower than Israel's God, and they are not to be honored by Israelites (Exod 15:11; 20:2–6; 22:28; Deut 4:19; 29:26; 32:8–9; Ps 82:1; Mic 4:5; Jas 2:19); images of other gods are to be destroyed in the Land (Exod 23:24; Deut 7:5).

¹¹ There are many reasons to believe that Israelites were prohibited from food and other items involved in the rites of other nations, although most of the evidence is more general, referring to the prohibition of actual participation in the rites, as is the case to which Paul refers in ch. 10, from Exodus 32 and Numbers 25; see also 4 Macc 5:1–4, although probably later than Paul. In addition to these and other passages mentioned in the above note, see Exod 24:11; Deut 14:22–26; Ps 106:28; 1 Sam 9:13; 1 Kgs 1:25; Hos 8:13. The rabbis proscribed eating idol food, although making subtle distinctions, such as the difference between interaction with idolaters and their goods, and between goods that had been used in idolatrous rites and those intended for such use, which have some similarities to the kind of distinctions that arise in Paul's discussion of eating marketplace food not known to be idolatrous, or at someone's invitation, in 10:25–31: *m. Abod. Zar.* 1.4–5; 2.3; 3.4; 4.3–6; 5.1; see Tomson, *Paul*, 151–77, 208–20; Cheung, *Idol Food*, 39–81, 152–64, 300–1; Smit, 'About the Idol Offerings,' 52–58, 65; Magnus Zetterholm, 'Purity and Anger: Gentiles and Idolatry in Antioch,' *Interdisciplinary Journal of Research on Religion* (2005): 15; David Jacob Rudolph, 'A Jew to the Jews: Jewish Contours of Pauline Flexibility in 1 Corinthians 9:19–23' (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Cambridge, 2006), 97–104.

¹² Gerd Theissen, *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity: Essays on Corinth* (trans. John H. Schütz, Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982), 121–43; this suggestion has proven to be popular in subsequent commentaries: Ben Witherington, *Conflict and Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 186–202; Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 607–61. See also Ronald F. Hock, *The Social Context of Paul's Ministry: Tentmaking and Apostleship* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980), 50–65; Peter Marshall, *Enmity in Corinth: Social Conventions in Paul's Relations with the Corinthians* (WUNT 2.23;

eating sanctified meat independent of religious festivals, when free “meat” was made available to them, whereas the “strong,” who had economic means, were used to eating sacrificial “meat” as a part of normal Greco-Roman social and business life. Being better educated, the knowledgeable were also able to reason more clearly, to understand the logical consequences of believing that there is no God but One, that food offered to idols was not actually sacred, and could be eaten as a matter of religious indifference. Yet it is not clear that all of the knowledgeable were elites. If even any of them were not, it would undermine defining the groups along that axis. There is also evidence that non-elites did eat meat, if often less desirable cuts and parts, and regularly enough, for example, at corner cook-shops (*popinae* and *ganeae*) and *tabernae*.¹³ Moreover, the food at issue is not defined strictly to be meat, but idol food (εἰδωλόθυτον), which everyone in Greco-Roman society commonly ate (or drank, in the case of wine).¹⁴

Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987), 284–85, 290; Dale B. Martin, *The Corinthian Body* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 70–76, for Cynic/Stoic implications.

¹³ Justin J. Meggitt, “Meat Consumption and Social Conflict in Corinth,” *JTS* 45 (1994): 137–41; Craig Steven de Vos, *Church and Community Conflicts: The Relationships of the Thessalonian, Corinthian, and Philippian Churches with Their Wider Civic Communities* (SBLDS 168; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999), 223.

¹⁴ That Paul mentions he would not even eat any “meats (κρέα)” if it would cause harm to his brother (v. 13) is not to be denied, but that point is made to emphasize how much further Paul would go than what he is asking of his audience, and does not mean the idol food in question is specifically meat (see Peter David Gooch, *Dangerous Food: 1 Corinthians 8–10 in its Context* [SCJ 5; Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1993], 53–55, 149–50). One should not overlook that he also mentions βρῶμα in v. 13: “if food would cause the brother to stumble...” It may well suggest that Paul would not eat anything that could be even mistaken to be idol food, which might apply to much of the meat in Corinth outside of that processed by a Jewish community (but not all, or Paul’s statement of exception would be meaningless). But idol foodstuffs consist of many other materials than meat, and idolatry was practiced by every segment of society, not just those wealthy enough to afford meat. Nevertheless, the point stands that the poor may not often eat meat beyond civic or private association rituals which provided such expensive fare; what is at question is whether it would not also be the case that some of those with “knowledge” in Corinth are among the poor, and thus economic level would not serve as the logical basis for defining the difference between the impaired ones and the knowledgeable ones. Cf. Justin J. Meggitt, *Paul, Poverty and Survival* (Studies of the New Testament and its World; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998); Steven J. Friesen, “Poverty in Pauline Studies: Beyond the So-called New Consensus,” *JNTS* 26.3 (2004): 323–61. For interaction between Meggitt and Theissen as well as Dale Martin, see their essays in *JNTS* 84 (2001): 51–94. See also Steven J. Friesen, “Prospects for a Demography of the Pauline Mission: Corinth among the Churches,” in Daniel N. Schowalter and Steven J. Friesen (eds.), *Urban Religion in Roman Corinth: Interdisciplinary Approaches* (HTS 53; Cambridge, Mass., and London: Harvard University Press, 2005), 351–70; Ray Pickett, “Conflicts at Corinth,” in Richard

A few interpreters argue that there actually was no one or group in Corinth fitting the description of the impaired; rather, the sensibilities being expressed are those of Paul himself, for various reasons.¹⁵ This is an interesting alternative; however, it does not sit well with several issues to be discussed, including that Paul, like most Jews, certainly anyone who had been a Pharisee, does not exemplify the profile: he was not one who was accustomed to eating idol food as sacred food. This also likely rules out that those whose sensibilities are at issue, the impaired, were Jews, or had been Jews, for the impaired were by habit idolaters.

According to the prevailing views, those who “know” that eating idol food is acceptable, being merely profane (ordinary) food, uphold this ideal to apply to *all* Christ-believers. Thus, the “knowledgeable” *Christ-believers* are understood to believe that the “impaired” *Christ-believers* should not object to the eating of idol food, and are generally believed to hold the impaired ones in contempt for doing so. In a slightly different direction, some interpreters maintain that the knowledgeable advocate that the impaired should be challenged and trained to overcome their mistaken notion that there is some significance to the eating of idol food, and thereby persuaded to abandon their reluctance to eat it.¹⁶

The judgments of the knowledgeable are generally understood—apart from mitigating circumstances, such as he describes in the case at hand—to reflect Paul’s own convictions about indifference to eating

A. Horsley (ed.), *Christian Origins* (A People’s History of Christianity: Vol. 1; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005), 113–37.

¹⁵ John Coolidge Hurd, Jr., *The Origins of 1 Corinthians* (New York: Seabury Press, 1965), 123–25, 147–48, argues that Paul is here creating a hypothetical case, that the knowledgeable were not eating in temples as v. 10 suggests, and that there are no weak ones, although the term can be imagined to apply to recent converts who had been idolaters, so that the case presented makes sense to them. Gooch, *Dangerous Food*, 65–72, 83–84, 97, 108, develops this idea also, but notes that it is problematic, since one would assume that upon entering this faith group they would learn that “there is no God but one.”

¹⁶ Clarence E. Glad, *Paul and Philodemus: Adaptability in Epicurean and Early Christian Psychagogy* (NovTSup 81; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 278–87, develops the latter viewpoint; see also Wendell Lee Willis, *Idol Meat in Corinth: The Pauline Argument in 1 Corinthians 8 and 10* (SBLDS 68; Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1985), 75, 98, 104, who notes variations on this theme among several earlier authors (J. Weiss, Lietzmann, Jewett); Khiok-Khng Yeo, “The Rhetorical Hermeneutic of 1 Corinthians 8 and Chinese Ancestor Worship,” *BibInt* 2.3 (1994): 298. A slightly different approach that draws on Theissen’s socio-economic distinction for identifying the knowledgeable and impaired is offered by John Fotopoulos, *Food Offered to Idols in Roman Corinth: A Social-rhetorical Reconsideration of 1 Corinthians 8:1–11:1* (WUNT 2.151; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 216.

idol food.¹⁷ Because of the immediate concern with the sensibilities of the impaired in Corinth, Paul is portrayed to be momentarily willing to forgo upholding the ideal of indifference to idol food, so that their “awareness of what is right will not be soiled (μολύνεται)” (v. 7), and so that “the sense of what is right (συνείδησις)” of the impaired will not lead him or her to be “strengthened (οἰκοδομηθήσεται) to eat food sacrificed to idols” (v. 10), “causing him/her to cause self-ruin (ἀπόλλυται)” (v. 11).

The Impaired as Christ-believers

The consensus view that the impaired ones are specifically *Christ-believers* appears to be based on several factors. Although often not discussed, the primary reason is probably that Paul refers to the impaired ones as ὁδελφοί (brothers/sisters) of his “knowledgeable” audience, who have the ability to trip up and thus harm the impaired if they continue to eat idol food in their presence.¹⁸ Also, Paul refers to Christ having died on behalf of the impaired brothers/sisters, so that sinning against them is sinning against Christ (8:11–12).¹⁹ Moreover, many understand the impaired to be vulnerable to the influence of the knowledgeable in a way that implies that the impaired would thus be led to act against their own sense of what is right, to “destroy him or herself” (ἀπόλλυται)” (8:11), because they have not yet completely broken free of their former way of thinking about idols (8:7–13).²⁰ That is presumed to be because

¹⁷ Cf. Johannes Weiss, *Der erste Korintherbrief* (MeyerK; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1910), 212; Murphy-O'Connor, “Freedom or the Ghetto,” 556–58; C. K. Barrett, *Essays on Paul* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1982), 50–56 [“Things Sacrificed to Idols”]; Theissen, *Pauline Christianity*, 138–40 [“Strong and Weak”]. This remains the case even among many who recognize that some of Paul’s statements are likely recitations of Corinthian positions, or slogans, and may not express his own views.

¹⁸ Gooch, *Dangerous Food*, 64, at least raises the possibility that those still intimate with idols are not Christ-believers only to dismiss it, because “Paul identifies these others as Christians: the consciousness of these who eat idol-food as idol-food is weak and is polluted by the act of eating (8:7); this weak one is a brother for whom Christ died (8:11)” (full discussion: 65–72).

¹⁹ The second reason Gooch provides in the above note.

²⁰ The first reason provided by Gooch in the above note. It is conceptualized somewhat differently by Paul Douglas Gardner, *The Gifts of God and the Authentication of a Christian: An Exegetical Study of 1 Corinthians 8–11:1* (Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1994), 40–64, who understands the impaired to want to be like the knowledgeable. Drawing on the confidence of the knowledgeable, they imitated them. But

the impaired are not mature enough in their Christ-faith to think like the knowledgeable ones, who have perhaps been Christ-believers longer, or are of higher economic standing and education. They are thus better able to rationalize the issues, granting the knowledgeable some degree of moral authority.

Many interpretations of this section are also shaped by larger constructions of a tension between Pauline and Jewish Christianity, variously conceptualized, or between Jewish and Gentile Christians.²¹ These naturally limit the options to be explored to identify the possible players and situations addressed in Corinthians; at the same time, decisions fundamental to those portrayals depend upon interpretive elements gathered from previous interpretations of Corinthians.

Finally, the impact of the traditional and still prevailing constructions of Paul and his theology plays an important role in suggesting the options to be explored. Interpreters generally uphold that the Corinthians understand Paul to proclaim a Torah-free gospel, and to be Torah-free as a matter of principle, although he may practice Torah when it is expedient for him to do so to reach Jews— notions at the heart of “Paulinism.” It is also generally agreed that Paul believes Christ-believing Jews should not observe Torah either, certainly not as an expression of covenantal faith, and that Christ-believing non-Jews should not observe Jewish cultural norms, such as those set out in the Apostolic Decree of Acts 15, or in the Noahide Commandments of rabbinic Judaism.²² Even if he may have appealed to these or something like them in his earlier letter, it did not and does not represent his own convictions.²³

they were insecure about taking this course, and carried along into idolatry. It logically follows that the impaired are at that point idolaters.

²¹ Ferdinand Christian Baur, *Paul the Apostle of Jesus Christ: His Life and Works, His Epistles and Teachings* (trans. Allan Menzies; two volumes in one vol.; ed. Eduard Zeller; 2nd ed.; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2003), 137, 145–48, 268–320; idem, “Die Christuspartei in der korinthischen Gemeinde, der Gegensatz der petrinischen und paulinischen Christentums in der ältesten Kirche, Petrus in Rom.,” *Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie* 4.3 (1831): 70–94, 222–53, 291–329; differently, Michael D. Goulder, *Paul and the Competing Mission in Corinth* (Library of Pauline Studies; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2001), esp. 92–124, 152–64.

²² Murphy-O'Connor, “Freedom or the Ghetto,” 558.

²³ Cf. Hurd, *Origins*, 240–70, 271–96, discusses an ambiguous relationship between Paul and the Jerusalem apostles over the Decree, and even that Paul had behaved “as one outside the law” during his first stay in Corinth (280), to which he returned “at a far more mature level” and based on more “independent theological bases for ethical

It is also commonly believed that Paul's argument here implies that he regards eating idol food independent of idolatrous rituals to be a matter of indifference, even that he ate it himself.²⁴ Hence, it is natural for Paul to be understood to be sympathetic to the propositional "knowledge" of the Christ-believers addressed, if not their lack of concern for how this might impact others, but also to be sensitive to the qualms of those ostensibly new to the idea of freedom to eat idol food as a matter of indifference. He too is understood to have experienced this transformation of attitude when moving from a Jewish to a Christ-believing based value system, and thus away from a Torah-defined life.

Paul's approach to the topic of idol food, based on the prevailing view that both the knowledgeable and the impaired are Christ-believers, and thus should ideally practice freedom in Christ to eat anything,²⁵ is generally combined with his supposed strategy to adopt the behavior of those to whom he seeks to relate, which allegedly involves compro-

action" following the negative reaction to his first letter, which was based on a veiled agreement with the Decree (289, 94).

²⁴ The majority view; e.g., Barrett, *Essays on Paul*, 50–56, upholds that Paul would not participate in idolatrous rituals (52), but he speaks for most interpreters of 1 Corinthians and of Paul in general when he observes: "in the matter of εἰδωλόθυτα (not to mention others) Paul was not a practicing Jew" (50). In contrast, several interpreters uphold that Paul did not and would not eat idol food, although most do not mean by this that Paul observes kashrut, or Torah per se: see Tomson, *Paul*, 185, 195–96, 201–203, 206–208, 219–20, 275–76, 280; Gooch, *Dangerous Food*, 94–95 (although he does not uphold Paul to observe kashrut conventions; 96 n. 60, 127, 129, 131–32, 135, 296–97); James D. G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 701–706 (but he does not observe kashrut or observe Torah as a matter of faith: passim, e.g., when discussing the Antioch Incident); Cheung, *Idol Food*, 76–81, 108–109, 136–41, 296–305 (he also distinguishes kashrut, which Paul did not practice, 78–79); Smit, 'About the Idol Offerings,' 3, 56–57, 154–65; E. Croy Still III, "Paul's Aims Regarding ΕΙΔΩΛΟΘΥΤΑ: A New Proposal for Interpreting 1 Corinthians 8:1–11:1," *NovT* 44.4 (2002): 333–43, although not dealing with the topic of whether Paul would eat idol food, argues that he does not permit it at all for the Corinthians; Fotopoulos, *Food Offered to Idols*, 222–23 (but on 226: "he [Paul] does not observe the Law"); David E. Garland, "The Dispute over Food Sacrificed to Idols (1 Cor 8:1–11:1)," *PRS* 30.2 (2003): 173–97, also emphasizes the complete proscription of idol food, but Paul "rejected Jewish food laws that erected barriers between Jews and Gentiles. . . . Idol food is a different matter entirely" (182, 184). Rudolph, "A Jew to the Jews," like myself, upholds that Paul did not eat idol food, or permit it to be eaten knowingly, and consistently observed kashrut too.

²⁵ Widely attested; see e.g., Weiss, *Der erste Korintherbrief*, 211–18 (esp. 212–13), 227–31; Barrett, *Essays on Paul*, 50, 54–56; Wayne A. Meeks, *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983), 97–100. Willis, *Idol Meat*, 116, challenges the idea that Paul is affirming the Corinthian slogans of 8:1, 4–6, as if giving priority to freedom, but tempered with love as required.

mising Torah as a matter of policy (9:19–23).²⁶ Hence, it is those who know that eating idol food is a matter of indifference who are labeled by interpreters to be “strong,” in concert with Paul’s own projected ideals. The other ones, those Christ-believers whose supposed lack of maturity leaves them uncomfortable with this Pauline propositional truth, are labeled “weak.”²⁷ This view, interestingly, implies that the Church Fathers were “weak,” because they upheld that no Christians were to eat idol food, based in part on their understanding that this passage prohibited it.²⁸

A New Proposal: The Impaired as non-Christ-believing Polytheists

In spite of several reasons to identify the impaired ones to be Christ-believers, which have been discussed, the consensus view is nevertheless

²⁶ This is especially evident with interpretations that describe the impaired to be Jewish Christ-believers who are not yet secure enough in their faith to eat idol food, or who are engaged in a Jewish Christian mission in opposition to Paul, but it can also be detected when the impaired are described as non-Jews: Weiss, *Der erste Korintherbrief*, 264; C. K. Barrett, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (BNTC; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1968), 194–95, describes the “weak” in 8:7 to be non-Jewish Christ-believers who are “foolish,” being “scrupulous where scrupulosity rests on pure error” about not eating idol food, and on 215, the “weak” in 9:22 are “Christians not yet fully emancipated from legalism.”

²⁷ Barrett, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 240, represents a good example of the basic point I seek to challenge, commenting on 10:25: “So far as the essential point of principle is concerned he [Paul] is at one with the strong Christians...neither food nor abstention from it will commend us to God. He makes a clean break with Judaism, where conscience demanded of the devout Jew the most searching inquiry before he might eat. Paul had in fact ceased to be a practicing Jew.” Similar comments are made with reference to ch. 8 and on 9:19–23. Barrett draws a monolithic portrait of Jewish observance that is mistaken (see above note discussing the nuanced views of the rabbis on idol food).

Willis, *Idol Meat*, 119–20, for a list of other arguments along similar lines, which he challenges, since Paul does not offer instruction to the impaired, and does not side with the knowledgeable; rather, Paul disagrees with the knowledgeable about there being no such thing as idols in the world, and does not favor eating idol food, although Willis believes that Paul regards food to be neutral. I would argue slightly differently, that food is theoretically neutral, since purity is not inherent, but imputed, and since Paul respects Torah as the word of God, idol food is imputed to be that which those belonging to the One God cannot eat. That is also in keeping with rabbinic teaching discussed in an earlier note.

²⁸ In addition to the proscriptions in Acts 15:20, 29; 21:25; Rev 2:14, 19–20; *Did.* 6.1–2; Ign. *Magn.* 8–10; Justin, *Dial.* 35; Tertullian, *Apol.* 9.13–14; see the discussions in Tomson, *Paul*, 177–86; Gooch, *Dangerous Food*, 122–27, 131–33; Cheung, *Idol Food*, 165–295.

far from certain, and I do not think that it is probable. I am convinced neither that from Paul's perspective the impaired ones are insecure in their faith, specifically, that they are troubled by eating idol food,²⁹ nor that he fears they will revert to idolatry if the knowledgeable behave against their sensibilities.³⁰ Rather, I propose that the impaired are *polytheist idolaters* with whom the Christ-believers in Corinth interact, even those to whom they are proclaiming the gospel message. The impaired are not *resistant* to eating idol food; rather, *the impaired have always eaten idol food as an act of religious significance*.³¹ After all, is it not more logical to suppose that Christ-believers "know" the truth about idols now, by definition, being Christ-believers? In what sense have they become Christ-believers if not by confessing the truth of the One, thus turning from the truth they had supposed before about idols and other gods and lords?³²

I thus suggest that the impaired are not insecure in their faith; they do not share faith in Christ with the knowledgeable. They are not troubled by eating idol food; that is what they do and have always done as a matter of course, "until now." Thus Paul's concern is not that the impaired will *revert* to idolatry, but that they will never turn away from it. If they witness that even Christ-believers, who otherwise deny their convictions, nevertheless still eat idol food, they will *continue* to sense that idolatry is right, leading to their self-destruction, when it should be the role of the knowledgeable to live in such a way as to prevent that outcome. Their "impaired" sense of what is right will ironically be "built up (οἰκοδομηθήσεται)," that is, they will be "edified" or

²⁹ Wendell Willis, "1 Corinthians 8–10: A Retrospective after Twenty-five Years," *ResQ* 49.2 (2007): 11, observes: "Almost everyone sees the 'weak' as simply those who are troubled by the eating of sacrificial meat."

³⁰ Cheung, *Idol Food*, 128–29.

³¹ Max Rauer, *Die 'Schwachen' in Korinth und Rom nach den Paulusbriefen* (Biblische Studien; Freiburg: Herder, 1923), 27–29, identifies the impaired to be Christ-believers, yet when arguing why they were not Christ-believing Jews, he recognizes that the impaired eat idol food as sacred to the idols and not common food because of their previous way of regarding it to be sacred to idols.

³² Cf. 1 Thess 1:9–10. This does bring up the interesting issue of whether the impaired might include some who have sought to add Christ-faith to their pantheon; see my discussion below of option four, about how Paul might fear the self-destruction of the impaired could follow from failure to conform to his teaching about idol food. See discussion of his instructions in ch. 5 about Christ-believers who engage in idolatry, for why I do not believe they are included among the impaired.

“strengthened”³³ to continue the course on which they have spent their whole lives, instead of challenged by the fact that Christ-believers are willing to abandon even the pretense of worshipping their many gods and lords (v. 10). They are brothers and sisters for whom Christ died, but they would not be reached with that message if the Christ-believers live according to the rights they suppose themselves to have, regardless of the consequences for those who do not share their knowledge.

It is not necessary here to define which specific idolatrous rites are at issue in Corinth, such as those carried out at the many religious temples, in mysteries, associations, homes, and festivals, most of these in some way integrated into the expression of imperial cult.³⁴ What is significant is that the “impaired ones” are so labeled because they do not share in the “knowledge” of Christ-believers that there is no god but the One; hence, their “*sense of what is right*” is “*impaired*.”³⁵

In other words, Paul fears that if these “impaired” idolaters were to see the Christ-believers’ eating idol food—which is notably introduced as a *hypothetical possibility* in 1 Cor 8:10³⁶—their own sensibilities would be *confirmed* instead of challenged as *misguided*. That outcome would be the opposite of what the knowledgeable Christ-believers, as former idolaters themselves, have apparently supposed to be the case. That case may be theoretical, that is, the knowledgeable may not be eating idol food, but they have enquired about the possibility of doing so.³⁷ Paul explains why they cannot begin that course.

³³ Interpreters regularly note that Paul uses the word meaning “to build up” ironically, to signify tearing down by arrogantly behaving in a way that encourages the other to do something harmful to themselves. However, Paul’s comment here need not mean that the impaired were not already doing the harmful thing at issue, which most interpreters understand to be implied. Building up need not signify the same thing as starting from scratch. The point is that they are strengthened in resolve to do it.

³⁴ For full discussions of the options, see, e.g., Willis, *Idol Meat*; John K. Chow, *Patronage and Power: A Study of Social Networks in Corinth* (JSNTSup 75; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992); Gooch, *Dangerous Food*; Derek Newton, *Deity and Diet: The Dilemma of Sacrificial Food at Corinth* (JSNTSup 169; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998); Fotopoulos, *Food Offered to Idols*; and the essays in Daniel N. Schowalter and Steven J. Friesen (eds.), *Urban Religion in Roman Corinth: Interdisciplinary Approaches* (HTS 53; Cambridge, Mass., and London: Harvard University Press, 2005).

³⁵ Willis, *Idol Meat*, 92, although upholding that the impaired are Christ-believers, makes an observation that fits my proposal that they were not: “Those who were ‘weak’ in *συνείδησις* were simply those who were ‘not knowing’ (8:7) the truth about idols and idol meat.” See also Martin, *Corinthian Body*, 179–89.

³⁶ Similarly noted by Garland, “Dispute Over Food,” 180.

³⁷ Karl-Gustav Sandelin, “Drawing the Line: Paul on Idol Food and Idolatry in 1 Cor 8:1–11:1,” in David E. Aune *et al.* (eds.), *Neotestamentica et Philonica: Studies in Honor*

Although Paul begins to explain why they cannot eat it on the basis of consideration of the negative impact on the impaired in ch. 8, in 1 Cor 10:1–22 Paul betrays the ultimate Jewish convictions that are at work in his thinking, and to which he will seek to move his audience as the argument unfolds: there are such things as daemons involved in idol worship, and thus food that has been associated with idolatry cannot be eaten by those who eat at the table of the Lord.³⁸ Although secondary to strategically agreeing with the knowledgeable that “we know that there are no idols in the *kosmos*” (8:4), and concluding that “for us there is One God” (8:6), as well as diminishing their importance when stating “even if there are those being called gods” (8:5a), Paul nevertheless includes from the start of his argument the admission that “there are many gods and lords” (8:5b).³⁹ While the knowledgeable know these gods represented by statues made by humans do not measure up to the God to whom they have now turned, and apparently are asking about eating idol food for any number of other reasons, not least probably to demonstrate that conviction or to avoid negative social consequences for failing to do so, they *cannot* eat it. Paul will finally make clear: What is sacrificed to daemons and not to God *must not be eaten*! God is *jealous* and does not accept for his people to associate in any way with such things. Thus, like the Israelites, the Corinthians, as members of the family of the One God must *flee from idolatry*; food that has been involved in idolatrous rites cannot be on their table (10:1–22).

What is the “ruin” Paul fears will result for the impaired if they witness Christ-believers eating idol food? Although the “ruin” or “destruction” (ἀπόλλυται) is self-inflicted by the impaired one in 8:11 (“he will cause himself to be ruined”), it is the knowledgeable who “strengthen” them to choose that course for themselves, who thus cause them to “stumble” in the direction of self-destruction, who “sin” against them, who “wound” their “sense of what is right” (vv. 9–13). At least several possibilities can be imagined to describe what Paul envisages:

(1) Idolaters may fail to *understand* that Christ-faith makes exclusivistic claims for the One God and Christ over against the claims of any other gods, since it appears to incorporate eating of food offered to other

of Peder Borgen (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 108–25, esp. 119. Whether the questions were posed to Paul in a challenging tone or not does not alter the point.

³⁸ For sources, consult notes 10 and 11 above.

³⁹ See also 2:8; 15:24–27, all of which admit the role of other gods and lords to articulate God’s superiority (also Rom 8:38–39; 16:20; 2 Cor 4:4; Phil 2:10).

gods.⁴⁰ Hence, the message of good in Christ is not being proclaimed as it should be, and cannot effect the changes Paul believes should result from proclamation of this news (cf. 14:22–25). The knowledge of the One that can save the impaired is being obstructed by the very ones who have themselves already benefited from understanding that message.

(2) Idolaters may not take the message of Christ-faith *seriously*, that is, on the exclusivistic and superiority terms that it claims against other gods and lords, such as the worship of the One God alone, and the message of salvation in Christ.⁴¹ Idolaters may conclude that even those who profess faith in Christ and the One God do not want to risk the wrath of the gods, or any of the other socio-economic, physical, and psychological consequences that polytheists might expect to result from neglect or abstention of various rites, or from opting out of the social networks within society that participation in these rites entails. That would likely lead to the a priori dismissal of the claims of the message of good in Christ. The message of good is thus being compromised, corrupted by its messengers.

(3) If idolaters did understand and take their exclusivistic claims seriously, and recognized that they claimed to have something superior to that which idolaters uphold to be true, then idolaters may regard those who profess it to *lack integrity*: they are hypocrites, arrogant troublemakers, or simply foolish.⁴² There is little force to their confession of faith in God and Christ to be exclusive of and superior to other gods. For these Christ-believers fail to live up to the truths proclaimed when they still participate in idolatrous rites, and eat idol-related food they have otherwise renounced to be inferior. This is different than being regarded to be foolish because of believing in the message of a crucified lord, and behaving consistent with that confession in the face of resistance, which Paul expects and experiences for his faithfulness to

⁴⁰ Deut 4:6–7, speaks of the nations who witness the Israelites observing Torah, which will therefore lead them to call Israel wise and understanding, and will recognize that there is no other God like theirs. Alternatively, often the prophets warn of the mocking of them and their God that failure to observe Torah will bring.

⁴¹ Somewhat similarly, Tomson, *Paul*, 216, states that to eat idol food after it is announced, would “*de facto* renounce the belief that ‘For us there is One God the Father’”; Cheung, *Idol Food*, 159, suggests: “If the Corinthians eat the food regardless, they will compromise their confession of the One God and abandon the basic Christian (and Jewish) critique of pagan gods.”

⁴² Similarly, Garland, “Dispute over Food,” 196.

the message. If idolaters conclude that Christ-believers are hypocrites, they will likely dismiss the message of good in Christ out of hand as lacking integrity.

(4) The Christ-believers' faith might be *perceived to incorporate the worship of other gods alongside* faith in Christ. If any polytheists are interested in Christ-faith for themselves, they may conclude that they can add the One God and Christ to their pantheon, in keeping with the common practice in Greco-Roman culture of incorporating new gods. This would appear to be fully compatible with their polytheistic sensibilities, based on observing the behavior of those who proclaim this news.⁴³ Ironically, the "superstitions" of their idolatrous family members, friends, neighbors, fellow association members, and social and political contacts, will all be confirmed, not denied. They will be caused to stumble, taking the form of merely adding God and Christ to their idolatrous way of life. The already impaired are thus rendered unable to know that which the knowledgeable know, and are being destroyed by continuing to live in idolatry. From Paul's implied point of view, if the knowledgeable eat food that idolaters (i.e., the impaired ones) regard to be sacred, it will confirm that it is indeed sacred, and the idolaters will be ruined as a result.⁴⁴

This option can be amplified by altering the language of Peter Borgen's argument for the consensus view: "Paul here seems to assume that the recent convert will interpret this [the knowledgeable eating idol food] positively and see it as permission to participate in polytheistic sacrificial meals. This may lead him to attempt a syncretistic fusion of

⁴³ Somewhat similarly, Hans Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians: A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (trans. James W. Leitch; Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975), 178, observes: "the Christian would objectify the power of the gods, and thereby 'preach' faith in them"; and Willis, *Idol Meat*, 241, notes: "the pagan who observes a Christian eating *ἱερὸν* might either think Christianity was syncretistic, or the Christian really is uncommitted in faith." Garland, "Dispute Over Food," 196, who interprets the impaired in chs. 8 and 10 to be Christ-believers, nevertheless observes the consequences concerning the unbeliever who identifies the food to be idol food in 10:27–29 in a way that is sympathetic to my argument throughout: if a Christ-believer knowingly eats idol food, "It would confirm, rather than challenge, the unbeliever's idolatrous convictions and would not lead the unbeliever away from the worship of false gods. If a Christian were to eat what a pagan acquaintance regards as an offering to a deity, it signals the Christian's tacit endorsement of idolatry"; Rudolph, "A Jew to the Jews," 91; see also Cheung, *Idol Food*, 159.

⁴⁴ *t. Aboda Zara* 6.4–6, discusses the rabbinic concern to avoid any behavior that could be seen by a polytheist and create the impression of idolatry; cf. Tomson, *Paul*, 162–63.

Christianity and polytheistic worship. According to Paul the convert is in this way destroyed.”⁴⁵ *Mutatis mutandis*, this could describe someone “impaired” who never desisted from polytheism, but sought to add Christ-faith, and indeed, it is possible that someone was regarded to be a member of the community by some other gospel than Paul’s, which did not include turning from idols to Christ. But that seems unlikely, since Paul does not here confront the Corinthians about what the proclamation of the gospel entails, but draws upon a shared understanding of that knowledge. Moreover, as will be discussed, this fails to take into account the implications of Paul’s instructions in ch. 5 about those *named* brothers and sisters who persist in idolatry: they are not to be accommodated, but challenged or dislodged. Rather, the alternative I wish to suggest to Borgen’s description is this: If the impaired one is not a “recent convert” but a polytheistic idolater who is not a Christ-believer, would not this lead him or her to see Christ-believers eating idol food sanctioning continued participation in idolatry, without knowing that it should be otherwise? Might he or she not conclude that Christ-faith can be added to his or her current mix of beliefs—“lead[ing] him to attempt a syncretistic fusion of Christianity and polytheistic worship”? Would that not lead the non-Christ-believer to self-ruin in a way not unlike the supposed Christ-believer Borgen posits—all the more so?

In each of these scenarios, the impaired can be understood to be *strengthened* in their misguided sense of what is right, failing to perceive “the truth” about idolatry, and thus Paul may conclude that the *perpetuation* of their *impaired* state as a result of the wrong behavior by the knowledgeable will lead the impaired *to their ruin*. All of these outcomes, including various combinations of them, would represent alienation from the message of good in Christ that Paul believes can be avoided if the Christ-believers refrain from eating idol food on behalf of the sensibilities of idolaters. He does not want idolaters to be “scandalized” by behavior not befitting those confessing the faith. He wants them to know the One God through Christ-faith. He wants his audience to follow his own example, for he would not even eat “meat” if the eating of any kind of “food” would cause the stumbling of some over the message of Christ (8:13); moreover, he adapts his presentation of the

⁴⁵ Peder Borgen, “‘Yes,’ ‘No,’ ‘How Far?’: The Participation of Jews and Christians in Pagan Cults,” in Troels Engberg-Pedersen (ed.), *Paul in His Hellenistic Context* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995), 51.

message to “everyone” in order that he might “gain” even “some” to be “saved” (9:19–23).

I thus conclude, in direct contrast to the consensus views, that the impaired ate idol food without any qualms; that is what idolaters do. Moreover, the knowledgeable most likely did not eat idol food,⁴⁶ or dine at polytheists’ temples,⁴⁷ just as Christ-believers would not be expected to do.⁴⁸ This point is accentuated all the more to the degree that we accept that these Christ-believers likely met as subgroups within the Jewish communities of Corinth.⁴⁹ Although these former polytheists wondered if it would be acceptable to eat it, most likely for a host of the socio-economic and psychological reasons associated with remaining “in the world,” in addition to the notion that it would demonstrate their faith proposition of indifference to idols, Paul herein sought to make it plain that they must not. It would perpetuate the impaired state of their idolatrous neighbors, rather than helping to bring them to faith in Christ, and it involved a relationship with evil forces that should be avoided at all costs (10:16–22). Paul reminds them what happened to Israelites who indulged in similarly mistaken logic (10:5–22, drawing on Numbers 25).

Paul’s original audience knew what we cannot know; namely, whether there were any Christ-believers behaving in the way in which the impaired are described, or whether his descriptions and concerns naturally matched those of their polytheist families, friends, and neighbors. Are there any other clues either within or outside of chs. 8–10 that might support the notion proposed herein, that it was polytheistic

⁴⁶ Similarly, Sandelin, “Drawing the Line,” 118–19.

⁴⁷ Thus giving weight to Paul’s example as an hypothetical construction to respond to their questions about whether they could do so. Note the conditional clause and subjunctive verb when Paul sets out the example: “for if (ἐάν) someone was to see (ἴδῃ) you...” (8:10).

⁴⁸ But see Zetterholm, “Purity and Anger,” 11–16. Although I agree that it is not the intrinsic nature of idol food that is at issue for Paul or for that matter the rabbis when discussing this topic (Mark D. Nanos, *The Mystery of Romans: The Jewish Context of Paul’s Letter* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996], 199–200), the basic premises of Paul’s argument here (and in Romans) suggests that he instructed from the start that any food known to have been involved in idolatrous rites was not to be eaten by those committing to Christ-faith. The implications of this policy have likely intensified after Paul left Corinth, leading to the questions that this discourse aims to answer.

⁴⁹ Cf. Richard A. Horsley, “Paul’s Assembly in Corinth: An Alternative Society,” in Schowalter and Friesen (eds.), *Urban Religion in Roman Corinth*, 371–95.

brothers and sisters' sensibilities and outcomes in Corinth with whom Paul was concerned?

Paul's Concern about Polytheists in 8:1–11:1, and throughout the Letter

That there were divisions among the Christ-believers in Corinth is not to be denied (cf. 1:11–12; 3:3–4; 6:6–8; 11:18–19).⁵⁰ Paul is apparently responding to issues reported to him (1:11; 5:1), or, more likely, that the recipients raised in correspondence to him (7:1; 8:1), which probably arose in response to his earlier letter, lost to us (cf. 5:9–11).⁵¹ But it is not clear whether Paul was specifically responding to a division between or among the addressees over idol food in 8:1–11:1,⁵² or instead addressing questions raised, or implications arising from the attitudes they expressed, perhaps in the way certain questions were posed, about how Christ-believers should behave “in the world.” A concern with factionalism in this letter does not exclude a concern with how Christ-believers should think and live in view of their role among their polytheist families, friends, neighbors, and larger world. Learning to eliminate factionalism amongst themselves is an important aspect of how they are to stand out from the world, as in, but not of it. They are those who celebrate the dawning of the age to come in the midst of the present age in a spirit of oneness, who must uphold that ethos on behalf of the service of their brother/sister of the world.

Paul draws a contrast between those who believe in many gods and lords and “us,” who believe in the One God, and in Christ Jesus (8:6).

⁵⁰ William Baird, “‘One Against the Other’: Intra-Church Conflict in 1 Corinthians,” in Robert T. Fortna and Beverly R. Gaventa (eds.), *The Conversation Continues: Studies in Paul & John in Honor of J. Louis Martyn* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1990), 116–36; Margaret Mary Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992).

⁵¹ Hurd, *Origins*, 47–94, passim.

⁵² I accept that this section was written as a composite: Hurd, *Origins*, 43–94, 114–49, who also raises questions about the prevailing assumption that there are two parties quarreling in the Corinthian church about this matter, albeit to a different conclusion, that the quarrel is between Paul and Corinthians, which I also find to be convincing. But I maintain that the impaired are real people, although not members of the community of God (*ekklesia*). They are the topic around which the issues (conflicts?) turn concerning how Christ-believers should live in the world among idolaters, and bear witness to their faith; cf. Smit, ‘*About the Idol Offerings*,’ 29–46.

While in 8:1 Paul apparently agrees that “we realize that everyone has knowledge” about things sacrificed to idols, that is, “we realize that there is no such thing as an idol in the world” (v. 4), at the same time Paul undermines this ostensible agreement: “however, there is not in everyone this knowledge” (8:7). Are not the “we” and “us” Christ-believers, versus the “them” who believe in idols, who do not realize that God is One, or believe in Jesus Christ?⁵³ It cannot be proven that the impaired “for whom Christ died” in 8:11 is intended to describe polytheist idolaters, or that to sin against polytheists is “to sin against Christ” (v. 12), but how can it be dismissed as if not within the conceptual range of such a statement? Did Christ not die for the unbeliever? Would not living in such a way as to prevent polytheists turning to Christ be considered by Paul to be sinning against Christ? Are not polytheists also “brothers/sisters” of God’s creation for whom Paul’s addressees should be unselfishly concerned?

It is hard to imagine that the addressees did not perceive that Christ died for those who do not yet believe in him, or that they could read his comments in 15:3 to mean that it was only the sins of Christ-believers for which he died, or upon receipt of the comments later in 2 Cor 5:14–15, that the “all” for whom he died was only all Christ-believers. And although I do not wish to claim that the Corinthians anticipated Romans, certainly Paul made the case in that letter that Christ died for those who did not yet believe in him. Not only that, but he describes the unbelievers of the world to be ἄσθεναί, before Christ died for them. Paul writes:

For while we were *still weak* (ἄσθενῶν), at the right time Christ died for the ungodly. Indeed, rarely will anyone die for a righteous person—though perhaps for a good person someone might actually dare to die. But God proves his love for us in that *while we still were sinners Christ died for us*. Much more surely then, now that we have been justified by his blood, will we be saved through him from the wrath of God. For if *while we were enemies*, we were reconciled to God through the death of his Son, much more surely, having been reconciled, will we be saved by his life. (Rom 5:6–10 NRSV; emphasis added)

⁵³ Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 379, maintains that the impaired are Christ-believing former idolaters, nevertheless he observes that “yet for *them* (i.e., the pagans) there are many ‘gods’ and many ‘lords.’”

Throughout 1 Corinthians Paul addresses matters arising from the polytheist communal context of the recipients (especially in chs. 7–11, 14).⁵⁴ Note, for example, that 5:9–13 sets out the difference between being in the world and behaving like the world, and his references to Gentiles (ἔθνεσιν) and the outsider (τοὺς ἕξω) function more like later usage of “polytheist” or “pagan.” In 6:1–11, Paul contrasts their identity as well as treatment of each other with that of the “unrighteous” (ἄδικοι) and “unbelievers” (ἀπίστων). 7:12–16 involves a discussion of marriage to an “unbeliever,” including how their partner is thereby “sanctified,” and the hope that he or she will be thereby “saved.” In 9:19–23, in the midst of this discussion of idol food in chs. 8 to 10, Paul states explicitly that he does everything he does for the sake of the gospel in order “to gain” and “to save some.”⁵⁵ He concludes ch. 10 with a seamlessly constructed concern to seek to avoid offending not only the Christ-believing ἐκκλησία (community), but also the Jews and Greeks (v. 32). The topic of women’s hair in 11:2–16 arguably involves how they will be perceived by outsiders.⁵⁶ Paul wraps up his instruction about proper conduct at the Lord’s supper with the powerful warning that those who undertake this rite improperly will be disciplined by the Lord: they are instructed to “judge” themselves in order that they “may not be condemned along with the cosmos” (11:27–32). Chapter 12 begins a discussion that extends through ch. 14 about how to conduct gifts and other behavior thus: “You know that when you were ‘members of the nations (ἔθνη),’ you let yourself be led away to dumb idols, however you were led” (v. 2). Paul expresses specific concern with the effect of the Christ-believer’s “spiritual” behavior upon “unbelievers” in 14:16–17, 22–25. He argues: “Tongues, then, are a sign not for

⁵⁴ Victor Paul Furnish, *The Theology of the First Letter to the Corinthians* (New Testament Theology; Cambridge, U.K. and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 16: “In one way or another, the issues taken up in the second section, 5.1–11.1, all derive from the church’s struggle to *be* the church in a world to which it does not finally belong.”

⁵⁵ Although some argue that the impaired in this text are Christ-believers, they do not argue that Paul cannot be referring to winning polytheists to faith in Christ here; instead, they seek to extend the reach to include winning Christ-believers to Paul’s way of thinking: cf. Wendell Willis, “An Apostolic Apologia? The Form and Function of 1 Corinthians 9,” *JNT* 24 (1985): 37; David Carson, “Pauline Inconsistency: Reflections on 1 Corinthians 9.19–23 and Galatians 2.11–14,” *Churchman* 100 (1986): 14–15; Gardner, *Gifts of God*, 96–99, 104–105; Richard B. Hays, *First Corinthians* (Interpretation; Louisville, John Knox Press, 1997), 155.

⁵⁶ Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins* (New York: Crossroad, 1984), 227–30.

believers (πιστεύουσιν) but for unbelievers (ἀπίστοις), while prophecy is [a sign] not for unbelievers (ἀπίστοις) but for believers (πιστεύουσιν). If, therefore, the whole church comes together and all speak in tongues, and outsiders (ἰδιῶται) or unbelievers (ἄπιστοι) enter, will they not say that you are out of your mind (μαίνεσθε)? But if all prophesy, an unbeliever (ἄπιστος) or outsider (ἰδιώτης) who enters is reproved by all and called to account by all. After the secrets of the unbeliever's heart are disclosed (τὰ κρυπὰ τῆς καρδίας αὐτοῦ φανερά γίνεται),⁵⁷ that person will bow down before God and worship him, declaring, 'God is really among you'" (14:22–25 NRSV). It is not difficult to see that Paul is not focused solely on intra-"Christian" matters in this letter: he wants his audience to learn how to live in order to "win" their polytheist families, friends, and neighbors to the confession of Jesus Christ.

Within the framework of 8:1–11:1, and allowing for the observation that there are dissimilarities between the cases described in chs. 8 and 10—the former about activity in a temple, and the latter seemingly about a home or other place that is not dedicated to cultic activity per se⁵⁸—a pertinent example arises in 10:27. Paul discusses the possible case of accepting an invitation to dinner from "one of the unbelievers (ἀπίστων)." In v. 28, Paul notes the possibility of a certain one—it is unclear whether the host or another guest—pointing out that the food served is "sacred food (ιερόθυτον)."⁵⁹ This terminology appraises

⁵⁷ NRSV adds the referent "unbeliever's" here, but literally this is a pronoun, "causing to be made known the secrets of *their* heart."

⁵⁸ Smit, 'About the Idol Offerings,' 61–65, clearly sets out the similarities and dissimilarities between 8:1–3, 7–13 and 10:23–30. Fotopoulos, *Food Offered to Idols*, 241–43, for discussion of the options for the food at issue in 10:27–11:1, and passim, for investigation of the probable locations and dynamics of idol food eating in Corinth.

Contra proposals that require the references to idol food only be to food eaten in cultic contexts, or that limit Paul throughout this section to only be addressing the issue of eating food in cultic contexts, or that insist idol food in markets was no longer considered to be idolatrous and thus not objectionable to Paul: Gordon Fee, "Εἰδωλόθυτα Once Again: An Interpretation of 1 Corinthians 8–10," *Biblica* 61 (1980): 181–87; Ben Witherington, "Not so Idle Thoughts about *Eidolothuton*," *TynBul* 44.2 (1993): 237–54; Gardner, *Gifts of God*, 183–85. See the challenges mounted by Bruce N. Fisk, "Eating Meat Offered to Idols: Corinthian Behavior and Pauline Response in 1 Corinthians 8–10 (A Response to Gordon Fee)," *TrinJ* 10 NS (1989): 49–70; Cheung, *Idol Food*, 101–12, 319–22; E. Coxe Still III, "The Meaning and Uses of ΕΙΔΩΛΟΘΥΤΟΝ in First Century Non-Pauline Literature and 1 Cor 8:1–11:1: Toward Resolution of the Debate," *TrinJ* 23 NS (2002): 225–34; see also Terry Griffith, "ΕΙΔΩΛΟΝ As 'Idol' in Non-Jewish and Non-Christian Greek," *JTS* 53 (2002): 95–101.

⁵⁹ It should be considered whether only some of the food was identified to be idol food, as a host or another guest today might indicate certain food or preparation issues

the food from a non-Jewish and non-Christ-believing cultural point of view; in contrast, Paul uses “idol food (εἰδωλόθυτον)” everywhere else in this passage.⁶⁰ This strongly suggests that Paul is portraying this “someone” to have the perspective of a polytheist idolater. Nevertheless, many interpreters maintain that this “someone” is an impaired Christ-believer.

Commentators have been baffled by the idea that Paul would express concern here for the “sensibilities” of polytheists, in language like that used in ch. 8 when discussing the impaired. But that is just the point! These interpretations travel in a circle that excludes consideration of the possibility that Paul might have been concerned with impaired unbelievers as “brothers/sisters” in ch. 8. Among other results, this leads to drawing sharp distinctions between the referent in 10:27 and the person described in vv. 28–29, and to other strained arguments.⁶¹ But there does not seem to be any grammatical or contextual grounds for a change of the referent from a polytheist to a “Christ-believer” between these verses.⁶²

The reasons that a non-Christ-believing host might inform a Christ-believer that the food had been sanctified could be many, including from helpful to malicious. For example, having offered the invitation, it could have been out of concern for the sensibilities of the

of concern to a known vegan guest, or one with allergies, to steer them away from certain choices, but also toward others.

⁶⁰ Although non-Jews and non-Christ-believers did sometimes refer to these representations as εἶδωλον (idols or images), it was a common Jewish characterization that played negatively off a term connoting merely an appearance or copy rather than the real item it represented, and later it continued to be used in similar ways by Christ-believing groups (Griffith, “ΕΙΔΩΛΟΝ As ‘Idol,’” 95–101; cf. F. Buchsel, *TDNT* 2.375–78).

⁶¹ E.g., Barrett, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 242; Gardner, *Gifts of God*, 96–105, 176–79; Fotopoulos, *Food Offered to Idols*, 245. Willis, *Idol Meat*, 235–45, offers a particularly useful discussion.

⁶² It is of interest to note that although many interpreters insist Paul always refers to Christ-believers when using ἀδελφοί (brothers/sisters), since he does not signal a change, the same standards are not always applied to his use of ἀσθενής (weak) in chs. 8 to 10, and all the more remarkably, between vv. 27 and 28–29 in ch. 10. Also the case of 11:29–30 should not be overlooked, where being weak and sick and even asleep/dead are linked to eating and drinking without proper discernment of the body in a way that would seem to point to the knowledgeable rather than to the impaired, since it represents the more liberal who need to be more circumspect; is Paul still using ἀσθενής for the same referents? It is most likely that these terms do not represent only one possible meaning for Paul. Meaning is derived from within the changing contexts of usage. Later interpreters are disadvantaged, not knowing the context in Corinth in the ways that the addressees do.

Christ-believing guest, or someone rumored to be such, or merely to cover the possibility of such guests among the invitees. That might be based on what the polytheist host has learned to be the *possible* “superstitions” of Christ-believers, which are understood to be like those of which they might be aware among Jews, even if only aware in stereotypical or secondhand terms about their supposed beliefs.⁶³ Or, it could have been a way of testing a Christ-believer, for example, to find out if he or she would eat idol food and thus be exposed as a hypocrite.

In 10:23–31, Paul explains to the knowledgeable, after making it clear up until this point that they cannot eat any food known to be set apart to idols, that this does not mean that they are responsible to investigate whether food that is not known to be idol food (i.e., available outside of cultic situations) is idol food, a concession to the practicalities of their lives in this Greco-Roman city. This exception does not pertain if someone informs them that it is idol food they are about to eat (v. 28). Similar rabbinic sensibilities are expressed in the sources listed in the discussion above. Paul’s instruction also implies that the market has available for purchase non-idol-related-food; otherwise, everything there would be known to be idol food, and thus by definition proscribed, rendering Paul’s point moot.

The concerns Paul expresses on both sides of chs. 8–10, which urge the audience to evaluate their behavior in terms of its impact upon polytheists, correspond to Paul’s message in this section, as argued herein, for why Christ-believers cannot eat idol food on behalf of the impaired. But one more ostensible obstacle remains to discuss.

⁶³ Interpreters do not generally seem to consider the potential for a benign or even concerned effort on behalf of a polytheist idolater toward the sensibilities of the Christ-believer; e.g., Gooch, *Dangerous Food*, 69, dismisses the option of non-Christ-believers in view because “there is no evidence whatever that non-Christians were objecting to Christians eating idol-food.” Indeed, but that does not mean that this possible identification “may be rejected immediately,” for “objecting” need not be at issue based on what Paul describes. Moreover, this may be a case representing just that evidence which Gooch considers missing, because it is being dismissed out of hand via circular reasoning. Also arguing for the likelihood of positive motives, see de Vos, *Community Conflicts*, 213. Fee, *Corinthians*, 483–85, suggests that a pagan is in view, and takes a somewhat similar line to the argument offered here, however he accounts for accommodating a pagan’s consciousness very differently: because “it [idol food] is *not* a matter of Christian moral consciousness” (485).

Polytheists as “Brothers/Sisters on Behalf of Whom Christ Died”?

Standing in the way of my proposed identification of the “impaired,” as well as my interpretation of other language in 1 Cor 8:1–11:1, is the fact that Paul refers to the impaired as ἀδελφός/οί.⁶⁴ The translators of the NRSV are certain enough that Paul means by ἀδελφός fellow-believers in Christ that the fact that Paul refers to them as ἀδελφός is masked in the text that English-only readers meet in 8:11: “So by your knowledge those weak *believers* for whom Christ died are destroyed,” although literally Paul writes: “for by what you know you are causing the impaired one to destroy him/herself, the brother/sister (ἀδελφός) on behalf of whom Christ died.”⁶⁵

Throughout 1 Corinthians Paul regularly refers to Christ-believers in the kinship terminology of brotherhood (ἀδελφός/οί), referring to people who are not related to each other by other familial ties, such as by birth or legal adoption. Before ch. 8 he refers to “our brother” Sosthenes (1:1), addresses and exhorts them as “brothers/sisters” (1:10, 11, 26; 2:1; 3:1; 4:6; 7:24, 29), and uses this language to differentiate between Christ-believers and others (5:11; 6:5–8; 7:12–15). This kinship

⁶⁴ Elsewhere, I have argued in other letters for instances where Paul uses this kinship language to refer to non-Christ-believers: in Rom 9:3, for non-Christ-believing Jews as “my brethren (ἀδελφῶν μου)”; throughout Romans 14 with reference to the ἁσθένεια, whom I understand to be non-Christ-believing Jews; and in Gal 2:4, for the “pseudo-brothers (ψευδοἀδελφούς)” in Jerusalem, whom I understand to be fellow Judeans, but not Christ-believers; see Nanos, *Mystery of Romans*, 110–13; idem, “Intruding ‘Spies’ and ‘Pseudo-brethren’: The Jewish Intra-Group Politics of Paul’s Jerusalem Meeting (Gal 2:1–10),” in Stanley E. Porter (ed.), *Paul and His Opponents* (PAST 2; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 65–68. Objections to my argument in the case of Romans have been made by Robert A. Gagnon, “Why the ‘Weak’ at Rome Cannot Be Non-Christian Jews,” *CBQ* 62 (2000): 64–82, which I have answered in Mark D. Nanos, “A Rejoinder to Robert A. J. Gagnon’s ‘Why the ‘Weak’ at Rome Cannot Be Non-Christian Jews,’” *Unpublished Paper* available at <http://www.marknanos.com/Gagnon-rejoinder-6-20-03.pdf> (2000): 1–37.

⁶⁵ Emphasis added; note that the KJV and NASV as well as RSV do not similarly substitute “believer” for “brother.” Reidar Aasgaard, *My Beloved Brothers and Sisters! Christian Siblingship in Paul* (Early Christianity in Context: JSNTSup 265; London and New York: T&T Clark International, 2004), in an extensive and useful study, does not even express awareness that this question could arise for this passage. He begins a discussion of sibling language in Paul’s letters with the subheading, “Christian Siblingship in Paul,” and early in the introduction has already concluded that Paul uses ἀδελφοί only for fellow-Christians, except in Rom 9:3, where it is specifically “used in a traditional way, of compatriots”; “it occurs here in a metaphorical-ethnic sense, not in a metaphorical-Christian” (4 n. 5).

language continues to be used in similar ways after ch. 8 as well: for specific Christ-believing fellow-workers: 16:11–12 (general: 16:20); in general address to the recipients of the letter: 10:1; 11:33; 12:1; 14:6, 20, 26, 39; 15:1, 31, 50, 58; 16:15; and to differentiate Christ-believers from others: 9:5 (note lit.: “*sister-wife* (ἀδελφὴν γυναῖκα),” as well as “*brothers* of the Lord and Cephas”); 15:6.

Such usage of fictive kinship language is common in other Pauline as well as other New Testament texts,⁶⁶ just as it is common in the Tanakh⁶⁷ and other Second Temple literature,⁶⁸ and Greek and Roman literature too.⁶⁹ At the same time, many of these sources use familial language to reach across group boundaries in ways not unlike it is being proposed that Paul should be read in this case.⁷⁰

The concept of a household or family was broader than generally conceptualized today, more extended and fluid. It could include a broad array of family members, slaves, former slaves who are now freepersons as well as their families, and other employees.⁷¹ There were

⁶⁶ To note just Paul, for example, it is applied to fellow non-Christ-believing Jews by Christ-believing Jews: by Paul in Rom 9:3; and in speeches attributed to Jews in Acts 2:29; 3:17; 7:2; 13:15, 26, 38; 22:1; 23:1; 28:17.

⁶⁷ Exod 2:11; 32:27; Lev 19:17; Deut 3:18; 15:2–3, 11–12; 23:19; 24:7; Judg 20:13; 21:6; 2 Chron 19:10; Neh 5:1; Job 30:29; Ps 22:22; Prov 18:24; Isa 66:20; Jer 22:18; Zech 11:14. von Soden, *TDNT* 1.144–46, observes categorically: “There can be no doubt, however, that ἀδελφός is one of the religious titles of the people of Israel taken over by the Christian community” (145).

⁶⁸ Tobit 1:3, 10, 16; 5:10–14; 7:1–12; 10:6; 14:4; Jdt 7:30; 8:14; 1 Macc 5:16; 2 Macc 1:1; 1 Esdras 1:5–9; 4:61; 8:77. For the Qumran group, see 1QS 1.9; 2.24–25; 5.25; 6.10, 22; CD 6.20; 7.1; 1QSa 1.18. Philo, *Det.* 140, universalizes the lesson to be learned from Cain’s denial of responsibility to his brother; *Virt.* 82: “Therefore Moses forbids a man to lend on usury to his brother, meaning by the term brother not only him who is born of the same parents as one’s self, but every one who is a fellow citizen or a fellow countryman”; *QG* 1.65–77, universalizes from Cain’s murder of Abel, his brother; Josephus, *War* 2.122, to describe the brotherhood among the Essenes. See also *m. Sota* 7.8.

⁶⁹ Plato, *Menex.* 238e–239a, for compatriots; Xenophon, *Anab.* 7.2.25, for friends; Plotinus, *Enn.* 2.9.18, for all things in the world; in many papyri and inscriptions for members of religious societies; von Soden, *TDNT* 1.146; Aasgaard, *My Beloved Brothers and Sisters!*, 107–12.

⁷⁰ E.g., 1 Macc 11:30; 12:10, 17, to refer to the bond between the Judeans and the Spartans; Philo, *QG* 2.60, which universalizes brotherhood around “all we men are akin to one another, and are brothers, being connected with one another according to the relation of the highest kind of kindred; for we have received a lot, as being the children of one and the same mother, rational nature.”

⁷¹ See Philip Harland, *Associations, Synagogues, and Congregations: Claiming a Place in Ancient Mediterranean Society* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003), 30–33; Aasgaard, *My Beloved Brothers and Sisters!*, 34–60.

also household-based associations,⁷² and one should not discount the dynamics associated with patron-client relationships. The Hippocratic oath bound the medical student not only to his teacher as a son, but to the teacher's sons.⁷³ Fictive kinship labels were common not only in synagogue groups, but also among polytheist friends, political allies, fellow soldiers, members of religious groups, trade guilds, and voluntary associations, which are attested in surviving epigraphs and letters.⁷⁴ Members of the Great Mother cult regarded themselves to be family, and called each other mother and father as well as sister and brother, as did also participants in the Mithras cult, including reference to "holy brother" and "holy father," and fictive sibling language is attested for other cults.⁷⁵

Fictive kinship is expressed in a more general sense within virtually any group, and in many overlapping, even disparate ways, including across different group boundaries. It is a constructed and thus dynamic concept based on the perception of shared history and characteristics that can either be understood to be inherent to a group of people, such as blood or seed or land (i.e., essentialist), or defined by a group around values which they perceive themselves to share in common and in contrast to other groups and their values (i.e., processual).⁷⁶ These two seemingly different concepts are actually both at work at the same time, for the claim to an inherent bond is itself the construction of identity, and both what is claimed and how it is emphasized can change. Kinship can also be used to signify non-human relationships.⁷⁷ Late in the first or early in the second century, Ignatius calls upon his addressees to pray for outsiders to the church, and to conduct themselves as "brothers/sisters (ἀδελφοί)" to them, which is expressed not by behaving like them, but by imitating how Christ lived humbly toward his neighbor,

⁷² Harland, *Associations*, 30–33.

⁷³ *The Oath*, lines 5 to 15; cf. Caroline Johnson Hodge, *If Sons, Then Heirs: A Study of Kinship and Ethnicity in the Letters of Paul* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 40.

⁷⁴ Harland, *Associations*, 30–33, for examples; Aasgaard, *My Beloved Brothers and Sisters!*, 107–12.

⁷⁵ Aasgaard, *My Beloved Brothers and Sisters!*, 109–11.

⁷⁶ Gerd Baumann, *The Multicultural Riddle: Rethinking National, Ethnic, and Religious Identities* (New York: Routledge, 1999), 81–95; Johnson Hodge, *If Sons, Then Heirs*, 20–22, 118–20, and passim, for many implications for the study of Paul.

⁷⁷ Cf. Philo, *Leg.* 1.8, "And appetite is the brother of imagination"; *Det.* 40; 66; *Post.* 100; *Ebr.* 70–71; *Fug.* 90–91; *Somn.* 109; *Contempl.* 7; *QG* 2.12; *QG* 2.60; *QG* 3.43, 56.

including choosing to be wronged rather than to wrong them (*Eph.* 10).⁷⁸ Although Chrysostom understood the impaired in 1 Corinthians 8–10 to be Christ-believers, he made an argument relevant to the point I am trying to make, that on socio-economic grounds the Christian in his own audience ought to regard as *brother* the fellow-laborer more than the elite or wealthy.⁷⁹

The concept of a brotherhood of humankind is not a Christian innovation, or only attested earlier among Israelites. It was at work in Alexander the Great's concept of uniting the world under his rule,⁸⁰ and it was an important concept among philosophical groups, especially articulated by the Stoics and Cynics.⁸¹ Although slightly later than Paul, Epictetus appealed to the brotherhood of humankind through the shared nature of all humans, including slaves, because all were offspring of Zeus, thus citizens of the universe and sons of god (*Diatr.* 1.9.4–6; 1.13.4). Elsewhere he describes the Cynics to revile all whom they meet because they regard them to be parents, children, brothers, and themselves to be servants of Zeus, father to all humans (*Diatr.* 3.22.81–82). Marcus Aurelius upheld that all humans were kin, including the sinner, who should cooperate with one another like various parts of one body, since all had within themselves an element of the divine (2.1; 7.22; 9.22–23).

But did Paul herein employ fictive kinship language for polytheist idolaters, or can he even be imagined to conceptualize them in such affectionate terms? Is that not just how he urges his audience to think and behave, and how he lives his whole life, on behalf of “the some” he can “gain” and “save”?⁸² Are not the concerns he expresses in 10:24 made in the most general terms: “Let no one seek his own [interest],

⁷⁸ Ignatius also writes of looking not only to one's own concerns, but to those of “one's neighbors (τοὺς πέλας),” which is juxtaposed with discussing how true love is not marked only by the desire “that oneself be saved (σώζεσθαι), but all the brothers (τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς) as well” (*Mart. Pol.* 1.2; M. Holmes transl.).

⁷⁹ Schaff (ed.), *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. First Series. Vol. XII. Chrysostom: Corinthians*, 117 [Homily 20].

⁸⁰ In an effort to explain the universalistic aspirations and policies of Alexander, the first-century CE Roman historian Quintus Curtius, *History of Alexander* 10.3.11–14, portrays Alexander addressing his new Persian troops to understand themselves in his eyes to be “soldiers of our blood, not brought in from outside.” Plutarch portrays Alexander envisioning a philosophical commonwealth united around the virtuous as kin, and the wicked as foreigners (*On the Fortune of Alexander* 329B–D).

⁸¹ Aasgaard, *My Beloved Brothers and Sisters!*, 108–109.

⁸² 1 Cor 9:19–23; Chrysostom observes that Paul claims “all things whatsoever I do, I do for the salvation of my neighbor” (Schaff [ed.], *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. First Series. Vol. XII. Chrysostom: Corinthians*, 132 [Homily 23]).

but that of the other (τοῦ ἑτέρου)? Does Paul not wrap up his overall case against eating idol food in just these terms: in 11:1, to imitate his example of imitating Christ, and in 10:32–33, with the call to “become inoffensive to Jews and to Greeks and to the *ekklesia* of God,” just as he does himself, in order to “save” “the many”?⁸³

Paul’s language in 5:9–12, especially v. 11, opens a window into his perspective on believers in Christ versus non-believers that is important to this discussion. Paul explains that when he instructed them in an earlier letter not “to be associated with immoral people (συναναμίγνυσθαι πόρνοις)” (v. 9), he did not mean all of the immoral people “of this world,” such as “the greedy,” “thieves,” and “*idolaters* (εἰδωλολάτραις),” because that would necessitate departing from the world to be accomplished (v. 10). He meant that they should not associate with someone “calling themselves brother or sister (ἀδελφὸς ὀνομαζόμενος),”⁸⁴ “if” he or she “is an immoral person, a greedy person, an *idolater*, a swindler, a drunkard, or a thief”; indeed, they are not to even eat with anyone [causing themselves to be called brother or sister] of that sort (v. 11). He continues in vv. 12–13, by way of ironic questions, to make the point that it is not his place to judge those “outside,” which it is God’s place to do, but it is however the audience’s place to judge those “inside.” He concludes with the imperative to remove from their midst the immoral man (v. 13), who was the topic of the preceding verses (5:1–8).

This usage of fictive kinship language distinguishes Christ-believers from others. But notice that there is a formality introduced in Paul’s language to identify specifically those who choose “to call themselves” brother or sister, and he also uses inside/outside terminology to accentuate the point. It is relevant to observe that Paul’s instruction does not suggest the kind of respect and tolerance toward a fellow-Christ-believer that the usual interpretations for the impaired in ch. 8 require. For the impaired ones continue to be idolaters if they eat food offered to idols, *since they continue* to believe that idols represent real gods, that food offered to them is sacred, which Paul refers to as their habit “until

⁸³ Chrysostom observes the logical connection here: “Not only, however, should the brethren receive no hurt from us, but to the utmost of our power not even those that are without. . . . Since even Gentiles are hurt, when they see us reverting to such things: for they know not our mind nor that our soul hath come to be above all pollution of sense. And the Jews too, and the weaker brethren, will suffer the same” (Schaff [ed.], *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. First Series. Vol. XII. Chrysostom: Corinthians*, 146 [Homily 25]).

⁸⁴ Middle voice, accentuating the action of the one who chooses this kinship label.

now." On the prevailing interpretations, they would be Christ-believers, but nevertheless *idolaters*.⁸⁵ That anomaly could arise, as discussed in point four above, for one seeking to add Christ-faith to their pantheon, based upon witnessing Christ-believers eating idol food, coupled with a proclamation of a gospel quite different than the one Paul proclaims, which involves turning away from idols as fundamental. It is to ensure that just such a case does not arise that he undertakes several arguments in this letter. While in theory it could have already occurred—the implications of his instructions in ch. 5 seem to preclude it to be the case addressed in chs. 8–10.

In view of Paul's instruction in ch. 5, if they have eaten with a bothered sensibility about doing so, or even refrained because they sensed that food offered to idols remained sacred to the god it represented, as usually described, then this should suggest that, *instead of being accommodated* (the knowledgeable might say, "pandered to"), Paul would call for them to be properly instructed *to change* their ways, *or else be removed* from the assembly. Yet Paul does not call for the "impaired ones" to be instructed to change or be thrown out of the assembly in chs. 8–10. He makes it clear that those who are "called brothers and sisters" *cannot* practice idolatry, whereas those who are idolaters but do not believe in Christ are to be treated under a different, more tolerant standard, such as that articulated in the text under consideration: they are to adjust to the sensibilities of the impaired. Paradoxically, that is the kind of accommodation one might expect to be promoted toward a natural-born brother or sister, or a spouse (cf. 7:10–16!), but it is quite different from the judgment Paul commands toward those identified to be Christ-believing brothers and sisters.

The accommodation Paul expresses in ch. 8 toward the impaired corresponds to the position he champions in ch. 5 toward polytheists, not toward fellow Christ-believers. Why does Paul not also instruct the impaired, if Christ-believers, to undertake the ideas and behavior that he otherwise instructs the Corinthians to express, in this case, to give up idolatry? Because they are not Christ-believers, they are not "named" ἀδελφοί in terms of shared faith in Christ. They are not members of "the community of God." At the same time, why does he not address the knowledgeable as if they are Christ-believing

⁸⁵ Hans Lietzmann, *An die Korinther I/II* (HNT 9; 5th ed.; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1969), 43, tellingly writes of an "Halbchristen."

ἁδελφοί who would be guilty of idolatry if they ate idol food knowingly? Because the knowledgeable do not eat idol food. Although they have apparently enquired about the possibility, which likely arose for them on theoretical, logical grounds, because idols are now regarded by them to be neutral. And because they live within in an idolatrous culture, this issue arises for them on practical grounds too. How else are they to succeed in the world?

Conclusion

Paul's perspective reveals a sense of fictive kinship with all humankind—"on behalf of whom Christ died." Idolaters who do not yet profess faith in Christ are to be regarded as brothers and sisters too, fellow-members of the family of humans God created and seeks to restore in Christ. That is a dimension of their identity about which the knowledgeable needed to be set straight, in view of their resistance to his earlier instruction proscribing idolatry for all Christ-believers.⁸⁶ They have apparently failed to properly calculate the destruction such "know-it-all" behavior will bring both upon themselves, and upon their polytheist neighbors, whom they are instead to learn (to know how) to love as they do themselves.

The impaired are to be treated differently than fellow Christ-believers, those "being named" brother and sister. Rather than being judged, polytheists are to be gained by behavior consistent with the confession of Christ-faith. That involves not eating any food know to be set apart to idols. It involves not insulting the "mistaken" beliefs of the impaired, but learning how to develop speech and behavior calculated to implicitly undermine them. The knowledgeable are to relate to the impaired on terms that will communicate the "knowledge" of Christ to them, which means they must not live in a way that can be mistaken to deny their confession of the One.

Paul outlines his own strategy for accomplishing this on behalf of those whom he seeks "to save," by way of example, in the midst of his instructions in these chapters, in 9:19–23. Paul sketches how he relates

⁸⁶ Furnish, *Corinthians*, 55, similarly observes: "what drives and shapes his mission to 'outsiders' is the conviction that no one stands beyond the circle of God's saving purpose, and that, in this sense, even unbelievers are 'insiders' to God's grace (see 9.19–23)."

to various kinds of people according to their own premises in order to proclaim the gospel to each in terms to which they can relate. He does not behave like them, for example, he does not eat like them, but remains Torah-observant when he eats. Yet he adjusts his rhetorical behavior and posture to deliver the gospel to different people in different ways. For example, to the Jew he argues like a Jew, from Torah, to the lawless he argues like a lawless person would, apart from appeal to law, and to the impaired he argues like the impaired would argue. That is just how Luke portrays him to proceed in the Areopagos speech of Acts 17:16–31, where Paul discloses the Unknown God to which they have built a statue (idol) to be the Creator God (v. 23), that is, he begins his argument from within their own premises. But in the course of his argument he eventually reveals his own very different conviction about the appropriateness of building this or any image to represent the divine (v. 29), and challenges them to turn away from idols to the God who has raised Jesus Christ from among the dead (vv. 30–31; cf. v. 18). Notably, Luke understands Paul to appeal to the brotherhood of all humankind based upon common origin in one man (vv. 26–31).⁸⁷

In Romans, Paul, the Christ-believing Jew, will teach non-Jews how to live in order to gain their Jewish brothers and sisters, those for whom Christ came first of all;⁸⁸ in 1 Corinthians we witness Paul teaching non-Jews how to gain their Greek (and Roman) polytheist brothers and sisters. Albeit informed by Paul's own Christ-faith based Jewish group perspective, both instructions appeal to the development of empathy across communal lines where sibling rivalry, or worse, so often prevails.

⁸⁷ Cf. Acts 2:5; 10:35; Rom 5:12–19; 1 Cor 15:45–49; F. F. Bruce, *The Acts of the Apostles: The Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary* (3rd revised and enlarged ed.; Grand Rapids and Leicester, U.K.: Eerdmans and Apollos, 1990), 382–83.

⁸⁸ Nanos, *Mystery of Romans*.

“FLESHLY” VERSUS SPIRIT PERSPECTIVES IN ROMANS 8:5–8

Craig S. Keener

Palmer Theological Seminary, Wynnewood, Pennsylvania, USA

Scholars have often explored the dominant biblical and Jewish motifs of Paul’s description of flesh and Spirit,¹ which certainly inform how we should understand Paul’s contrast between the “frame of mind of the flesh” (φρόνημα τῆς σαρκὸς) and the “frame of mind of the Spirit” (φρόνημα τοῦ πνεύματος).² Although this Jewish understanding contributes most to our understanding of the passage, I want to explore briefly how an audience familiar with the sort of language represented in Greek and Roman philosophy would have heard Paul’s argument here. This exploration may make available additional nuances in understanding how members of a probably mixed real Diaspora community would have heard Paul’s words.³

Greek and Roman philosophers contrasted two ways of thinking, wisdom and folly, as ideal types. Although they would not have adopted the biblical language of “flesh” (σάρξ) and (God’s) “Spirit,” some associated folly with bodily passions and true wisdom with transformation by meditation on God. Some elements of Paul’s argument (such as the

¹ E.g., David Flusser, *Judaism and the Origins of Christianity* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, Hebrew University, 1988), 62–65.

² On this sense of φρόνημα, see BDAG. Sometimes below I have translated it as “perspective,” to avoid an awkward double genitive construction in English. In any case, it suggests not every individual thought but a settled way of thinking, a pervasive conviction or direction of thought.

³ Most scholars, in fact, recognize that Paul’s audience in Rome was predominantly Gentile (cf. Rom 1:5–6, 13–16; 11:13); see, e.g., Mark D. Nanos, *The Mystery of Romans: The Jewish Context of Paul’s Letter* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996), 77–84; James D. G. Dunn, *Romans 1–8* (WBC 38A; Dallas: Word, 1988), 1:xlvi, liii; Thomas H. Tobin, *Paul’s Rhetoric in Its Contexts: The Argument of Romans* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2004), 37; Robert Jewett, *Romans: A Commentary* (with R. D. Kotansky; Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), 70. Moreover, Hellenistic anthropology deeply impacted Jewish sources, not only those widely acknowledged as Hellenized (e.g., *Let. Aris.* 236; Josephus, *Ag. Ap.* 2.203) but even sources normally reflecting a more traditional Semitic perspective (*1 En.* 102:5; *Sipre Deut.* 306.28.2; see discussion below). For some dualistic language in Paul, see also, e.g., C. J. de Vogel, “Reflexions on Philipp. i 23–24,” *NovT* 19 (1977): 262–74; G. M. M. Pelser, “Dualistische antropologie by Paulus?” *Hervormde Teologiese Studies* 56 (2000): 409–39.

importance of right thinking or dependence on a divine rather than merely personal, human perspective) would have been more intelligible to them than others.

The Emphasis on Wise Thinking in Philosophy

Philosophers emphasized the importance of reason. Thus reason was the part of the human that embraced philosophy;⁴ philosophy claimed to offer reason as the cure for the human discontent with nature.⁵ In fact, for Stoics (the most popular philosophic school in Paul's era), the virtues are themselves types of knowledge.⁶ True prudence involved the recognition that the only true good one could control was virtue, and the only true evil was vice.⁷ Thinking rightly also involved not fearing fortune and remaining joyful in hardship, thus controlling the one matter over which one held power, namely oneself.⁸ Stoics thought that falsehood perverted the mind, and this distortion produced the harmful emotions.⁹

φρόνησις, a cognate to Paul's term in Rom 8:6–7,¹⁰ was one of the four traditional Aristotelian virtues, now widely used beyond Aristotelian circles;¹¹ the term and its cognates often describe the sound thinking

⁴ Musonius Rufus 16, p. 106.3–6, 12–16.

⁵ Cora E. Lutz, "Musonius Rufus: The Roman Socrates," *JCS* 10 (1947): 3–147, here 28 (citing Musonius Rufus frg. 36).

⁶ Arius Didymus, *Epit.* 2.7.5b5, pp. 18f, lines 15–17.

⁷ Lutz, "Musonius," 28.

⁸ Seneca, *Nat. Quaest.* 3, praef. 11–15; Epictetus, *Diatr.* 2.19.32; cf. Seneca, *Ep.* 96.1–2; 123.3; *Prov.* 1.3.1; Musonius Rufus 17, p. 108.37–38; Epictetus, *Diatr.* 2.5.4; 2.14.7–8; for a later Platonist, Porphyry, *Marc.* 30.470–76. For Stoic unconcern with matters not under one's control, see, e.g., Seneca, *Vit. beat.* 7.8.3; Epictetus, *Diatr.* 1.12.23; 1.29.22–29; 4.1.133; Lucian, *Vit. auct.* 21; but they did recognize some externals as good (Arius Didymus, *Epit.* 2.7.5c, pp. 30–31.5–6).

⁹ Diogenes Laertius 7.1.110.

¹⁰ This cognate of φρόνημα should not be confused with it, but their semantic range overlaps significantly (see BDAG).

¹¹ E.g., Musonius Rufus 4, p. 44.11–12; 4, p. 48.1; 6, p. 52.21; 9, p. 74.26; 17, p. 108.9–10; Arius Didymus, *Epit.* 2.7.5b1, pp. 12f, lines 13–22; 2.7.5b2, pp. 14f, lines 1–4; 2.7.5b5, pp. 18f, lines 21–35; Menander Rhetor 1.3, 361, lines 14–15; 2.5, 397.23; cf. Arius Didymus, *Epit.* 2.7.5a, pp. 10–11, lines 7–9; 2.7.5b, pp. 10–11, lines 16–21. For rulers and governors, Dio Chrysostom, *Or.* 3.7, 58; Menander Rhetor 2.1–2, 373.7–8; 2.3, 380.1–3; 2.3, 385.28–386.6; 2.10, 415.24–26; for cities, Dio Chrysostom, *Or.* 32.37.

appreciated by Stoics¹² and others.¹³ For Stoics, this virtue involved right and virtuous thinking.¹⁴ The real heart of philosophy lies ἐν τῷ φρονεῖν ἃ χρὴ καὶ διανοῖσθαι—in thinking on the things that are necessary and contemplating them.¹⁵ Perhaps relevant for Paul's comments about the perspective of the flesh involving death (Rom 8:6), for Stoics thinking (φρονεῖν) the right way included overcoming the fear of death.¹⁶

Jewish sources in Greek also speak of purifying the mind from evil desires,¹⁷ sometimes by meditating on what was right.¹⁸ Some of these sources speak of meditating on wisdom¹⁹ or on what was good.²⁰ Just as Stoics emphasized agreeing with nature's decrees, many Jews emphasized that right thinking recognized God's rule over human affairs.²¹

Two Categories in Humanity as Ideal Types

Traditional Stoics divided humanity into two categories: the wise, virtuous and otherwise perfect (an extremely small minority); and the foolish and vice-ridden (the masses of humanity).²² Virtues were inseparable; whoever had one had all²³ (thus whoever had virtue could simply

¹² E.g., Arius Didymus, *Epit.* 2.7.5f., pp. 30f., lines 22, 33.

¹³ The virtue was praiseworthy in cities (Menander Rhetor 1.3, 364.10–16) and rulers (Menander Rhetor 2.1–2, 376.13–23; 2.3, 385.28–386.6; 2.10, 415.26–416.1).

¹⁴ Arius Didymus, *Epit.* 2.7.5b1, pp. 12f., lines 13–16, 22–25; 2.7.5b2, pp. 14f., lines 4–5, 12–14; 2.7.5b5, pp. 18f., lines 21–26; 2.7.11e, pp. 68f., lines 12–16; 2.7.11i, pp. 78f., lines 12–14.

¹⁵ Musonius Rufus 16, p. 106.16. For focusing thoughts on the nature of the universe, hence accepting necessity, see also Musonius Rufus frg. 42, p. 138.9–11.

¹⁶ Musonius Rufus 3, p. 42, line 3. We discuss this perspective further below.

¹⁷ *T. Reub.* 4:8. Evil enters through the mind (e.g., *T. Iss.* 4:4).

¹⁸ *T. Ash.* 1:7–9.

¹⁹ *Wis* 6:15; 8:17.

²⁰ *Let. Aris.* 236 (cf. 212).

²¹ *Let. Aris.* 244; cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 18.18; *T. Iss.* 4:3. Jewish sources can also tend to emphasize God's sovereignty over the mind (*Let. Aris.* 227, 237–38, 243).

²² See Arius Didymus, *Epit.* 2.7.11g, pp. 72f., lines 5–24; cf. 2.7.5b8, pp. 22–23.5–14; 2.7.5b10, pp. 24–25.5–17; 2.7.5b12, pp. 24–25.28–30; 2.7.5c, pp. 28f., lines 3–16. The good person is as good as Jupiter (Seneca, *Ep.* 73.12–16).

²³ Arius Didymus, *Epit.* 2.7.5b5, pp. 18f., lines 17–20; 2.7.5b7, pp. 20f., lines 25–26. Most ancient philosophic schools agreed that virtue was a settled disposition rather than partial (Troels Engberg-Pedersen, "Paul, Virtues, and Vices," in J. Paul Sampley (ed.), *Paul in the Greco-Roman World: A Handbook* [Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 2003], 608–33; idem, *Paul and the Stoics* [Louisville Westminster John Knox; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000], 52; cf. Maximus of Tyre, *Or.* 8.7).

act accordingly).²⁴ Others sometimes ridiculed this portrait;²⁵ Lucian points out that Stoic sages themselves did not claim to have achieved this ideal wisdom.²⁶ At least by this period, however, Stoics, may have often employed these categories as ideal types.²⁷ Stoics might recognize that mental transformation took time,²⁸ and they spoke of “progress” in virtue;²⁹ Seneca, for example, acknowledged that his own progress in virtue was not yet adequate.³⁰

Of course, the biblical wisdom tradition also divided humanity into wise and foolish, again to some extent as ideal types.³¹ A moral division between righteous and wicked, those with knowledge of God and those who lack it, pervades the Qumran scrolls as well,³² in which God’s Spirit purifies the righteous remnant community.³³ Like the Stoics, the community that produced the scrolls also recognized their own imperfection; here the righteous could be called “perfect” in some sense, yet recognized their weakness before God.³⁴

²⁴ Diogenes Laertius 7.1.125 (reporting the Stoic view).

²⁵ Cf. Wayne A. Meeks, *The Moral World of the First Christians* (LEC 6; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986), 45, citing Plutarch.

²⁶ Lucian, *Hermotimus, or Sects* 76–77. Ancient sages in other cultures could also assume the distinction between an ideal type and its attainment (e.g., Confucius, *Analects* 7.16; 14.30). Some Greco-Roman thinkers also argued for degrees of virtue and vice, against the Stoic ideal types (Cicero, *Fin.* 4.24.66); later Platonists averred that the philosopher could be virtuous and wise by nature yet still need guidance in that direction (Plotinus, *Enn.* 1.3, ch. 3).

²⁷ For one nuanced portrait, see Engberg-Pedersen, “Paul, Virtues, and Vices,” 612–13 (on three types of person).

²⁸ E.g., Epictetus, *Diatr.* 1.15.6–8.

²⁹ See, e.g., Cicero, *Fin.* 4.24.67; Seneca, *Ep.* 87.5; 94.50; Epictetus, *Diatr.* 2.17.39–40; *Encheir.* 12–13; 51.2; Lucian, *Hermot.* 63; Marcus Aurelius 1.17.4; Diogenes Laertius 7.1.25; Arius Didymus, *Epit.* 2.7.7, pp. 42–43.26; cf. Anna Lydia Motto, “The Idea of Progress in Senecan Thought,” *CJ* 79 (1984): 225–40.

³⁰ Seneca, *Ep.* 87.4–5.

³¹ Thus a wisdom psalm praises the wholly righteous (Ps 119:1–3), then pleads to be among them (Ps 119:5). Rabbis warned against violating the least commandment (e.g., *Abot R. Nat.* 35, §77 B; *Sipre Deut.* 48.1.3) yet acknowledged that nearly everyone sinned (George Foot Moore, *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era* [2 vols.; New York: Schocken, 1971], 1:467–68; Flusser, *Judaism*, 62).

³² E.g., 1QM 1.11, 11; 13.16; 1Q34bis f3i.5.

³³ See, e.g., 1QS 3.7; 4.21; 4Q255 f2.1; cf. Max-Alain Chevallier, *Ancien Testament, Hellénisme et Judaïsme, La tradition synoptique, L’œuvre de Luc*, vol. 1 in *Souffle de Dieu: Le Saint-Esprit dans le Nouveau Testament* (Le Point Théologique 26; Paris: Éditions Beauchesne, 1978), 56–57; Craig S. Keener, *The Spirit in the Gospels and Acts: Divine Purity and Power* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1997), 8–10; J. Coppens, “Le Don de l’Esprit d’après les textes de Qumrân et le Quatrième Évangile,” in *L’Évangile de Jean: Études et Problèmes* (Recherches Bibliques 3; Louvain: Desclée De Brouwer, 1958), 209–23, esp. 211–12, 222.

³⁴ For their “perfection” or completeness by some standard, see, e.g., 1QS 4.22; 8.25;

When Paul divides humanity into those with the perspective of the flesh and those with the perspective of the Spirit, in a sense he addresses ideal types, rather than differentiating levels of commitment within those types. All those who have the Spirit are people of the Spirit (Rom 8:9); all others belong in the sphere of helpless, mortal humanity, i.e., in the flesh (or, as many commentators put it, in the sphere of the old Adam). That is, the actual division is not based on the degree of accommodation to the "flesh," but on whether or not the Spirit is active. The Spirit effects true righteousness; ideally this produces perfect character, but ancient hearers could recognize that in practice this ideal might not obviate the value of progress.

The Perspective of the Flesh

Paul's particular language contrasting the spheres of human flesh with God's Spirit is surely Jewish.³⁵ It reflects first the LXX use of σάρξ (especially in Gen 6:3, where it is contrasted with God's Spirit) and more broadly early Jewish usage, including the equivalent Hebrew term, such as is also reflected in the Qumran scrolls. "Flesh" was not by itself evil, but its mortality and finiteness deprived it of moral perfection, hence making it susceptible to sin.³⁶ For Paul, then, the "frame of mind involving the flesh" would be a chronic perspective from mere human, bodily existence as opposed to a life perspective informed and led by God's presence.

While Jewish usage informs Paul's vocabulary, some analogies in broader Mediterranean thought may augment his argument's intelligibility. Because Paul does use "flesh" at least partly with relation to bodily existence (Rom 7:5, 23–25), although not fully identifying

10.22; 1QM 14.7; 4Q403 f1i.22; 4Q404 f2.3; 4Q405 f3ii.13; f13.6; 4Q491 f8–10i.5; 1QHa 8.35; 9.38; but contrast 1QHa 12.30–31; 17.13; 22.33.

³⁵ See, e.g., W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology* (4th ed.; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980), 18; Flusser, *Judaism*, 64–65; Jörg Frey, "Die paulinische Antithese von 'Fleisch' und 'Geist' und die palästinisch-jüdische Weisheitstradition," *ZNW* 90 (1999): 45–77.

³⁶ E.g., 1QH 9.14–16; 1QS 11.9, 12; *T. Jud.* 19:4; *T. Zeb.* 9:7. Cf. Max Wilcox, "Dualism, Gnosticism, and Other Elements in the Pre-Pauline Tradition," in Matthew Black (ed.), *The Scrolls and Christianity: Historical and Theological Significance* (London: SPCK, 1969), 83–96 (here 94–95). In Paul, see, e.g., Dunn, *Romans*, 1:370; idem, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 67–73.

“flesh” with “body,”³⁷ some observations about the body in some Greek thought may help us better approximate how some of Paul’s audience may have heard him.³⁸

Gentile intellectuals regularly distinguished soul from body,³⁹ frequently emphasizing the former’s immortality⁴⁰ (although not all held this view).⁴¹ Some Greek thinkers denigrated the body, even regarding it as a tomb from which one might be released at death.⁴² Some complained that they were imprisoned in or shackled to it.⁴³

Against common scholarly opinion, even early Jewish sources often distinguish soul from body. We might expect this distinction in Josephus⁴⁴ and other Hellenized sources,⁴⁵ but it also appears in many sources traditionally viewed as less Hellenized.⁴⁶ Jewish sources, both

³⁷ The observations of John A. T. Robinson, *The Body: A Study in Pauline Theology* (London: SCM Press, 1957), 31, remain helpful here; but see also Robert H. Gundry, *Sôma in Biblical Theology: with Emphasis on Pauline Anthropology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 50.

³⁸ Stoics could view σάρξ as physical and unimportant (Epictetus, *Diatr.* 2.23.30; Marcus Aurelius 2.2), and Philo could view it as the source of ignorance (*Gig.* 29–31).

³⁹ E.g., Aristotle, *Eth. nic.* 1.12.6 1102a; Lucretius, *Nat.* 3.370–95; Plutarch, *Isis* 78, *Mor.* 382F; *Plat. Q.* 3.1, *Mor.* 1002B; *Pleas. L.* 14, *Mor.* 1096E (using σάρξ); Marcus Aurelius 5.13; 6.32; Diogenes Laertius 3.63; Heraclitus, *Ep.* 9; Diogenes, *Ep.* 39; Sextus Empiricus, *Pyr.* 1.79; *Greek Anth.* 7.109. Some recognized this distinction for humans only (Sallust, *Bell. Cat.* 1.2, 7), but others applied it to animals also (Aristotle, *Pol.* 1.2.10 1254a; Diogenes Laertius 8.1.28).

⁴⁰ Plato, *Leg.* 828D; *Phaed.* 64CE; *Phaedr.* 245C; *Resp.* 611BC; Aristotle, *De an.* 1.4 408b; Herodotus 2.123; Cicero, *Sen.* 20.78; *Tusc.* 1.14.31; Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. rom.* 8.62.1; Seneca, *Helv.* 12.11.7; *Ep.* 57.9; Plutarch, *D. V.* 17, *Mor.* 560B; Diogenes Laertius 8.5.83; Plotinus, *Enn.* 4.7–8; Philo, *Virt.* 67. On the weakness of flesh (σάρξ), see, e.g., Plutarch, *Pleas. L.* 6, *Mor.* 1090EF.

⁴¹ Most notably, Epicureans viewed the soul as mortal (Lucretius, *Nat.* 3.417–829; Diogenes Laertius 10.124–25); Stoics also came to accommodate their view of the soul to their view of the cosmic conflagration (Seneca, *Marc.* 6.26.7).

⁴² Plato, *Crat.* 400BC. The concept appears often, with or without the language: Plato, *Phaed.* 80DE; Epictetus, *Diatr.* 1.1; 1.8–9; 1.9.11–12, 16; 3.13.17; 4.7.15; Arrian, *Anab.* 7.2.4; Plutarch, *Isis* 5, *Mor.* 353A; Marcus Aurelius 3.7; 4.5, 41; 6.28; 9.3; Plotinus, *Enn.* 1.5.3.

⁴³ E.g., Philostratus, *Vit. Apoll.* 7.26.

⁴⁴ Josephus, *Ag. Ap.* 2.203; *Ant.* 17.353; *War* 1.650; 3.372; 7.340, 348.

⁴⁵ *Let. Aris.* 236; *L.A.B.* 3:10; *T. Ash.* 2:6; *T. Naph.* 2:2–3; *T. Job* 20:3; *Apoc. Ezek.* 1–2. When conjoined, “soul and body” often imply the whole (e.g., 2 Macc 7:37; 14:38; *Let. Aris.* 139; *T. Sim.* 2:5; 4:8).

⁴⁶ E.g., *1 En.* 102:5; *t. Sanh.* 13:2; *b. Ber.* 10a; 60b; *Yoma* 20b. See especially the Hellenistic dualistic language in *Sipre Deut.* 306.28.3; later, *Gen. Rab.* 14:3; *Ecl. Rab.* 6:6–7, §1.

those traditionally regarded as more Hellenized⁴⁷ and other sources,⁴⁸ also usually embraced the immortality of the soul. Some even used various forms of the Greek idea of the body as a tomb.⁴⁹ More to the point here, Gentiles could relate the body to passions,⁵⁰ and some Jewish writers followed suit.⁵¹

Later Platonists pressed this distinction between soul and body farther than most of Paul's contemporaries would have.⁵² That the body must obey the soul⁵³ was not an unusual idea, but Platonists could also advocate fleeing the body.⁵⁴ One must hold the connection with the body lightly,⁵⁵ for the passions nailed the soul down to the body.⁵⁶ Already Plato himself had spoken of the body and its desires as a source of evil.⁵⁷ Even the first-century Jewish Middle Platonist Philo warned against the mind loving the body.⁵⁸ But such thinking was not limited to Platonists. Even Cicero emphasized the mind acquiring freedom from the body and its passions, hence escaping pain and fear

⁴⁷ E.g., Philo, *Leg.* 1.1; *Abr.* 258; Josephus, *Ant.* 17.354; 18.14, 18; *War* 1.84; 2.154, 163; 7.341–348; *T. Abr.* 1:24–25A; 4:9; 9:10B; *Jos. Asen.* 27:10/8; *Apoc. Mos.* 13:6; 32:4; 33.2.

⁴⁸ E.g., *1 En.* 22:7; *4 Ezra* 7:78; *Gen. Rab.* 14:9. Sadducees, however, reportedly denied immortality (Josephus, *Ant.* 18.16).

⁴⁹ Philo, *Somm.* 1.138–39; cf. *Wis* 9:15; Josephus, *War* 2.154–55.

⁵⁰ Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. rom.* 9.52.6; Seneca, *Dial.* 2.16.1; Plutarch, *Adv. Col.* 27, *Mor.* 1122D (σάρκινον); Maximus of Tyre, *Or.* 7.7; Iamblichus, *VP* 31.205; Porphyry, *Marc.* 14.242–44, 249–50.

⁵¹ For the body and passions, see, e.g., Philo, *Leg.* 2.28; *Sacr.* 48; *Post* 96, 155; *Deus* 111; *Agr.* 64; *Plant.* 43; *Abr.* 164; *Mos.* 2.24; *T. Jud.* 14:3; for contrast with the soul, see, e.g., Philo, *Gig.* 29–31; for the earthly body versus the heavenly soul, e.g., *Sipre Deut.* 306.28.2. Cf. later rabbinic comments on bodily members and the evil impulse (e.g., *'Abot R. Nat.* 16A; 16, §36 B; *Pesiq. Rab Kah.* Sup. 3:2).

⁵² They generated a context that influenced some patristic interpretation. Augustine interpreted Paul as supporting a dichotomy between a spiritual mind and a fleshly body (*C. Jul.* 70; Augustine was influenced heavily by Platonism); but even Augustine denied that the body was evil (Augustine, *Contin.* 10.24). Chrysostom, *Hom. Cor.* 17.1, places the sphere of temptation especially in the mind.

⁵³ Porphyry, *Marc.* 13.234–35.

⁵⁴ Porphyry, *Marc.* 10.176; cf. 9.172–73; 33.506–7. One must “ascend” from the body, gathering the fragments of the soul into their original unity (10.180–183); pleasures hindered ascent from the body to the gods (*Marc.* 6.103–8; 7.131–134). Loving the body too much violates natural law (Porphyry, *Marc.* 25.394–395).

⁵⁵ Porphyry, *Marc.* 32.485–495.

⁵⁶ Iamblichus, *VP* 32.228 (cf. Plato, *Phaed.* 83D). Still, the real source of evils came from choices in the soul, not from the body (Porphyry, *Marc.* 29.453–57).

⁵⁷ Plato, *Phaed.* 66CD.

⁵⁸ Philo, *Deus* 111.

of death.⁵⁹ Dio Chrysostom warned of those who loved the body and bodily pleasures.⁶⁰

Others, like Stoics, focused not on the bodily character of the passions but on the danger of false beliefs.⁶¹ Paul is probably closer to the Stoic understanding here, but is not exactly the same. For most philosophers, reason would help them to subdue the passions⁶² (the rabbinic struggle between the Torah-enlightened mind and the evil impulse⁶³ is probably analogous). For Paul, however, the mind struggling with the passions (Rom 7:23–25) is probably still the fleshly mind (8:5–7).

In Paul, the body, guided by a renewed mind (Rom 12:2–3), could be used for good (12:1; cf. 6:13); but it could also be used for sin (1:24; 6:12–13; 7:5), and even be closely associated with it (6:6; 8:10, 13; cf. 7:24). Relevant to our discussion of the “fleshly mind,” bodily passions could war against the mind (7:23). Yet, though the mind might disagree with bodily passion (7:23, 25), it could be subject to it and corrupted by it (1:28). Thus the frame of mind shaped by the flesh, by human frailty susceptible to temptation, cannot please God (8:8). In this context, only new life in the Spirit could free one (8:2).

This failure was not because of an inherent deficiency in the original creation. Rather, fleshly choices of the mind that lacked the Spirit warped the mind. From early in Romans’ “narrative,” ungrateful minds became too “futile” to recognize God in creation, distorting creation by idolatry (Rom 1:19–23), hence ultimately their own sexuality made

⁵⁹ Cicero, *Leg.* 1.23.60. The mind should control the body, and especially the baser parts of the mind (Cicero, *Resp.* 3.25.37; *Inv.* 2.54.164); reason rather than pleasure should rule (Maximus of Tyre, *Or.* 33.3). For Stoics, everything was material, including the mind and virtues (Arius Didymus, *Epit.* 2.7.5b7, pp. 20f., lines 28–30).

⁶⁰ Dio Chrysostom, *Or.* 4.115; 13.13.

⁶¹ Stanley K. Stowers, “Paul and Self-Mastery,” in J. Paul Sampley (ed.), *Paul in the Greco-Roman World: A Handbook* (Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 2003), 524–550 (540).

⁶² See, e.g., 4 Macc 1:1, 9, 29; 2:18, 21–22; 3:2–5; 13:1–2; Philo, *Leg.* 3.156; Porphyry, *Marc.* 31.478–83. Stowers, “Self-Mastery,” 529, views this approach as Platonic rather than Stoic. This contrast may be technically true, though cf. Arius Didymus, *Epit.* 2.7.10a, pp. 56–57.24–30; pp. 58–59.5–6.

⁶³ See, e.g., *Sipre Deut.* 45.1.2; *Abot R. Nat.* 16A; *Pesiq. Rab Kah.* Sup. 3:2; *Tg. Qoh.* on Eccl 10:4. Cf. 4 Macc 2:23; Stowers, “Self-Mastery,” 531–34, on Philo and Josephus. Paul speaks not only of the mind but of the “law” of the mind (Rom 7:23, 25); the law is, as often noted, the central issue in Romans 7.

in God's image (1:24–27).⁶⁴ Thus creation was subjected to "futility"⁶⁵ until the glorification of God's children, when the original divine image would be restored (8:20–23, 29).⁶⁶ For Paul, however, believers with the first fruits of the Spirit are not bound by the same "futility" of the fleshly mind that is blinded by the world's idolatry.

The Perspective of the Spirit

Gentile references to deities dwelling in or affecting mortals' minds are not, of course, as relevant to Paul's discussion as Jewish sources concerning the the Spirit of the one true God,⁶⁷ but they illustrate that Paul's imagery need not have been unfamiliar or unintelligible to even some of the less biblically literate members of his real audience.

For a Stoic, the ideal was to be of "one mind" with God, hence accepting reason and the will of fate;⁶⁸ such a person had become virtually divine, though such a person was difficult to find.⁶⁹ One could approach God only rationally, because God was pure Intelligence.⁷⁰ The Stoic philosopher Epictetus speaks of the presence of the deity in all people.⁷¹ The Roman Stoic Seneca likewise insists that God comes into

⁶⁴ Paul's terms for "male" and "female" here need not, but probably do, allude to the creation of humanity in God's image in Gen 1:27 (cf. Mark 10:6), so that his Stoic language of "nature" for him evokes also the biblical creation narrative.

⁶⁵ Rom 8:20 offers the only use of a *ματαιο-* cognate in Romans outside 1:21. One might therefore suppose that Adam subjects creation to futility by his embrace of the spirit of idolatry (cf. Gen 3:5–6); but elsewhere Pauline literature uses *υποτάσσω* in the active with respect to God subjecting all things to Christ (1 Cor 15:27–28; Eph 1:22) or Christ subjecting all things to himself (Phil 3:21). While none of these references speak of subjecting creation to "futility," and Christ is for Paul the second Adam, Pauline usage may still favor God being the one subjecting creation here.

⁶⁶ For "image" and "glory" in Paul, see 1 Cor 11:7; 2 Cor 3:18; 4:4. This is a reversal of distorting God to resemble the "image" of creation (Rom 1:23). Slavery to "corruption" in 8:21 echoes the "corruptible" creation worshiped in 1:23 (liberated in the future, in 8:21–23; cf. imperishable resurrection bodies in 1 Cor 15:42, 50, 53–54).

⁶⁷ Which could also "dwell" in them, e.g., Wis 7:27; *L.A.B.* 28:6; *T. Sim.* 4:4; cf. Keener, *Spirit*, 8.

⁶⁸ See Musonius Rufus frg. 38, p. 136.4–5 (literally, simply *τῷ θεῷ*); Epictetus, *Diatr.* 2.16.42. On thinking like Zeus, cf. Dio Chrysostom, *Or.* 4.42–43. Mortals' minds, unlike those of the gods, were ignorant (Socrates in Valerius Maximus 7.2. ext. 1a).

⁶⁹ Epictetus, *Diatr.* 2.19.26–27.

⁷⁰ Epictetus, *Diatr.* 2.8.2.

⁷¹ *Diatr.* 1.14.13–14; 2.8.10–11, 14.

people, with divine seeds being sown in them.⁷² For Paul, God's Spirit specifically dwelt in those who belonged to Christ (Rom 8:9).

Platonists also emphasized connecting the mind to God, and they believed that they could become like God⁷³ by meditating on him. For a later Platonist, the mind contemplating God could be God-possessed,⁷⁴ and could be God's temple.⁷⁵ One would honor God by conforming one's διάνοια (thought) to him;⁷⁶ virtue would achieve this "likeness" to God, because virtue causes the soul to ascend to what is related to it.⁷⁷

In this system, pure intellect constituted the means to achieve this contact with the divine. For an orator with Middle Platonic affinities, removing layers of sense perception helps one to see God;⁷⁸ meditating on divine beauty frees the soul from the lower realms' corruption.⁷⁹ Although divine beauty was perfect in the heavenly realms, only intellect could penetrate it in the lower, sensory realms.⁸⁰ In a later period, a Neoplatonist averred that the soul envisions the beauty of the Good in the sphere of Ideas.⁸¹ Another Neoplatonist opined that the wise soul was always beholding God.⁸²

For the Jewish Middle Platonist Philo, intelligence represented a divine element in humanity.⁸³ For Philo, God was transcendent, hence

⁷² Seneca, *Ep.* 73.16 (after arguing that good people are divine, 73.12–16); cf. later Marcus Aurelius 2.13, 17; 3.5, 6, 12; 3.16.2; 5.10.2. Cf. Ovid, *Fasti.* 6.5–6; divinizing intimacy and union in Iamblichus, *VP.* 33.240.

⁷³ On Platonists desiring to be like God, see A. D. Nock, *Early Gentile Christianity and its Hellenistic Background* (New York: Harper & Row, 1964), 55.

⁷⁴ Porphyry, *Marc.* 19.314–16; 20.329–30. The divine law was accessible only to the mind (Porphyry, *Marc.* 26.409–10), and thoughts of God cleanse one (*Marc.* 11.204). Thales allegedly opined that one should keep one's thoughts pure because the celestial spirit was present even during thinking (Valerius Maximus 7.2. ext. 8); Pythagoras allegedly purified his mind (Iamblichus, *VP.* 16.70).

⁷⁵ Porphyry, *Marc.* 19.318–19. Much earlier, some associated a certain way of thinking with the immortal element (Isocrates, *Demon.* 32). Later Platonists also believed that evil δαίμονες in the soul caused wickedness (Porphyry, *Marc.* 11.201–2).

⁷⁶ Porphyry, *Marc.* 16.265–267.

⁷⁷ Porphyry, *Marc.* 16.267–268.

⁷⁸ Maximus of Tyre, *Or.* 11.11.

⁷⁹ Maximus of Tyre, *Or.* 11.10.

⁸⁰ Maximus of Tyre, *Or.* 21.7–8.

⁸¹ Plotinus, *Enn.* 1.6, "On Beauty," especially chap. 9.

⁸² Porphyry, *Marc.* 16.274.

⁸³ E.g., Philo, *Leg.* 2.10, 23; *Deus* 46–48. The view that reason shared in divinity was widespread (e.g., Aelius Aristides, *Or.* 2.409–10, §139D).

could be encountered through mystical vision, especially ecstatically.⁸⁴ In contrast to Gentile Platonists, in Philo this vision depends completely on God's self-revelation,⁸⁵ as among other Platonists, however, only the pure soul could see God.⁸⁶

For some ancient thinkers, as the mind contemplates realities from a heavenly perspective, it transcends human finiteness and mortality.⁸⁷ The wiser spirits rise to the stars, while those addicted to physical pleasures long remain in the lower realms even long after their death.⁸⁸ Thus one should contemplate good and honorable matters;⁸⁹ some opined that such thoughts "emanated from the divine."⁹⁰ When Job's daughters are inspired with angelic languages, they stop thinking of (φρονεῖν) "earthly" things.⁹¹ Such language may be relevant to "heavenly" imagery in some later Pauline literature (Eph 2:6; especially Col 3:1–2).⁹²

Thus for Platonists one experienced the divine mind through meditating on God's perfection, and Stoics accepted the divine mind by embracing fate. By contrast, for Paul, as we have mentioned, the Spirit internalizes God's law (Rom 8:2–4), as the prophets had promised.⁹³ The new mind exists by virtue of being in Christ, and one accesses the divine mind through the experience of the Spirit. Like Philo, Paul would reject any notion of reaching God by pure reason apart from revelation.

⁸⁴ See Marie E. Isaacs, *The Concept of Spirit: A Study of Pneuma in Hellenistic Judaism and its Bearing on the New Testament* (Heythrop Monographs 1; London: Heythrop College, 1976), 50; John Dillon, "The Transcendence of God in Philo: Some Possible Sources," in *Center for Hermeneutical Studies in Hellenistic and Modern Culture Colloquy* 16 (Berkeley: Center for Hermeneutical Studies in Hellenistic and Modern Culture, 1975), 1–8; Donald A. Hagner, "The Vision of God in Philo and John: A Comparative Study," *JETS* 14 (1971): 81–93, here 89–90.

⁸⁵ *Abr.* 80.

⁸⁶ Philo, *Mut.* 92. For biblical examples, see *Mut.* 3–6; *QG* 4.138; *Mut.* 92, 146; *Somn.* 1.171; *Abr.* 57.

⁸⁷ Seneca, *Nat.* 1, praef. 7, 17.

⁸⁸ Cicero, *Resp.* 6.26.29; *Tusc.* 1.31.75.

⁸⁹ E.g., Iamblichus, *VP* 5.26; see Phil 4:8.

⁹⁰ Porphyry, *Marc.* 11.199–201 (trans. p. 55).

⁹¹ *T. Job* 48:2 (cf. no longer "desiring" worldly things in 49:1); cf. also the approach of *merkabah* mystics.

⁹² See further discussion of "heavenly" perspectives in C.S. Keener, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2003), 559–61.

⁹³ In light of 2 Cor 3:3, 6 (cf. Rom 7:6), a midrashic combination of Ezek 36:26–27 and Jer 31:31–34 inform Paul's understanding (cf., e.g., F. F. Bruce, *Paul: Apostle of the Heart Set Free* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977], 199; Dunn, *Romans*, 1:417).

The Frame of Mind of the Spirit is Peace (Romans 8:6)

When ancient writers spoke of something like “peace” (quietness, lack of disturbance) in connection with the mind, they could refer to inner harmony or tranquility. While Paul undoubtedly thinks of more than tranquility (as we suggest below), it may be part of the sense that he and his real audience would hear in this context.

Various philosophies claimed to provide peace and tranquility;⁹⁴ this could contrast, as in Rom 8:6, with preoccupation with “death.” Epicureans, for example, claimed to establish peace of mind by banishing superstition and fear of death.⁹⁵ Many thinkers claimed that the fear of death was irrational,⁹⁶ including Stoics⁹⁷ and Epicureans.⁹⁸ How bravely a philosopher dies, ancient observers often maintained, is a real test of the philosopher’s beliefs and character.⁹⁹ A philosopher should remain unafraid when facing dangers.¹⁰⁰

⁹⁴ For various ancient philosophic approaches to achieving tranquility, see Richard Bett, “The Sceptics and the Emotions,” in Juha Sihvola and Troels Engberg-Pedersen (eds.), *The Emotions in Hellenistic Philosophy* (TSHP 46; Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1998), 197–218 (212). On the importance of peace of mind (ἀταραξία) in philosophy, see Malte Hossenfelder, “Ataraxia,” in Hubert Cancik and Helmuth Schneider (eds.), *Brill’s New Pauly: Encyclopaedia of the Ancient World* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 2:218–19.

⁹⁵ Cicero, *Fin.* 1.18.60; Lucian, *Alex.* 47 (εἰρήνην καὶ ἀταραξίαν); for lack of disturbance in the mind, see Lucretius, *Nat.* 5.1203; Diogenes Laertius 10.144.17. Epicureans advised temperance as a means for achieving this objective (Cicero, *Fin.* 1.14.47).

⁹⁶ E.g., Cicero, *Leg.* 1.23.60; Diogenes *Ep.* 28; Maximus of Tyre, *Or.* 11.11; 36.2; Iamblichus, *VP* 32.228. Cf. Valerius Maximus 9.13. praef.; 9.13.3; Plutarch, *Poetry* 14, *Mor.* 37A; Sir 40:2, 5; Heb 2:14–15; *Mart. Pol.* passim.

⁹⁷ Seneca, *Ep.* 80.6; 82 passim; 98.10; *Nat.* 1, praef. 4; 2.58.3; 6.32.12; *Tranq.* 9.11.4–5; Musonius Rufus 1, p. 34.31–33; 3, p. 40.35–p. 42.1; 3, p. 42.3; 4, p. 48.5–6; 17, p. 110.1, 12–13; Epictetus, *Diatr.* 1.17.25; 2.1.13; 2.18.30; Marcus Aurelius 9.3; 12.35; cf. Marcus Aurelius 8.58. But even philosophers could admit to struggling with this fear (Musonius Rufus 6, p. 54.35–p. 56.7, esp. p. 56.2).

⁹⁸ Perhaps especially Epicureans; see, e.g., Lucretius, *Nat.* passim (esp. 1.102–26; 3.1–30, 87–93; cf. Tim O’Keefe, “Lucretius on the Cycle of Life and the Fear of Death,” *Apeiron* 36 [2003]: 43–66; James Warren, “Lucretius, Symmetry Arguments, and Fearing Death,” *Phronesis* 46 [2001]: 466–91); Cicero, *Fin.* 1.18.60; 4.5.11; *Nat. d.* 1.20.56; Diogenes Laertius 10.125.

⁹⁹ E.g., Cicero, *Fin.* 2.30.96–98; cf. tested bravery in Seneca *Ep.* 66.50. For failure in this regard exposing a false philosopher, see Lucian, *Peregr.* 42–44.

¹⁰⁰ Musonius Rufus 8, p. 66.10; cf. Iamblichus, *VP* 32.224–25. On philosophers against fear, see further Valerius Maximus 3.3. ext. 1; Seneca, *Ben.* 4.27.1; *Ep.* 13; 98.6; Dio Chrysostom, *Or.* 1.13; 3.34; Crates, *Ep.* 7; Arius Didymus, *Epit.* 2.7.5a, p. 10.11; 2.7.5b, pp. 12–13.6; 2.7.5b1, pp. 12–13.27–29; 2.7.5c, pp. 28–29.14–15; Philostratus, *Vit. Apoll.* 1.23. Stoics valued tranquility and peace of mind (Seneca, *Ira* 4.12.6; 4.13.2; 5.6.1; 9 passim; *Ep.* 75.18; Musonius Rufus frg. 38, p. 136.1–3; Epictetus, *Diatr.* 1.4.1; Arius Didymus, *Epit.* 2.7.5b1, p. 12.31–33; 2.7.5k, p. 34.1–4; 2.7.11s, p. 100.7), as did

Consequently, one sign of true philosophers in general was to be their tranquility even in hardship.¹⁰¹ Granted, philosophers often fell short of this standard;¹⁰² yet they did not believe that this failing negated the value of their ideal. Many averred that uncontrolled negative emotions were harmful,¹⁰³ but also that philosophy was instrumental in conquering useless emotions.¹⁰⁴ Paul's approach to suffering will be different here (Rom 8:17–18, 35–39), but it is possible that he could have accepted a contrast between tranquility and anxiety about death, had some of his first audience so understood him (cf. 1 Cor 15:58; 2 Cor 4:13–14; 5:6–8; Phil 1:20–21; 1 Thess 4:13).

Stoics in particular emphasized tranquility and lack of internal disturbance;¹⁰⁵ the ideal wise person was tranquil.¹⁰⁶ For Seneca, the reward for disciplining the mind for endurance was tranquility of the soul;¹⁰⁷ this was the opposite of such disturbing passions as anger.¹⁰⁸ Truth liberates from error and fear, hence provides tranquility in the soul.¹⁰⁹ The mind should be as tranquil and restful as the highest heavens.¹¹⁰ Another Roman Stoic, Musonius Rufus, emphasized that the correct use of reason could lead to serenity and freedom.¹¹¹ One achieved serenity by gaining the object of the only desire one could be certain to gain by seeking it exclusively, namely virtue.¹¹²

Epicureans (Lucretius, *Nat.* 5.1198–1206; Cicero, *Fin.* 1.14.47; Lucian, *Alex.* 47; Diogenes Laertius 10.131; 10.144.17) and others (Iamblichus, *VP* 2.10; cf. Cicero, *Amic.* 22.84; Hossenfelder, "Ataraxia").

¹⁰¹ E.g., Seneca, *Nat.* 6.32.4; Epictetus, *Diatr.* 2.19; Iamblichus, *VP* 2.10; 32.220; Philostratus, *Vit. Apoll.* 1.23. Other factors, like friendship, could bring the soul tranquility (Cicero, *Amic.* 22.84).

¹⁰² Musonius Rufus 6, pp. 54.35–56.7 (esp. p. 56.2); Aulus Gellius 19.1.4–21; Diogenes Laertius 2.71 (on Aristippus).

¹⁰³ E.g., Cicero, *Off.* 1.29.102; 1.38.136; Iamblichus, *VP* 32.225. To restrain passions was part of virtue (*Off.* 2.5.18).

¹⁰⁴ E.g., Valerius Maximus 3.3. ext. 1.

¹⁰⁵ Arius Didymus, *Epit.* 2.7.5k, pp. 34–45.1–3; at length, Seneca, *Tranq.* 9. A virtuous soul was in harmony with itself, lacking contradictory impulses (Arius Didymus, *Epit.* 2.7.5b1, pp. 12f, lines 31–33).

¹⁰⁶ Arius Didymus, *Epit.* 2.7.11s, pp. 100f, lines 7–10.

¹⁰⁷ Seneca, *Ira* 4.12.6. This may be distinguished from simple relaxation (as in Seneca the Elder, *Controv.* 1. preface 15).

¹⁰⁸ Seneca, *Ira* 4.13.2. For such disturbances of the soul, cf., e.g., Dio Chrysostom, *Or.* 13.13.

¹⁰⁹ Seneca, *Ep.* 75.18. For overcoming fear, see also Epictetus, *Disc.* 2.16.11; 2.17.29.

¹¹⁰ Seneca, *Ira* 5.6.1. On the relation of the mind to the heavens, see discussion above.

¹¹¹ Musonius Rufus frg. 38, p. 136.1–3.

¹¹² Epictetus, *Diatr.* 1.4.1, 3; cf. *Ench.* 8.

While such tranquility is probably partly in view here, Paul undoubtedly has exegetical reasons for his view and wording. Paul would know that in Isa 26:3, the mind of *faith* has peace (εἰρήνη).¹¹³ (Paul elsewhere draws on Isaiah to address the new mind [1 Cor 2:16], and his meditation on Isaiah seems to form a significant substratum for his language elsewhere in his letters.)¹¹⁴ Paul's "life" (Rom 8:6) could well derive from the same context in Isaiah, which Paul would understand as announcing the coming resurrection (Isa 25:8–9; 26:19), just as "life" in his own literary context involves resurrection (Rom 8:11).¹¹⁵

Given the context about the mind, Paul may intend "peace" to include internal tranquility.¹¹⁶ Nevertheless, his usage elsewhere suggests that it involves more than this; often Pauline "peace" involves nonhostility, reconciliation or unity (with God or humans).¹¹⁷ Indeed, the normal semantic range of the term involves peace with others or wholeness, more than internal tranquility,¹¹⁸ and Paul's audience would probably envision the relational dimension, especially given the context of this letter and its likely setting of Jewish-Gentile conflict.

In contrast to the mind-frame of the Spirit that involves peace, the mind-frame of the flesh involves enmity with God (Rom 8:7). For Stoics, any wrong act is impiety against the gods,¹¹⁹ and those ruled by folly

¹¹³ In the larger context, this "peace" also is relational (Isa 26:12; 27:5), as usually in Paul.

¹¹⁴ On Paul's use of Isaiah, see, e.g., J. Ross Wagner, *Heralds of the Good News: Isaiah and Paul "In Concert" in the Letter to the Romans* (Leiden: Brill, 2002); Richard B. Hays, *The Conversion of the Imagination: Paul as Interpreter of Israel's Scripture* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 25, 46–49; Douglas A. Oss, "A Note on Paul's Use of Isaiah," *BBR* 2 (1992): 105–12; Klaus Haacker, *The Theology of Paul's Letter to the Romans* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 100. This usage also accords with the prominence of Isaiah among some other "eschatological" interpreters of his era (cf. Charles T. Fritsch, *The Qumran Community: Its History and Scrolls* [New York: Macmillan, 1956], 45).

¹¹⁵ Paul *might* even infer the "Spirit" from Isa 26:9, but there it is the spirit of the person praying (*my* spirit), paralleled with his soul. More likely, he simply attributes resurrection, and presumably the life of faith, to the Spirit.

¹¹⁶ Such a connection need not exclude moral connotations; in *T. Sim.* 3:5, the mind is eased when God expels the spirit of envy.

¹¹⁷ E.g., with humans, Rom 3:17; 12:18; 14:19; 1 Cor 7:15; 14:33; 16:11; 2 Cor 13:11; with God, Rom 5:1. Even in the sparsely worded Rom 15:33, some of the earliest interpreters found the relational emphasis (Theodoret of Cyr, *Interp. Rom.*; Pelagius, *Comm. Rom.*; cf. Ambrosiaster, *Comm. Paul's Epistles*). One could argue for the meaning of tranquility in Phil 4:7, but cf. Phil 4:2–3.

¹¹⁸ Even most of the terms used by various writers above involve "quietness" or "lack of disturbance."

¹¹⁹ Arius Didymus, *Epit.* 2.7.11k, pp. 84f., lines 4–6.

are enemies of the gods,¹²⁰ always in disharmony against them.¹²¹ Paul’s ideal types or spheres involve the two kinds of humanity with their contrasting statuses before God. Paul’s reference to the fleshly mind’s inability to submit to God’s law (8:7) alludes to the mind’s failure in 7:23, 25; only the Spirit can inscribe the law in the heart (8:2–4).

The Function of this “Mind” in Romans

In Romans as in Galatians, the “flesh” offers an inadequate response to God’s righteous standard in the law (Rom 7:5, 14, 25; 8:3–4, 7; cf. 2:28; 3:20); the Spirit, by contrast, empowers true righteousness, providing an internal rather than external law (Rom 8:2, 4; cf. 7:6; Gal 3:2, 5; 5:18, 23). The mind of the Spirit, then, is a mind led by righteousness such as embodied in the principles of the law (cf. Rom 8:2), perhaps fulfilling the ideal of meditation on the law (Deut 6:6; Josh 1:8; Pss 1:2; 119:15, 23, 48, 78, 148) and providing obedience (Ezek 36:27; cf. Deut 5:29; 30:6). This mind directed by the Spirit is undoubtedly at least part of what it means to be “led by the Spirit” (Rom 8:14; cf. Gal 5:16–23).

For Paul, the “mind-frame of the Spirit” is the mind of God’s Spirit, as appears clearly in this context in Rom 8:27 (the only other Pauline or New Testament text employing φρόνημα). Whether or not all of Paul’s Roman audience would have understood him immediately, both Phoebe and Paul’s former colleagues in Rome could probably explain his usage to them (cf. especially Rom 16:1–5, 7).

How would believers have God’s mind by the Spirit? Paul elsewhere avers in 1 Cor 2:16 that all believers have the mind (νοῦς) of Christ, drawing on the language of “the mind of the Lord” in Isa 40:13 LXX. Yet the context of Paul’s own argument in that passage (1 Cor 2:11–12) suggests that he is aware of the Hebrew reading in Isaiah, namely, “the Spirit of the Lord.” For Paul, to have God’s Spirit in one is also to have God’s mind.

¹²⁰ Arius Didymus, *Epit.* 2.7.11k, pp. 84–85.23–24, 29, 33. Zeno reportedly taught that all bad persons were naturally at enmity with other persons (Engberg-Pedersen, *Paul and Stoics*, 74–75).

¹²¹ Arius Didymus, *Epit.* 2.7.11k, pp. 84–85.27–28.

For Stoics, corrected beliefs would allow one to reconstitute one's identity based on reality.¹²² For Paul, correct understanding of the believer's union with Christ and his death should have the same effect (Rom 6:2–11, noting ἀγνοεῖτε in 6:3, γινώσκοντες in 6:6, εἰδότες in 6:9, and λογίζεσθε in 6:11).¹²³ Although Paul is aware that believers do not always live consistently with this reality, he is deeply concerned about that incongruity (6:1–2; 8:12–13), which he regards as unnatural for those who truly understand the new reality into which their conversion has initiated them (6:3–4, 12–23).¹²⁴

A Renewed Mind

Paul later revisits the issue of proper thinking in Rom 12:2, where “renewing” undoubtedly alludes to the new life obtained by union with the risen Christ (6:4) and by the Spirit (7:6). More concretely, how does this renewed mind think? Here the renewed mind recognizes God's will as that which is good, acceptable, and perfect.¹²⁵ Paul here uses conventional language for moral criteria.¹²⁶

¹²² Stanley K. Stowers, “Does Pauline Christianity Resemble a Hellenistic Philosophy?” in Troels Engberg-Pedersen (ed.), *Paul beyond the Judaism/Hellenism Divide* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2001), 81–102 (92); Engberg-Pedersen, *Paul and Stoics*, 65.

¹²³ Paul recalls λογίζομαι from his midrash in ch. 4, where he employs the term eleven times, especially for God accounting righteousness to Abraham or to his spiritual successors; in 6:11, believers are called to agree with God's verdict and account righteousness to themselves.

¹²⁴ Stoics went further than Platonists in believing that the passions could be extirpated, a view that many others criticized (Simo Knuuttila and Juha Sihvola, “How the Philosophical Analysis of the Emotions was Introduced,” in Knuuttila and Sihvola (eds.), *Emotions in Hellenistic Philosophy*, 1–19, esp. 16–17). Platonists shared the ideal but more realistically (cf. e.g., Eyjólfur Kjalar Emilsson, “Plotinus on the Emotions,” in Knuuttila and Sihvola (eds.), *Emotions in Hellenistic Philosophy*, 339–63, esp. 359). Paul resembles Stoics here (Tobin, *Rhetoric in Contexts*, 229), but perhaps more importantly follows the Jewish notion of the eschatological destruction of sin (cf. Jer 3:17; 31:32–34; 1 En. 5:9; 91:8–11, 17; 92:5; 107:1; 108:3; Jub. 50:5; 1QS 4.18–20, 23; Ps. Sol. 17:32; T. Moses 10:1), and his tension between indicative and imperative, while intelligible on Stoic terms (Engberg-Pedersen, *Paul and Stoics*, 233), may follow also biblical roots (Brian S. Rosner, *Paul, Scripture, & Ethics: A Study of 1 Corinthians 5–7* [Grand Rapids: Baker, 1999; reprint of Leiden: Brill, 1994], 86–89).

¹²⁵ For Stoics, too, reason enabled one to distinguish good from bad (Musonius Rufus 3, p. 38, lines 26–30). Such discernment was necessary to prevent utter folly (see Epictetus, *Diatr.* 2.24.19).

¹²⁶ For good, see, e.g., Seneca, *Ep.* 71; Musonius Rufus 15, p. 96, line 25; Arius Didymus, *Epit.* 2.7.5b2, pp. 14f., lines 20–22; 2.7.5h, pp. 32f., 19–24; 5i, p. 32, lines 25–32;

Ancient philosophic language would allow Paul’s audience to understand some of his language, but they might also recognize that he employs it somewhat differently. Stoics, too, recognized that wisdom should “transform” one’s mind, conforming it to wisdom.¹²⁷ For Paul, of course, the transformation is into Christ’s image (cf. Rom 8:29; 2 Cor 3:18).¹²⁸ Imitation of God is also prominent in philosophic discourse;¹²⁹ but in the context of Romans it is the Spirit rather than human ability that effects the transformation. Most philosophers emphasized that one should not follow the views of the masses;¹³⁰ but for Paul, lack of conformity to this “age” belongs to his realized approach to the traditional Jewish “two ages” schema (cf. Rom 8:11, 23; 1 Cor 2:9–10; 10:11; 2 Cor 1:22; Gal 1:4).

In context, this new way of thinking affects relationships in the Christian community. Paul goes on in Rom 12:3 to emphasize “sober” thinking, playing on *φρονεῖν* and *σωφρονεῖν*. Although the verb *σωφρονέω* need not imply the cognate noun *σωφροσύνη*, the semantic ranges overlap considerably. The usage of *σωφροσύνη* and its cognates in moral discourse extended far beyond philosophers, but in keeping with our discussion of philosophy, some summary comments about typical philosophic usage may be in order here. Plato’s Socrates was known for emphasizing this virtue,¹³¹ as were philosophers in the early Empire.¹³² Like “prudence” mentioned above, *σωφροσύνη* was one of

2.7.5 L, pp. 34f., lines 17–20; 2.7.5m, pp. 36f., lines 10–12; 2.7.6d, pp. 38.34–41.3; 2.7.7g.23–26. For “pleasing” (although Paul borrows this from his depiction of the sacrifice in 12:1), see, e.g., Arius Didymus, *Epit.* 5i, pp. 32, lines 25–26. In Wis 9:10, Wisdom shows what is “pleasing” to God. For moral criteria more broadly, see, e.g., *Rhet. Alex.* 1, 1421b, lines 25–26.

¹²⁷ Seneca, *Ep.* 94.48.

¹²⁸ These texts about Christ’s image employ cognate terms in a relevant manner. On Christ as God’s image embodying expectations for divine wisdom (cf. 2 Cor 4:4; Wis 7:26), see, e.g., discussion in Craig S. Keener, *1–2 Corinthians* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 169–71, 174.

¹²⁹ See, e.g., Cicero, *Tusc.* 5.25.70; Seneca, *Dial.* 1.1.5; Epictetus, *Diatr.* 2.14.12–13; Marcus Aurelius 10.8.2; Heraclitus, *Ep.* 5; Plutarch, *Borrowing* 7, *Mor.* 830B; *Let. Aris.* 188, 190, 192, 208–10, 254, 281; Philo, *Opit.* 139; *T. Ash.* 4:3; *Mek. Shirata* 3.43–44; *Sifra Qed.* par. 1.195.1.3; *Sent. Sext.* 44–45; Culbert G. Rutenbar, “The Doctrine of the Imitation of God in Plato” (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1946; published by Columbia University Press, 1946), chs. 2–3; cf. Eph 5:1.

¹³⁰ E.g., Musonius Rufus frg. 41, p. 136.22–24; Philo, *Abr.* 38.

¹³¹ See especially Plato, *Charm.* 159B–176C (LCL 4:26–89); cf. Xenophon, *Mem.* 1.2.23.

¹³² See, e.g., Musonius Rufus 18B, p. 116.20; Arius Didymus, *Epit.* 2.7.5f, pp. 30–31.23; 2.7.11g, pp. 72–73.15; Lucian, *Icar.* 30 (Zeus complaining that they were not living accordingly). Cf. also the moralist Plutarch in *Poetry* 11, *Mor.* 32C.

the four chief Aristotelian virtues,¹³³ and Stoics viewed it continued to treat it as one of the traditional virtues.¹³⁴

Stoics employed it especially for self-control over the passions, the baser emotions.¹³⁵ It should characterize the reign of the ideal ruler¹³⁶ but particularly should typify the philosopher.¹³⁷ In women, philosophers associated this virtue with chastity and avoiding unlawful relations.¹³⁸ The virtue was widespread among philosophers far more broadly than in Stoicism,¹³⁹ e.g., among Pythagoreans.¹⁴⁰ Although outsiders might question the σωφροσύνη of someone who abandoned everything for philosophy, many intellectuals countered that such a person was genuinely wise.¹⁴¹ How does Paul apply σωφρονέω specifically in Rom 12:3?

This renewed mind does not view itself more highly than it ought (Rom 12:3; cf. 12:16), but in the context of Christ's body (12:4–6), hence unity (cf. 15:5). That is, Paul's emphasis on the right way to

¹³³ Though ultimately said to derive from Socrates (Plato, *Resp.* 4.428–34).

¹³⁴ E.g., Musonius Rufus 4, p. 44.10–22, especially 16–22; p. 48.1, 4, 8, 13, especially 4; 6, p. 52.15, 17, 19, 21, especially 15; 7, p. 58.25–26 (minus “courage”); 8, pp. 60.22–64.9, especially p. 62.10–23; 8, p. 66.7–8, especially 8; 17, p. 108.9–10; Marcus Aurelius 3.6; 8.1 (σώφρονες); Arius Didymus, *Epit.* 2.7.5a, pp. 10–11.7–9 (Zeno's views); 2.7.5b1, pp. 12–13.13–22 (and their converse in lines 22–29; as *samples* of virtues and vices—see lines 29–30); 2.7.5b2, pp. 14–15.1–4 (esp. 3); 2.7.5b5, pp. 18–19.27–31 (with lines 21–26, 32–35). Cf. Musonius Rufus 7, p. 58.25–26 (esp. 26); 16, p. 104.32–34, especially 33; frg. 38, p. 136.3. See discussion in Lutz, “Musonius,” 27, including n. 113. Cf. lists of virtues including at least three of these, e.g., Arius Didymus, *Epit.* 2.7.5b, pp. 10–11.16–21 (esp. 17); 2.7.11c, pp. 68–69.12–16; Philostratus, *Vit. Apoll.* 1.20.

¹³⁵ E.g., cf. Musonius Rufus 3, p. 40.20–22; 4, p. 44.18–22; 6, p. 52.15–17; 8, p. 62.14–17; 16, p. 104.33–35; 17, p. 108.11–14; frg. 24, p. 130; Arius Didymus, *Epit.* 2.7.5b2, pp. 14–15, line 6. Against sexual indulgence, see, e.g., Musonius Rufus 12, p. 86.13–16; against gluttony, e.g., Musonius Rufus 18A, p. 112.6–7 (cf. 112.29); 18B, p. 116.4–22, especially 19–20; 18B, p. 118.4–7, especially 5; p. 120.2–7, especially 6–7; against grief, e.g., Arius Didymus, *Epit.* 2.7.5 L, pp. 36–37.3–5. See further Lutz, “Musonius,” 28 (noting esp. 6, p. 54.2–25). For the fullest definition, see Arius Didymus, *Epit.* 2.7.5b1, pp. 12–13.18–19; 2.7.5b2, pp. 14–15.15–16, 31–35; pp. 16–17.1–3; cf. also 2.7.5b, pp. 10–11.21–25 (esp. 23); p. 12.1–2.

¹³⁶ Musonius Rufus 8, p. 60.10–23; 8, p. 62.10–21; Dio Chrysostom, *Or.* 3.7; Philostratus, *Vit. Apoll.* 5.35, 36.

¹³⁷ E.g., Musonius Rufus 8, p. 66.8; Dio Chrysostom, *Or.* 35.2.

¹³⁸ E.g., Musonius Rufus 3, p. 40.17–18, 20; 4, p. 44.16–18. For the virtue as appropriate for women, see also Musonius Rufus 4, p. 48.4; for philosophy teaching women this virtue, see also Musonius Rufus 3, p. 42.26–28. See more broadly Helen F. North, “The Mare, the Vixen, and the Bee: *Sophrosyne* as the Virtue of Women in Antiquity,” *ICS* 2 (1977): 35–48.

¹³⁹ Cf. even Epicureans in Cicero, *Fin.* 1.14.47 (*temperantiam*), a concession Stoics were ready to exploit (Musonius Rufus frg. 24 p. 130 with Lutz's note, p. 131).

¹⁴⁰ Cf., e.g., Philostratus, *Vit. Apoll.* 6.11; Iamblichus, *VP* 1.1; ruling the tongue, 31.195; concerning the temptations of youth, 8.41; 31.195 (sexual).

¹⁴¹ Dio Chrysostom, *Or.* 80.1.

think in Romans fits his larger emphasis on unity, as he probably seeks to reconcile Jewish and Gentile believers (an emphasis many scholars find in this letter).¹⁴²

This larger context of Romans reinforces our suggested additional meaning of "peace" beyond "tranquility," despite the plausibility of emphasis on the latter in ancient discussions of the mind. Presumably for Paul, the mind-frame of the Spirit also leads believers to peace with one another, whether across ethnic lines (as in Romans as a whole) or in the diversity of believers' ministry gifts (as in Rom 12:4–8).

Conclusion

For Paul, the "frame of mind involving the flesh" is the perspective or habitual way of thinking dominated by worldly, purely human concerns. Focused on one's personal bodily existence, this mental lifestyle is incapable of fulfilling the righteous purpose of God's law. Even its best efforts yield only the sort of struggle depicted in Rom 7:15–24 (especially in 7:22–23, where even the law-informed mind is helpless to defeat bodily passions).

By contrast, the "frame of mind involving the Spirit" is a righteous mental lifestyle in which God's presence and Spirit make the decisive difference. This frame of mind involves life and peace, possibly evoking the context of Isa 26:3. "Peace" may partly involve tranquility, an emphasis in some ancient discussions of thinking (also contrasted by some ancient thinkers with fear of death). Paul's emphasis in the context of Romans itself, however, probably especially addresses peace in relationships in the Christian community.

¹⁴² E.g., Dunn, *Romans*, lviii; Lo Lung-Kwong, *Paul's Purpose in Writing Romans: The Upbuilding of a Jewish and Gentile Christian Community in Rome* (ed. Philip P. Chia and Khiok-khng Yeo; Hong Kong: Alliance Bible Seminary, 1998), 413–14; Haacker, *Theology*, 48–49; A. Katherine Grieb, *The Story of Romans: A Narrative Defense of God's Righteousness* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2002), 7.

EDUCATING THE DIVIDED SOUL IN PAUL AND PLATO:
READING ROMANS 7:7–25 AND PLATO’S *REPUBLIC*

Joshua W. Jipp

Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia, USA

“What then shall we say? Is the Law Sin? May it never be!”¹ So begins Paul’s monologue in Rom 7:7–25, a text which has exerted enormous influence not only upon Christianity but upon the whole of Western civilization.² Few religious texts have so resonated with, and been interpreted in the light of human experience of inner turmoil whereby one’s good and noble intentions are frustrated by an irrational desire for its opposite. Nevertheless, New Testament interpreters have struggled to make sense of many aspects of Romans 7. Paul’s literary-rhetorical use of the first person singular “I” is undoubtedly the most notorious crux of the text and has been endlessly debated, but scholars have only recently come to grips with Paul’s surprising yet recognizable appropriation of a Platonic discourse in this text.³ The depiction of inner turmoil whereby the person wills but is unable to do the good, the language of the “mind” and the “inner person,” the good and the beautiful, the role of the appetitive desires and the body, as well as the metaphors of slavery and warfare against the soul are rare concepts for

¹ Translations of the New Testament are my own. Unless noted, all other translations are from the Loeb Classical Library.

² Augustine’s view that Paul is here describing not the unregenerate but the truly spiritual person had great influence on Luther and the Reformers and has been particularly influential on Western civilization’s conceptions of sin, personhood, and psychology. For the history of the interpretation of this passage, see Ulrich Wilckens, *Der Brief an die Römer* (EKKNT 6; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1980), 2.101–17. See also Mark Reasoner, *Romans in Full Circle: A History of Interpretation* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2005), 67–84. For a critique of the Augustinian and Western reading of Paul (and Romans 7), see Krister Stendahl, “Paul and the Introspective Conscience of the West,” in *Paul among Jews and Gentiles and Other Essays* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976), 78–96.

³ Virtually all scholarship on Romans 7 takes its point of departure from the landmark study of W. G. Kümmel, *Römer 7 und das Bild des Menschen im Neuen Testament* (TBü 53; Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1929). On Paul’s use of the “I,” see Brian Dodd, *Paul’s Paradigmatic ‘I’: Personal Example as Literary Strategy* (JSNTSup 177; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 221–34.

Paul and make best sense within the context of a Greek, specifically Platonic, philosophical discourse.

This study builds upon the seminal work of Stanley Stowers and Troels Engberg-Pedersen, who have argued that Romans 7 depicts the moral situation of *akrasia*, as well as the essay of Emma Wasserman who sees Romans 7 as appropriating a Platonic/Philonic depiction of the death of the soul.⁴ While my argument is indebted to these interpreters who have rightly discerned Paul's appropriation of a philosophical discourse, I suggest that they have not adequately reckoned with the major theme of Romans 7, which is not anthropological or psychological in the first instance but is rather the pessimistic view of Paul regarding the ability of Law or education to achieve a state of unity for the "I." While it is true that Paul is indebted to a philosophical discourse which resembles a situation of *akrasia*, he actually subverts the Platonic (and Jewish) view of Law and reason which is able to curb illegitimate desire and bring harmony to the individual parts of the person. On the Platonic model of the soul, the education of the desires by Law and Reason is that which results in a state of δικαιοσύνη ("justice"), or a harmony of the individual parts, whereby the person is able to do and contemplate the ἀγαθός ("good") and the καλός ("beautiful"). Studies of Romans 7 subtly go astray, however, when they become preoccupied solely with Paul's anthropological and psychological language to the neglect of the role of the Law, which is Paul's major concern in Romans 7.⁵

Furthermore, I suggest that by paying close attention to Paul's appropriation of this philosophical discourse we may be aided in rhetorically situating Romans 7, and thus be enabled to provide an account for its role within Paul's overall argumentative discourse. Specifically, I will argue that, contrary to many interpreters, the primary function of Romans 7 is not to provide an apology for the Law, but rather to counter Jewish-Christian opponents who advocate the Jewish Law as

⁴ Stanley K. Stowers, *A Rereading of Romans: Justice, Jews, and Gentiles* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994), 258–84; Troels Engberg-Pedersen, "The Reception of Greco-Roman Culture in the New Testament: The Case of Romans 7:7–25," in Mogens Müller and Henrik Tronier (eds.), *The New Testament as Reception* (JSNTSup 230; London/New York: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002) 32–57; idem, *Paul and the Stoics* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2002), 239–46; Emma Wasserman, "The Death of the Soul in Romans 7: Revisiting Paul's Anthropology in Light of Hellenistic Moral Psychology," *JBL* 126 (2007): 793–816.

⁵ As is the case, in my view, of the important and influential study of Rudolf Bultmann, "Romans 7 and the Anthropology of Paul," in *Existence and Faith: Shorter Writings of Rudolf Bultmann* (trans. Schubert Ogden; London: Collins, 1960), 173–85.

a means of curbing the passions of the body.⁶ On this account, Paul's description of the divided person who is unable to control the body's passions and perform the good sounds a warning against accepting his opponents' Law-centered approach to ethics and functions as a foil to his own specific, non-nomistic ethical program in 8:1–17.

It is important to make two disclaimers regarding the scope and method of this paper. First, I do not argue that Paul is slavishly reproducing a Platonic discourse, that he has firsthand access to philosophical literature during his composition of the epistle, or that he self-consciously situates himself within a specific philosophical tradition. My argument does depend, however, on Paul's acquaintance with Greek and Hellenistic philosophy at the popular level, an assumption which can hardly be denied.⁷ Thus, while Paul's argument makes the most sense in light of Platonic assumptions and argumentation, my essay by no means precludes the possibility that Aristotelian, Stoic, and other Hellenistic philosophies have influenced Paul at a popular level.⁸ Therefore, I do not regard Plato and the Greek philosophical tradition as so-called background for Paul, but rather see Paul himself as operating within the context of the Greek and Hellenistic ethical traditions. Secondly, regarding the structure of this paper, I have thought it best to begin with Paul's own testimony in Romans 7 before examining Plato so as to guard against the temptation of forcing Paul into a preconceived philosophical straightjacket. Only after examining Paul and Plato separately do I, then, attempt to situate Paul's argument

⁶ That Romans 7 functions as an apology for the Law was argued to great effect by Kümmel, *Römer*, 7–9.

⁷ That Paul is clearly acquainted with popular Greek and Hellenistic philosophy has been demonstrated most clearly in the work of Abraham J. Malherbe. See, in particular, his *Paul and the Popular Philosophers* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989). See also Dale B. Martin, *The Corinthian Body* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995); Daniel Boyarin, *A Radical Jew: Paul and the Politics of Identity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), 17–19. On Paul's education, see Abraham J. Malherbe, *Social Aspects of Early Christianity* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1977), 29–59; Ronald F. Hock, "Paul and Greco-Roman Education," in J. Paul Sampley (ed.), *Paul in the Greco-Roman World: A Handbook* (Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 2003), 198–227.

⁸ The description of *akrasia* in Romans 7 does not fit well with the Stoic understanding, which saw weakness of the will as primarily due to a lack of knowledge. On the Stoics' view of the passions and self-restraint, see Martha C. Nussbaum, "The Stoics on the Extirpation of the Passions," in *The Therapy of Desire: Theory and Practice in Hellenistic Ethics* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1994), 359–401; A. A. Long and D. N. Sedley, *The Hellenistic Philosophers: Volume 1, Translations of the Principal Sources, with Philosophical Commentary* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 410–29.

within the Platonic discourse and suggest a hypothesis for its rhetorical function within the epistle.

1. *Paul on Akrasia, Mental Conflict, and Education by the Law in Romans 7:7–25*

1.1. *The Event of Israel's Reception of the Law: Reading Romans 7:7–12*

Stowers and Engberg-Pedersen have rightly identified the situation described in 7:14–25 as one of *akrasia*, and while their insights have generated a certain amount of progress in our reading of Romans 7, their failure to integrate 7:7–12 and, specifically, the role of the Jewish Law into this akratic situation calls for further examination of the problem. Making sense of the relationship between vv. 7–12 and vv. 14–25 is, admittedly, a difficult task for any interpreter, and yet it is sufficiently evident that the akratic situation described in the latter section is the result of this prior event.⁹ That is to say, in 7:7–12 the dramatist, the “I”, uses aorist verbs to refer to a *complete event*, whereas in 7:14–25 this speaker uses present tense verbs in order to foreground an apparently currently existing *situation*.¹⁰ More specifically, 7:7–12 describes the event and immediate impact of Israel's receipt of the Law at Sinai, while 7:14–25 vividly portrays the individual's continuing existential situation under the Law. I suggest that this earlier section and the event it depicts are crucial for understanding the reason for the present and continuing condition of the divided “I” and, thus, for the presence of the philosophical discourse in the latter half of Romans 7. In this section I will argue that in 7:7–12 Paul depicts Israel's reception of the Law at Sinai as a paradoxical event, an event which was intended to educate and thereby curb Israel's passions but which, instead, inexplicably inflamed them.

The main focus of Rom 7:7–12 centers upon the giving of the Law to Israel and the paradoxical role which it played in inciting illicit desire.

⁹ Scholars have had a hard time deciding whether 7:13 should be attached to 7:7–12 or 7:14–25. It seems evident, however, that this verse functions as something of a transitional link or a bridge between these two sections. See also Pedersen, “The Reception of Graeco-Roman Culture,” 39–40.

¹⁰ So Francis Watson, *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith* (London/New York: T&T Clark, 2003), 374–75; Wilckens, *Der Brief an die Römer*, 2.85; Mark A. Seifrid, “The Subject of Rom 7:14–25,” *NovT* 34 (1992): 320–21.

While the identity of the ἐγώ has been taken to refer to Paul himself, to the Adam of the Genesis narrative, or to humanity in general, only Israel and the event of the giving of the Law can account for the dynamics of this passage and the speaker's claims.¹¹ Most important for this argument is the explicit citation of the 10th commandment of Israel's Decalogue: "You shall not desire" (οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις; Rom 7:7b; Exod 20:17).¹² That this text was used as a representative commandment of the entire Jewish Law is witnessed to by both Philo (*Decal.* 142–153) and the author of 4 Maccabees (2:6).¹³ Furthermore, Paul's declaration of the intention of "the commandment which was to result in life" (ἡ ἐντολὴ ἡ εἰς ζωὴν; 7:10a) is a clear allusion to the summary description of Israel's Law from Lev 18:5.¹⁴ Furthermore, the characteristic descriptions of νόμος throughout 7:7–12 is precisely indicative of Paul's broader characterization of the Mosaic Law.¹⁵ Specifically, that the Mosaic Law has somehow been hijacked through sin is explicitly indicated throughout Paul's epistles (Rom 3:20; 4:15; 5:13–14, 20; Gal 3:22; 1 Cor 15:56). Paul frequently refers to the Law as that which belongs to Israel alone, and as that which separates Israel from the Gentiles (e.g. Rom 2:12–14). Most importantly, however, is the speaker's intriguing distinction between the time before and after the coming of the Law. For example, the speaker refers to a time when "I was living apart from the Law" (ἐγὼ δὲ ἔζων χωρὶς νόμου ποτέ; 7:9a), but when the commandment came "I died" (ἐγὼ ἀπέθονον; 7:10). This

¹¹ Engberg-Pedersen takes it as "established that Paul is describing an experience of living under the Mosaic Law as seen from the Christ-believing perspective that he introduces in 8.1" ("The Reception of Graeco-Roman Culture," 37). The argument that Paul is speaking autobiographically has fallen into disfavor. See, however, J. D. G. Dunn, "Romans 7, 14–25 in the Theology of Paul," *TZ* 31 (1975): 257–73. For a recent and convincing critique of Dunn's position, see now Hae-Kyung Chang, "The Christian Life in a Dialectical Tension? Romans 7:7–25 Reconsidered," *NovT* 49 (1997): 257–80.

¹² That Israel and its experience of the giving of the Law is the primary focus of this text is argued convincingly by D. J. Moo, "Israel and Paul in Romans 7.7–12," *NTS* 32 (1986): 122–35; N. T. Wright, *The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991); idem, *Romans* (NIBC 12; Nashville: Abingdon, 2002), 549–64.

¹³ On which, see J. A. Ziesler, "The Role of the Tenth Commandment in Romans 7," *JNT* 33 (1988): 41–56.

¹⁴ On the development of Lev 18:5 in Jewish thought, see Simon J. Gathercole, "Torah, Life, and Salvation: Leviticus 18:5 in Early Judaism and the New Testament," in Craig A. Evans (ed.), *From Prophecy to Testament: The Function of the Old Testament in the New* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2004), 126–45.

¹⁵ Paul's use of νόμος is treated comprehensively in M. Winger, *By What Law? The Meaning of NOMOS in the Letters of Paul* (SBLDS 128; Chico, Calif. Scholars Press, 1992).

language clearly belies Paul's temporal redemptive-historical perspective on the Law whereby it is not until the Law's advent that sin is taken into account: "For until the Law sin was in the world, but sin is not counted as such when there is no Law" (ἄχρι γὰρ νόμου ἁμαρτία ἦν ἐν κόσμῳ, ἁμαρτία δὲ οὐκ ἐλλογεῖται μὴ ὄντος νόμου; 5:13; cf. 4:15; 5:20; Gal 3:15–29). It seems best, therefore, to interpret the event in 7:7–12 as the depiction of a situation under the Jewish Law.

Israel's Scriptures univocally depict this Law as a divine gift, as sacred, and as the means whereby the nation is enabled to avoid sin, pollution, and the desires of the body. Thus, the author of 4 Maccabees in quoting the 10th commandment says: "Since the Law has told us not to desire, I could prove to you all the more that reason is able to control the desires" (2:6). Likewise Sirach: "Whoever obeys me [the Law] will not be put to shame, and those who work with me will not sin" (24:22).¹⁶ Paul's portrayal of the Law is, therefore, radically shocking in that, unlike Sirach, the speaker declares that the Law has not kept him from doing sin but has, in fact, brought him face to face with sin and desire, "But I would not have known sin *except through the Law*" (ἀλλὰ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἔγνων εἰ μὴ διὰ νόμου, 7:7b), and again: "I would not have known desire unless the Law had said..." (τὴν τε γὰρ ἐπιθυμίαν οὐκ ᾔδειν εἰ μὴ ὁ νόμος ἔλεγεν; 7:7c). The claim is that, rather than defining the perfect will of the deity, the Law has actually functioned as the agent making the speaker cognizant of sin.¹⁷ But not only is the Law that which makes one aware of sin, the Law's commands inexplicably produce and evoke the very desires which they are supposed to restrain. The speech act of the Law's command "Do not desire" is hijacked by sin so as to "work about every desire in me" (κατειργάσατο ἐν ἐμοὶ πᾶσαν ἐπιθυμίαν; 7:8).¹⁸ Thus, while the

¹⁶ For the very positive role which the Law played in Israel's history and practice during the time of Paul, see E. P. Sanders, *Judaism: Practice & Belief, 63 BCE–66 CE* (London: SCM Press, 1992), 190–240; idem, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1977), 1–428.

¹⁷ On Paul's complexity regarding whether he regards the Law as revealing, defining, or causing sin, see Heikki Räisänen, *Paul and the Law* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1986), 140–50.

¹⁸ Robert Gundry's argument that the "I" is autobiographical and refers to the awakening of sexual lust at the time of his bar mitzvah is intriguing. His argument is rightly sensitive to the sexual connotations of desire in Paul and in Romans 7 in particular. There are too many statements made by the I, however, which do not fit this reading. For example, Gundry wants to read the statement "when the commandment came" not as a reference to Sinai but rather as referring to its coming to Paul at his bar mitzvah.

enemy is in fact ἁμαρτία, the Law functions as the instrument which makes one aware of sin, produces all desire, and finally kills the speaker (7:8b–10).¹⁹ The educative intent of the Law to guard the speaker from ἐπιθυμία, to instruct the will of God, and to curb deadly passions, has been the very agent which has produced the speaker's death. It is important to note that when Paul uses ἐπιθυμία it is almost invariably connected with the flesh or the body and is often explicitly a reference to sexual passion (Rom 1:24; 1 Thess 4:5; cf. Gal 5:16, 24; Eph 2:3; Col 3:5). This emphasis on bodily and fleshly passions will fit the speaker's experience quite well in vv. 14–25.

The speaker's experience of the Law producing πᾶσαν ἐπιθυμίαν could not be further from the standpoint of the author of 4 Maccabees who, with all of the Jewish tradition behind him, sees the Law's commands as restraining desire. But it is evident here that while the Law is portrayed as weak and counterproductive, it is ἁμαρτία which is the real enemy. Sin is portrayed as a deadly enslaving power, which thwarts the educative intent of the Law. Sin is an irrational force in that it uses the Law in some mysterious sense to trick and deceive and thereby work forth death (cf. 7:11; ἡ γὰρ ἁμαρτία ἀφορμὴν λαβοῦσα διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς ἐξηπάτησέν με καὶ δι' αὐτῆς ἀπέκτεινεν).

1.2. *The Akrotic Experience of the "I" under the Law: Reading Romans 7:14–25*

The events depicted in 7:7–12 come into vivid and detailed focus now in the dramatist's depiction of its experience under Law. The fundamental split of the "I" is indicated immediately in v. 14: "For we know that the Law is spiritual, but I am fleshly having been enslaved under sin." This statement functions as something of a thesis for the section, for in the same breath the "I" articulates exuberant praise for God's Law and yet

See Robert H. Gundry, "The Moral Frustration of Paul before His Conversion: Sexual Lust in Romans 7:7–25," in Donald A. Hagner and Murray J. Harris (eds.), *Pauline Studies: Essays Presented to Professor F. F. Bruce on his 70th Birthday* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), 228–45.

¹⁹ Wasserman ("The Death of the Soul in Romans 7," 793–816) argues that the death depicted in 7:9–10 should be read against the Platonic background of the death of the soul. Despite the merits of her study, there is great difficulty in accepting her thesis precisely because she neglects or is unaware of the echoes and allusions to Israel's Scriptures in 7:7–12.

affirms its carnal state of bondage.²⁰ The expression “having been sold under sin” (πεπραμένος ὑπὸ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν) conveys the connotations of slavery to an irrational master. And this slavery to the irrational is theatrically portrayed in the confession: “For that which I work about I do not understand, and that which I do not want is that which I do, but what I hate this I do” (ὁ γὰρ κατεργάζομαι οὐ γινώσκω· οὐ γὰρ ὃ θέλω τοῦτο πράσσω, ἀλλ’ ὃ μισῶ τοῦτο ποιῶ; 7:15). There could hardly be a clearer description of the weakness of the will which intends to do the noble and the good, but in fact is inexplicably overpowered by some stronger desire.²¹ The “I” wants to place itself on the side of Law, but inexplicably finds itself living out its fleshly bondage to sin by doing the opposite of what the Law commands. This language of θέλω, to want or intend, in contrast to ποιέω, to do or perform, runs throughout the speaker’s perplexed situation (7:15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21).²²

What, in particular, is the object of the speaker’s desire? In 7:16 the “I”-figure declares paradoxically that the akratic situation is actually evidence of its agreement with the beauty and goodness of the Jewish Law: “But if what I do not want, this I do, I agree with that Law that it is good” (7:16b). In other words, the very intent to do the Law, despite its inability to follow through, is testimony to the goodness of the Law. It is important to recognize that throughout the monologue the object of the speaker’s desire is explicitly referred to as ὁ νόμος (7:14, 16, 21, 22, 23, 25). Oddly, for Paul, he refers to the Law and the speaker’s desire to do the Law interchangeably as “the good” (ἀγαθός) and “the beautiful” (καλός). While Paul uses these adjectives frequently, never

²⁰ On Paul’s use of “flesh” and other anthropological terms, see Rudolf Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament* (trans. K. Grobel; 2 vols.; New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1951), 1:191–220.

²¹ Stowers (*A Rereading of Romans*, 260) noted Euripides’ *Medea* as the starting point for this akratic tradition. See, in particular, *Medea* 1077–1080: “I am being overcome by evils. I know that what I am about to do is evil but passion (θυμός) is stronger than my reasoned reflection (βουλευμάτων) and this is the cause of the worst evils for humans.”

²² Robert Jewett (*Romans* [Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007], 463) is unconvinced that the situation described in Rom 7:14–25 is that of *akrasia* due to the fact that the speaker maintains in v. 15 that what she works about she does not *know* (οὐ γινώσκω). In other words, it is not weakness of the will but rather lack of knowledge which is the problem. This argument is weak on two levels, however. First, it ignores the more prevalent contrast between “intent” and “action.” Secondly, it is unlikely that one should read the speaker’s confession in v. 15 as a lack of knowledge, but rather as a description of its utterly perplexed state. See also the negative conclusions of Ronald V. Huggins, “Alleged Classical Parallels to Paul’s ‘What I Want to Do I Do Not Do, but What I Hate, That I do’ (Rom 7:15),” *WTJ* 54 (1992): 158–61.

outside of Romans does he refer to the Law as “the good” or “the beautiful.” We shall return to this oddity in due course. At this point, it is crucial to note that it is the reasoning part of the “I” which is said to be focused on the good, the Law. It is “the inner person” (ἔσω ἄνθρωπον) of the “I” that agrees with the Law (7:22). Allied with “the inner person” is the “mind” (νοός, 7:23) which unsuccessfully tries to resist the slavery of the passions. The “inner person” and the “mind” is that part of the speaker which wants to do the Law (οὐ γὰρ ὁ θέλω ποιῶ ἀγαθόν; 7:19a). It will be important to remember the connection between the reasoning part of the “I” and the intention to do the Law when we examine Plato.

Why, then, is the reasoning part of the person unable to see its actions through to performance? Again, the speaker indicates its fundamental split as it cries out that inability to do the Law is the result of “sin inhabiting in me” (ἡ οἰκοῦσα ἐν ἐμοὶ ἁμαρτία; 7:17b; cf. 7:20b). We are justified in interpreting ἁμαρτία here as an irrational entity, for in some fashion it makes its home within the person thereby inexplicably frustrating its ability to do the reasonable good.²³ Sin has become the director or guide of the “I,” forcing and compelling it into action which is undesired by its reasoning part.²⁴ But we now see why sin has been able to dominate the reasoning part of the speaker, for this sin allies with the physical body and desires of the speaker. As v. 14, the thesis statement, has already mentioned: “I am fleshly” (ἐγὼ δὲ σάρκινός εἰμι). The I-figure is aware that sin has made an ally with its body’s desire, and thus it declares: sin inhabits “in me” (ἐν ἐμοί, 7:17; cf. 7:20), and “nothing good dwells in me, that is in my flesh” (οὐκ οἰκεῖ ἐν ἐμοί, τοῦτ’ ἔστιν ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου, 7:18). This split between the speaker’s reasoning components and physical members extends now even to the Law itself, so that the dramatist can schizophrenically claim: “I see a different Law in my members waging war against the Law of my mind and forcefully

²³ It is a commonplace to capitalize ἁμαρτία in Romans 5–8, for Sin appears as an apocalyptic force or entity. Emma Wasserman (“The Death of the Soul in Romans 7,” 795–800) has made a compelling case, however, that sin in Romans 7 is nothing more than the irrational parts of the soul. While this reading works well for and has illuminated Romans 7, it is not at all clear that Paul’s use of the word can be defined this narrowly. See, also, for the apocalyptic interpretation, J. Louis Martyn, “Apocalyptic Antinomies,” in idem, *Theological Issues in the Letters of Paul* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1997), 111–23.

²⁴ For a balanced discussion of sin in Paul, see James D. G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 102–27.

taking me captive by the law of sin which is in my members” (βλέπω δὲ ἕτερον νόμον ἐν τοῖς μέλεσίν μου ἀντιστρατευόμενον τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ νοός μου καὶ αἰχμαλωτίζοντά με ἐν τῷ νόμῳ τῆς ἁμαρτίας τῷ ὄντι ἐν τοῖς μέλεσίν μου; 7:23).²⁵ Sin has found its ally with the lower physical parts of the speaker, its “physical members” (τοῖς μέλεσιν), and thus has overpowered the reasoning part of the mind. The desires of the body, therefore, enslave, physically force, and draw away the reasoning part from the good of the Law. That the physical body has become enslaved and captivated by desire is dramatically portrayed in the cry: “Wretched person that I am, who will release me from this body of death (ἐκ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ θανάτου τούτου; 7:24b)?”

Paul uses this “I”-figure as a way of demonstrating the complex experience of a person undergoing opposite desires in relation to the same thing and at the same time. At the same moment, the “I”-figure intends to do the good of the Law and yet is overpowered by desire. The desires of the “I”-person contradict each other at the same time, for while its reasoning part intends to do the Law, its desires for the body overpower its good intentions. The body’s passions are metaphorically described as enslaving and waging war against the intentions of the person’s mind. The “I”-person appears, therefore, as a soul lacking harmony between its parts. It seems a bit odd that in this passage, it is actually the Law which is Paul’s prime concern, for the Law appears not as a power which is able to curb the desires of the flesh, but rather as a malleable and weak entity which is helpless to serve reason in the face of sin and desire.

2. *Plato on Akrasia, Mental Conflict, and Education in the Republic*

Resistance against the view that Paul is appropriating a Platonic discourse in Romans 7 may be due, I suggest, to the general failure of scholars to provide a close reading of Romans 7 and also the appropriate philosophic texts. In this section, therefore, I engage in a reading of Plato’s *Republic*, with particular attention to Books 4 and 9, with the

²⁵ Paul Meyer is right to note that the Law becomes split between “the law of God” and “the law of sin” (7:25) but he unnecessarily, and oddly, denies that the persona itself is split as well. See his “The Worm at the Core of the Apple: Exegetical Reflections on Romans 7,” in R. T. Fortna and B. R. Gaventa (eds.), *The Conversation Continues: Studies in Paul and John* (FS J. Louis Martyn; Nashville: Abingdon, 1990), 62–84.

aim of describing Plato's theory of the soul, human motivation, justice, and nomistic education.

2.1. *Mental Conflict, Justice, and the Good: Reading Book 4*

Using the polis as an analogue for the soul, Socrates compares the polis's threefold classes of citizens to the soul's threefold constituent parts of reason (τὸ λογιστικόν), spirit (τὸ θυμοειδής), and appetite (τὸ ἐπιθυμητικόν) (*Resp.* 436; cf. *Phaedr.* 253C–254E). Each of these distinct parts or classes represents both the competitive interests within the polis as well as the soul which vie for the authority to rule.²⁶ At this stage of the argument, the three parts of the soul are distinguished primarily with regard to their respective functions within the city and the soul: reason must know the truth and rule, spirit is the soul's means of action, and appetite desires and procures the body's needs (*Resp.* 436a6–b7). It is within this argument for the division of the soul that Plato articulates his important thesis of the Principle of Conflict: “It is obvious that the same thing will never do or suffer opposites in the same respect in relation to the same thing and at the same time” (436b8–9).²⁷ Socrates intends to demonstrate that if a single subject undergoes contraries with regard to the same thing and at the same time, it must do so in different parts of the soul: “So that if we ever find these contradictions in the functions of the mind we shall know that it was not the same thing functioning but a *plurality*” (436b10–11).²⁸ What then, one might ask, is this “same thing” which causes a division

²⁶ The question, therefore, arises as to whether Plato was actually committed to the tripartite division of the psyche or if he forced his understanding of human psychology into this model in order to fit with his political theory. For a convincing argument that Plato's understanding of the human psyche is more fundamental, see John M. Cooper, “Plato's Theory of Human Motivation,” in idem, *Reason and Emotion: Essays on Ancient Moral Psychology and Ethical Theory* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1999), 118–37.

²⁷ This is often referred to as the ‘Principle of Opposites’ or the ‘Principle of Contraries’ but I think it best to refer to it as conflict instead, due to the fact that at this point in the argument Plato is concerned with the mental conflict involved when reason and desire battle over the same entity. See Julia Annas, *An Introduction to Plato's Republic* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1981), 137.

²⁸ A good portion of scholarship sees this argument as marking an important break for Plato with Socrates' notion of mental conflict in the earlier dialogues where a person's failure to do the good results simply from the fact that they are mistaken about the good and not as a result of irrational desires within the soul. See, for example, the discussion of the very different account of the appetites and hedonism in *Protagoras* by Terence Irwin, *Plato's Ethics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), Ch. 6.

within the single soul? The examples which Socrates gives lead one to the conclusion that this “same thing” is the soul’s desires. More specifically, the single soul may at the same time both experience a desire to drink and a desire to reject drink.

The soul of the thirsty then, in so far as it thirsts, wishes nothing else than to drink, and yearns for this and its impulse is towards this...Then if anything draws it back when thirsty it must be something different (ἕτερον ἂν τι ἐν αὐτῇ) in it from that which thirsts and drives it like a beast (ἄγοντος ὥσπερ θηρίου) to drink. For it cannot be, we say, that the same thing with the same part of itself at the same time acts in opposite ways about the same thing. (439a8–b6)

This passage is critical for it demonstrates not only that the mental conflict occurs in different parts of the soul but with respect to the exact same object, but it also describes this appetitive part as the brutish element which violently wages war (“drives it like a beast”) against the reasoning part of the soul. Despite the fact that the reasoning part of the soul knows and, in a sense, desires the good it is, nevertheless, possible for the appetitive impulses to defeat reason.

Can we define these different parts of the soul more clearly?²⁹ It appears that for Socrates it is the reasoning part of the soul which is focused on the welfare of the entire soul, whereas the appetitive part, though less clearly defined, is shortsightedly fixated on the body’s physical desires of food, drink, and sex. And, as we have seen, it is clearly possible for these two parts to conflict with each other.

[I]s it not the fact that that which inhibits such actions arises when it arises from the calculations of reason (ἐκ λογισμοῦ), but the impulses which draw and drag (τὰ δὲ ἄγοντα καὶ ἔλκοντα διὰ παθημάτων) come through affects and disease? ...shall we claim that they are two and different from one another, naming that in the soul whereby it reckons and reasons the rational and that with which it loves, hungers, thirsts, and feels the flutter and titillation of other desires (τὰς ἄλλας ἐπιθυμίας), the irrational and appetitive—companion of various repletions and pleasures. (439c7–d8)

²⁹ In answering this question, I have learned much from: G. R. F. Ferrari, “The Three-Part Soul,” in G. R. F. Ferrari (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Plato’s Republic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 165–201; A. W. Price, *Mental Conflict* (Issues in Ancient Philosophy; London: Routledge, 1995), 30–103; C. D. C. Reeve, *Philosopher-Kings* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1989), 118–69; Mariana Anagnostopoulos, “The Divided Soul and the Desire for Good in Plato’s *Republic*,” in Gerasimos Santas (ed.), *The Blackwell Guide to Plato’s Republic* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2006), 166–83.

Reason and appetite, on this account, constitute two irreconcilable forces which do battle against each other when they come into conflict over their motivating desires.³⁰ In the two passages cited above, the appetites are described as “dragging” against the rational part of the soul (439b3–5; 439d1–2), and is spoken of as “irrational” (ἀλόγιστον, 439d7). Reason, on the other hand, deliberates, judges, and keeps the body's desires in check and, significantly, is endowed with the function of ruling the entire soul for the sake of its greater good.

But before we examine reason's function in more detail we must, first, follow Socrates' lead by examining the part of the soul called the *θύμος* and the conflicted soul of Leontius (439e–440a). Socrates recounts having heard the story of Leontius who, as he is passing by the place where the rotting corpses of recently executed criminals lie, feels within his soul the dual desire to both gaze upon the bodies and also to restrain his eyes and veil his vision from the sight. Despite his longing to restrain his base desire, Leontius runs to gaze at the corpses and cries: “There, ye wretches take your fill of the fine spectacle!” (440a3–4). It appears that we simply have to do here with the reasoning and appetitive parts of the soul. Socrates, however, introduces *θύμος*, the part of the soul which, while difficult to define precisely, gives rise to action, feels strong emotion and particularly anger, and most importantly is able to ally itself with either reason or appetite. Socrates asserts that spirit will ally itself with reason against appetite, but this statement is soon qualified: “there exists a third kind, this principle of high spirit, which is the helper of reason by nature, unless it is corrupted by evil nurture” (441a2–3). In addition to Leontius's anger with himself for giving in to his desire to look at the corpses, Socrates mentions crying infants (441a7–9), barking dogs (441b2–3), and Odysseus's furor at Penelope's maids (441b4–c2) as examples of *θύμος*. And in Books 8 and 9 Socrates refers to the timocratic man who is concerned with nothing else than competitively pursuing honor as the example of a soul devoted to *θύμος*. Thus, as the rational part of the soul desires its overall good and the appetitive desires its physical cravings, so the *θύμος* too has its own values and desires.³¹ While the descriptions of *θύμος* in Books 4 and 9 appear to be different, the former emphasizing the emotion of anger and the latter that of honor-seeking, in both cases

³⁰ So Cooper, “Plato's Theory of Human Motivation,” 123.

³¹ Cooper, “Plato's Theory of Human Motivation,” 130–36.

it is only concerned with appearances. In Book 4 *θύμος* is described as being content with what merely “seems to be just” (*τῷ δοκοῦντι δικάϊῳ*; 440c9), and in Book 9 Plato describes the timocratic person as willing to sacrifice everything for the sake of image and reputation.³² Reason alone, to which has been granted the duty to know things as they are, is fit to rule.

In concluding our discussion of Book 4, we must finally examine in a bit more detail the role of the reasoning part of the soul and Socrates’ description of “justice.” The reasoning part of the soul is, according to Plato, working rightly when it both looks out for the overall good of the whole person and rules the person in light of the good: “Does it not belong to the rational part to rule (*λογιστικῷ ἄρχειν*), being wise and exercising forethought in behalf of the entire soul (*σωφῶ ὄντι καὶ ἔχοντι τὴν ὑπὲρ ἀπάσης τῆς ψυχῆς προμήθειαν*)?” (441e2–4). Reason rightly rules the entire soul by first discerning the overall good and then issuing the necessary commands and injunctions to the rest of the soul (442c5–6).³³ The reasoning part of the soul is, therefore, capable of discerning and so ordering the soul’s welfare in a manner which is entirely independent from the appetitive parts. Thus, every situation of mental conflict within the soul can be reduced to a conflict between the desire of the reasoning part for what is best for the soul and a conflicting desire from one of the other two parts.³⁴

When the reasoning part discerns the overall good and rightly rules over appetite and spirit such that there is a harmony between the parts, this soul can rightly be described as the “just man” (441e1).³⁵ Justice (*ἡ δικαιοσύνη*, 443d1) has to do with one’s own internal constitution and this pinnacle of virtue results when the soul has:

first attained to self-mastery and beautiful order within himself, and having harmonized these three principles...and having linked and bound

³² See the excellent account of *θύμος* in Plato and its relationship to reason by Angela Hobbs, *Plato and the Hero: Courage, Manliness and the Impersonal Good* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 14–23.

³³ That the reasoning part of the soul cannot be understood apart from its fundamental concern to know the good is rightly argued in Michael Morris, “*Akrasia* in the *Protagoras* and the *Republic*,” *Phronesis* 51 (2006): 195–229, esp. 219–20.

³⁴ So, also, Christopher Bobonich, *Plato’s Utopia Recast: His Later Ethics and Politics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 235–36.

³⁵ Aristotle articulates a similar view: “Therefore, the appetitive part of the temperate person must agree with reason. For their shared goal is the beautiful (*καλόν*), and the temperate person desires what he should and as he should and when he should; this is what reason commands (*Eth. nic.* 1119b15–18).

all three together and made of himself one man instead of many, self-controlled and in unison (σώφρονα καὶ ἡρμοσμένον), he should then and then only turn to practice if he find aught to do either in the getting of wealth or the tendance of the body...in all such doings believing and naming the just and honourable action to be that which preserves and helps to produce this condition of the soul...(443d6–e3)

Thus, the just soul will be the person who has her reasoning component fully in control of the entire soul, harmonizing and ordering the specific values and desires of each part of the soul in such a way that the parts do not engage in a civil war, but instead work together as a single person intent on its overall good.³⁶

2.2. *The Tyrant Enslaved to Appetite: Reading Book 9*

Having described the epistemological conditions for the soul's knowledge of the good in Books 5–7, Plato returns to the theme of Book 4 by describing a series of increasingly unjust souls or constitutions. The soul of the tyrant is the last in the series of descent which moves from the philosopher-kings, to the timocratic, to the oligarchic, and then to the penultimate democratic soul. The philosophers are dominated by the reasoning part of the soul, the timocratic by the spirited, and the final three by, in some manner, the appetitive. The figure of the miserable tyrannical soul casts a long shadow over the *Republic*, and Plato clearly uses him as a foil against which the just philosopher is to be viewed. Plato, in fact, uses the tyrant, and the other constitutional figures, as a way of "writing up internal conflict in the style of external drama."³⁷ In this section we will examine the tyrant, paying attention to the psychic interplay between his reasoning and appetitive part, the vivid description of desire's violent mastery and of the entire person, and the reason why Plato describes him as the most unhappy and miserable figure of all.

At the beginning of Book 9, Plato makes the distinction between necessary and unnecessary pleasures and appetites, the former which are useful for healthy functioning (559a–c).³⁸ The unnecessary appetites,

³⁶ For the role of justice in the *Republic*, see Aryeh Kosman, "Justice and Virtue: The *Republic's* Inquiry into Proper Difference," in Ferrari (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Plato's Republic*, 116–37.

³⁷ Price, *Mental Conflict*, 56.

³⁸ On Plato's view regarding pleasures mixed and unmixed with pain, see J. C. B. Gosling and C. C. W. Taylor, *The Greeks on Pleasure* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1982), 111–22.

however, are lawless, harmful, and necessary to be rid of by education and reason. They are:

Awakened in sleep when the rest of the soul, the rational, gentle and dominant part, slumbers, but the beastly and savage part replete with food and wine, gambols and, repelling sleep, endeavors to sally forth and satisfy its own instincts... It does not shrink from attempting to lie with a mother in fancy or with anyone else, man, god or brute. It is ready for any foul deed of blood; it abstains from no food, and, in a word, falls short of no extreme of folly and shamelessness. (559c2–d4)

While Socrates suggests that, in some measure, these unnecessary desires are present in all people (571b5–6), it is the tyrannical soul which embodies these appetites in full measure. Having been raised by a democratic father, whose object of desire we remember is entertainment (572c1–4), the son is seduced by a group of men who “contrive to engender in his soul an erotic love to be the protector of his idle and prodigal appetites, a monstrous drone” (572e7–573a2). The violent militaristic language of a single drone which controls the soul so as to make war against its reasoning part pervades Plato’s description of the tyrant (cf. 573e2–8). This implanted “ruling passion” (ἑρῳτά τινα)³⁹ in the tyrant’s soul gives rise to a plethora of uncontrolled and excessive bodily delights with “incense and myrrh and chaplets and wine” (573a5–6), such that the reason, as the captain of the soul’s bodyguard, is displaced “by madness” (ὑπὸ μανίας; 573b1).⁴⁰ So strong is this maniacal longing for bodily pleasure that if the soul happens to encounter any decent and worthy opinions residing within itself “it slays them and thrusts them forth (ἀποκτείνει τε καὶ ἔξω ὄθει παρ’)

³⁹ I depart from the Loeb translation at this point which translates ἑρῳτά as “ruling passion.”

⁴⁰ Richard D. Parry (“The Unhappy Tyrant and the Craft of Inner Rule,” in Ferrari [ed.], *The Cambridge Companion to Plato’s Republic*, 395–96) argues that this ruling eros appears to be primarily sexual, though the passage appears to me to include any excessive bodily appetite such as drunkenness and violence.

⁴¹ Note that Plato does not intend to argue that the tyrant no longer has the ability to engage in reasoning or to deliberate, but rather refers to a situation whereby the reasoning part of the soul is controlled and dominated by the body’s lusts. So Irwin, *Plato’s Ethics*, 284, 290–91.

to the harmonic state of the just philosopher's soul is one of the most radical images in Book 9 and it occurs repeatedly. When distinct parts of the soul have competing conceptions of the good which cannot brook each other's desires, Plato portrays the mental conflict which results in graphically violent imagery, not unlike the description of the appetites in Book 4 which "drag and draw the soul" and "drive it like a beast to drink" (439a–b).⁴² Plato's description of the bodily desires of the appetitive part of the soul are highly reminiscent of the *Phaedo* where Plato restricts the meaning of desire and pleasure to that which is true of the body (60B3–C7, 65C5–7, 68E8–69A1, 81B3–6). The body is that which weighs down the soul and tempts the soul to keep its gaze fixed on that which it is becoming.⁴³ The violent imagery in the *Republic* continues in the famous description of the soul as the combination of a many-headed beast, a lion, and a human (588b–591b). Unjust souls will starve the human and make it weak so that "he can be pulled about whithersoever either of the others drag him, and not to familiarize or reconcile with one another the two creatures but suffer them to bite and fight and devour one another" (589a1–3). The soul of the unjust tyrant is in utter contrast to the just soul who acts as a good farmer nourishing and caring for his inner parts by giving its "inner person complete domination over the entire human" (ὅθεν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὁ ἐντὸς ἄνθρωπος ἔσται ἐγκρατέστατος; 589a8–b1).

Just as the subjects of a tyrannical king are the most deplorable and unhappy citizens, so is the tyrant himself the most miserable and unhappy of all the souls, for "the tyrannical nature never tastes freedom or true friendship" (ἐλευθερίας δὲ καὶ φιλίας ἀληθοῦς τυραννικὴ φύσις ἀεὶ ἄγευστος; 576a6–7; cf. 576c1–4; 576e4–5). It supposes that by engaging fully in its lawless desires and thereby subjecting and killing all the thoughts and desires which proceed from the better part of its soul that it has attained "complete freedom" (ἐλευθερίαν ἅπασαν; 572e3), but in reality the soul of the tyrant is "entirely enslaved" (μάλιστα δούλην; 577c7). The reason the tyrant is entirely enslaved is a result of its choice to privilege the baser part of its soul and so enslave its best part (577c8–d4). Paradoxically this choice results in the tyrant's misery:

⁴² In addition to the passages in the *Republic* listed in this paper, see the famous image of the charioteer and the two horses in the *Phaedrus* (esp. 254A–E).

⁴³ Price, *Mental Conflict*, 37–40.

Then will you say that such a soul is enslaved or free? “Enslaved, I should suppose.” Again, does not the enslaved and tyrannized city least of all do what it really wishes? “Decidedly so.” Then the tyrannized soul—to speak of the soul as a whole—also will least of all do what it wishes, but being always perforce driven and drawn by the gadfly of desire it will be full of confusion and repentance. “Of course.” And must the tyrannized city be rich or poor? “Poor.” Then the tyrant soul also must of necessity always be needy and suffer from unfulfilled desire. . . . And do you not think you will find more lamentations and groans and wailing and anguish in any other city? (*Resp.* 577d8–e11).

At this point it is quite evident that the unjust soul of the tyrant and its attendant misery and unhappiness has been advanced by Plato as confirmation of his thesis that only the just soul is truly happy. Yet we might ask how it is that the unjust soul is necessarily the most miserable and unhappy wretch of all. We have seen that for Plato it is the duty of the reasoning part of the soul to discern the good for the soul and so order the parts accordingly. The tyrant, despite its waging battle against reason, still appears to suffer from “unfulfilled desire” for it can never fully squelch reason’s pursuit of the good.⁴⁴ The tyrant is the epitome of mental conflict for it never entirely rids itself of reason’s desire for the good, and thus it is continually filled with “confusion and repentance.” The parts of the soul are in such complete disharmony with one another that they literally torture the unjust soul. Because the motivations and desires of reason are never entirely eradicated, the tyrant is aware that his life is truly miserable.⁴⁵ Nevertheless, his mad desires for his bodily appetites have so powerfully enslaved the soul that he can never attain to the good.

2.3. *Law and Education as Allies of Reason in the Republic*

With this ghost of the tyrant looming over the *Republic* the reader cannot help but ask the question: what can restrain and curb the desires of the appetitive part of the soul so as to preserve its harmony and justice? In this section, I will argue that Plato sees the reasoning part

⁴⁴ Additionally, the desires will never be fulfilled because, according to Plato, these physical pleasures are not even real because they are simply releases from pain (583b–86c). On this, see George Klosko, *The Development of Plato’s Political Theory* (New York: Methuen, 1986), 103–05; Price, *Mental Conflict*, 59–60.

⁴⁵ Parry, “The Unhappy Tyrant and the Craft of Inner Rule,” 400–401.

of the soul as maintaining its rightful place only through a process of philosophic and nomistic education. Education and the Laws, in other words, are the means whereby the soul maintains its proper ordering.⁴⁶ Parts of Books 2, 3, 7, and 10 of the *Republic* are dominated by Plato's description of the educational program which the citizens of his ideal city must undergo, but unfortunately it is beyond the scope of this essay to examine these books in detail.⁴⁷ What is most important for our objectives, however, are Plato's assumptions regarding the purpose of education and nomistic legislation, and this can largely be ascertained by a short account of his most specific statements on the subject.⁴⁸

Plato mentions that the education of the soul will consist of a combination of music, which will soothe and tame the appetitive part, and gymnastics, which will intensify the rational part (cf. *Tim.* 88b–c). When the soul of each part “has been educated to do their own work [the rational part] will preside over the appetitive part which is the mass of the soul in each of us” (442a3–6). While Plato says very little about the specific content of this educational program, he frequently emphasizes the importance of the education (τὴν παιδείαν, 518b9) of young minds so they will be able to discern the good. Education is not simply a transfer of knowledge from one soul into another, for the soul already has the inner capacity and power to see the good and needs be simply “turned around from the world of becoming...until the soul is able to endure the contemplation of essence and the brightest region of being...which is the good (τἀγαθόν)” (581c7–11). The good is that which is beyond essence, is the source of knowledge, is present in some manner to every person, and which is surpassingly beautiful as it guides the soul beyond the unstable world of false pleasures (508a5–b10).⁴⁹ For

⁴⁶ See W. Jaeger, *Paideia* (3 vols.; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1939–45), 1:236.

⁴⁷ For an insightful treatment of some of Plato's education concerns with respect to Book 10, see Jessica Moss, “Why is Imitative Poetry Bad?” in Ferrari (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Plato's Republic*, 415–44.

⁴⁸ For a fuller account of Plato's treatment of education in the *Republic*, see Klosko, *The Development of Plato's Political Theory*, 117–32; Christopher Gill, *Personality in Greek Epic, Tragedy, and Philosophy: The Self in Dialogue* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996), 240–320.

⁴⁹ For more on this complicated aspect of Plato's thought, see Christopher Rowe, “The Form of the Good and the Good in Plato's *Republic*,” in Douglas Cairns, Fritz-Gregor Herrmann, and Terry Penner (eds.), *Pursuing the Good: Ethics and Metaphysics in Plato's Republic* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007), 124–53; Gerasimos Santas, *Goodness and Justice: Plato, Aristotle, and the Moderns* (Maden, Mass.: Blackwell, 2001).

Plato, the soul is characterized by always being drawn to the beautiful (τὸ καλόν; cf. *Phaedr.* 250D).⁵⁰

Therefore, it is necessary that the soul be “hammered from childhood” (ἐκ παιδὸς . . . κοπτόμενον, 519a9) so as to rid it of all that weighs it down from ascending toward virtue and knowledge of the good (519a9–b9). Those who are uneducated (τοὺς ἀπαιδεύτους) will never be fit to rule because they will have no knowledge of truth and the good (519b9–c4). There is an inextricable connection, for Plato, between the philosophers’ duty to educate the young, by turning their minds toward the vision of the good, and the latter’s advancement in virtue. Those souls who fail to have their souls turned and educated toward the good, inevitably are brought down to the world of becoming and are thus enslaved and beset by all manners of bodily pleasures which prevent the soul from setting its vision on that which is real (519b).

That education is oriented toward the ethical formation of the individual is strongly emphasized in Plato’s description of the unjust souls/constitutions in Books 8–9. The creation of the oligarchic soul from a timocratic one, for example, arises not merely due to its desire for wealth, but because it “runs away from the law . . . since they have not been educated by persuasion but by force” (τὸν νόμον ἀποδιδράσκοντες οὐχ ὑπὸ πείθους ἀλλ’ ὑπὸ βίας πεπαιδευμένοι; 548b6–7). The oligarchic soul is dominated by the unnecessary and lawless appetite for excessive money to spend on its pleasures for food, drink, and sex which “by correction and training from youth up (ἐκ νέων καὶ παιδευομένη) can be got of in most cases . . . and is a hindrance to the soul’s attainment of intelligence and sobriety (φρόνησιν καὶ τὸ σωφρονεῖν)” (559b7–10). Lack of education is explicitly blamed, in fact, for the dominance of the oligarch’s baser desires: “Shall we not say that owing to this lack of education (ἀπαιδευσίαν) the appetites of the drone spring up in him, some the beggarly, others the rascally . . . ? (554b8–10; cf. 556a). The unjust souls believe that their only hope for freedom consists in their “paying no heed to the laws written or unwritten” (γεγραμμένων ἢ ἀγράφων) so as to allow no checks on their unnecessary appetites (563d8–9).

⁵⁰ Sabina Lovibond, “Plato’s Theory of Mind,” in Stephen Everson (ed.), *Psychology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 39–40.

Plato emphasizes without fully explaining that in some way these lawless appetites are rightly controlled by means of the laws. The lawless appetites, for example, when “controlled by the laws (ὑπό τε τῶν νόμων) and the better desires in alliance with reason, can... be altogether got rid of” (571b6–8). The tyrant himself “flees from law and reason” (φυγὼν νόμον τε καὶ λόγον) in its pursuit of phantom bodily pleasures (597c2). The tyrant’s choice, in other words, lacks proper intellectual education toward the good, and therefore they unreflectively accept the values and priorities of their seducers. In one of the clearest passages regarding the purpose of the law, Plato argues that it is “reason and law” (λόγος καὶ νόμος) which exhorts one to resist from expressing fully one’s bodily feelings even should it be the loss of his wife or child (603d–604d). The law’s primary function is, therefore, one of bodily restraint and it is only through education, the laws, and reason that one can be steered away from the phantom pleasures of the body toward knowledge of the good.

3. *The Law’s Inability to Educate the Passions in Romans 7:7–25*

3.1. *A Platonic Discourse in Romans 7?*

I have engaged in a reading both of Rom 7:7–25 and of the pertinent passages from Plato’s *Republic* at some length so as to set forth the arguments of both on their own terms, and thus my comparative comments will be more brief. It is my contention that Paul’s argument in Romans 7 makes the best sense within this context of a Platonic discourse. I see at least three broad features of this discourse which enlighten our understanding of Romans 7.

First, Paul follows the Platonic division of the soul between its higher and lower parts, associating the better principle with the mind and rationality and the lower with the body and flesh. While Paul frequently characterizes the body and the flesh with negative overtones, it is only here in Romans 7 where the person’s constituent parts are actually split and divided with respect to its desires leading to contradiction within the soul. In Rom 7:7–25 it is the reasoning part of the soul, namely the “mind” (7:23, 25) and “the inner person” (7:22), which consistently identifies with and desires to do the good which the Law commands. Paul’s language of τὸν ἔσω ἄνθρωπον (7:22) in fact echoes and likely

derives from Plato's description of the $\delta\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\varsigma$ which attempts to tame and suppress the beast's passions (*Resp.* 589a9).⁵¹ In both Paul and Plato, it is this rational part which fights for control over its bodily passions in its attempt to rule. For, as we have seen with both Paul and Plato, it is only the mind which is capable of reasoning, deliberating, and orienting the entire soul toward the good. And, in fact, the mind never hesitates in Romans 7 regarding its desires and its orientation toward the good. The rational part is, however, susceptible to the deceitful passions of the body, which in both Plato and Romans 7 are described as irrational impulses toward the false pleasures of the body which violently wage war against and enslave the mind (Rom 7:5, 7–11, 23–25; *Resp.* 573b). The body's desires drive the soul "like a beast" to drink (*Resp.* 439a); they are like a beastly lion (588–91); they slay and purge the thoughts of the rational part (518). That Paul is appropriating a Platonic as opposed to a Stoic discourse is indicated precisely in the manner in which he portrays the body's desires as it has been taken over by sin as irrational and as violently enslaving the mind against its own will.⁵² The power of the irrational for Plato, and the power of $\acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\rho\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha$ for Paul, is so strong that a mere increase in knowledge will not alter the situation.

Secondly, reckoning with the Platonic discourse in Romans 7 helps one make sense of Paul's reason for using the literary device of speech-in-character ($\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\omega\pi\omicron\iota\acute{\iota}\alpha$) whereby he personifies the soul's individual parts through the "I"-figure.⁵³ As we have seen, in the *Republic*, Plato

⁵¹ For a detailed discussion of the tradition history and its particular appropriation in Paul, see Hans Dieter Betz, "The Concept of the 'Inner Human Being' ($\delta\ \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\omega\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\varsigma$) in the Anthropology of Paul," *NTS* 46 (2000): 315–41; Walter Burkert, "Towards Plato and Paul: The 'Inner Human Being,'" in A. Y. Collins (ed.), *Ancient and Modern Perspectives on the Bible and Culture: Essays in Honor of Hans Dieter Betz* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998), 59–82.

⁵² This aspect is most insightfully articulated by Wasserman, "The Death of the Soul in Romans 7," 808–89.

⁵³ Reading Rom 7:7–25 as a case of speech-in-character has been argued convincingly by Stowers, *Rereading Romans*, 264–72; idem, "Romans 7.7–25 as a Speech-in-Character ($\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\omega\pi\omicron\iota\acute{\iota}\alpha$)," in Troels Engberg-Pedersen (ed.), *Paul in his Hellenistic Context* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995), 180–202; idem, "Apostrophe, $\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\omega\pi\omicron\iota\acute{\iota}\alpha$ and Paul's Rhetorical Education," in John T. Fitzgerald, Thomas H. Olbricht, and L. Michael White (eds.), *Early Christianity and Classical Culture: Comparative Studies in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 351–69. Quintilian, with reference to speech-in-character, says: "This is a device which lends wonderful variety and animation to oratory. By this means we display the inner thoughts of our adversaries as though they were talking with themselves" (*Inst.* 9.2.30–31).

writes of the embodied soul as if it were multiple persons each with its own desires and motivations. The tyrant is written up as a dramatic figure which vividly portrays mental conflict. Just as the tyrannical soul “least of all does what he wishes” so Paul’s “I”-figure “does not do what I want but I do the very thing I hate” (Rom 7:16). Paul draws on this literary device to depict the paradoxical and tragic nature of the mind’s defeat by its sinful bodily passions.

Thirdly, both Plato and Paul identify “the good” (Rom 7:18–19; *Resp.* 505a–b) as that toward which the soul must be directed for its own happiness and health. Paul, however, parts company with Plato, and really his entire Greek and Jewish ethical background, in his conviction that the Law and education actually work not to curb but to produce desire.⁵⁴ We have seen with Plato the importance attached to education as the means toward turning the soul of the individual toward the good, and education by the laws as that which restrains the desires of the appetitive part of the soul. But for Paul the advent of the Law’s command, “Do not desire” (Rom 7:7b), paradoxically incites sin and desire. In fact, throughout 7:14–25 the “I”-figure is portrayed as educated and knowledgeable of the Law. The “I”-person’s desire, however, to do the Law which it knows and loves is ultimately frustrated and overpowered by its bodily appetites which conquer and enslave its intent to do the good. Paul parts ways with Plato, therefore, in his pessimistic conviction that training, education, and the Law are ultimately powerless to overcome the body’s appetites.

3.2. *Rhetorically Situating Romans 7: Two Competing Ethical Programs in Rome?*

If my argument is convincing up to this point, we are still left with the questions as to the role which Romans 7 plays in Paul’s argument, and as to why he has appropriated a philosophical discourse in the middle of the second major movement of his letter (chs. 5–8). I suggest that Paul uses this well-known Platonic discourse as a vivid way of countering and warning against the ethical program of his Jewish-Christian opponents. If Paul’s epistolary audience in Romans is Gentiles, which I think is highly likely based on Paul’s own statements within the letter (cf. Rom

⁵⁴ So Kathy L. Gaca, *The Making of Fornication: Eros, Ethics, and Political Reform in Greek Philosophy and Early Christianity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003), 156.

1:5, 13; 11:13), then it is almost certain that they would have been at least minimally acquainted with dramatic depictions of inner conflict.⁵⁵ Paul has craftily, I suggest, embedded the ethical program of his missionary competitors within this well-recognized dramatic depiction of the divided and conflicted soul.

It should really not be too controversial that Paul's epistle to the Romans manifests a concern with Jewish-Christian competitors.⁵⁶ Assuming that ch. 16 belongs to the original manuscript, which almost all Pauline scholars now do, Paul explicitly warns the Romans to watch out for certain people whose teaching is "in opposition to the teaching that you have learned" (παρὰ τὴν διδαχὴν ἣν ὑμεῖς ἐμάθετε ποιοῦντας; 16:17b).⁵⁷ Paul slanders them as well as their teaching which "does not serve our Lord Christ but their own bellies" (τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν Χριστῷ οὐ δουλεύουσιν ἀλλὰ τῇ ἐαντῶν κοιλίᾳ; 16:18).

Three simple points should be noted about 16:17–20. First, for Paul the teaching of these people fails to secure mastery over the desires of the body as they succumb to the desires of their bellies. Secondly, Paul regards their teaching as somehow not fully Christocentric as they fail to serve Christ. And finally, Paul warns the Romans against being deceived by their smooth and persuasive ability to speak. While scholars have been perplexed regarding the identity of the interlocutor in Rom 2:17–29 we should not fail to note the manner in which this text resonates with 16:17–20 and 7:7–25. In this passage a figure appears whom Paul describes as a Jewish teacher of the Law who claims to know and be able to teach the pure will of God through his possession of

⁵⁵ Euripides, Seneca, and Ovid all engaged in authoring plays centering on Medea's inner conflict and turmoil. See Chris Gill, "Two Monologues of Self-Division: Euripides, *Medea* 1021–80 and Seneca, *Medea* 893–977," in Michael Whitby, Philip Hardie, and Mary Whitby (eds.), *Homo Viator: Classical Essays for John Bramble* (Bristol: Bristol Classical Press, 1994), 25–37.

⁵⁶ On this see what is a convincing if somewhat neglected argument by Peter Stuhlmacher, "Der Abfassungszweck des Römerbriefes," *ZNW* 77 (1986): 180–93. Also, see Douglas A. Campbell, "Determining the Gospel through Rhetorical Analysis in Paul's Letter to the Roman Christians," in L. Ann Jervis and Peter Richardson (eds.), *Gospel in Paul: Studies on Corinthians, Galatians and Romans for Richard N. Longenecker* (JSNTSup 108; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1998), 315–35. For a more balanced treatment of the issue, see Stanley E. Porter, "Did Paul Have Opponents in Rome and What Were They Opposing?" in Stanley E. Porter (ed.), *Paul and His Opponents* (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 149–68.

⁵⁷ Most now regard Romans 16 to have been an original part of Romans since the work of Harry Gamble, *The Textual History of the Letter to the Romans* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977).

the Law. Paul mocks the sage who identifies himself as a “guide for the blind, a light for those in darkness, an instructor of fools, a teacher of infants, because he has the form of knowledge and of truth in the Law” (ὁδηγὸν . . . τυφλῶν, φῶς τῶν ἐν σκότει, παιδευτὴν ἀφρόνων, διδάσκαλον νηπίων, ἔχοντα τὴν μὀρφωσιν τῆς γνώσεως καὶ τῆς ἀληθείας ἐν τῷ νόμῳ; 2:19–20a). Yet, like the “I”-figure in Romans 7 who knows the good through the Law but is unable to perform it, so this sage teaches the Law but, so according to Paul, breaks and transgresses it at numerous points (2:22–24). When this passage is coupled with 16:17–20 and 7:7–25 it presents itself as strong evidence that Paul was engaged in or at least concerned with a potential battle against opponents with a nomistic ethical program.

Furthermore, Paul himself hints throughout Romans that his Law-free gospel is under attack and being questioned by some. For example, some are charging Paul with teaching: “Let us do evil so that good may come” (Rom 3:8). Paul’s sensitivity to the issue is reflected in his drawing of a false inference from the nature of his Law-free gospel in his claim: “Shall we sin since we are not under law but under grace? May it never be!” (Rom 6:15; cf. 6:1). It takes little historical imagination to draw the likely inference that Paul’s gospel was being attacked precisely because it failed to provide its Gentile converts with the stable, historical, and revered ethic of the Jewish Torah.⁵⁸ The Jewish Law after all was frequently portrayed as that which not only taught but enabled one to master and control its bodily passions. Philo, for example, notes that the Sabbath is intended by God to function as a day of training in virtue, wisdom, and self-mastery according to the Law’s teachings (*Spec. Leg.* 2.61 (62). For the teaching of the Torah controls the pleasures of the belly and exalts reason as the charioteer of its baser parts (*Spec. Leg.* 2.162–163). And for the author of 4 Maccabees the giving of the commandment “Do not desire” proves that reason when coupled with the Jewish Law can control desires (2:5–6). For when God created humanity, he enthroned the mind and made the Law its ally to govern the body for the sake of virtue (2:21–3:2).⁵⁹ In light of the incredibly

⁵⁸ This was after all the situation which eventually led to Paul’s epistle to the Galatians.

⁵⁹ On the theme of self-mastery in Judaism, see David Aune, “Mastery of the Passions: Philo, 4 Maccabees and Earliest Christianity,” in Wendy E. Helleman (ed.), *Hellenization Revisited: Shaping a Christian Response within the Greco-Roman World* (Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1994), 125–58; Stanley K. Stowers, “Paul and

high regard which Jewish tradition held for the ethical guidance and teaching of the Law, it is highly likely that Paul's Law-free gospel to the Gentiles was attacked by competing Jewish-Christian opponents who were teaching nomistic education to the Gentile converts as a means of curbing their sinful passions.

Paul counters his opponents by dramatically depicting the internal conflict and ultimate defeat of any Christian who seeks to live under the Law. For, according to Paul, the Law teaches God's will but is impotent to produce obedience. Paul, thus, depicts in Rom 7:7–25 both the event of the giving of the Torah (vv. 7–12) and the experience of living under it (vv. 14–25) as an entirely futile and counter-productive undertaking so as to warn the Gentile-Christians against pursuing this ethical program. It is hardly coincidental, therefore, that Rom 7:7–25 lacks any references to Christ or the Spirit, for Paul conceives of his ethical program alone as being marked by their empowering agency. Rom 7:7–25 is, in other words, a foil crafted by Paul for his own ethics. Rom 8:1–17 articulates Paul's ethical program which characterizes the person in-Christ as: marked by freedom (8:2), the powerful agency of the Spirit (8:2, 9–11), justice (8:4), and a healthy functioning of the soul's parts (8:5–11).

4. *Conclusions*

In this paper I have attempted to demonstrate that Rom 7:7–25 should be viewed within the context of specific Platonic assumptions and images, particularly the depiction of the divided soul whose reasoning part is defeated by the passions and desires of the appetitive part. I have argued that Paul's context was characterized by a popular understanding of Platonic philosophy, and thus Paul's appropriation of such popular images and concepts should not be surprising. While other scholars have argued a similar thesis I have attempted to set forth both Paul and Plato on their own terms by providing a close reading of the pertinent passages. I argue, however, that Paul's emphasis on nomistic education has been underplayed, and thus I have attempted to set this forth in more detail. Paul overturns both the Platonic view of educa-

Self-Mastery," in Sampley (ed.), *Paul in the Greco-Roman World: A Handbook*, 531–34.

tion and the Jewish tradition which argues that the body's passions are kept in check precisely through education and the Law. Perhaps the most important part of this essay, however, is the suggestion that Paul appropriates a popular Platonic discourse in order to counter Jewish-Christian opponents who are both slandering Paul's Law-free gospel and encouraging them to submit to the Torah as a means of curbing their bodily passions.

ADOPTED AS SONS (ΥΙΟΘΕΣΙΑ): THE MISSING PIECE IN PAULINE SOTERIOLOGY

Trevor J. Burke

Moody Bible Institute, Chicago, Illinois, USA

1. *Introduction*

What did Paul think God in Jesus Christ was doing and how is this manifested in the letters he wrote to his churches? Responses to these questions are usually couched in terms of soteriology, a point clearly demonstrated in a recent collection of essays entitled *Salvation in the New Testament*.¹ In this collection, many metaphors in the New Testament are delineated, but three Pauline images are treated separately and extensively—justification, redemption and reconciliation. Indeed, these three images more than any others are the most commonly discussed under the rubric of salvation.² To be sure, Paul's understanding of soteriology is rich and many-sided but in addition to the above metaphors is another one which is only briefly mentioned in the above collection of essays³ and which is unique to the *corpus Paulinum*—the expression υιοθεσία, “adopted as son(s)” (Gal 4:5; Rom 8:15, 23; 9:4; Eph 1:5). Rarely, if at all, is adoption considered important and given the in-depth treatment it merits as another metaphor for the apostle's understanding of salvation. In this essay, I will begin by showing how a proper view of Paul's adoption metaphor provides a unique contribution to the apostle's understanding of soteriology. This will be followed by a consideration of adoption as a salvific work of the divine Family—Father, Son and

¹ Jan G. van der Watt (ed.), *Salvation in the New Testament: Perspectives on Soteriology* (Leiden: Brill, 2005). The three essays are Andrie B. du Toit, “Forensic Metaphors in Romans and Their Soteriological Significance,” 213–46; D. Francis Tolmie, “Salvation as Redemption: The Use of ‘Redemption’ Metaphors as Pauline Literature,” 247–69; and Cilliers Breytenbach, “Salvation of the Reconciled (With a Note on the Background of Paul's Metaphor of Reconciliation),” 271–86. Whilst the second of these three essays just mentioned is wider in scope the author deals with the δικ- word group.

² I am using these terms in a generic sense and whilst the above three essays are wider in scope they do treat the verbs δικαιόω, ἀγοράζω, and καταλλάσσω.

³ Du Toit, “Forensic Metaphors,” 241.

Holy Spirit. I will conclude by looking at how Paul not only uses his adoption metaphor to describe salvation for the individual but also employs this metaphor in more novel and innovative ways to describe how God's adopted offspring are the conduit for the deliverance and transformation of the whole cosmos (Rom 8:18–25).

2. *Mapping Paul's Soteriological Metaphors*

As already noted, the term "salvation" is a comprehensive one for the apostle Paul and more often than not the terms justification, redemption and reconciliation are employed in elucidating his views. What is significant about most of these discussions—in both the past and the present—is how often Paul's adoption metaphor is treated within the orbit of these other metaphors. Historically, for example, adoption has been sometimes subsumed under justification, as evidenced by Francis Turretin, the seventeenth-century Genevan scholar, who posed the question "What is the adoption which is given us in justification?" to which he responded "Adoption is included in justification as a part."⁴ On other occasions, adoption has been mistakenly viewed as a synonym for justification, as the following remark by Robert L. Dabney in the nineteenth century amply demonstrates: "Adoption cannot be said to be a different act of grace for justification... [Adoption] performs the same act for us...which justification does."⁵ Today, such misunderstandings persist so that whenever adoption is discussed it is generally treated under these others soteriological expressions, as the following comment by A. Hoekema⁶ demonstrates:

⁴ Sinclair B. Ferguson. "The Reformed Doctrine of Sonship," in N. de S. Cameron and Sinclair B. Ferguson (eds.), *Pulpit and People: Essays in Honour of William Still on his 75th Birthday* (Edinburgh: Rutherford House, 1986), 83.

⁵ Robert L. Dabney, *Syllabus and Notes of the Course of Systematic and Polemic Theology* (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1996), 627.

⁶ A. Hoekema, *Saved by Grace* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 185 (emphasis added). See also the most recent article by Gordon D. Fee, "Paul and the Metaphors for Salvation," in Stephen T. Davis, Daniel Kendall and Gerald O'Collins (eds.), *The Redemption: An Interdisciplinary Symposium on Christ as Redeemer* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 54, 66. Fee subsumes his discussion of adoption under general treatments of "Redemption" and "Justification." This is surprising because earlier in his *magnum opus*, *God's Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1994), 855, Fee considers adoption as a soteriological category in its own right under the rubric of what he calls "The Pauline Soteriological Metaphors."

two positive benefits of justification that we mentioned earlier [are] first our adoption as children of God. By this I do not mean the spiritual rebirth whereby we become children of God through regeneration...I mean adoption in the legal sense: our being placed in the status of sons...of God.

The upshot of these misunderstandings and the misconstruing of adoption under other soteriological categories has meant that Paul's υιοθεσία metaphor has been compromised and relegated to a position of secondary importance. Rarely, if at all, is adoption treated as the separate metaphor that it fully deserves. As a consequence, instead of adoption occupying a more central role in the apostle Paul's soteriological understanding, it has either been minimized or been pushed to the periphery of his thinking.

Not all subscribe to these views, however. In fact, scholars are becoming increasingly aware of the view that whilst adoption is related to these other soteriological metaphors it is nevertheless distinct, different and separate from them. This is evident in the comments by C. A. Anderson Scott, who asserts

Christianity according to St. Paul is best studied under the aspect of salvation, inasmuch as "Salvation" is really the most comprehensive term for what the Apostle found in Christ. It includes...all the chief factors in Christianity...and embraces all the great topics with which we are familiar—Redemption, Justification, Reconciliation, *Adoption*.⁷

James D. G. Dunn also comments that there is a "diversity of metaphors that Paul uses in his talk of salvation...sowing and watering (1 Cor 3:6–8), grafting and harvesting (Rom 11:17–24), first instalment and first fruits (Rom 8:23), birth (1 Cor 4:15), *adoption* (Rom 8:15)."⁸ Unfortunately these remarks are not elaborated on or more fully amplified as to how adoption functions soteriologically in the *corpus Paulinum*.⁹

⁷ C. A. Anderson Scott, *Christianity According to St. Paul* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961), 17–18.

⁸ James D. G. Dunn, *The Theology of the Apostle Paul* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 296. Alister McGrath also discusses adoption under the general heading entitled "Pauline Images of Salvation"; see *Christian Theology: An Introduction* (Oxford: Blackwell Press, 2001), 431.

⁹ Part of the reason is due to the fact that nowhere do systematicians state the essential "ingredients" necessary to "qualify" one metaphor and not another for it to be considered a soteriological term. Tim Trummer, a systematician, takes proper cognizance of this point when he comments: "Our first line of argument is that there exists a deficiency in the very definition of a soteriological metaphor"; see his article "The Metaphorical Import of Adoption: A Plea for Realization," *SBET* 15.2 (1997): 98–115 (108).

The relationship (and difference) between *υιοθεσία* and these three most commonly discussed metaphors for salvation will be discussed below, but Gordon Fee in relation to the latter makes an important and insightful observation that captures well the nuances and shades of meaning of the apostle's understanding of soteriology: "[s]laves to sin (and law) are 'redeemed'; those in enmity to God are 'reconciled'; those who are guilty of transgressing the law are 'justified.'"¹⁰ Each of these images is a part of the rich tapestry that is the mosaic of Pauline soteriology.

It is my view that, in addition to these images, adoption is another important metaphor that adds to and enriches Paul's understanding of soteriology precisely because the apostle is drawing from an entirely different conceptual field, that of the ancient family. Adoption stands apart from these other expressions and is not, for example, a synonym for justification nor is it to be subsumed or included as part of this term or any of the above mentioned expressions. To the contrary, Paul's *υιοθεσία* metaphor elucidates aspects of salvation that are different and are not found in any of the above expressions. For example, whilst justification connotes the language of penal law and acquittal,¹¹ redemption the language of the slave market and freedom,¹² reconciliation the language of friendship and the removal of enmity,¹³ adoption connotes the more intimate language of the family and the notion of

I have tried to address this question by considering some of the essential "ingredients" necessary for the apostle's adoption metaphor to be considered as another soteriological term for Paul; see Trevor J. Burke, *Adopted into God's Family: Exploring a Pauline Metaphor* (New Studies in Biblical Theology 22; Nottingham/Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2006), 37–45.

¹⁰ Fee, "Paul and the Metaphors of Salvation," 51.

¹¹ See Du Toit, "Forensic Metaphors," 214–15; Fee, "Paul and the Metaphors of Salvation," 57, makes the point that even if Jews did not understand the language of the "law court" "Paul's Gentile believers would find an easy 'transfer' to the Roman legal system."

¹² Tolmie, "Salvation as Redemption," 252; Fee, "Paul and the Metaphors of Salvation," 52. In regard to the question of background, Tolmie argues for a "both and" approach (i.e., Old Testament and the notions about slavery in the social world of Paul) whilst Fee posits an Old Testament context.

¹³ Breytenbach, "Salvation of the Reconciled," 272; Fee, "Paul and the Metaphors of Salvation," 60. Stanley E. Porter has written extensively on this metaphor and has most recently concluded that "Reconciliation language... seems to have been used by Greek writers to describe the... process by which hostility between parties is eliminated and friendship is created" (132); see Stanley E. Porter, "Paul's Concept of Reconciliation, Twice More," in Stanley E. Porter (ed.), *Paul and His Theology* (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 131–52.

transference from one οἶκος to another οἶκος. Additionally, whilst the first three metaphors approach salvation from a more *objective* viewpoint—that is to say, what *God* has done for humankind—adoption looks at soteriology from a different perspective, the *subjective*, the experiential or relational, and *what happens to the believer* as a result of God's saving intervention.¹⁴ Adoption, therefore, provides us with another—"a different lens"¹⁵—through which to view Paul's understanding of salvation, thereby deepening our understanding of what God in Christ has achieved for sinful humankind.

Certainly I am not suggesting that adoption is *the* most important metaphor but—to change the metaphor—υἰοθεσία is another soteriological arrow in the quiver of the apostle Paul which he had at his disposal.¹⁶ It is a mistake of some proportion to imagine that one single metaphor can fully exhaust or delineate Paul's many-sided understanding of salvation. So, in order that we might understand the salvific ramifications at work in Paul's adoption metaphor we need to lay some ground-work by briefly discussing the background and context upon which he was drawing.¹⁷ It is to this aspect that we now briefly turn our attention.

Adoption: The Roman Social Context

The New Testament soteriological metaphors in general and the Pauline soteriological metaphors in particular were not created *ex nihilo*; rather they are planted firmly in the soil of the social context of the

¹⁴ Fee, *God's Empowering Presence*, 855ff.

¹⁵ Jeanne Stevenson-Moessner, *The Spirit of Adoption: At Home in God's Family* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2003), 99.

¹⁶ The mistaken view that one soteriological metaphor can suitably encapsulate the totality of Paul's views on soteriology has been well recognized by others; see Ferguson, "The Reformed Doctrine of Sonship," 86; Fee, "Paul and the Metaphors of Salvation," 51.

¹⁷ I hesitate to discuss the background in great depth because it is this issue more than any other which has dominated research into υἰοθεσία in the last century. As a result of this rather narrowly driven agenda, the issue of background is the only one remarked upon by commentators. I have endeavored to widen the debate by approaching adoption from an exegetical-theological perspective. I hold the view that Paul's adoption term is a key metaphor for it opens up new opportunities for us to look afresh at Paul's understanding of a whole raft of theological ideas, including pneumatology, ecclesiology, ethics, and the foundational value of honor in ancient Romans society. See Burke, *Adopted into God's Family*, 29–30.

first-century Mediterranean world.¹⁸ Proper cognizance of this fact has been taken by Jan van der Watt, who remarks:

The socio-historical framework within which a metaphor was originally created plays an important role in the continued cognitive and emotive functioning of metaphor. When reading ancient texts, it is even more critical that one should assimilate socio-historical data when interpreting metaphors. In order to understand the intensity, intent and meaning of a metaphor in ancient texts, it is necessary to understand the socio-historical context in which it was originally used.¹⁹

Paul is a master of metaphor and the images he uses would have immediately resonated with those who first heard them. In particular, Paul's use of the term *υιοθεσία* would have struck an immediate chord with his hearers since adoption played an important part in ancient Roman civilization. We know that successive Emperors during the Julio-Claudian era adopted men with the sole intention that they would succeed them in the principate. Beginning with Julius Caesar's adoption of Octavian (Augustus) and concluding with Claudius's adoption of Nero, each case ensured the continuation of the Julio-Claudian line.

In the ancient Roman world the family²⁰ was the basic building-block of society. According to Cicero (*Dom.* 35), the Roman statesman, adoption was undertaken for the purposes of maintaining the *nomen* (name), *pecunia* (property), and *sacrum* (religious rites). Situated at the apex of the familial pyramid of all Roman households was the father, the head of the household (*paterfamilias*), and all matters of authority, including the issues of life and death, were in his hands. In accordance

¹⁸ I also accept that Israel's (singular) and the Israelites (plural) relationship to God as son/s is important Old Testament background and needs to be considered. Thus, the background question is not resolved as "either-or" (i.e., Roman or Old Testament) but "both-and." The notion of divine sonship occurs frequently in intertestamental literature (e.g., Wis. 2:13, 16, 18; 5:5; 9:7; 22:7, 20; 16:10; 18:13; 19:6). See B. Byrne, "Sons of God"—"Seed of Abraham": A Study of the Idea of the Sonship of God of all Christians in Paul against the Jewish Background (AnBib 83; Rome: Biblical Institute, 1979).

¹⁹ Jan van der Watt, *Family of the King: Dynamics of Metaphor in the Gospel According to John* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 12.

²⁰ Neither ancient Greek, Hebrew nor Latin has words that directly translate the English word "family" or "house." The Greek words *οἶκος* and *οἰκία* and the Hebrew *בֵּית* and Latin *domus* can all refer to the physical building as well as the "household," including the material goods and the slaves. In the English-speaking world the word "house" can likewise have an extended meaning such as in the case of the expression "House of Windsor" so that the word can be used in different ways; see H. Moxnes, "Introduction," in Halvor Moxnes (ed.), *Constructing Early Christian Families: Family as Reality and Metaphor* (London: Routledge, 1997), 21.

with Roman law, if an adoption was to take place it would only do so at the behest of the *paterfamilias* (head of the household), the one who initiated the procedure.

Two forms of adoption were practiced in Roman antiquity: *adrogation*²¹ and *adoptio*. The latter of these two practices was the more important, and in accordance with this procedure a son came under the authority of the *patria potestas* of the adopting father through a fictitious sale or process of law (*legis actio*). The whole procedure involved, in the first instance, the severance of the old *potestas* (power) followed by the establishing of the paternal authority of the new father. The *paterfamilias* would sell his son into civil bondage (*in mancipio*) which effectively made him a slave. On the release of the son, he still belonged to the natural father and could by right be sold into slavery again and again. In order to prevent the son becoming a familial football, the law of the Twelve Tables (established by the Decemvirate, c. 450 BC) ensured that after three sales the father ceased to have any authority over him. This is the procedure to which Cicero alludes in the following comment: *in eo filio... quem in adoptionem D. Silano emancipaverat* (*Fin.* 1.7.24). It was from this law that the *adoptio* procedure was derived.

The legal implications of the Roman adoption procedure were many and principally meant that adopted sons were no less important than biologically born offspring; in actual fact, they were accorded the same position within the family as Gaius's remark makes clear: "Adoptive sons in their adoptive family are in the same legal position as real sons" (*Inst.* 2.136).²² In addition to their changed status, adopted sons also acquired the name of the new family into which they had been transferred. The adoptee laid aside his old name and assumed the new name of

²¹ It is unlikely that the procedure of *adrogation* is behind Paul's use of his υιοθεσία metaphor for at least two reasons. First, according to this form of adoption, the *familia* from which the son was taken ceased to exist; secondly, *adrogation* was geographically restricted to Rome itself; see W. W. Buckland, *A Textbook of Roman Law from Augustus to Justinian* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963), 124–28.

²² See A. Berger, B. Nicholas and S. M. Tregarri, "Adoption," in S. Hornblower and A. Spawforth (eds.), *The Oxford Classical Dictionary* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 12–13, who comment that the result of adoption "was to place the adopted son for all legal purposes in the same position as if he had been a natural child in the potestas of the adopter. The adopted son took his adoptive father's name and rank. He acquired rights of succession on death in his new family and lost all such rights as he had in his old family." For the most recent defense of the Roman legal adoption procedure see now Sam Tsang, *From Slaves to Sons: A New Rhetoric Analysis on Paul's Slave Metaphors in His Letter to the Galatians* (Studies in Biblical Literature 81; New York: Peter Lang, 2005), 54–57.

the adoptive father.²³ Primarily and fundamentally adoption signified a *transfer* from one family to another with all its attending privileges and responsibilities. Francis Lyall²⁴ spells out clearly the implications of a Roman legal adoption procedure:

the profound truth of Roman adoption was that the adoptee was taken out of his previous state and placed in a new relationship of son to his new father, his new *paterfamilias*. All his old debts were cancelled, and in effect the adoptee started a new life as part of his new family.

When Paul employs his metaphor of adoption there is good reason to believe he is drawing from the social context of the ancient Roman family. Not only was adoption an integral part of ancient Roman law, but Paul only uses this term in letters to churches which were under Roman jurisdiction. Moreover, Paul's intense use of family metaphors in general, and his adoption term in particular, in the passages we will consider (Gal 4:1–7; Rom 8:12–17; 18–25) are utilized in highly unusual ways (not set formulae). In my view, there is good reason to believe Paul by employing family metaphors is working with what he considers to be a familiar source field and that there is a shared world of meaning about families—of which adoption was an integral part—from which he is borrowing.²⁵ Indeed, perhaps more than a metaphor is involved here, for Christians genuinely understood their primary allegiances were no longer to their physical families but that these were subordinate to a new loyalty to God, the Father of a new household.²⁶

When Paul draws from the ancient Roman social context when giving theological expression to the metaphor *υιοθεσία*, we should not assume a simple one-to-one correspondence between the social reality and the apostle's usage of this expression.²⁷ For example, the

²³ W. J. Woodhouse, "Adoption (Roman)," in J. Hastings (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics* vol. 1 (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1908), 111–14.

²⁴ Francis Lyall, *Slaves, Citizens, Sons: The Legal Metaphors in the Epistles* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984), 83.

²⁵ See further Trevor J. Burke, *Family Matters: A Socio-Historical Study of Kinship Metaphors in 1 Thessalonians* (JSNTSup 247; London: T&T Clark, 2003); *idem*, "Paul as 'Father' to his Corinthian 'Children' in Socio-Historical Context (1 Cor 4:14–21)," in Trevor J. Burke and J. Keith Elliott (eds.), *Paul and the Corinthians: Studies on a Community in Conflict. Essays in Honour of Margaret Thrall* (NovTSup 109, Leiden: Brill, 2003), 95–113.

²⁶ So R. Aasgaard, "Paul as a Child: Children and Childhood in the Letters of the Apostle," *JBL* 126 (2007): 129–59 (133).

²⁷ Whilst I agree with James D. Hester, who situates adoption against a Roman background, he perhaps overstates his case when he concludes: "all the elements present in

eschatological tension between the “now” (Rom 8:15) and the “not-yet” (Rom 8:23) of adoption has no antecedent in the Roman context or any other context (i.e., Jewish or Greek) against which the expression has been understood. Moreover, we need to take cognizance of the way in which Paul uses the same metaphor in different contexts/letters so that we can provide a more nuanced interpretation of their usage. Thus we should be alert not only to times when Paul draws from a particular social milieu but also tuned into occasions when he strays beyond the mere conventional understandings of how these terms were heard and understood—times when he appears to extend their usage in highly original and creative ways. When this happens new meanings are brought to bear on the metaphor and we shall be especially alert to this in the last part of this essay.

3. *Adoption: A Salvific Action of the Divine Family—Father, Son, and Holy Spirit*

A cursory reading of two of the main texts where Paul employs his adoption metaphor reveals a clear Trinitarian emphasis. For example, in Gal 4:4–6, the apostle states:

But when the fullness of time had come, God sent his Son born of a woman, born under law, to redeem those who were under the law, that we might receive the adoption as sons (υιοθεσίαν). Because you are sons, God sent the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, the Spirit who calls out, “Abba, Father.”

For Paul, the salvific purpose of God the Father in sending his Son was to bring about the adoption as sons, and it is the Spirit—no less than the “Spirit of his Son” (4:6)—who issues the cry “Abba, Father” and who brings an awareness of this filial disposition. This Trinitarian focus is also evident in Paul’s letter to the house church/es at Rome where, in Romans 8, it is particularly instructive to note how he stresses God the Father (8:3) sends “his own Son” as a sacrifice for sin (8:3) before going on to discuss the role of the Spirit—more precisely the

the Roman form of adoption are present in Paul’s adoption metaphor”; see James Hester, *Paul’s Concept of Inheritance: A Contribution to the Understanding of Heilsgeschichte* (SJTOP 4; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1968), 60–62.

“Spirit of adoption” (Rom 8:15, πνεῦμα υἱοθεσίας) in adoption. These Trinitarian patterns are most striking and invite further reflection. We turn first to Paul’s letter to the Galatians.

Salvation as Adoption by God the Father, the Paterfamilias of a New Household

In sharp contrast to his other letters (e.g., Rom 1:8; Phil 1:3), Paul’s letter to the Galatian Christians is the only one that lacks a formal thanksgiving greeting. Evidently there is a problem and the apostle cuts to the chase by registering his astonishment that the Galatians, members of a church Paul himself had founded (Gal 4:19), were so quickly deserting the good news by turning to another gospel (1:6–9). The converts at Galatia had started out well (Gal 3:1–5) but opponents, “the agitators” (οἱ ἀναστατούντες, 5:12), had come in amongst them and were zealously trying to win them over to their ways and alienate them from Paul. More specifically, these agitators were foisting another requirement upon the Galatian Christians, as Paul states: “...they want you to be circumcised that they may boast about your flesh” (6:13). All this is despite the fact that Paul had earlier emphasized that circumcision was of no value to them (5:2).

This context makes Paul’s opening salvo of the letter all the more striking and significant because on closer examination of this text Paul actually records his amazement of how the Galatians are so quickly deserting “*the one* who called you” (τοῦ καλέσαντος ὑμᾶς, 1:6). Paul uses a similar participial phrase towards the end of the letter, which functions as an *inclusio* when he states: “You were running a good race. Who cut in on you and kept you from obeying the truth? That kind of persuasion does not come from *the one who calls you*” (τοῦ καλοῦντος ὑμᾶς, 5:8). There are at least two points that require further attention here. First, the identity of the one who called them, and secondly, Paul’s use and meaning of the participle “calling.”

Regarding the former, it is highly significant how Paul in the immediately preceding verses uses a heavy proliferation of paternal language: on three separate occasions he specifically identifies the “*one* who had called them” as none other than the “Father” (1:1, 3, 4).²⁸ This “father”

²⁸ J. L. Martyn makes the following point about the participial phrase in 1:6: “By the substantive participle ‘the one who called you’ ... Paul clearly refers not to himself, but rather to God, and the Galatians will have known as much. Elsewhere in the letter he twice refers to God by using this simple participle (1:15; 5:8), and when we turn to

not only was responsible for initiating the Galatians' salvation by raising Jesus from the dead (1:1) but had also rescued them (and Paul) from the present evil age (1:3) in which they had previously lived and moved. This paternal language at the opening of the letter serves an important purpose, namely, to emphasise that salvation finds its spring and origin in the actions of God the Father. More importantly, as David deSilva rightly observes, "Paul uses references to God as Father of believers at the start of . . . his letters, showing the prominence and almost 'givenness' of this new household and its *paterfamilias* within Christian culture."²⁹ In short, the Galatians, by their desertion, were not only deviating from a doctrine but were singularly failing in their filial loyalty to their Father.³⁰ The second point substantiates the salvific element because, the father who is at the forefront of Paul's discussion is the one who calls them (1:6; 5:8), where the participle must refer to the time when they embraced the good news. Indeed, the context—"rescued from the present evil age" (1:4)—verifies the point that Paul is delineating the initiation of salvation.³¹

Tracing Paul's use of this paternal language at the opening of the letter is important but what is even more striking is the way that this same language comes full circle and converges later in the adoption pericope (Gal 4:1–7). Here the family term *πατήρ* in vv. 2 and 6 straddles and connects both the illustration (vv. 1–2) and application (vv. 3–7).³² These verses require us to look further at the context.

his other letters, we gain the impression that in Paul's preaching the Greek participle *ho kalon*, 'he who calls,' virtually functions as a name for God (1 Thess. 2:12; 5:24; Rom. 9:12); see *Galatians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (New York: Doubleday, 1997), 108.

²⁹ David deSilva, *Honor, Patronage, Kinship and Purity: Unlocking New Testament Culture* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2000), 207.

³⁰ For an in depth discussion of the relationship between adoption and honor, see Burke, *Adopted into God's Family*, 152–76.

³¹ Peter O'Brien states in connection with Gal 1:6: "The *καλέω* word group is often used by the apostle to describe God's historical call of men and women through the gospel to salvation"; see "Was Paul Converted?" in D. A. Carson, Peter O'Brien and Mark A. Seifrid (eds.), *Variegated Nomism: The Paradoxes of Paul* (vol. 2; Tübingen/Grand Rapids: Mohr Siebeck/Baker Academic, 2004), 365.

³² Most scholars agree that Paul is using an illustration in vv. 1–2 which he then goes on to apply in vv. 3–7. See Brendan Byrne, "Review of Adoption As Sons: An Exegetical Investigation into the Background of *ΥΙΟΘΕΣΙΑ* in the Pauline Corpus," *JTS* 44 (1994): 288–94; John L. White, *The Apostle of God: Paul and the Promise of Abraham* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1999), 185ff.; Peter Balla, *The Child-Parent Relationship in the New Testament and Its Environment* (WUNT 55; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002), 189; J. C. Walters, "Paul, Adoption and Inheritance," in J. Paul Sampley (ed.), *Paul in the Greco-Roman World: A Handbook* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2003), 42–76;

In ch. 3 Paul has previously discussed the law which he had earlier likened to a “prison warder” (3:23) and a pedagogue (3:26); he continues with this legal language in Galatians 4 where in vv. 1–2 he states that even though the Galatians are under the law they are nevertheless regarded as under aged minors (νήπιος)—their situation appears to be no different to that of slaves when they are subject to the supervision of “guardians” (ἐπίτροποι) and “trustees” (οἰκονόμοι)—terms which “are descriptive in Roman tutelage”³³—who were responsible for their affairs. The significant act which brings this period to a conclusion is not the maturity of the heir-in-waiting but “the sovereign act on the part of the father”³⁴ (4:2b, ἄχρι τῆς προθεσμίας τοῦ πατρός).

Paul proceeds to apply this legal language in his application in vv. 3–7: “So also when we were children we were under the basic principles of the world” (v. 3). By including himself Paul evidently sees all (Jew and Gentile) as under some kind of bondage to sin. In a very similar passage on adoption, Paul contrasts the Roman Christians’ former position to the present in the following manner: “For you did not receive a spirit that makes you a slave again to fear, but you received the Spirit of adoption” (Rom 8:15). For the Galatians, a radical change is under way which for Paul is the turning point of salvation history and it is initiated by God the Father: “when the fullness of time had come God sent his Son in order that we might receive the adoption as sons” (vv. 4–5). The time of which Paul speaks is not one which ripened of its own accord but one which was of God the Father’s own choosing. The connection between the illustration (vv. 1–2) and the application (vv. 3–7) is evident in that just as in the former (vv. 1–2) the human father was solely responsible for determining when the minor would come of age, so God the Father has a timetable in view. In negative terms and especially for the Galatian Christians this means that the clock of salvation-history cannot be forced back to the era of the law

Burke, *Adopted into God’s Family*, 55–58, 85 n. 83. Thus, James M. Scott is very much in the minority when he tries to set this passage within the framework of Egyptian typology. Scott’s singularly Jewish thesis not only runs counter to Paul’s role as apostle to the Gentiles but also the apostle’s use of Exodus typology is not a primary theme in his theology. Indeed, the whole sweep of Paul’s argument rests on the period prior to Egyptian bondage rather than the era afterwards; see J. M. Scott, *Adopted as Sons of God: An Exegetical Investigation into the Background of ΥΙΟΘΕΣΙΑ in the Pauline Corpus* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992).

³³ Walters, “Paul, Adoption and Inheritance,” 62.

³⁴ Martyn, *Galatians*, 388–99.

or of circumcision. Stated more positively, Paul's point is that the climactic moment of salvation has been sovereignly engineered by God the Father which culminates in υιοθεσία. Just as in the case of adoption in the ancient Roman social context where the role of the father is paramount so "the primary actor in the whole drama of salvation"³⁵ is God the Father, who takes the initiative by adopting individuals into his household (Gal 6:10).

Salvation, as expressed in Paul's metaphor of adoption, is the taking of an outsider—one who does not belong—and bringing him into a new family, "the household of faith" (τοὺς οἰκείους τῆς πίστεως, Gal 6:10). In this respect, υιοθεσία shares with other salvation metaphors both positive and negative elements: regarding the latter and viewed anthropologically, adoption means deliverance from a pessimistic human condition.³⁶ Whilst here in Galatians Paul does not explicitly identify the "family" from which these adopted sons and daughters have come, it is worth noting how in Eph 1: 5 after discussing υιοθεσία he reminds the Ephesian believers of a different "family" allegiance prior to their conversion where he describes them as "sons of disobedience" (υἱοὺς τῆς ἀπειθείας, 2:2; cf. 5:6) and "children of wrath" (τέκνα ὀργῆς, 2:3).³⁷ If salvation, according to Paul, is understood in terms of being adopted into the family of God—a family to which one is not a child by nature—perhaps it may not be stretching the point too much to think of this as a transfer from their old "family," viz. the evil one;³⁸ moreover, it is instructive to note that the author of the Fourth Gospel records Jesus' awareness of opposing family allegiances when he castigated the Pharisees thus: "If God were your Father, you would love me...you belong to your father the devil" (εἰ ὁ θεὸς πατὴρ ὑμῶν

³⁵ Timothy George, *Galatians: New American Commentary* (Nashville: Holman and Broadman, 1994), 294.

³⁶ van der Watt, "Soteriology in the New Testament: Some Tentative Remarks," 515.

³⁷ The New International Version misses these familial descriptions in its translation.

³⁸ At least two commentators follow this line of interpretation. E. K. Simpson and F. F. Bruce, *Commentary on the Epistles to the Ephesians and the Colossians: The English Text with Introduction, Exposition and Notes* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957), 27, describes the changes that take place as a result of adoption in the following manner: "It transfers the enfranchised soul from the serfdom of Satan's slave-camp to the family circle of God's favour." Harold W. Hoehner, *Ephesians: An Exegetical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002), 197, "[T]he saints were under the tyrant the devil who was their slave-master... In contrast, the saints have a new father..."

ἦν ἡγαπᾶτε ἄν ἐμέ... ὑμεῖς ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ διαβόλου ἔστε, John 8:43–44).

More positively, another soteriological benefit that ensues from the status that the Father has brought about for his newly adopted offspring is the right to be called an “heir.” Paul writes in Gal 4:6: “So you are no longer a slave, but a son; and since you are a son, God has also made you an heir.” Paul puts it this way in the corresponding passage in Romans: “Now if we are children, then we are heirs—heirs of God and co-heirs with Christ” (8:17). Whilst at first glance it might appear this is where Paul’s adoption metaphor falls apart, because no-one is heir of the living, it is instructive to note that this is not so

in Roman law (to which we believe Paul was referring). Here the heir was understood to be the embodiment of the testator—the father lived on, so to speak, in the son—not from the time of the father’s death but from the time of the son’s... adoption.³⁹

Those whom God has adopted are “joint heirs with Christ” (συγκληρονόμοι... Χριστοῦ, Rom 8:17), but Paul earlier in this verse states that they are also “heirs of God” (κληρονόμοι... θεοῦ, 8:17) where the genitive may be either understood subjectively or objectively. Viewed from the former perspective, God possesses the believer and they inherit what he has promised for them.⁴⁰ But if we accept the latter as a legitimate interpretation Paul says something much more surprising: adopted sons and daughters actually inherit God himself, a view shared by Cranfield *et al.*:

Christians are men [and women] who have great expectations, that their expectations are based upon their being sons of God, that these expectations are of sharing not just in various blessings God is able to bestow but in that which is peculiarly His own, the perfect and imperishable glory of his own life.⁴¹

³⁹ David J. Williams, *Paul’s Metaphors: Their Context and Character* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1999), 65. Lyall, *Slaves, Citizens, Sons*, 110 also asserts: “The existence of heirs... was not conditional on the death of their ancestor...”

⁴⁰ So D. J. Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 505.

⁴¹ *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (vol. 1; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1975), 419. See also Thomas R. Schreiner, *Romans* (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998), 427; *contra*, Moo, *Romans*, 505.

Adoption through Jesus the Son of God

Even though υιοθεσία in Paul's understanding is primarily and profoundly a salvific act on the part of the father, the apostle also makes it clear that there is an inextricable link between the sonship of Jesus and the adopted sonship of Christians.⁴² This is seen in the double ἵνα purpose clause in Gal 4:4–5:⁴³ “But when the time had fully come, God sent his Son born under law in order to redeem those under law in order that we may receive the adoption as sons.” The connection between God's Son and the adopted sons of God is clearly evident in the chiasmic structure of these verses, as recognized by J. B. Lightfoot:⁴⁴

A God sent his Son
 B born under law
 B¹ in order to redeem those under law
 A¹ in order that we may receive the adoption as sons

The key point lies with the two statements situated at the extremity of the chiasm—“God sent His Son...in order that we may receive the adoption as sons”—but it is not the mere sending or appearance of the Son of God in the last days which *ipso facto* brings about the adoption of the sons of God. Paul's emphasis lies not merely with the incarnational, the eschatological appearing of the Son of God in human flesh, but also with the sacrificial (cf. Rom 8:3) which brings about the redemption unto adoption. Paul goes on to demonstrate in clear soteriological terms the work of God's Son as the means through whom the adoption of sons and daughters is effected. In so doing he does not confuse his metaphors for there is a definite link between the redemptive work of Christ the Son of God and the adoption that is brought about.

By sounding a note of redemption (Gal 4:5) Paul has probably got in view the Roman legal practice of adoption in mind. As we earlier observed, in the ancient Roman legal practice, a father released his son

⁴² L. H. Hurtado, “Son of God,” in Gerald F. Hawthorne, Ralph P. Martin and Daniel G. Reid (eds.), *Dictionary of Paul and his Letters* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1993), 905.

⁴³ There are other references in Paul where these two ideas are closely tied together; see Rom 8:3, 17; Eph 1:4–6.

⁴⁴ J. B. Lightfoot, *The Epistle of St. Paul to the Galatians with Introductions, Notes and Dissertations* (Zondervan: Grand Rapids, 1975), 168.

from the *potestas* by formally selling him (*mancipatio*)⁴⁵ and if this was done three times the son was finally free of his father's *potestas*. After two sales the son could be manumitted (like a slave) back to his father who could receive him back by a fresh act of *adoptio*. This explains why Paul moves so easily from speaking of *slaves* (Gal 4:5; cf. Rom 8:15) to freedom/*redemption* (Gal 4:5) which culminates in the *adoption as sons* (Gal 4:5).⁴⁶ Moreover, the verb which Paul employs in (Gal 4:5) is significant and is not what we would normally expect: instead of using the simple form of the verb λαμβάνω ("receives") he uses instead the compound form ἀπολάβωμεν "receives back" which aptly describes just what is happening in the adoption process: a son who was emancipated was then manumitted back, or "receives back" the adoption as son. In sum, Paul's point is that the salvation which God the Father brings about through adoption is always and only through Jesus Christ, his Son.

*Adoption, the Spirit, and the Resocialization of Salvation*⁴⁷

As we have observed, radical changes took place in the ancient Roman world when a son was adopted into a new family. Moreover, this metaphor is also an apt one for the apostle Paul for it suitably describes the seismic changes that come about as a result of being adopted into God's new household.⁴⁸ Wayne Meeks most graphically describes just what was happening to those early Christian converts who embraced the good news:

the image of the initiate being adopted as God's child and thus receiving a new family of human brothers and sisters is a vivid way of portraying what a modern sociologist might call the resocialisation of conversion. The natural kinship structure into which a person had been born and

⁴⁵ J. D. G. Dunn, *Galatians* (BNTC; London: A & C Black, 1993), 217; W. G. Rollins, "Greco-Roman Slave Terminology and Pauline Metaphors for Salvation," in K. Richards (ed.), *Society of Biblical Literature 1987 Seminar Papers* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 100–110; Stanley E. Porter, "Family in the Epistles," in R. S. Hess and M. D. R. Carroll (eds.), *Family in the Bible: Exploring Customs, Culture and Context* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2003), 148–66 (164–65).

⁴⁶ Dunn, *Galatians*, 217; Porter, "Family in the Epistles," 165.

⁴⁷ The volume by Jan van der Watt (ed.), *Salvation in the New Testament*, does not address the question of ethics and the practical implications of living in God's new family.

⁴⁸ For a fuller discussion, see Trevor J. Burke, "Pauline Adoption: A Sociological Approach," *EvQ* 73 (2001): 119–34.

which previously defined his place and connection with society is here supplanted by a new set of relationships.⁴⁹

As a soteriological expression, adoption into God's new household for these early Christians was profound and thoroughgoing—it speaks of a real experience of sharp displacement which many converts would have undergone because it brought about a radical change in relationships, attitudes and values similar to those acquired by a new child growing up in a family.⁵⁰ Moreover, just as children growing up in a family need to be socialized so God's adopted offspring needed to learn how to conduct themselves circumspectly as those who belong in the divine family. This was especially important in Paul's communities which were comprised not only of Jewish Christians but also of Gentile believers who had converted from their pagan past.⁵¹ The latter would have been in particular need of moral instruction in order to know what was expected of them; indeed, Paul's letters are full of such ethical injunctions. For example, in the paraenetic section of his letter to the Romans he urges the Christians thus: "in view of God's mercy... offer your bodies as living sacrifices, holy and pleasing to God—this is your spiritual act of worship" (Rom 12:2). And in Eph 4:22 he exhorts the Christians "to put off the old man...and to put on the new man" (cf. Col 3:5). A good example of this resocialization of salvation as it relates to adoption is found in Romans 8 where Paul's focus for the children of God is to be "actively participating in the work of salvation."⁵² Romans 8 not only contains Paul's most profound discussion of the Spirit but it is also soaked in the language of the Spirit—the noun πνεῦμα occurs no less than 21 times, which is more frequent than in any other Pauline passage.⁵³ Paul uses a variety of different expressions to describe the work of the πνεῦμα: the noun is employed on its own (8:4); as τοῦ πνεύματος

⁴⁹ Wayne A. Meeks, *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul* (New Haven : Yale University Press, 1984), 88.

⁵⁰ Admittedly, those who were adopted were adult sons but they still needed to learn how to conduct themselves.

⁵¹ See A. Andrew Das who has recently argued the case that the Roman community was comprised only of Gentiles. *Solving the Romans Debate* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007).

⁵² J. Ayodeji Adewuya, "The Holy Spirit and Sanctification in Romans 8:1–17," *JPT* 18 (2001): 71–84 (81). Keith Dyer, "Paul's Salvation: Re-Working Soteriological Categories in the Pauline Corpus," unpublished paper given at SBL Singapore, 2005, rightly argues that soteriological categories "have an ongoing ethical content."

⁵³ 1 Cor 12 comes nearest with *pneuma* being used roughly once in every three verses; see Moo, *Romans*, 468.

τῆς ζωῆς (8:4); πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ (8:9); πνεῦμα θεοῦ (8:9), and τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἐγείραντος τὸν Ἰησοῦν (8:11). These pneumatological statements climax in what is not only the mid-point of the chapter but also of the letter in the *hapax legomenon*, “Spirit of adoption” (πνεῦμα υἰοθεσίας, 8:15). A careful examination of this chapter, however, demonstrates that the Spirit is not the main focus of the chapter but sonship as described in Rom 8:12–17 and to which we now turn.⁵⁴

Paul presents a closely reasoned argument in Rom 8:12–17 evident by the series of post-positive particles that link his thoughts together. We begin with v. 14 since this is the first mention of sonship language and where Paul states: “those who are led by the Spirit are the sons of God.” This prompts the question: what exactly is this leading to which the apostle refers? The immediately preceding verse (v. 13b) is crucial in order to help us arrive at a satisfactory conclusion *vis-à-vis* the “guidance” Paul has in mind.

In vv. 12–17 there is a noticeable shift in the mood of the verbs—from “the indicative to the imperative mood,”⁵⁵ a change which is clearly evident in v. 13b where the apostle’s use of the verb θανατόω in the phrase “put to death the misdeeds of the body” is a strong one and means “to kill someone, hand someone over to be killed, especially of the death sentence and its execution.”⁵⁶ Moreover, this verb is in the present tense, hence our putting to death the sinful nature is a progressive activity and not a complete act. Further still, the verb is in the “active” (as opposed to passive) voice and denotes that this is an action for which God’s adopted sons must take the initiative and for which they are responsible. Further, God’s adopted children are not left powerless to do this; to the contrary, Paul states that they do this in the energy and with the resources of the *pneuma*: “by the Spirit” (πνεύματι, v. 13).⁵⁷ What is involved here is nothing less than “Paul’s

⁵⁴ I am in agreement with I. Ninan who comments: “the *pneuma* is not the principal issue that is discussed: rather it is subservient to spelling out the eschatological sonship of Christians”; see “Jesus as Son of God: An Examination of the Background of ‘Son of God’ in Paul’s Christology with Particular Reference to Rom. 8” (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Coventry, 1994), 316.

⁵⁵ Philip F. Esler, *Conflict and Identity in Romans: The Social Setting of Romans* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003), 246.

⁵⁶ BDAG, 443.

⁵⁷ Taking πνεύματι as a dative of agent.

Spirit ethic”⁵⁸ in relation to υιοθεσία and the apostle’s teaching is immensely practical.

But can we be more precise in determining the “leading” to which Paul refers in v. 14 immediately above? Ernst Käsemann argues that the passive verb (ἄγονται) means “driven by” the Spirit and is the language of “ecstatics” or “enthusiasts” (1 Cor 12:2), hence to translate it as “led by” would be to weaken its meaning. There is little in the context, however, to suggest that the problem of the “ecstatics” in Corinth was one which affected the church at Rome. Moreover, the lexical evidence is lacking because nowhere is this verb translated “drive”⁵⁹ and Paul is here more concerned with a *relationship* between the believer and God via adoption than he is with any experience as such. Being led by the Spirit is not restricted to a few “enthusiasts” but is a distinguishing mark of *all* of those who related to God as his adopted sons and daughters. The one necessarily includes the other—all God’s sons are led by the Spirit and all those who are led by the Spirit are the sons of God.⁶⁰

If we understand the specific “leading of the sons of God” (v. 14) to which Paul refers as situated against the immediately preceding verse (v. 13b), Paul has not got in mind general guidance or God’s will for the unknown future—though this cannot be entirely excluded.⁶¹ Rather, Paul’s comments in the present context are more to do with the *known* and revealed “will of God” which has a clear moral focus.⁶² In other words, the phrase “led by the Spirit” is pregnant with moral content where Spirit-led-sons-of-God are responsible for killing off/mortifying all sin in their lives. Paul’s intention is that God’s adopted sons must demonstrate a certain ruthlessness towards all/any sin in their lives: they are to kill it off, starve it of its oxygen supply and not allow it any room to breathe. “*These*”—the pronoun οὗτοι is in the emphatic position—are the sons who are led by the Spirit (v. 14). Cranfield aptly

⁵⁸ Dunn, *Theology of the Apostle Paul*, 643. Although Romans is not usually viewed as a locus for Pauline morals, G. Bornkamm (*Paul* [London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1977], 156) has pointed out that “Rom. 8 deals expressly with the counter movements to the thoughts and endeavours of the ‘flesh’ . . . and clearly outlines Paul’s ‘ethics.’”

⁵⁹ BDAG does not include “drive” as a possible meaning for the verb ἀγώ. Rather it has this passage under “be led/allow oneself to be led” which is very different to “be driven.”

⁶⁰ Schreiner, *Romans*, 422; see Burke, *Adopted into God’s Family*, 137–43, for further elaboration of this as well as the meaning of the often overlooked genitival phrase πνεύμα υιοθεσίας (Rom 8:15).

⁶¹ So rightly Fee, *God’s Empowering Presence*, 563.

⁶² Schreiner, *Romans*, 422.

sums up the moral thrust of the “leading” to which Paul refers here when he states: “[t]he daily, hourly putting to death of the schemings and enterprises of the sinful flesh by means of the Spirit is a matter of being led, directed, impelled, controlled by the Spirit.”⁶³ The believer’s adoptive relationship to God as Father, then, should provide the motive for authentically holy living which must not only be expressed in the Christian’s sense of filial dependence but also demonstrated in increasing likeness to the new family to which he now belongs.⁶⁴ This is no small point given that in the ancient world “who you were” was of much less importance than the one “to whom you belonged” and God’s spiritually adopted progeny were to ensure they did not do anything that would potentially besmirk the father or the family name.⁶⁵

This, then, is a part of the resocialization of salvation for the adopted child of God—a continual hatred of all sin and the desire to eradicate it by living a life that honors the Father and by espousing the values, conduct and attitudes of those who belong to this new household. The difference between acknowledging that one is an adopted son of God and behaving as one has been well stated by L. H. Marshall:

The ethical implications of Adoption are obvious. A “son of God” must behave in a manner worthy of his august descent, and only those who behave so are truly “sons” . . . only as men behave like God can they really prove themselves to be the sons of God.⁶⁶

⁶³ Cranfield, *Romans*, 395. Sinclair B. Ferguson, *The Christian Life: A Doctrinal Introduction* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1981), 88, also comments: “the leading of which Paul speaks has a very clear and definite content here. It is connected intimately with the help the Spirit is said to give in verse 13, to ‘put to death the misdeeds of the body’. The *guidance the Spirit provides is that of clear-cut opposition to sin*. To claim to experience the ministry of the Spirit of adoption and yet to dally with sin is to be utterly deceived. The Spirit of adoption is the same Person as the Spirit of Holiness of whom Paul had spoken earlier (Rom. 1:4). *His presence brings a new attitude to sin*” (emphasis added).

⁶⁴ I am unable to concur with Francis Lyall’s statement: “in Romans 8:15, Ephesians 1:5, and Galatians 4:5 the metaphor points to the selection of believers as sons: their justification is their entry into sonship, and from the point of view of His guidance and authority (in legal terms, under his *potestas*), *irrespective of how they actually live*”; see *Slaves, Citizens, Sons*, 68. If as Lyall rightly argues the Roman background is in view, it mattered a great deal to the reputation of the father and the family name as regards how sons and adopted sons conducted themselves and this is no less true or important in the spiritual realm. David deSilva, *An Introduction to the New Testament: Contexts, Methods & Ministry* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2004), 143, states: “nothing seems to drive New Testament ethics quite so much as kinship topics, from showing oneself a true child of God by embodying characteristics of God . . . (the motif “like parents, like child”) . . .”

⁶⁵ See B. Witherington, *The Paul Quest: The Renewed Search for the Jew of Tarsus* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1998), 44–48.

⁶⁶ L. H. Marshall, *The Ethics of the New Testament* (London: Macmillan, 1960), 259.

4. *Adoption and the Cosmic Scope of Salvation*

Rom 8:18–25 contains Paul’s second reference in this important chapter to his υἱοθεσία (v. 23) metaphor where it occurs in one of the most eschatologically oriented passages in the Pauline corpus. In fact, this passage contains a heavy preponderance of filial language which is highly significant to Paul’s argument as we shall see. Earlier in Rom 8:12–17 Paul delineated the present (“now,” 8:15) dimension of adoption; in v. 23 he focuses on the future (“not-yet”) aspect. Here Paul addresses the situation which God’s adopted children find themselves in, namely, the intervening period between the “now” and the “not-yet.” An additional element brought into Paul’s discussion here, however, is his grand description of the future cosmic drama of the material created order;⁶⁷ moreover, the way that he ties this together with the suffering and future of humankind, described here as adopted sons (v. 23), and their salvation, is highly significant. Earlier in the letter Paul delineates his view of salvation for the individual (cf. Rom 3:28); this idea is not dropped but is instead developed and widened to a more global perspective. N. T. Wright is right when he comments:

Whereas, up until now, Paul was simply talking about God’s salvation in relation to human beings, from here on it is clear that the entire cosmos is in view... Within this, the wider vista that Paul opens up is the invitation to the Christian to live within the horizon of God’s new creation. This great project, the global and *cosmic dimension of salvation* under the just and healing rule of God’s children (emphasis added).⁶⁸

Moreover, this a not new theme introduced, rather the “world view” which Paul is describing links back to God’s promise to Abraham (Αβραάμ ἢ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ, τὸ κληρονόμον αὐτὸν εἶναι κόσμου, 4:13), and more importantly to the patriarch’s heir Jesus Christ, who would be the initiator for this cosmological change.

In light of this development in Paul’s thinking *vis-à-vis* the future cosmological consequences of the inanimate order, we are prompted to ask how he came to associate adoption with the future unfolding of cosmic events he goes on to describe? To be sure, there is no antecedent

⁶⁷ Paul here uses the word κτίσις four times in vv. 19, 20, 21, and 22. Most commentators understand this as a reference to the inanimate order (i.e., rocks, seas, planetary bodies etc.).

⁶⁸ N. T. Wright, *Romans* (NIB 10; Nashville: Abingdon, 2002), 596–97. Similarly, Dyer, “Paul’s Salvation” (no pagination).

of this in the ancient Roman practice of adoption from which he appears to be drawing. Perhaps in this instance we are given an important insight into Paul's creativity as a theologian: he takes a well known term (υιοθεσία) from the social context of his own day and extends and infuses it with new meaning by applying it in novel and innovative ways to serve his own soteriological purposes.⁶⁹

What Paul has to say about the materially created order has not always been given sufficient recognition; indeed, there has been a certain reluctance on the part of some exegetes to do justice to the full import of what Paul has to say about the inanimate order and the ensuing events about to take place.⁷⁰ The cosmic aspect is sometimes deemed as insignificant and of little relevance since the real center of gravity revolves around human beings or the future salvation of God's adopted sons and daughters (8:23). The global description given by Paul in this passage needs to be recovered but it is also important to bear in mind the manner in which the passage unfolds because it suggests that adoption is the dominant idea.⁷¹ Most important is the need to take proper cognizance of the manner in which Paul utilizes his adoption metaphor to not only describe salvation for individuals but now employ it as the *means* by which the rest of the created order, the cosmos, will be transformed. The soteriological aspect is clearly seen in the manner in which his thought unfolds in the pericope: he first of all describes the inanimate creation (vv. 19–22) before moving on to treat the human order, described in terms of adoption (v. 23) with the hope of salvation (σώζω, v. 24a). So whilst here the cosmic and the anthropocentric may join hands, it is the latter which is uppermost in the apostle's mind, as v. 19 makes clear: "The creation *waits* in expectation for the sons of God to be revealed." Marcus Loane is right when he comments:

⁶⁹ Paul's ingenuity as a theologian is at work in another important way in this passage evident by the way he takes up different apocalyptic themes which he re-works "in a creative and distinctive way"; E. Adams, *Constructing the World: A Study in Paul's Cosmological Language* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000), 181. For the most recent study on the influence of apocalyptic on Paul, see Harold Alan Hahne, *The Corruption and Redemption of Creation: Nature in Romans 8:19–22 and Jewish Literature* (LNTS 336; London: T&T Clark, 2006).

⁷⁰ Adams remarks: "Following Bultmann's lead it has been argued that while cosmological motifs in this passage may have had a significant place in the traditions underlying Rom. 8:19–22, they are of no real significance to Paul, whose concern is solely with human beings"; see *Constructing the World*, 181.

⁷¹ Marcus L. Loane, *The Hope of Glory: An Exposition of the Eighth Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1968), 89.

This is the last reference in this chapter to our adoption, and it refers to the recognition of our status in the day of glory. St. Paul alternates between sons and children throughout the whole of this passage (8:14–23): his use of such themes was synonymous, but *the underlying idea of adoption was dominant* (emphasis added).⁷²

On closer examination of these two aspects, the inanimate and the human orders, we discover there is a close linkage and solidarity between them. The destinies of the two are intertwined, evident by the way in which Paul states similar things about them. Before we consider this it is important to note how Paul prefaces his discussion of these twin aspects (and the entire pericope 8:18–25) with the important contextual link of suffering in v. 17: “Now if we are children, then we are heirs—heirs with God and co-heirs with Christ, if indeed we share in his sufferings in order that we may also share in his glory” (εἰ δὲ τέκνα, καὶ κληρονόμοι· κληρονόμοι μὲν θεοῦ, συγκληρονόμοι δὲ Χριστοῦ, εἴπερ συμπάσχομεν ἵνα καὶ συνδοξασθῶμεν).⁷³ The conditional statement Paul employs here connotes a condition that must be met if believers are to enjoy the future inheritance.⁷⁴ That is to say, if suffering was the experience of Christ, the Son of God, God’s adopted sons can, indeed, *must* expect suffering on their way to glory. This note of suffering links with v. 18 where Paul further develops the idea; moreover, present sufferings cannot compare to the future glory that will be revealed in us, a thought expressed elsewhere by Paul in 2 Cor 4:17: “For our light and momentary troubles are achieving for us an eternal weight of glory that far outweighs them all.” The present suffering which is so much a part of Rom 8:18–25 is also suffused with hope as everything (both inanimate and human) moves inexorably toward a glorious future.⁷⁵

⁷² Loane, *Hope of Glory*, 83.

⁷³ One interesting lexical point about this verse is that the Greek does not explicitly refer to Christ’s suffering even though most English translations (KJV, RSV, NIV, and NRSV) include the phrase “with him” (i.e., “with Christ”). The Greek verb (συμπάσχω) which Paul employs is only found in one other place in the New Testament (1 Cor 12:26) where it refers to the sufferings of other people as opposed to Jesus Christ. However, “with him” is inferred from what Paul states in the previous sentence by using the compound word συγκληρονόμοι “co-heirs with Christ.” Thus, W. Michaelis is right to conclude “the συν- in συμπάσχω has in view a relation to Christ”; see “συμπάσχω,” in *TDNT*, 5:935.

⁷⁴ Schreiner, *Romans*, 428.

⁷⁵ Paul uses the word “hope” no less than five times in vv. 20–25 in both its verbal (vv. 24–25) and noun (vv. 20, 24) forms.

The Transformation of the Inanimate Order and the Imagery of Biological Birth (vv. 19–22)

As observed earlier, the linkage between the two notions, the non-human and the human orders, is apparent in one way by the fact that Paul has similar things to say about them. Concerning the non-human order, here described by Paul on four occasions as the κτίσις (vv. 19, 20, 21, 22),⁷⁶ he states it “groans” (v. 22), “waits” (v. 19), is destined for deliverance (v. 21, ἐλευθερωθήσεται), and is to be emancipated from its present form of slavery (v. 21, ἀπὸ τῆς δουλείας) into a state of “glorious freedom” (v. 21, εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν).⁷⁷ Paul is quite emphatic about the future state of the material order evident in the phrase αὐτὴ ἡ κτίσις (“*This* creation will be redeemed”). There is thus a high degree of continuity between the present order and the future renewal about to take place. Most importantly for Paul, this present order will not cease to exist but instead will be transformed.⁷⁸

The manner in which Paul describes this waiting-room existence for the non-human order is particularly graphic—he employs a compound word ἀποκαρδοκία unique to Christian literature and comprising two Greek words, καρὰ (“head”) and δεχομαι (“to stretch out”), prefaced by the preposition ἀπο (“away from”). The non-human order is standing on tip-toe but there is nothing it can do other than to look for the future revelation of God’s sons and daughters. During this limbo period, the inanimate creation is in bondage to decay, a situation which came about because of “the will of the one who subjected it” (v. 20), a reference to God, since the one who brought about the present situation of bondage of the κτίσις is the only one with the power to bring about its future emancipation. But such suffering is not meaningless but meaningful because Paul remarks that “the whole creation has been groaning in the pains of *child-birth* right up to the present time” (v. 22). For Paul, a male in a patriarchal society, to employ female imagery is highly novel and must not be down-played or over-looked. Beverly Roberts Gaventa has rightly drawn attention to the female imagery at work in this (and other)

⁷⁶ I tend to side with most commentators and see the κτίσις as referring to the non-human order.

⁷⁷ Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 87–88, draws attention to the chain of genitives or concatenative genitives where each successive genitive modifies the one that precedes it.

⁷⁸ Adams, *Constructing the World*, 181.

passage in Paul (e.g., 1 Thess 2:7; Gal 4:19) and makes the important observation: “in this passage, neither Paul nor a biological mother is in labor; instead, the one who labors to bring birth is creation itself.”⁷⁹ The material order has been locked into a recurring cycle of birth and death but this present suffering is suffused with hope and its “eyes” are firmly fixed on the outcome of what God has planned and purposed for the children of God. The note of hope is underscored by Paul’s use of the imagery of *birth* (not death) pains where we ought to note that the conceptual field Paul is working with is that of biological birth. The maternal imagery that Paul employs is very graphic—creation is not only heavily pregnant, its waters are about to break!

What is significant, however, is that Paul does not flesh out and bring the natural birth imagery to completion—the baby he describes is never born and there is good reason for this.⁸⁰ Paul leaves his discussion of natural birth deliberately suspended in mid air as his thoughts shift from the imagery of biological birth of the inanimate order to a different and more important legal metaphor of adopted sons and daughters (v. 23), the ones through whom deliverance for the non-human order will come about. As we argued earlier, the main thrust in the passage has to do with the υιοθεσία and the suspension of the biological imagery of natural birth (vv. 19–22) used to describe the non-human order and the subsequent shift to the new imagery of adoption (vv. 23–25) needs to be properly recognized. Two points are worth noting here: first, whenever Paul describes the inanimate creation as he does here, he is drawing from one source domain, that of biological birth (vv. 19–22); whenever he describes the human order in vv. 23–25, he draws from an entirely different source field, that of the ancient Roman legal practice of adoption (υιοθεσία). Most important is that Paul in his letters only and always reserves his adoption metaphor to describe believers and never the non-human order—the distinction between these two semantic fields needs to be clearly distinguished.⁸¹

⁷⁹ B. Roberts Gaventa, *Our Mother Saint Paul* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2007), 52. For a discussion of 1 Thess 2:7, see Burke, *Family Matters*, 151–54.

⁸⁰ Roberts Gaventa, *Our Mother Saint Paul*, 57.

⁸¹ The language of “adoption” is sometimes understood to describe Christ and the new phase of sonship (e.g., Rom. 1:3–4) he entered into by virtue of his resurrection from the dead; see Scott, *Adoption as Sons of God*, 237–44. But in Rom 1:3–4 the more general term υἱός is employed twice (vv. 3–4) to describe the sonship of Christ and not the term υιοθεσία which is only and always reserved for believers in the Pauline corpus. For this latter view, see Burke, *Adopted into God’s Family*, 102–107.

Secondly, and perhaps more importantly, although the non-human and the human orders may share similar experiences, the future destiny of the former is entirely dependent and contingent upon God's purposes for his spiritually adopted off-spring. Paul has already stated this in v. 19: "the *creation* (κτίσις) *waits* in eager expectation for the sons of God to be revealed." The final destiny of the non-human order is not in its own hands; rather it has a purely passive role to play, evident by the way in which it is inextricably tied to the more active role of the children of God and the outworking of God's future plans for both.⁸² This is one reason why Paul's description of the non-human order breaks off and moves to the more important idea of adoption, God's sons and daughters, through whom deliverance for the former will come.

The Salvation of the Human Order and the Imagery of Adoption (vv. 23–25)

In vv. 23–25, Paul's thoughts turn to the human order, believers, described here as adopted sons and daughters (v. 23). Paul employs similar language to that used earlier of the inanimate order to describe them. Christians too are suffering and "groan inwardly" (v. 23) as they "wait eagerly" for the future consummation of their salvation, i.e., υιοθεσίαν (v. 23). Moreover, as with the inanimate order, there is also continuity between the present and the future for the human order: Paul states that the believer's body will be redeemed (v. 23) which also rules out any notion of annihilationism or cessation of existence as well as any idea of a purely spiritual existence.⁸³ "[T]he bodily redemption is real, bodily values will not be lost, and is not an aspect of adoption, but the very essence of it."⁸⁴

The sufferings to which Paul refers here may include adversities because of their new status as God's adopted children but the context suggests these afflictions are due to their being a part of the created

⁸² Schreiner, *Romans*, 437, rightly comments: "The focus is not finally on the transformation of the created world, although that is included, but the future redemption that awaits God's children."

⁸³ F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans: An Introduction and Commentary* (Leicester: InterVarsity Press, 1985), 161.

⁸⁴ David B. Garner, *Adopted in Christ* (unpublished PhD thesis, Westminster Theological Seminary, 2002), 53. See also Jan Lambrecht, "Brief Anthropological Reflections on 2 Corinthians 4:6–5:10," in Burke and Elliott (eds.), *Paul and the Corinthians*, 259–66, where he similarly argues that Paul expected a glorified, spiritual body at the resurrection, which also implies a somatic existence.

order with all the attending limitations, weaknesses and failings which living in the present era brings. Ultimately, of course, all suffering is due to sin. Moreover, the connection here with what Paul says earlier in v. 17 regarding suffering would not be lost on his readers: just as Jesus the Son of God suffered so God's adopted children can also expect to suffer on their way to glory.⁸⁵ For God's spiritual offspring, however, the intervening period is also impregnated with hope that makes salvation assured, a point Paul makes clear by his reference to the Spirit as the first-fruits (v. 23; cf. v. 15), the Spirit guaranteeing the consummation of adoption.⁸⁶

The whole passage is pervaded with an optimistic note of "hope [which] holds out for this final adoption."⁸⁷ There is the eschatological tension between the "now" (Rom 8:15) and the "not-yet" (Rom 8:23) of adoption where Paul's emphasis in Rom 8:18–25 falls on the latter. Moreover, the role of God's spiritually adopted offspring in bringing about the deliverance of the created order is an important one—their unveiling is instrumental in bringing about a restoration and healing to the whole cosmos. The apostle's description of the climax of salvation for which believers wait will also mean the transformation of the rest of the created order. If Paul here is reworking the Genesis story—which undoubtedly he is—then just as the non-human order had a share in humanity's fall (Gen 3:17–19) so it will have a share in the future glory through the final revelation of the adopted children of God.⁸⁸ The eschatological deliverance of the material order with the final glorification of the adopted sons and daughters will usher in a reinstatement of the stewardship and responsibility which humanity originally enjoyed in Gen 1:31 (cf. Gen 2:15).⁸⁹

⁸⁵ Christ's suffering is, of course, not the *same* as that of the Christian's. The theme of suffering in the Pauline corpus has been a much neglected theme; see now L. Ann Jervis, *At the Heart of the Gospel: Suffering in the Earliest Christian Message* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007). Jervis's discussion is pastorally sensitive and borne out of the crucible of personal experience.

⁸⁶ The participle ἔχοντες can be understood concessively (i.e., "they groan *despite* having the Spirit") but it is better to understand it in a causal sense ("they groan *because* they have the Spirit") since the very presence of the Spirit causes the tension for God's children as they long for the consummation of their υιοθεσία.

⁸⁷ Stevenson Moessner, *The Spirit of Adoption*, 111.

⁸⁸ Edward Adams, "Paul's Story of God and Creation: The Story of How God Fulfills His Purpose in Creation," in Bruce W. Longenecker (ed.), *Narrative Dynamics in Paul: A Critical Assessment* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002), 19–43 (28).

⁸⁹ Adams, "Paul's Story of God and Creation," 29.

The last element in adoption is the “redemption of our body” (v. 23) where the two phrases *ὑιοθεσίαν ἀπεκδεχόμενοι* and *τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν*⁹⁰ are related exegetically and understood as one event. The body of the believer is in need not only of deliverance but also of transformation, and only when that has happened will salvation—understood here primarily as adoption—be complete and the change for the created order be able to take place. In short, salvation which is here primarily described in terms of the consummation of adoption is the work of God and it is through the *ὑιοθεσία* that God will also bring wholeness to the world.⁹¹

Conclusion

Traditionally, Paul’s understanding of soteriology has been discussed using the metaphors of justification, redemption and reconciliation. However, such descriptions have truncated the apostle Paul’s kaleidoscopic view of salvation; indeed, treatments of these three metaphors have sometimes misconstrued and misunderstood another often overlooked metaphor—unique to the letters of Paul—which adds to his view of soteriology, adopted as son(s) (*ὑιοθεσία*, Rom 8:15, 23; 9:4; Gal 4:5; Eph 1:5). Rightly understood, Paul’s metaphor of adoption complements these other soteriological terms as it draws from a different source field, the Roman family in antiquity. Unlike other metaphors, however, adoption especially emphasizes the subjective, relational side of salvation, where the focus is upon what happens to the Christian.

When Paul employs his metaphor of adoption he does so within a Trinitarian framework where *ὑιοθεσία* is a salvific action of the divine family—Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Regarding the former, adoption for Paul is primarily and profoundly a paternal initiative of God the new *paterfamilias* where a son is transferred from an alien family into God’s new household. The soteriological consequences of such an action included the receiving of a new name, status and inheritance

⁹⁰ The phrase *τοῦ σώματος* should be taken as an objective genitive (i.e., the body is in need of redemption) rather than ablative (i.e., redemption *from* the body).

⁹¹ Dyer, “Paul’s Salvation,” states in reference to these wider ecclesial and cosmic themes with which Paul deals: “Romans 8 clearly show that he understands God’s transformative work in Christ to extend far beyond just human salvation... there can be no doubting that Paul also understood it to refer to a process already underway between the Creator and all creation” (no pagination).

equal to the heir of the family. For Paul, the salvific act of adoption is also inextricably linked to the Son of God who through an act of son-making—described in Gal 4:5 as a redemption from slavery unto adoption—is God’s conduit in salvation. We also observed how Paul uses his υιοθεσία expression in letters not only comprising Jews but also Gentiles who have been converted from their pagan past. In light of the latter, adoption functions as a means of reminding believers (8:12–17) that their incorporation into the divine family necessarily involves a gradual resocialization in salvation. That is to say, adoption brings the moral responsibility where Spirit-led-sons-of-God (8:14) are expected to put to death the sin in their lives (v. 13b) and to acquire new attitudes and codes of conduct commensurate of those who now belong to God’s new household.

Finally, adoption connotes the notion of *transference* and is used by Paul to refer to individual salvation. In Rom 8:18–25, however, Paul creatively and innovatively takes this metaphor and employs it in a highly unusual manner as he describes God’s salvific plans for the future unfolding of the material and human orders. In this explicitly eschatological and apocalyptic passage with a distinctly familial flavor, Paul delineates the intervening period between the present and the future as he brings both anthropocentric and cosmic aspects together. Significantly, Paul describes the future unfolding of events for the inanimate and human orders using two different metaphors: for the former he employs the imagery of natural or biological birth (vv. 19–22) and for the latter he uses a different metaphor, that of adoption (vv. 23–25), without ever blurring the distinction between them. Whilst in Rom 8:18–25 Paul’s comments regarding the inanimate order need to be recovered, the imagery of natural birth which he uses to describe this is set aside and replaced by the more important metaphor of adoption. By not following through with the imagery of natural birth Paul wishes to show that the glorious outcome of the material order is wholly dependent upon the human order. In all this, the cosmos plays a passive role and is wholly reliant on the climactic unveiling of God’s adopted sons and daughters (v. 23) who live in the period between the now (8:15) and the not yet (8:23) of final salvation and through whom the *transformation* of the cosmos will also come about.

DID PAUL SPEAK LATIN?

Stanley E. Porter

McMaster Divinity College, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada

1. *Introduction*

This paper is an exploration of the languages that Paul used, focusing upon one in particular, Latin. This paper could have been an exploration of Paul's use of Greek and/or his Semitic languages, Aramaic and/or Hebrew, and still have fit appropriately within a volume such as this. Those languages in relation to Paul, however, have been studied before to a large extent.¹ Latin as a possible language of Paul used to be a topic that was more widely studied as well, although in recent scholarship this topic has virtually disappeared from consideration. Just because scholars choose not to write on a topic, however, does not mean that the issue is settled or that there is not more that can be said. All too often the agenda for contemporary scholarship is simply adapted from one's contemporaries, without raising new questions. I myself have ignored this particular issue. In the essay that I wrote on the "Latin Language" for the *Dictionary of New Testament Background*, I focused exclusively upon the possible use of Latin by Jesus and the use of Latin in Palestine. I neglected to mention Paul entirely.² In this paper, I wish to re-introduce the question of whether Paul may have used Latin, and if he did where and when he would have used

¹ Still an excellent study of the language of the New Testament is J. H. Moulton, "New Testament Greek in the Light of Modern Discovery," in H. B. Swete (ed.), *Essays on Some Biblical Questions of the Day: By Members of the University of Cambridge* (London: Macmillan, 1909), 461–505; repr. in S. E. Porter (ed.), *The Language of the New Testament: Classic Essays* (JSNTSup 60; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), 60–97, along with other essays on this topic.

² S. E. Porter, "Latin Language," in C. A. Evans and S. E. Porter (eds.), *Dictionary of New Testament Background* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 2000), 630–31. See also A. Millard, "Latin in First-Century Palestine," in Z. Zevit, S. Gitin and M. Sokoloff (eds.), *Solving Riddles and Untying Knots: Biblical, Epigraphic, and Semitic Studies in Honor of Jonas C. Greenfield* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1995), 551–58; J. A. Fitzmyer, "The Languages of Palestine in the First Century AD," *CBQ* 32 (1970): 501–31. This last essay has been reprinted numerous times.

it. Along the way I will bring into the discussion and examine some of the indirect evidence that may indicate whether Paul had at least passive competence in Latin, if not active competence.³

2. *Paul's Use of Greek and Aramaic/Hebrew*

It is a misconception to say that Greek was the language of the Greek or Hellenistic Paul and Aramaic and/or Hebrew the language of the Jewish Paul. There were many Jews in the ancient world who did not know either Semitic language, and the vast majority of diaspora Jews did not.⁴ Instead, Greek was the *lingua franca* not only of the Greco-Roman world, but more particularly of the Jews who lived in it, both in Palestine and in the diaspora. I do not wish to enter into full discussion of Paul's use of Greek and Aramaic/Hebrew, except to note what has already been established through previous scholarship.

There is little dispute that Paul used Greek. The evidence is widespread and significant that Paul was an active, first language user of Greek.⁵ Besides the fact that Greek was the *lingua franca* of the Greco-Roman world, we have the direct evidence from his letters, all of which are written in Greek, including his own signature in 1 Cor 16:21, Gal 6:11–17/18, Col 4:18, 2 Thess 3:17, and Phlm 19.⁶ We also have the indirect evidence of the book of Acts. Within Acts, there is the direct statement of the Roman centurion who seizes Paul, when he expresses surprise that Paul speaks Greek, because he thinks that Paul is someone else (Acts 21:37). Having been born in Tarsus (Acts 22:3), one of the educational centers of the world of the time, Paul would have learned Greek as his first language. If Paul went through the first level of education in Tarsus, as he probably did, he would have

³ See H. Baetens Beardsmore, *Bilingualism: Basic Principles* (Multilingual Matters 1; 2d ed.; Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1986), 1–42.

⁴ See, e.g., V. Tcherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews* (trans. S. Applebaum; New York: Atheneum, 1975 [1959]), 347, who states that “Jews outside Palestine spoke, wrote, and generally thought in Greek,” citing evidence including Philo, *Conf. Ling* 129, who refers to Greek as “our language” (pp. 524–25).

⁵ On the terminology regarding language use, see S. E. Porter, *The Criteria for Authenticity in Historical-Jesus Research: Previous Discussion and New Proposals* (JSNTSup 191; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 132–33.

⁶ See T. J. Kraus, *Ad fontes: Original Manuscripts and Their Significance for Studying Early Christianity. Selected Essays* (TENT 3; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 207–30.

completed that level of education in Greek.⁷ There is also the indirect evidence of Paul conversing with a wide range of non-Jews who would not have been expected to know a Semitic language, but who would have spoken the lingua franca of the Greco-Roman world. These non-Jews would include people that Paul spoke to in the various cities that he visited, most of which were known as Greek-speaking cities, such as Rome, Thessalonica, Athens, most of the cities of Asia Minor, the cities of Cyprus, and the like. Certainly Paul would have spoken Greek to the Romans that he encountered, such as not only centurions but Festus and Felix.⁸ Paul probably also spoke Greek, even if he also used Aramaic or Hebrew, when he entered synagogues outside of Palestine and spoke with his fellow Jews. The evidence of Paul's active use of Greek as a first language is substantial.

The support for Paul's use of Aramaic and/or Hebrew, while not as clear as for his use of Greek, is nevertheless strong. Paul himself states in Phil 3:5 that he is a Hebrew of Hebrews. This passage has been interpreted in several ways. As Martin and Hawthorne indicate, the passage may mean that Paul is claiming not to have any non-Jewish blood in his line. Alternatively, Paul is making a claim that he, like his family before him, speaks the ancestral Jewish language, either Aramaic and/or Hebrew.⁹ The latter viewpoint is more likely, as the term "Hebrew" is used in Acts 6:1 and elsewhere to indicate Jews who spoke a Semitic language, probably Aramaic.¹⁰ Paul's use of Aramaic and/or Hebrew is supported in several incidents in the book of Acts, where the narrator says that Paul hears or uses the language (e.g. Acts 26:14, where the Lord speaks to Paul in "the Hebrew dialect"; Acts 21:40, where Paul speaks in "the Hebrew dialect" to the angry crowd

⁷ On Paul growing up in Tarsus and receiving his grammatical education there, see S. E. Porter and A. W. Pitts, "Paul's Bible, his Education and his Access to the Scriptures of Israel," *Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism* 5 (2008): 9–41.

⁸ See H. I. Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity* (trans. G. Lamb; London: Sheed & Ward, 1956), 256.

⁹ R. P. Martin and G. F. Hawthorne, *Philippians* (WBC 43; rev. ed.; Dallas: Word, 2004), 185. It is not important to the argument here to differentiate whether the language was Aramaic or Hebrew. On the relative uses of these languages, see S. E. Porter, *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament, with Reference to Tense and Mood* (SBG 1; New York: Lang, 1989), 111–17.

¹⁰ See P. T. O'Brien, *The Epistle to the Philippians* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 371. O'Brien, following M. Hengel (*Between Jesus and Paul* [trans. J. Bowden; London: SCM Press, 1983], 9–11, 142–43), states that the term "Hebrew" as used in inscriptions indicated a close connection to Palestine.

outside the temple; cf. Acts 22:2, where the crowd hears him use “the Hebrew dialect”).

The use of Greek, Aramaic and/or Hebrew might be expected from a Jew born in Tarsus, educated there until moving to Jerusalem.

3. *Paul's Use of Latin*

The question that I wish to pursue, if only briefly on the basis of the limited amount of evidence available, is whether Paul also spoke a third or fourth language, Latin. We have no direct evidence that Paul spoke or understood Latin on the basis of statements that he makes in his letters. Nevertheless, there is a certain amount of indirect evidence that can be gleaned from his own letters and the depiction of him in Acts that at least makes raising of the question worthwhile. There are three strands of indirect evidence to consider in weighing whether Paul used Latin.

3.1. *Paul's Travel Itinerary*

The first line of evidence concerns Paul's own stated travel itinerary. In the letter to the Romans, he states that “from Jerusalem and round about as far as Illyricum I have fully preached the gospel of Christ” (Rom 15:19; NASB rev.).

The area that is called Illyricum, and later was called Dalmatia, was originally settled by a people who spoke one of the Indo-European languages. There is very little evidence by which to study ancient Illyrian, its remains being confined to personal names and place names, and so there has been much speculation. Scholars have argued for links between Illyrian and a number of other Indo-European dialects. Current scholarship holds that, on the basis of Baltic proper names, Illyrian was an independent branch of Proto-Indo-European that originated in East-Central Europe.¹¹ In the eighth century BC, a people from

¹¹ E. G. Polomé, “The Position of Illyrian and Venetic,” in H. Birnbaum and J. Puhvel (eds.), *Ancient Indo-European Dialects: Proceedings of the Conference on Indo-European Linguistics Held at the University of California, Los Angeles, April 25–27, 1963* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1966), 59–76, esp. 59. For a chart of the Indo-European languages, see L. Campbell, *Historical Linguistics: An Introduction* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1998), 168.

the east invaded and settled on the east coast of the Adriatic Sea, as evidenced by linguistic remnants found on the east coast of Italy.¹² There is some speculation that Armenian, Messapian (used in Aulia and ancient Calabria), and possibly Thracian, are descended from Illyrian.¹³ However, beginning from around 230 BC, with the wars between the Romans and Queen Teuta, there was a process of Romanization that occurred in the region, no doubt because of geographical proximity and the growing power of Rome. Illyrian as a language appears to have survived in some ways until the seventh century AD, when it was totally eliminated by Slavic invasion.¹⁴ The territory itself called Illyricum, however, which included the areas of Pannonia, Moesia, Dalmatia and parts of Macedonia, became a Roman province probably around 167 BC, with the fall of its King Genthius. The provincial organization took place later, as the result of a number of events. Julius Caesar was given the territory as his proconsular province in 59 BC. In 35 BC, Octavian conquered the Dalmatian tribes, who were incorporated into the territory, and then in 27 BC the entire territory became a Senatorial province. However, in 11 BC, the province became an imperial province, and its boundaries established by AD 10, when Pannonia became its own province, so that by the time of Cicero it was a recognized province. From the time of the Flavian emperors, it was most often known as Dalmatia.¹⁵

There are two questions to raise regarding Paul and Illyricum. (1) The first is whether Paul actually visited the province. There are several considerations regarding whether Paul actually visited Illyricum. (a) The first is that we do not have a record of Paul's visit to Illyricum. However, Paul would have had a chance to visit Illyricum on at least two occasions by the time he wrote his letter to the Romans sometime around AD 56 or 57.¹⁶ On his second missionary journey, when he was

¹² L. R. Palmer, *The Latin Language* (London: Faber and Faber, 1954), 39.

¹³ See W. P. Lehmann, *Historical Linguistics: An Introduction* (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1962), 24; W. B. Lockwood, *Indo-European Philology: Historical and Comparative* (London: Hutchinson, 1969), 37; L. R. Palmer, *Descriptive and Comparative Linguistics: A Critical Introduction* (London: Faber and Faber, 1972), 387; Palmer, *Latin Language*, 39–41.

¹⁴ Lockwood, *Indo-European Philology*, 37.

¹⁵ B. W. Henderson, "Alphabetic List of Provinces," in J. E. Sandys (ed.), *A Companion to Latin Studies* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1910), 401–409, here 404; F. F. Bruce, *Paul, Apostle of the Heart Set Free* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974), 316.

¹⁶ See L. M. McDonald and S. E. Porter, *Early Christianity and its Sacred Literature* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2000), 451.

in Macedonia and visiting such places as Philippi, Thessalonica and Berea, Paul possibly could have traveled into Illyricum. More probably, on his third missionary journey when he visited Macedonia, before writing the letter to the Romans, probably from Corinth, Paul could have traveled into Illyricum. As Cranfield points out, if Paul traveled the Via Egnatia to its westernmost end at Dyrrhachium (or Epidamnus), he would have been only about forty miles from the city of Lissus, which was in Illyricum. The Greek phrasing of Acts 20:1b–2, as Cranfield points out, does not prohibit a long enough period to make such a trip.¹⁷ This period may have been as long as two years.¹⁸ (b) The language of Rom 15:19 does not indicate that Paul necessarily went into Illyricum. As Dunn points out, the phrase μέχρι τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ may mean “up to” but not necessarily “into.”¹⁹ This understanding of Rom 15:19 is sometimes linked to a related consideration. The language does not necessarily indicate that Paul himself went to Illyricum, but that those in his missionary entourage may have gone into Illyricum.²⁰ However, ancient maps of the time may give some insight into what Paul is saying here. Paul speaks of his trip to Illyricum in terms of καὶ κύκλῳ μέχρι τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ. Jewett points out that Roman maps were drawn with the Mediterranean at the center and the world divided into quadrants. Travelers then took with them strip maps with their specific traveling route on them, depicting the trip not in terms of exact geographical proportions but in terms of their relation to the Mediterranean. Thus, a map could connect Rome to Macedonia or Asia Minor, or even Jerusalem, by means of going through Illyricum.²¹ Thus, Illyricum would be seen to be on Paul’s route to Rome, a trip that he indicates that he wishes to make but has previously been hindered from making (see

¹⁷ C. E. B. Cranfield, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (vol. 2; ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1979), 761–62. In particular, note the use of the two aorist tense-form participles in Acts 20:2. These are used to indicate the length of time of the events concerned, taken as a complete action. See Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, esp. 183.

¹⁸ F. F. Bruce, *The Letter of Paul to the Romans* (TNTC; 2d ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985), 247.

¹⁹ J. D. G. Dunn, *Romans 9–16* (WBC 38B; Dallas: Word, 1988), 864.

²⁰ Dunn, *Romans 9–16*, 864.

²¹ R. Jewett, *Romans* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), 911–13. See also J. M. Scott, *Paul and the Nations: The Old Testament and Jewish Background of Paul’s Mission to the Nations with Special Reference to the Destination of Galatians* (WUNT 84; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995), esp. 5–56, where he finds a similar pattern, with Jerusalem at the center, for Jewish conceptions of the world.

Rom 1:13, 15; 15:22–25). (c) Paul may not be referring to Illyricum in Rom 15:19, but to people who were Illyrians by race.²² However, there is no indication that Paul knew of the Illyrians as a distinct people group apart from those who lived in Illyricum, and he uses the term Illyricum, the title of the Roman province.²³ In this context (Rom 15:19–26), Paul only uses names of Roman provinces, apart from mentioning the city of Jerusalem. (d) Paul may have not gone as far as Illyricum proper but to a region that was known as or thought of as Illyrian.²⁴ Strabo (*Geogr.* 7.7.4) states that the Via Egnatia ran east from Epidamnus and was here called the Road to Candavia, Candavia being “an Illyrian mountain,” and then “passes through Lychnidus, a city, and Pylon, a place on the road which marks the boundary between the Illyrian country and Macedonia” (LCL). It appears that Strabo understood Illyricum to include territory further south that bordered the Via Egnatia, possibly on the basis of Illyrians living in an area that was technically in the province of Macedonia.²⁵ If Paul traveled this road to or from Thessalonica, in the west he would have possibly been in Illyrian territory. However, despite this evidence, Strabo may only be referring to the mountain range, and not the territory or the people. (e) Hahn thought that Paul made reference to Illyricum to mark the boundary between the eastern and western parts of the Empire.²⁶ However, there is no indication in Paul’s writings (cf. 2 Tim 4:10) that he thinks of Illyricum as a boundary. If anything, he seems to think of Rome as the transition point, with his work done in the east and his looking forward to the west. (f) Finally, there is the view that Paul made mention of the sweep of the gospel from Jerusalem to Illyricum in words that reflect the apostolic commission of Acts 1:8 in order to establish himself as an apostle on equal footing with the twelve disciples.²⁷ However, as Bruce has pointed out, it “seems most improbable” that Paul would use reference to Illyricum as a way of saying that the gospel had reached “the end of the earth,” which is the goal of

²² Cranfield, *Romans*, 761.

²³ See Bruce, *Paul*, 316–17.

²⁴ Cranfield, *Romans*, 762.

²⁵ W. Sanday and A. C. Headlam, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1903), 407–408.

²⁶ F. Hahn, *Mission in the New Testament* (SBT 47; London: SCM Press, 1975), 96 and n. 8.

²⁷ A. S. Geyser, “Un essai d’explication de Rom xv. 19,” *NTS* 6 (1959–60): 156–59. Cf. B. Byrne, *Romans* (SP; Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical, 2007), 438.

Acts 1:8.²⁸ Thus, even though there is no direct evidence that Paul visited Illyricum, there is indirect evidence that he may have visited this area, either the provincial territory proper or an area understood as being Illyrian, probably during his third missionary journey.

(2) The second question is concerning why, from a language standpoint, Paul may have visited Illyricum. As noted above, Illyricum had been influenced by Rome early on, and had been a province for a number of years. As we will note below, there are several other cities that Paul visited where it is possible that he used Latin. The question concerning Illyricum is the purpose for such a visit. Whereas the eastern Empire was primarily Greek speaking, the western Empire was Latin speaking, which would include Spain, which had been conquered by Rome in 197 BC and organized into two and then three provinces.²⁹ In fact, Spain was the most Romanized part of the Empire. As Strabo states, the indigenous people of the Iberian peninsula gave up their native language and became Romans (*Geogr.* 3.2.15).³⁰ Paul was perhaps already planning his travels to Spain when he was on his third missionary journey,³¹ and took the time, perhaps up to two years, to visit a Latin-speaking area, Illyricum, so that he could prepare for such a visit to Spain.

3.2. *Cities Visited by Paul*

There are other cities that Paul traveled to and through where there is evidence that Latin may have been used. It is worth considering whether he may have used Latin in any of these cities when he visited them.

1. Lystra. Ramsay thought that Paul may have used Latin when he preached at Lystra, which occurred on his first missionary journey. Ramsay notes that the Lystran tombs that are dated earlier have Latin inscriptions, while at the same time Greek is the usual inscriptional language for Iconium, a nearby city. As Moulton says in summarizing

²⁸ Bruce, *Paul*, 316 n. 10.

²⁹ Henderson, "Alphabetic List," 408.

³⁰ See J. Murphy-O'Connor, *Paul: A Critical Life* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 362.

³¹ Bruce (*Paul*, 316) raises the question of whether Paul is referring to a proposed Spanish trip when he refers to preaching the gospel in "the lands beyond you" in 2 Cor 10:15–16. Second Corinthians may well have been written while Paul was traveling in the Macedonia (and Illyricum?) area. See McDonald and Porter, *Early Christianity*, 370.

Ramsay's comments, "This may involve our substituting Latin as the language of Paul's preaching at Lystra: such a conclusion would not in itself be at all surprising."³² Ramsay notes that the city had colonial status, having been made a Roman colony by Augustus, and that there was a "large proportion of Latin inscriptions," as well as coins in Latin.³³ However, as Ramsay himself points out, there is little in the account in Acts that gives indication of the influence of things Latin. As Ramsay admits, there is no "trace of the Roman aristocracy" in Acts, and he thinks there was a greater influence of things Greek on the educated population.³⁴ Paul's contacts in Lystra all seem to be of the lower socio-economic level (e.g. the lame man, and the crowds who attempt to worship him and Barnabas as Hermes and Zeus). There is evidence that a local indigenous language, Lycaonian (Acts 14:11), was in use in the area, but nothing to indicate that Latin was used, at least by Paul and those he spoke with.³⁵

2. Pisidian Antioch. Ramsay thought that "the Roman element in the population of the Colonia was not nearly so strong in Lystra as in Antioch."³⁶ In his discussion of Antioch, Ramsay notes the strong influence of being a Roman colony. This means that it was organized politically according to Roman administrative structures, the more important citizens gained Roman citizenship, the social activities were Roman in nature, and the language used for public and administrative affairs was Latin. The lower levels of the population were forced to adapt to this Romanization. This included adopting various Roman customs, learning Latin, and trying to gain citizenship. Ramsay notes that the inscriptions of Antioch, whether in Latin or Greek, do not

³² J. H. Moulton, *Prolegomena*, vol. 1 of *A Grammar of New Testament Greek* (3d ed.; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1908), 233, citing an article by William Ramsay in *The Expositor*, September 1905 (see also *The Expositor*, March 1906, according to A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* [4th ed.; Nashville: Broadman, 1934], 110 n. 5). A similar statement regarding Ramsay's position is made by T. R. Glover (*Paul of Tarsus* [London: SCM Press, 1925], 14 n. 3) but without any reference.

³³ W. M. Ramsay, *The Cities of St. Paul: Their Influence on his Life and Thought. The Cities of Eastern Asia Minor* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1907), esp. 411–17, quotation 412.

³⁴ Ramsay, *Cities*, 417.

³⁵ See S. E. Porter, "The Languages that Paul Did Not Speak," in S. E. Porter (ed.), *Paul's World* (PAST 4; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 131–49.

³⁶ Ramsay, *Cities*, 416.

reflect Hellenistic influence, but are all Roman in nature.³⁷ However, as Ramsay also notes, there are Greek inscriptions as well as Latin, and only a few people would have reached the upper socio-economic levels. Also, as Ramsay admits, the proof for the city of Antioch becoming thoroughly Roman is later than the period when Paul visited.³⁸ Paul's primary contacts in Antioch were Jews, to whom he would have spoken Greek rather than Latin, as they were diaspora Jews also. The Gentiles he converts seem to have come in response to his synagogue teaching, and so presumably spoke Greek (Acts 13:44).

3. Corinth. Corinth was destroyed by the Romans in 146 BC, but was re-founded as a Roman colony in 44 BC by Julius Caesar. Murphy-O'Connor gives a description of the characteristics of Corinth.³⁹ (a) In terms of language, at the time of Paul's visiting Corinth, the city would have been predominantly Latin-speaking. According to the inscriptional evidence, there are 104 texts from before the reign of Hadrian in AD 117–138, but only three are in Greek; the rest are in Latin.⁴⁰ (b) Architecturally, the city is the most Italian in style of any city located in Roman Greece. There is apparently no evidence of a person with a Greek name building, repairing or restoring a building in Corinth at this time.⁴¹ (c) In terms of administration, the city was a Roman colony, and it was organized according to the typical pattern of a Roman colony. This would mean that, among other possible conversations, Paul may have spoken in Latin to Gallio, the Roman proconsul. Gallio, or Lucius Junius Gallio, was the son of the rhetorician Lucius Seneca and older brother of Lucius Annaeus Seneca, the renowned philosopher. Both Senecas were accomplished in Latin, and there is no doubt that Gallio too would have known Latin, as he came from an established and wealthy family.⁴² However, as Murphy-O'Connor himself admits on two counts, Paul nevertheless wrote his letters to the Corinthians in Greek, and it would be what he calls a "gross exaggeration" to make

³⁷ Ramsay, *Cities*, 270–71.

³⁸ Ramsay, *Cities*, 271.

³⁹ J. Murphy-O'Connor, *St. Paul's Corinth: Texts and Archaeology* (3d ed.; Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical, 2002), 8.

⁴⁰ Murphy-O'Connor (*Corinth*, 8) cites J. H. Kent, *Corinth*. Vol. 8, pt. 3. *The Inscriptions 1926–1950* (Princeton: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1966), 19.

⁴¹ Murphy-O'Connor (*Corinth*, 8) cites D. Engels, *Roman Corinth: An Alternative Model for the Classical City* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990), 69, 70.

⁴² Murphy-O'Connor, *Corinth*, 168–69.

the claim that there were no Greeks or there was no Greek spoken in Corinth during this time.⁴³ Furthermore, a person of Gallio's status, besides knowing Latin as he assuredly did,⁴⁴ would have known Greek, which was a requirement for Roman governors in the eastern kingdom, from Greek to the east.

4. Philippi. The city of Philippi was named after Alexander the Great's father, who had captured the small town of Krenides and built a new city on the site. In 42 BC, Antony and Octavian defeated Brutus and Cassius at Philippi, and from then on retired Roman soldiers were settled there (see Strabo, *Geogr.* 7 frg. 41). The city was designated a Roman colony, and the settlement of soldiers continued after the defeat of Antony by Octavian in 31 BC at the battle of Actium. The city eventually received the *jus italicum*, by which the colony had the same rights as those in Italy. The official language of Philippi apparently was Latin. Around 85 per cent of the inscriptions found at Philippi that can be dated to around the first century AD are in Latin, an unusually high number for a Roman city in the eastern part of the Empire, with only 15 percent of the inscriptions being in Greek.⁴⁵ In Philippi, Paul comes into contact with Lydia, who is from Thyatira, the woman with the Pythian spirit, the magistrates and the jailer, besides the crowds. Some of these may have spoken Latin. However, as with his letter to the Corinthians, Paul nevertheless writes his letter to the Philippians in Greek. Whereas the official language, including that of inscriptions, may have been Latin, only a small portion of the population would have been in this upper class of people. The vast majority would have spoken Greek, and it was with these that Paul wished to communicate. Thus, Lydia, though from Thyatira, would have spoken Greek, as the Lydian language was no longer used by the first century AD.⁴⁶ The woman with the spirit,⁴⁷ the jailer and the crowds represent those of

⁴³ Murphy-O'Connor, *Corinth*, 8.

⁴⁴ Note the Latin inscription on the Bema, or Rostra, used by Gallio in Corinth. See J. McRay, *Archaeology and the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1991), 334–35.

⁴⁵ See McDonald and Porter, *Early Christianity*, 461–62, with notes; L. M. McDonald, “Philippi,” in Evans and Porter (eds.), *Dictionary of New Testament Background*, 787–89, esp. 787–88. For the inscriptions, see P. Pilhofer, *Philippi. II. Katalog der Inschriften von Philippi* (WUNT 119; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000).

⁴⁶ See Porter, “Languages that Paul Did not Speak,” 144–45.

⁴⁷ The woman with the spirit may have been linked to Apollo and the Delphic oracle (so F. F. Bruce, *The Acts of the Apostles* [3d ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990], 360), or the label may have been used of anyone using ecstatic speech (or she may simply have

lower socio-economic classes. Only the magistrate may have spoken Latin, but he would also have spoken Greek. Furthermore, the *jus italicum* may not have come into effect until later than Paul's time there.

5. Caesarea Maritima. This city, founded by Herod the Great sometime between 22 BC and 10/9 BC, was built on the site of an earlier Phoenician or Hellenistic port. The city first served as a Herodian administrative city, and then was taken over by the Romans in AD 6 when Judea became a Roman province, and became the Roman administrative center. The city grew in importance over the next three centuries, both politically (and in size) and in terms of Christianity. To date, over four hundred Greek and Latin inscriptions have been found, dating from the first to the seventh centuries AD.⁴⁸ The recently published collection of all of the inscriptions discovered so far indicates that most of those that are not funerary in nature are concerned with public life, with 61 of 84 of the public inscriptions that are pre-Constantinian being in Latin.⁴⁹ It is not until the third century that Greek inscriptions begin to supplant Latin inscriptions.⁵⁰ While being held in Roman captivity (Acts 23–26), Paul has possible conversations with a number of people. These include Ananias the high priest, Tertullus the rhetor, Felix and Festus the governors, and Agrippa and his wife Bernice. While it is possible Paul spoke in Aramaic to Ananias (if not Greek, in the light of the context), it is possible that he used Latin with any of the others, including Agrippa (II), who as one in the Herodian line had studied in Rome, and almost assuredly learned Latin there.⁵¹ However, the inscriptions are heavily geared toward Roman administrative matters, being very useful for establishing the history of the city and its governance under the Romans, but not very useful by the common people. As for those whom Paul met, whereas Latin may have been

been used by her owners); see W. W. Gasque, "Philippi," in R. K. Harrison (ed.), *Major Cities of the Biblical World* (Nashville: Nelson, 1985), 198–207, esp. 204.

⁴⁸ C. M. Lehmann and K. G. Holum, *The Greek and Latin Inscriptions of Caesarea Maritima* (Joint Expedition to Caesarea Maritima Excavation Reports 5; Boston: American Schools of Oriental Research, 2000), 1.

⁴⁹ Lehmann and Holum, *Greek and Latin Inscriptions*, 6. The funerary inscriptions are just under half of the entire collection of inscriptions (see p. 24).

⁵⁰ Lehmann and Holum, *Greek and Latin Inscriptions*, 8.

⁵¹ See N. Kokkinos, *The Herodian Dynasty: Origins, Role in Society and Eclipse* (JSPSup 30; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 317–41, esp. 317–20, where he establishes that Agrippa II, born in Rome, probably lived there with Claudius until around AD 51/52, when he would have been in his young twenties.

used in conversing with many if not most of them, Greek was as likely a language. Felix and Festus, as Roman governors, would have known Greek, as would have Tertullus the rhetor. Agrippa II was known as one who was Hellenistically educated (ἑλληνικὴ παιδεία), according to Josephus (*Life* 359).⁵²

6. Rome. Paul eventually arrived in Rome. As the center of the Roman Empire, the city certainly evidenced widespread use of Latin, both in inscriptions and in the language used by people in everyday conversation. In Rome, Paul came into contact with Roman soldiers, who presumably could have spoken Latin, and leading Jews. There is surprisingly little else known about Paul in Rome. However, it is not entirely clear that Paul would have used Latin even in Rome. Latin was the official language of the army, but the evidence is that there were those in the army who, though they used Latin for official correspondence, were native users of another language, as the soldiers were recruited from throughout the Empire.⁵³ We have correspondence from soldiers, for example, in Greek, which reflects their native language in Egypt.⁵⁴ Further, when the soldiers were enlisted and deposited their money with the army, they were given a receipt, in Greek.⁵⁵ The predominant language of the Jews of Rome appears to have been Greek, with some knowing Latin.⁵⁶ Paul may well have been mostly involved with those like the Jews and others who had migrated to the central city of the Empire, the people he calls “Greeks” (Rom 1:16), including tradespeople and others of similar economic and social status.⁵⁷ More to the point is the observation that, even in Rome of this time, there was widespread use of Greek. Adrados notes that Julius Caesar said “you too, my son” in Greek to Brutus at his assassination, Tiberius would speak Greek when he wished to speak confidentially with someone, and Agrippa I spoke in Greek to the Roman senate, with the presumption being not only that Agrippa was more comfortable speaking Greek but that the

⁵² Kokkinos, *Herodian Dynasty*, 318.

⁵³ See G. R. Watson, *The Roman Soldier* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1969), 37–38, citing: P.Mich. VIII 468.35ff.; P.Oxy. I 32; and P.Berlin 11649; p. 103, citing P.Gen.Lat. 1.

⁵⁴ Watson, *Roman Soldier*, 44, citing BGU II 423.8–10 (= Wilcken, *Chrestomathie* II 480); pp. 77–78, citing P.Mich. VIII 465, 466.

⁵⁵ Watson, *Roman Soldier*, 51–52, citing PSI IX 1063.

⁵⁶ J. Finegan, *The Archeology of the New Testament: The Life of Jesus and the Beginning of the Early Church* (rev. ed.; Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992), 326.

⁵⁷ D. B. Saddington, “Rome,” in Harrison (ed.), *Major Cities*, 208–22, here 219.

Senators could understand him. There was a huge population in Rome that was Greek-speaking, including Greeks, Jews, Syrians, and others from the Empire, which is substantiated through both inscriptions and a statement such as that of Juvenal, who called Rome a *Graecam urbem* (Greek city) (*Sat.* 3.61).⁵⁸

The evidence is mixed regarding Paul's possible use of Latin in these various contexts. There is certainly a possibility that Latin may have been used on any of these occasions. However, there is also the possibility that Paul's use of Greek would have been more than sufficient, especially as he was personally interested in making contact not with the upper levels of society but with the majority of the population. When he encountered political figures, he may well have relied upon his use of Greek. A similar example may be found in the city of Cremna, a city in Pisidia. This city, though of ancient standing, was re-founded as a Roman colony by Augustus, until a rebellion led to its destruction in the third century. In the remains of the city, there have been found coins and inscriptions (seventy-five inscriptions to date) that bear witness to the civic and religious nature of the city. As Mitchell says in describing this feature of the city, "Cults with strong Roman associations appear on many coin issues and Latin continued to be widely used, at least on public inscriptions and on coin legends, although not necessarily as a language of everyday communication."⁵⁹

3.3. *Latinisms in Paul's Language*

In this section, I wish to examine both Paul's letters and other instances where he is recorded as speaking, to see if there is evidence that he may have used Latin. I will examine the indirect evidence found in his letters written in Greek, and the more direct evidence of what he is reported as speaking.

⁵⁸ See F. R. Adrados, *A History of the Greek Language: From Its Origins to the Present* (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 208, 210. Adrados also notes that Greek was considered the language of love (Lucretius *Nat.* 4, 160ff but criticized by Juvenal, *Sat.* 6.196ff). See also Plutarch, *Cato Major* 23.3, referring to Rome: "while the city was at the zenith of its empire, she made every form of Greek learning and culture her own."

⁵⁹ S. Mitchell, with S. Cormack, R. Fursdon, E. Owens, and J. Öztürk, *Cremna in Pisidia: An Ancient City in Peace and in War* (London: Duckworth, 1995), 1–4, with quotation on 4.

1. Paul's Letters. A number of scholars have identified a wide range of Latinisms in Paul's letters. These include both grammatical and lexical Latinisms.

(a) Grammatical Latinisms. The following grammatical Latinisms have been identified.⁶⁰

(1) Use of the Greek Perfect Tense-form for the Aorist. Buttmann traced the influence of the use of the Greek perfect tense-form in historical narrative contexts to the possible influence of the Latin perfect.⁶¹ Possible examples from Paul that W. F. Moulton cites are 2 Cor 1:9; 2:13; 11:25. However, as Moulton admits, the use of the perfect tense-form in the New Testament is used in conformity with Greek norms, and no convincing case has been made that these norms are not being followed in the instances cited.⁶²

(2) Relative Clause Begins Sentence or Is Resolved into (καὶ) οὗτος. Buttmann claims that this construction is found in authors who write a more literary or periodic style. This would include especially Luke in his Gospel and in particular in Acts, though also the writers of the letters. Buttmann cites Gal 2:10 with the initial relative pronoun, and Gal 4:24 with the demonstrative pronoun alone.⁶³ Though attributed to the influence of Latin, the influence is much greater (if at all) in narrative authors than in Paul, and so it is hard to determine whether this is a tendency of Greek of the time or an indicator of Paul's knowledge of Latin.

(3) Use of πρό Specifying Time. W. F. Moulton, following Buttmann, notes that the prevalence of this phrasing was because of Latin influence. He cites 2 Cor 12:2: πρὸ ἐτῶν δεκατεσσάρων; 2 Tim 1:9 and

⁶⁰ Lists are found in J. H. Thayer, "Language of the New Testament," in J. Hastings (ed.), *A Dictionary of the Bible* (5 vols.; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1898–1904), 3:36–43, esp. 40; A. Buttmann, *A Grammar of the New Testament Greek* (Andover: Draper, 1880), Index s.v. Latinisms.

⁶¹ Buttmann, *Grammar*, 196–97, where he cites 2 Cor 11:25 as his only Pauline example.

⁶² W. F. Moulton, trans. and ed. of G. B. Winer, *A Treatise on the Grammar of New Testament Greek* (3d ed.; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1882), 340 n. 3. See also Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 245–59, 260.

⁶³ Buttmann, *Grammar*, 282–83.

Titus 1:2: *πρὸ χρόνων αἰώνιων*.⁶⁴ However, this grammatical usage is found in earlier Greek authors (including Doric Greek and Herodotus) and, as Buttmann also notes, is frequent in non-biblical authors of the time such as Plutarch, Lucian, Appian and Josephus, as well as the Egyptian papyri and other New Testament authors, and so does not necessarily illustrate that Paul knew Latin.⁶⁵

(4) Use of *ἀπό* after *φυλάσσω* and Other Verbs of Fearing.⁶⁶ This pattern, perhaps under the influence of Latin *cavere ab*, occurs once in Paul at 2 Thess 3:3. However, this construction appears elsewhere in the New Testament (e.g. Luke 12:15; John 5:21), and may be due to “the general analytic tendency to express the preposition with the case.”⁶⁷

(5) Restrictive Conclusion with Use of *ἵνα μή*. Buttmann cites Phlm 19 (he also compares 2 Cor 2:5) as an example that “corresponds to the Latin constructions *ne dicam* and the like.”⁶⁸ Though listed by him as a Latinism in his index, Buttmann treats it as a corresponding construction. Nevertheless, there is only one clear example.

(6) The Verb *τίθημι* or *ἵστημι* with *ἐν*. Buttmann finds this construction analogous to Latin usage with verbs such as *ponendi*, etc., and *in*.⁶⁹ Examples in Paul include: Rom 9:33: *τίθημι ἐν Σιών*; 1 Cor 12:18, 28: *ἔθετο τὰ μέλη... ἐν τῷ σώματι... ἔθετο ὁ θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ*; 2 Cor 5:19: *θέμενος ἐν ἡμῖν*; Rom 5:2: *ἐν ᾗ ἐστήκαμεν*; 1 Cor 7:37: *ἕστηκεν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ*; 1 Cor 15:1: *ἐν ᾧ καὶ ἐστήκατε*. Buttmann himself notes that in many of these instances there is no sense of motion of the verbs, and so these examples are excluded.⁷⁰ This would exclude examples such as Rom 9:33; 1 Cor 12:18, 28; Rom 5:2; and 1 Cor 15:1, among others.

⁶⁴ Moulton in Winer, *Treatise*, 698 n. 2; Buttmann, *Grammar*, 153.

⁶⁵ See Moulton, *Prolegomena*, 101.

⁶⁶ Buttmann, *Grammar*, 323; Thayer, “Language of the New Testament,” 3:40.

⁶⁷ Robertson, *Grammar*, 111.

⁶⁸ Buttmann, *Grammar*, 241.

⁶⁹ Buttmann, *Grammar*, 329.

⁷⁰ Buttmann, *Grammar*, 329.

(7) Preposition σύν for καί. Buttmann notes that σύν can be used instead of καί, as with *cum* in Latin. Examples include 1 Cor 16:9 and Eph 3:18. However, as Buttmann admits, “this phrase is no Latinism.”⁷¹

(8) Use of the Greek Dative Case for the Latin *dativus commodi*. Moule cites the following examples: Rom 6:10, 20: τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ἀπέθανεν ἐφάπαξ... ἐλεύθεροι ἦτε τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ; 1 Cor 14:11: ἔσομαι τῷ λαλοῦντι βάρβαρος.⁷² These may just be analogous uses, however, as Moule admits that they would take the dative case in either Greek or Latin.

(9) ἐκ (τοῦ) μέσου αἶρειν = *de medio tollere*. Blass and Debrunner admit that this phrase “may just as well be good Greek.”⁷³

There is some grammatical evidence from his letters that Paul may have known Latin and that this influenced his use of Greek. However, the number of clear cases that cannot be accounted for by earlier Greek usage or similar or greater usage in other Greek of the time, including that of the New Testament, is minimal, and provides no clear support for Paul’s use of Latin.

(b) Lexical Latinisms. The following Latin words are found in Paul.⁷⁴

θριαμβεύω (*triumphare*)—2 Cor 2:14; Col 2:15 (only two appearances in the New Testament)

μάκελλον (*macellum*)—1 Cor 10:25 (only appearance in the New Testament)

μεμβράνα (*membrana*)—2 Tim 4:13 (only appearance in the New Testament)

πραιτώριον (*praetorium*)—Phil 1:13 (used seven times elsewhere in the New Testament)

⁷¹ Buttmann, *Grammar*, 331.

⁷² C. F. D. Moule, *Idiom Book of New Testament Greek* (2d ed.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959), 46.

⁷³ F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (trans. R. W. Funk; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), 6.

⁷⁴ This is taken from the list in Robertson, *Grammar*, 109. See also S. G. Green, *Handbook to the Grammar of the Greek Testament* (London: Religious Tract Society, n.d.), 158–59; Blass and Debrunner, *Greek Grammar*, 4–5.

φελώνης (*paenula*)—2 Tim 4:13 (only appearance in the New Testament)

This is an insufficient number to establish that Paul knew Latin, as this is taken from a list of thirty-one such words in the Greek New Testament. Most of these Latin words appear most often in the Gospels and Acts.

2. Acts of the Apostles. There are several instances in Acts where Paul may have used Latin. These might have included his conversations with the Roman authorities, as noted above, often when he was invoking his Roman citizenship.⁷⁵ There may have been several particular instances where it was important that Paul use Latin. Two sets of these may be identified.

The first is when Paul identifies himself as and claims rights as a Roman citizen. As Bruce states, “When he claimed his citizen rights, he [Paul] may have done so in the Latin form: *ciuis Romanus sum*.”⁷⁶ As Ramsay says, “As his father, and possibly also his grandfather, had possessed the Roman citizenship, the use of Latin speech and names was an inheritance in the family.”⁷⁷ This may have occurred on at least two occasions. In Acts 16, Paul and Silas are dragged before the authorities by a mob, where they are sentenced to be beaten and thrown into prison. In the morning, after the miraculous events of the night, when the authorities wish to release them, Paul states: “They have beaten us in public without trial, men who are Romans, and have thrown us into prison” (Acts 16:37; NASB rev). In Acts 21 and 22, Paul is accused by the Jews of bringing a Gentile into the temple, and a riot breaks out. The Roman chilliarch rescues him, and allows Paul to speak to the crowd. When finished, just as the commander is about to have Paul beaten, Paul states: “Is it lawful for you to scourge a man who is a Roman and uncondemned?” (Acts 22:25; NASB.rev). There is nothing in these episodes to indicate whether the words regarding his citizenship are uttered by Paul in Latin. They may have been, but

⁷⁵ This is not the place to argue for whether or not Paul was a Roman citizen, but I note that the arguments for his citizenship far outweigh those against, as noted by M. Hengel with R. Deines, *Pre-Christian Paul* (trans. J. Bowden; London: SCM Press, 1991), 6–15.

⁷⁶ Bruce, *Paul*, 315–16.

⁷⁷ W. Ramsay, *The Expositor*, August 1906, p. 260, cited in Robertson, *Grammar*, 110 n. 5.

it is just as likely that Paul spoke them in Greek. In the second episode, when Paul first speaks to the Roman commander, he apparently speaks in Greek to him, because the commander I surprised, thinking him to be someone else (Acts 22:37–38).

The second set of episodes when Paul may have used Latin occurs when Paul makes his direct appeal to Caesar. As noted above, there is the chance that Paul's entire conversation—if he knew Latin—with Festus was in Latin. In Acts 25, Festus, under pressure from the Jewish leaders and wanting to please them (v. 9), tries to appeal to Paul for a change of venue for his trial. As Sherwin-White rightly indicates, Paul is not disputing the governor's right to judge his case, but he is objecting to having the Jewish leaders in any way involved in the case.⁷⁸ As Tajra reconstructs using the Vulgate, Paul in such a situation may have been asked by Festus: *Vīs Ierosolymam ascendere et ibi de his iudicari apud me?* (Acts 25:9). To which Paul may well have replied: *ab tribunal Caesaris sto ubi me oportet iudicari... Caesarem appello.*⁷⁹ However, as with the appeal to his Roman citizenship, there is nothing that makes clear in the text of Acts that Paul must have made such an appeal in Latin, or, even if he had, that indicates that he knew Latin in any meaningful sense.

4. Conclusion

A number of scholars have believed that Paul spoke Latin. The most noteworthy advocates include William Ramsay,⁸⁰ James Hope Moulton,⁸¹ Alexander Souter,⁸² and F. F. Bruce.⁸³ Whereas this was a topic of some discussion in an earlier period of scholarship, very few contemporary scholars raise the issue of whether Paul spoke Latin. Admittedly, there is no direct evidence to address the problem. However, there is some circumstantial evidence that Paul would have known Latin. This evidence

⁷⁸ A. N. Sherwin-White, *Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1963), 48–70, esp. 67.

⁷⁹ H. W. Tajra, *The Trial of St. Paul* (WUNT 2.35; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1989), 144.

⁸⁰ Besides the notes above, see W. M. Ramsay, *Pauline and Other Studies* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1906), 65, where he simply states: “it is as certain that he [Paul] had a Roman name and spoke the Latin language, as it is that he was a Roman citizen.”

⁸¹ Moulton, *Prolegomena*, 20, 233.

⁸² A. Souter, “Did Paul Speak Latin?” *The Expositor Series* 8 (1911): 337–42.

⁸³ Bruce, *Paul*, 315–16.

includes his travel itinerary that probably took him to Illyricum, a Latin-speaking province of the Roman Empire; his visiting a number of cities, such as Lydia, Pisidian Antioch, Philippi, Corinth, Caesarea Maritima, and even Rome, where there is some probability of his speaking Latin; and Latinisms, both grammatical and lexical, in both his letters and the book of Acts. Whereas there is some evidence from each of these that Paul may have spoken Latin, the evidence is far from convincing. Most of the evidence suggests that Paul *may* have spoken Latin, but it is far from requiring it, no matter what the circumstances. In most of the instances, it is just as probable, if not more likely, that Paul may have used Greek, the lingua franca of the Roman Empire of the first century.

PAUL THE ROMAN CITIZEN: ROMAN CITIZENSHIP IN THE ANCIENT WORLD AND ITS IMPORTANCE FOR UNDERSTANDING ACTS 22:22–29

Sean A. Adams
University of Edinburgh, UK

Paul is one of the most important characters within the New Testament, however, there is still much debate surrounding his life, ministry and theology. One of the key pieces of historical background that would shed light on the understanding of Paul is the understanding of his citizenship. Although not mentioned within his letters, Luke reports in the book of Acts that Paul was a Roman citizen in addition to being a Hellenistic Jew born in Tarsus. Determining if Paul was a Roman citizen is an important step in uncovering the Paul behind the letters and the Paul in Acts. In this paper, I will first outline the nature and development of Roman citizenship within the ancient world and its importance for the bestowing of rights and privileges to its holder. This will be followed by a discussion of the historical veracity of Acts and its story. Finally Paul's citizenship will be evaluated including the role of dual citizenship in the ancient world and the incident of Acts 22:22–29 and the possible ramifications of making a false claim of Roman citizenship.

Roman Citizenship

Citizenship, at the very beginning of Rome's development, was relatively limited to people who lived within Rome and the surrounding area. However, as their influence and power increased it became more desirable to have Roman citizenship. Originally, people could only become citizens in three ways: birth, manumission or special concession.¹ Citizenship by birth does not require much explanation except

¹ Charlotte E. Goodfellow, *Roman Citizenship: A Study of Its Territorial and Numerical Expansion from the Earliest Times to the Death of Augustus* (Lancaster: Lancaster Press, 1935),

that in the case that there is a marriage between a Roman citizen and a non-citizen, the child would take the citizenship of the father.² One of the unique aspects of Roman citizenship was that it was conferred upon slaves at the time of manumission. This policy was quite opposite to the practice of the Greeks, who did not grant citizenship to freed slaves. The third criterion, special concession, is quite complicated and to outline the various possibilities is not within the scope of this paper. However, some of these would include the founding of Roman colonies, outstanding service to Rome, military service, etc.³

Between the fifth and the third centuries BC there were only a few minor changes to the understanding of Roman citizenship. Although there was very little expansion preceding the Latin Wars (340–338 BC), after 338 BC the Romans began to seriously stretch the boundaries of their territories through colonizing the surrounding areas.⁴ In addition to this, the Romans also added to their territory through the conquest of neighbouring tribes and cities. Some of these *municipia* were fully incorporated into Roman citizenship, however, a number of them were given partial status, half-citizenship, for a time until being later included. This helped relieve the pressure on Rome to incorporate all conquered cities immediately into the Roman state as well as successfully integrate these cities and peoples into the Republic, and later the Empire.⁵

In the late second century BC there was a general movement by the Roman elite to restrict Roman citizenship for all foreigners, including the Latins and Italians.⁶ Attempts to appease the Latins and Italians by Marcus Flaccus in 125 BC and Gaius Gracchus in 122 BC were

7–8. For a more in-depth discussion of manumission, see Jamie F. Gardner, *Being a Roman Citizen* (London: Routledge, 1993), 8–19.

² The right to have such a mixed marriage, called *connubium*, existed between patricians and plebeians and was also granted to Latins. Livy 4.1.

³ In the case of colonies, its founding would be sanctioned by a *lex colonica*, which would indicate the number of people being sent as well as the fact that the colony would retain the full Roman franchise as part of the *populus Romanus*. See Goodfellow, *Roman Citizenship*, 10–25 for a detailed explanation of the various methods and issues that surrounded the acquiring and distribution of Roman citizenship during the Republic.

⁴ For a discussion of the issues leading up to the Latin War, see A. N. Sherwin-White, *The Roman Citizenship* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1973), 15–37.

⁵ Goodfellow, *Roman Citizenship*, 13–15. Sherwin-White (*The Roman Citizenship*, 38–58) has an excellent discussion regarding the nature of the *municipia*, how they were organized and differed between cities, as well as their importance for the development of imperial citizenship which secured the success of the Roman Republic.

⁶ This was a result of the abuse of the *ius migrationis* by the Latins, who were allowed to gain Roman citizenship if they moved to Rome. Livy 39.3; 41.8–9.

relatively unsuccessful and an uneasy tension lasted until 95 BC.⁷ In this year the *Lex Licinia Mucia* passed, the main goal of which was to remove Latins and Italians from the citizen rolls by prosecuting everyone who falsely claimed to have Roman citizenship. This resulted in major unrest among the Roman allies. Attempts to provide citizenship to all the Latins and Italians by Marcus Livius Drusus in 91 BC was thwarted by the senate, resulting in his assassination, with the final consequence that most of the Roman allies declared war against Rome in what became known as the Social War (91–88 BC). In order to maintain its alliances and the loyalty of the tribes, Rome granted citizenship to all Italian allies who did not go to war with them through the *Lex Iulia* of 90 BC.⁸ This granting of citizenship to the whole of Italy was one of the first main causes of the rapid dispersion of Roman citizenship. This is shown through an excellent chart by Goodfellow, who maps the census records of Roman citizenship from 508 BC to AD 47.⁹

It is clear from this chart that there is a noticeable increase of Roman citizens in the census between 86 and 70 BC after maintaining a relatively constant census number for about four and a half centuries. Most notable is the citizen boom between 70 and 28 BC in which there is an unprecedented increase of nearly three million people added to the Roman citizen register.¹⁰ With this increase in numbers the general prestige of being a Roman citizen began to lessen, however, there was now a greater dispersal of legal and social benefits to a larger number of people. This growth of citizenship continued until Emperor Marcus

⁷ Both Flaccus and Gracchus sought to incorporate the Italian allies into the Roman Empire in the hope that they might waive their objections to the redistribution of public lands that they held. For some details on Flaccus's bill see Valerius Maximus 9.5.1.

⁸ Appian, *Civil Wars* 1.35–53, discusses the development and the events of the social war, concluding with the granting of citizenship to the whole of Italy except for the Lucanians and Samnites. For a solid article that outlines a number of the subtle issues regarding the restriction of Roman citizenship and the desire to gain it by the Italians, see P. A. Brunt, "Italian Aims at the Time of the Social War," *JRS* 55 (1965): 90–109; Sherwin-White, *The Roman Citizenship*, 134–49.

⁹ Goodfellow, *Roman Citizenship*, 26–27. This is an abridged version of this chart with only 7 examples out of 33 between 508 and 125 BC, but all of the remaining examples between 125 BC and AD 47. All of the population numbers given within this time period are relatively constant with a low of 103,000 in 474 BC and a high of 394,736 in 125 BC. There is some scepticism and debate over the veracity of the early census figures, however, there are some scholars who would support these figures. For example, see Tenney Frank, "Roman Census Statistics from 508 to 225 B.C.," *AJP* 51 (1930): 313–24.

¹⁰ This is most likely a result of the generous granting of citizenship to people in Spain, Gaul and Greece by Caesar. Sherwin-White, *The Roman Citizenship*, 225–36.

Table 1: Roman Citizen Census Records 508 BC to AD 47.

Year	Number	Source
508 BC	130,000	Dionysius of Halicarnassus, <i>Ant. Rom.</i> 5.20; Plutarch, <i>Publ.</i> 12.
459	117,319	Livy 3.24.
323 (ca.)	250,000	Livy 9.19.
204	214,000	Livy 29.37.
154	324,000	Livy, <i>Ep.</i> 48.
125	394,736	Livy, <i>Ep.</i> 60.
115	394,336	Livy, <i>Ep.</i> 63.
86	463,000	Jerome, <i>Ol.</i> 173.4.
70	910,000	Phlegon, <i>Ol.</i> 177.3; Livy, <i>Ep.</i> 98, gives 900,000
28	4,063,000	Augustus, <i>Res Gestae</i> 2.8.
8	4,233,000	Augustus, <i>Res Gestae</i> 2.8.
14 AD	4,937,000	Augustus, <i>Res Gestae</i> 2.8.
47 AD	5,984,072	Tacitus, <i>Ann.</i> 11.25

Aurelius Antoninus, called Caracalla, made all free men citizens of the Empire in AD 212 through the *Constitutio Antoniniana*, in order to increase the number of people who could be taxed and serve in the legion.¹¹ By this time, however, many of the privileges associated with citizenship had been eroded.

In light of the fact that there was such a dramatic increase and desire for Roman citizenship, it is fair to state that there were particular perks to being a Roman citizen.¹² Sherwin-White discusses the position and power that the provincial governors had over the populous in their territory. He states that the governor had near ultimate authority over his province even to the point of killing its inhabitants.¹³ However, this

¹¹ E. Mary Smallwood, *The Jews under Roman Rule: From Pompey to Diocletian, A Study in Political Relations* (Leiden: Brill, 1976), 502–503; Sherwin-White, *The Roman Citizenship*, 286–87.

¹² Cicero expressed this well, “But no one who had any acquaintance with our laws or our customs, who wished to retain his rights as a citizen of Rome, ever dedicated himself to another city.” Cicero, *Pro Balbo* 30.

¹³ The main constraint placed on these governors was the *lex repetundarum*, or extortion law, which allowed the governor to be as harsh or as arbitrary as he liked, as long as he did not take money or goods from a province, even with their consent. This changed slightly with the forbidding of *saevitia*, extreme cruelty, but only after Volesus Messala, a proconsul of Asia, executed 300 people in one day while walking through their bodies expressing “behold the royal deed.” On Messala see Tacitus, *Ann.* 3.68; A. N. Sherwin-White, “Poena Legis Repetundarum,” *Papers of the British School at Rome* 17 (1949): 5;

authority was not nearly as complete with Roman citizens, who were granted specific rights, among which were: the right to vote in the Tribal assembly (*ius suffragii*); the right to make legal contracts, and to hold property, as a Roman citizen (*ius commercii*); the right to sue in the courts; the right to appeal from the decisions of magistrates;¹⁴ the right to have a trial (to appear before a proper court and to defend oneself); the right not to be subjected to torture or scourging;¹⁵ and the right of immunity from some taxes and other legal obligations, especially local rules and regulations.¹⁶

There was, however, a second class of Roman citizens, who, in addition to citizenship, were also granted *immunitas*. This particular honour and privilege allowed the recipient to be immune from taxes as well as from various responsibilities, such as: exemption from tribute, exemption from military duty and public charges, and not being forced to entertain guests or provide winter quarters for soldiers, etc.¹⁷ The granting of *civitas et immunitas* needed to be explicitly mentioned by Augustus, Octavian or another Caesar otherwise the gift of citizenship would be of citizenship alone.¹⁸ This particular privilege was quite restricted during the Republic, however, it gradually became more common during

A. N. Sherwin-White, *Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament: The Sarum Lectures* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1963), 1–23.

¹⁴ Peter Garnsey, “The *Lex Iulia* and Appeal under the Empire,” *Journal of Roman Studies* 56 (1966): 167–89; Sherwin-White, *Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament*, 63–70; Kirsopp Lake and Henry J. Cadbury, *The Beginnings of Christianity: Part I: The Acts of the Apostles, Vol 5 Additional Notes to the Commentary* (London: Macmillan, 1935), 311–18.

¹⁵ Cicero, *Pro Rabirio* 12; Sherwin-White, *Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament*, 72–76; B. Rapske, *The Book of Acts and Paul in Roman Custody* (AIIFCS 3; Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1994), 51–52.

This point is particularly interesting when evaluating Acts 16:35–40 and the beating of Paul and Silus prior to receiving a trial. This was not only illegal, due to their claim of Roman citizenship, but also carried the possibility of strong censure, not only towards the soldiers, but towards the city in which the event took place. Tacitus, *Ann.* 4.36.2; Dio Cassius, *Roman History* 54.7.6; 57.24.6; 60.24.4; P. Garnsey, *Social Status and Legal Privilege in the Roman Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1970), 268–69.

¹⁶ It is important to note that these rights were developed over a number of years, as well as the fact that they were not always maintained or upheld. Consequently, one must use discretion regarding statements of citizen rights for Romans.

¹⁷ For a specific example of the granting of citizenship with *immunitas* by Octavian to a soldier Seleukos from Rhosos, see P. Roussel, “Un Syrien au Service de Rome et d’Octave,” *Syria* 15 (1934): 33–74. It is also important to note that a succinct understanding of *immunitas* has yet to be thoroughly outlined or discovered from ancient sources, although examples like this one are most helpful in providing a clearer picture.

¹⁸ Goodfellow, *Roman Citizenship*, 44. Another example of this would be the granting of citizenship and immunity by Caesar to Antipater of Judea after a dramatic rescue at sea. See Josephus, *Ant.* 14.137.

the Empire, especially since it was given to army veterans after their completion of service.¹⁹

One of the greatest rights was that a Roman citizen did not have to worry about being crucified, a punishment that was reserved for slaves and foreigners (*peregrini*).²⁰ Although being a citizen does spare a person from undue punishment and grant them a trial, it is not entirely correct to say that citizens were exempt from the punishment of crucifixion.²¹ There are some instances in which Roman citizens were nailed to a cross, but this is only for serious crimes and high treason.²² Such a death is referred to as *summum supplicium*.²³ The classic example of this was Verres, who, as the governor of Sicily, imposed this sentence on a Roman citizen, P. Gavius, for serving as a spy for Spartacus in the slave revolt.²⁴ Another example is the crucifixion of deserters by Scipio the Elder. In this example, a number of Roman citizens, who were handed over by the Carthaginians after the Second Punic War, were crucified because through their act of treason they had forfeited their

¹⁹ Goodfellow, *Roman Citizenship*, 46.

²⁰ For a detailed discussion of crucifixion in the ancient world, see Martin Hengel, *Crucifixion: In the Ancient World and the Folly of the Message of the Cross* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977); Sean A. Adams, "Crucifixion in the Ancient World: A Response to L. L. Welborn," in Stanley E. Porter (ed.), *Paul's World* (PAST 4; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 111–29.

²¹ Justinian, *Digest* 48.19.38.2: "Those who are responsible for sedition and disturbance when a mob has been excited are, according to their social standing, either hanged on the gallows (*in furcam tolluntur*) or thrown to the beasts or deported to an island." There is one noteworthy example of a person crying out that he was a Roman citizen as he was being beaten by rods and as a cross was being constructed. Cicero expresses that Verres did not even pause in his punishment when the only words that proceeded from the person's mouth were, "I'm a Roman citizen." This action was seriously questioned by Cicero who held it up as an example of the state of the Roman Empire. Cicero, *Verr.* 2.5.62–63.

There is one account of a person who, after he had been condemned to crucifixion, cried out in desperation that he was a Roman citizen, however, because of this lie he was placed on a particularly high cross that was painted white. Suetonius, *Galba* 9.2.

²² Hengel, *Crucifixion*, 39.

²³ In general, this sentence was hardly imposed on Roman citizens, however, Romans who did commit major crimes against the state often ended up dead, or committed suicide, an honourable death in the Roman Empire. In fact, suicide and other forms of honourable death were much more beneficial than being crucified. Hengel states that a Roman citizen, if given the death sentence, was left some freedom to determine the manner in which he would die. Hengel, *Crucifixion*, 43. For an interesting discussion on suicide and whether the perpetrator should be given a proper burial, see Seneca the Elder, *Controversiae*, 8.4.

²⁴ Cicero, *Verr.* 2.5.158–165. P. Gavius was faced towards the mother country due to the nature of the charge against him.

citizen privileges.²⁵ Overall Cicero summed up the Roman position on crucifixion well when he stated, “the very word ‘cross’ should be far removed, not only from the Roman citizen, but from his thoughts, his eyes and his ears... The mere mention of such a thing is shameful to a Roman citizen and a free man.”²⁶

Paul the Roman Citizen

Historical Authenticity of Acts

One of the major issues that clouds the study of Paul and his claim of being a Roman citizen is the question of the historical veracity of the Acts account. Although there are a number of scholars who support the historical accuracy of Acts in their construction of the person of Paul, there are some who do not see Acts as a book with historically accurate information. One of the most extreme views sees Paul’s claim to be a Roman citizen as a piece of authorial invention to make Paul more receptive to gentiles as well as to help plot development.²⁷ This view, however, is not sustainable because of the fact that the entire final sequence of Acts, namely Paul’s appeal, protection and travel to Rome, hinges entirely on Paul’s Roman citizenship.²⁸ To discount Paul’s citizenship would totally discount the entire narrative, as well as the narrator’s claims at the outset of his work (Luke 1:1–4; Acts 1:1).²⁹

Luke, in his preface, explicitly states that his intention for the writing of this work is to gather information and testimony from people

²⁵ Livy 30.43.13; Valerius Maximus 2.7.12. In the Second Punic War, discipline was particularly problematic and so increasingly harsh punishments were implemented in order to maintain control over the army. Another example of this is Avidius Cassius, who crucified any soldier who took any item from the province they had just conquered. Although it was within his right, it was almost considered more savagery than strictness of discipline. *Scriptores Historia Augustae: Avidius Cassius* 3.4.

²⁶ Cicero, *Pro Rabirio* 5.16.

²⁷ Wolfgang Stegemann, “War der Apostel Paulus ein römischer Bürger?“, *ZNW* 78 (1987): 200–29.

²⁸ Jerome Murphy-O’Connor, *Paul: A Critical Life* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996), 39.

²⁹ Scholarly opinion seems to agree that both Luke and Acts were written by the same author as two parts of one unified work. I. Howard Marshall, *Luke: Historian and Theologian* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1970), 13–20; Loveday Alexander, *The Preface to Luke’s Gospel: Literary Convention and Social Context in Luke 1.1–4 and Acts 1.1* (SNTSMS 78; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1993).

who were eyewitnesses of the events and to write an orderly account in order that Theophilus might know the truth (Luke 1:1–4). There has been much discussion regarding the nature of Luke’s preface and its relationship to the prefaces of other Greek historians to determine if there is a relationship in the historiographical methodology. One of the main critics of this view is Loveday Alexander, who sees Luke’s preface as more akin to scientific prefaces than to those of the Greek historians.³⁰ This position has come under criticism recently, with a number of scholars seeing a greater relationship between Luke and the Greek historians than between Luke and the scientific writers.³¹

Within the study of ancient texts, particularly Greek and Roman history, there is an understanding that a number of the ancient writers are relatively trustworthy sources and that their account can be accepted. This has been accomplished through the thorough study of their work and, in particular, the evaluation of their historical method, particularly located in their preface. In a previous paper, I evaluated the nature of Luke’s preface and its relationship to the prefaces and historical methodology explicitly mentioned in the Greek historical writers. In my investigation, I determined that there were a number of striking similarities between Luke and the Greek historians in the areas of style, personal introduction, preface length, dedications and common themes.³² Although there is too much detail to express in this paper, it is clear from my study that Luke was attempting to place himself within the bounds of Greek history through the use of particular features within his preface.³³

Despite these similarities, there are a number of scholars who still view Acts as reconstructions of historical imagination, which casts

³⁰ Loveday Alexander, “Luke’s Preface in the Context of Greek Preface-writing,” *Nov T* 28 (1986): 48–74; Alexander, *The Preface to Luke’s Gospel*, 26–34.

³¹ Sean A. Adams, “Luke’s Preface and its Relationship to Greek Historiography: A Response to Loveday Alexander,” *Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism* 3 (2006): 177–91; David E. Aune, “Luke 1.1–4: Historical or Scientific *Prooimion*?,” in Alf Christophersen, Carsten Claussen, Jörg Frey and Bruce Longenecker (eds.), *Paul, Luke and the Graeco-Roman World: Essays in Honour of Alexander J. M. Wedderburn* (JSNTSup 217; New York: T&T Clark, 2002), 138–48.

³² Adams, “Luke’s Preface and its Relationship to Greek Historiography.” For a recent discussion of eyewitnesses, see Richard Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: The Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006).

³³ William M. Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1965), 1–10.

serious doubts on the claim that Paul was a Roman citizen.³⁴ The understanding of reliability and trustworthiness is always tempered by the knowledge that each writer has a particular perspective and reason for writing their history. This, undoubtedly, affects their work, choice of sources and presentation of material, however, for ancient writers of history it is within this framework that they are reliable. Nevertheless, when one approaches the New Testament the reliability of texts is considered even more suspect, even if the author, in this case Luke, firmly establishes himself within the sphere of using accurate historical methodology. Sherwin-White expresses this well:

For Acts, the confirmation of historicity is overwhelming. Yet Acts is, in simple terms and judged externally, no less of a propaganda narrative than the Gospels, liable to similar distortions. But any attempt to reject its basic historicity, even in matters of detail, must now appear absurd. Roman historians have long taken it for granted.³⁵

In light of the discussion above, as well as those cited within the footnotes, it is unlikely that the mention of Paul's Roman citizenship within Acts is historically inaccurate. Consequently, it is from this perspective that the discussion of Paul's Roman citizenship will be treated.

Paul and Roman Citizenship

It is clear from the record in Acts that Paul claims a number of times to be a Roman citizen (Acts 16:37–38; Acts 22:25–28) and that it was bestowed upon him through birth (Acts 22:28).³⁶ Although this is a

³⁴ Calvin J. Roetzel, *Paul: The Man and the Myth* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999), 1–2. For a discussion of the arguments against Paul being a citizen, see Roetzel, *Paul*, 19–22; W. W. Tarn, *Hellenistic Civilisation* (London: Edward Arnold, 1927), 176–77.

³⁵ Sherwin-White, *Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament*, 189. See also Martin Hengel, *Acts and the History of Earliest Christianity* (trans. John Bowden; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1979), 35–39.

³⁶ For an interesting discussion of Roman birth certificates for legitimate and illegitimate children with a list of a number of ancient sources, see F. Schulz, "Roman Registers of Births and Birth Certificates, part I," *JRS* 32 (1942): 78–91; F. Schulz, "Roman Registers of Births and Birth Certificates, part II," *JRS* 33 (1943): 55–64.

It is at this time that Paul would have been given his tripartite name as is typical for a Roman citizen (forename, family name and an additional name). For discussion of this, see F. F. Bruce, *Paul: Apostle of the Heart Set Free* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977), 38; Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveler and the Roman Citizen*, 31; James S. Jeffers, *The Greco-Roman World of the New Testament Era: Exploring the Background of Early Christianity* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1999), 202–204.

completely legitimate means of gaining Roman citizenship, it does beg the question of how Paul's family gained Roman citizenship.

As mentioned above, there are a few methods of acquiring Roman citizenship.³⁷ First, one can be granted Roman citizenship at birth if the father of the child was a Roman citizen. Secondly, it was conferred upon slaves at the time of manumission from a Roman household. Thirdly, a common means of gaining citizenship was to serve in the auxiliary militia or the Roman army. Another method was that it was conferred on prominent and wealthy citizens within the Empire by the Emperor.³⁸ A final means of acquiring citizenship was to purchase it, likely illicitly and at a very high price.³⁹

Seeing that Paul is of Jewish heritage (Acts 21:39) it is fair to assume that his father or grandfather was a Roman citizen by nationality, but that it was acquired by some other means. Bruce and Tjara suggest that it was through military service that Paul's father or grandfather gained Roman citizenship.⁴⁰ This view, however, is potentially problematic seeing that observant Jews, who were also Roman citizens living in Asia, were beginning to be exempted from providing military service to the Romans beginning in 49 BC.⁴¹ The exemption was later expanded to all of the Jewish population regardless of Roman citizenship in 43 BC.⁴² When considering that, prior to Caesar, military service to Rome was not typically rewarded with citizenship, and that the Jewish attitude towards the Romans was poor, particularly in regard to serving in their military, it becomes unlikely that Paul's family gained citizenship through military service for the Romans.

Another possible means of gaining citizenship is through manumission from a Roman household. During the first century BC there were

³⁷ For the acquisition, loss or exchange of citizenship, see Theodor Mommsen, *Römisches Staatsrecht I* (Leipzig: Hirzel, 1887), 127–42.

³⁸ Sherwin-White, *The Roman Citizenship*, 225–36.

³⁹ Dio Cassius, *Roman History* 60.17.5–7. On the trafficking of citizenship, particularly during the reign of Claudius, see Sherwin-White, *The Roman Citizenship*, 237–50.

Witherington discusses the likelihood that the commander, Claudius Lysias, purchased his citizenship through Claudius and that he took his name as was customary when acquiring citizenship. Ben Witherington, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Social Scientific Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 681.

⁴⁰ F. F. Bruce, "Paul in Acts and Letters," in G. F. Hawthorne, R. P. Martin and D. G. Reid (eds.), *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1993), 679–92; H. W. Tjara, *The Trial of Paul* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1989), 83.

⁴¹ Smallwood, *The Jews under Roman Rule*, 127. See also Josephus, *Ant.* 14.228–232, 234, 236–240.

⁴² Smallwood, *The Jews under Roman Rule*, 128; Josephus, *Ant.* 14.223–227.

two occurrences in which a large number of Jewish people were taken to Rome as slaves: 63 BC with Pompey and 37 BC after the fall of Jerusalem.⁴³ After service or for some other reason, these Jewish people would have been released, an act granting them Roman citizenship.⁴⁴ These Jews were likely taken from Jerusalem and the surrounding area in Judea, suggesting that Paul's family would not have been included if they had maintained their residence in Tarsus for a significant amount of time.⁴⁵ Consequently, it would be unlikely that Paul's father or grandfather would have been one of the captives taken from Jerusalem and later returned to Tarsus to raise a family.⁴⁶

The other options remaining are that it was granted to their family by an Emperor or that it was purchased at great price. One of the major changes in policy between the Republic and Empire was the bestowing of citizenship on foreigners, which became a common practice with the Emperors, but was strongly resisted during the Republic. Both Caesar and Augustus had a strategy of granting citizenship to places where there was a strong foundation of Italian immigrants, and they also used this gift to win the favour and possible loyalty of some of the wealthiest and most influential citizens of other nationalities.⁴⁷ For instance, Strabo mentions at one time that Caesar granted to five hundred distinguished Greeks a place in his new colony Comum, as well as citizenship, with the understanding that they did not have to settle in that place, only lend their names to the record.⁴⁸

In light of this policy, it is time to evaluate Paul's hometown of Tarsus, which was an important city in Asia Minor.⁴⁹ Tarsus, although

⁴³ Smallwood, *The Jews under Roman Rule*, 131. Most of these Jews would have eventually been freed giving them Roman citizenship.

⁴⁴ *Contra* Stegemann ("War der Apostel Paulus ein römischer Bürger?", 224–25), who, although he admits that Jews could have received citizenship through manumission, fails to take this into account in his subsequent discussion.

⁴⁵ Martin Hengel, "The pre-Christian Paul," in Judith Lieu, John North and Tessa Rajak (eds.), *The Jews among Pagans and Christians in the Roman Empire* (London: Routledge, 1992), 30.

⁴⁶ *Contra* Hengel, "The pre-Christian Paul," 32. There is, however, an article that raises an interesting possibility of Paul's Roman citizenship based on Acts 6:9 and the mention of Ἀβερτινῶν, suggesting that Paul was a member of the synagogue of free-men, which would account for him being at the stoning of Stephen. Although this is an interesting suggestion, it lacks sufficient support to be entirely convincing. Peter van Minnen, "Paul the Roman Citizen," *JSNVT* 56 (1994): 43–52.

⁴⁷ Sherwin-White, *The Roman Citizenship*, 225–27; Goodfellow, *Roman Citizenship*, 90–108.

⁴⁸ Strabo, *Geogr.* 5.213; Sherwin-White, *The Roman Citizenship*, 231.

⁴⁹ For an ancient view on the importance of Tarsus, see Strabo, *Geogr.* 14.5.12–13.

a prominent city for many years, had become part of the larger battles between the Seleucids and the Ptolemies during the Hellenistic era until it became part of the Roman Empire. This developed because of a large problem with piracy on the Cilician coast, which drew the attention of Pompey, who crushed the marauders in 67 BC and set up Tarsus as the new Roman capital of the province of Cilicia.⁵⁰ Although there is no record of citizenship being granted to the people of Tarsus upon the promotion of that city to the provincial capital, there is some precedent for Pompey to grant citizenship to areas which he conquered.⁵¹ It is more likely that Paul's family, if it was part of the upper class of the city, was offered citizenship upon the capture of the city by Pompey, or that it was gained through a service to Pompey and/or Rome at this time.⁵²

In evaluating the means by which Paul's family would have gained Roman citizenship, it is unlikely, as some have suggested, that it was gained through manumission or through the service of a Jewish person in the Roman army. Likewise, it is also doubtful that citizenship was purchased by his father or grandfather. It is most likely that citizenship was bestowed upon the family by a general or Emperor, Pompey being the strongest possibility, due to the influence of the family or due to a service rendered to Rome.

⁵⁰ C. Edmund Bosworth, "The City of Tarsus and the Arab-Byzantine Frontiers in Early and Middle 'Abbāsid Times," *Oriens* 33 (1992): 268–69. Although it might have remained a "free city," see Robert Picirilli, *Paul The Apostle* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1986), 3.

⁵¹ For instance, the *lex Gellia Cornelia* of 72 BC authorized Pompey to confer Roman citizenship to the deserving as he saw fit. Mostly Pompey's clientele and the Spaniards benefited. Bruce states that the right to grant citizenship to approved individuals was included in the overall authority (*imperium*) conferred on the generals by law. Bruce, *Paul*, 37; Boyd Reese, "The Apostle Paul's Exercise of his Rights as a Roman Citizen as Recorded in the Book of Acts," *EvQ* 47 (1975): 139.

⁵² Bruce, *Paul*, 37; Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveler and the Roman Citizen*, 30–31. The suggestion that Paul's family was one of wealth and influence could be supported by the claim of Dio Chrysostom, *Or.* 34.23 that there was a minimum wealth requirement of 500 drachmae to be a citizen of Tarsus. T. Callander, "The Tarsian Orations of Dio Chrysostom," *JHS* 24 (1904): 62–67; Witherington, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 682. Witherington, as well as Bruce, tentatively suggests that Paul's family might have gained their citizenship by providing tents to the Roman army.

Multiple Citizenships

This discussion of citizenship, however, raises the question of the validity of Paul claiming to be a citizen of both Tarsus and of Rome. In the Acts narrative, Paul twice claims that he is a Roman citizen (Acts 16:37–38; Acts 22:25–28) and once claims that he is “a Jew from Tarsus of Cilicia, a citizen of no mean city” (Acts 21:39). Initially, this does not strike the modern reader as a problem due to the fact that dual citizenship is common. However, this was not typically the case in the ancient world, as part of the discussion above emphasizes. As a result, a deeper investigation into the nature of dual citizenship in the ancient world is required to determine if this poses an interpretive problem.

As mentioned before, Rome was rather restrictive in its granting of citizenship during the time of the Republic, which resulted in the incompatibility of holding citizenships of two different city-states.⁵³ As a result, there were very few persons, if any, who would have been able to be citizens of both Rome and another city. It is likely this understanding that led Cicero to state “But no one who had any acquaintance with our laws or our customs, who wished to retain his rights as a citizen of Rome, ever dedicated himself to another city.”⁵⁴ Accordingly, this understanding of citizenship in the Republic was similar to that of the Greek *polis*, that a person was generally a citizen of one town only, for fear that a person might have divided loyalties.⁵⁵ However, with the continuing expansion of Roman territory and influence, as well as the acceptance of other citizenships by Romans, particularly in the Greek east, it became apparent that this policy of limiting citizenship to a city would no longer work.⁵⁶

By the middle of the first century BC, there were significant numbers of Roman citizens who were no longer living within the confines of Rome, but were living in other places in Italy and even in some of the non-Italian provinces. Furthermore, this number continued to grow with more and more foreigners gaining the coveted prize of Roman citizenship. This posed serious problems for the cities in which these

⁵³ Sherwin-White, *The Roman Citizenship*, 291–93.

⁵⁴ Cicero, *Pro Balbo* 30. Nepos, *Att.* 3, states that Atticus refused Athenian citizenship on account of his Roman citizenship *quod nonnulli ita interpretantur amitti civitatem Romanam alia adscita*.

⁵⁵ This, however, was clearly loosened by the time of Cicero.

⁵⁶ Mason Hammond, “Germana Patria,” *HSCP* 60 (1951): 147–74. This was particularly evident with the development of the Social War. See discussion above.

Roman citizens were living because, once they had gained Roman citizenship, they were beginning no longer to pay taxes or obey the laws of that city. This issue, left unchecked, would have caused great hardship to the dependent city.

Although legally there was the idea that one could not hold multiple citizenships this did not permit a practical application, and, consequently, it became allowed.⁵⁷ By the time of Augustus's reign, there had been a complete turn with the result that Roman citizenship was consistent with membership in any other city of the Empire, whether it was of Latin or peregrine status.⁵⁸

This understanding is exemplified by an inscription found in the province of Cyrene dating to 6 BC, stating that there were 215 Roman citizens living in that province.⁵⁹ One of the main issues raised in this inscription was whether provincials who had obtained Roman citizenship, and correspondingly were claiming exemption, should continue to contribute to the public burdens of the Greek community. Augustus's decision was that all Roman citizens must continue to pay their share of the public liturgies, unless the granting of citizenship was accompanied by *immunitas*, in which case only the property that was possessed at the time of confirmation would be exempt, with all other property gained later still taxable.⁶⁰

In light of this inscription, it is important to note that the status of Roman citizens and their relationship to the local government was still not firmly established at this point. Furthermore, this edict established a new principle of citizenship within the Empire, namely, that a person who gained Roman citizenship continued to be a citizen of his or her provincial city with all the corresponding duties, unless he or she was explicitly exempted from them through the granting of *immunitas*.

This statement formalized the understanding that provincial or local citizenship was not in direct competition with Roman citizenship. This realization, that Roman citizenship was no longer tied to a city-state,

⁵⁷ Sherwin-White, *The Roman Citizenship*, 296–97.

⁵⁸ Goodfellow, *Roman Citizenship*, 41–42.

⁵⁹ For a complete edition of this inscription as well as some relevant commentary, see J. G. C. Anderson, "Augustan Edicts from Cyrene," *JRS* 17 (1927): 33–48.

⁶⁰ See discussion of *immunitas* in section one above. Anderson, "Augustan Edicts from Cyrene," 39–40; Goodfellow, *Roman Citizenship*, 42–43. Goodfellow makes a good point when she states that to exempt Roman citizens from paying local taxes would have been economically impractical, seeing that it was most likely the wealthy and the most influential who would have been able to obtain Roman citizenship in the first place.

but superseded local government, was merely the recognition of a trend that was almost impossible to stop. Consequently, empire citizenship became another highly prestigious tier for people to gain that would provide them with special rights within the Empire.⁶¹

In light of this discussion, Paul's claim of Tarsian citizenship poses no interpretive problems because they are functioning on different levels with Roman citizenship superseding all other forms of citizenship.⁶² The Tarsian citizenship would have been granted to Paul upon birth from a family who were residing in and a member of Tarsus, and would imbue Paul with particular rights and responsibilities to this town and to its members. In addition, Paul would have also been granted Roman citizenship at birth if his father was a Roman citizen. This would not only act within the local area, ensuring him certain privileges, but would also avail him of rights and protection while traveling within the Roman Empire that Tarsian citizenship would not provide.⁶³

Acts 22:22–29 and False Claims of Citizenship

The incident of Paul's arrest in Jerusalem provides an interesting discussion for the topic of citizenship, legal rights and the potential issue of a false claim of citizenship. In the text previous to this section, Paul had arrived at Jerusalem and had nearly finished the rite of purification, when some Jewish people from the city saw Paul at the temple and began to stir up the crowd. While they were beating him, the Roman commander heard about the commotion and interrupted them and had Paul bound and taken to the barracks. However, before he entered the barracks he asked for permission to speak to the crowd stating that he was a Jew from Tarsus in Cilicia. After gaining permission, he spoke to the crowd, but after he said that he was sent to the gentiles the crowd exploded and Paul was taken into the barracks to be beaten for information. However, before he was beaten he asked the centurion "is it legal for you to flog a Roman citizen who has not even been found guilty?"

⁶¹ Goodfellow, *Roman Citizenship*, 43.

⁶² Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveler and the Roman Citizen*, 31.

⁶³ This can be seen through Paul's interactions with the guards in Acts 16:37–38 and 22:25–28, where the soldiers and guards are shocked and retreat when Paul states that he is a Roman citizen. This reaction would not have been the same if, in the same circumstance, he declared that he was a citizen of Tarsus.

The centurion reported this to his commander, who said to Paul “tell me, are you a Roman citizen?” Paul responded “Yes, I am.”

This mistake by the centurion and the commander to have Paul beaten is understandable. First, they are in Jerusalem and there is an argument regarding the nature of the temple, which immediately suggests that it is an internal conflict. It was not particularly common for Jewish residents of Jerusalem to hold or even want to hold Roman citizenship.⁶⁴ Although there is a possibility that some of the captives from the fall of Jerusalem in 63 and 37 BC might have returned after gaining citizenship through manumission, it is unlikely and would not have been considered by the centurion.⁶⁵

Secondly, Paul introduced himself to the commander as a Jew from Tarsus and not as a Roman citizen. It is logical that the commander would assume that if Paul was a Roman citizen he would have expressed it at this point or at some time during their initial encounter. There has been some question regarding why Paul did not make explicit his Roman citizenship at this instance, but told the commander that he was a Jew from Tarsus. Lake and Cadbury suggest that Paul mentions his Jewish heritage at this point to state that he would have been allowed in the temple and his Tarsian citizenship because of his pride in the city and as a reason for his knowing Greek.⁶⁶ Although it is true that Paul does speak proudly about his Tarsian heritage this does not adequately account for his choice at this point, seeing that by stating that he was a Roman citizen would have also suggested that he would have known Greek through his education.⁶⁷ Witherington suggests that Paul withheld this understanding of his Roman citizenship until he was out of earshot of the violently hostile crowd.⁶⁸ This would make sense seeing that to express Roman citizenship at the time when he was accused of bringing gentiles into the temple would have been seriously detrimental to his cause and confirm their worst suspicions. Consequently, Paul wisely

⁶⁴ The notable exception would be some of the Jewish elite and the descendants of Herod the Great. Jeffers, *The Greco-Roman World of the New Testament Era*, 202.

⁶⁵ Smallwood, *The Jews under Roman Rule*, 565–67.

⁶⁶ Kirsopp Lake and Henry J. Cadbury, *The Beginnings of Christianity: Part I: The Acts of the Apostles, Vol. 4 English Translation and Commentary* (London: Macmillan, 1933), 277–78.

⁶⁷ For a more detailed examination of Paul’s education, see Andrew W. Pitts, “Hellenistic Schools in Jerusalem and Paul’s Rhetorical Education,” in Stanley E. Porter (ed.), *Paul’s World* (PAST 4; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 19–50.

⁶⁸ Witherington, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 680.

brings up his Roman citizenship when it would most benefit him and not escalate an already tense situation.

One of the most interesting features of Acts 22:22–29 is the manner in which Paul exposes his citizenship and the reaction of the guards and the commander. Just as Paul was being stretched out to be beaten he asks a question of the centurion: “is it legal for you to flog a Roman citizen who has not even been found guilty?” The centurion takes this question as a declaration of citizenship, however, the commanding officer is not as convinced and forces Paul to make an explicit declaration of Roman citizenship thinking that Paul might have been attempting to escape a flogging by suggesting, but not stating, that he was a Roman citizen.

This interplay is interesting when one understands the underlying issue of a false declaration of Roman citizenship. In the first interaction Paul did not explicitly claim citizenship, but hinted that what the centurion was about to do was illegal according to the rights and laws afforded by Roman citizenship. Clearly the centurion was convinced and Paul might have been let off at that point, however, the commanding officer required an explicit confession and then questioned the means by which Paul attained this honour.

In the ancient world the declaration that a person was a Roman citizen called for an immediate cessation of punishment until the claim of citizenship could be supported or proven false.⁶⁹ As a result of this, there were a number of incidents of people falsely claiming Roman citizenship to escape punishment or be given respite. This was highly distasteful to the Romans, and so to deter this sort of action a steep punishment was assigned, sometimes resulting in the execution of the person.⁷⁰ As a result of these severe punishments there was a strong deterrent to wrongly claim citizenship to attempt to escape a punishment.

As a result, the commander’s direct question was intended to gain a confession that he was not a citizen. Paul, however, claimed that he was a citizen, which resulted in a more thorough questioning of how it was attained. Such a claim would be difficult to determine seeing that

⁶⁹ The classic example of a person blatantly ignoring this right was Verres; see n. 21. Cicero, *Verr.* 2.5.62–63. Discussed in Sherwin-White, *Roman Law and Roman Citizenship*, 72–76.

⁷⁰ Suetonius, *Claud.* 25.3 states that the penalty for wrongly claiming citizenship could result in execution by axe.

there were likely no other citizens from Tarsus around or that they had no access to the birth records held in Tarsus.⁷¹ Although there is no evidence in this section, or in any of the Pauline letters, it is possible that Paul might have been in possession of a *diploma civitatis Romane* or a copy of the first registration, which would indicate that the holder was a Roman citizen.⁷²

Overall, this episode in Acts is quite consistent with the nature of citizenship and the national interactions between the Jews and the Romans. Furthermore, this series of events provides a good example of the animosity of the Jews towards the gentiles, as well as the Roman position of authority within Judea and Jerusalem. Consequently, Acts 22:22–29 is a significant illustration of how Roman citizenship was valued and respected during the first century AD, and its ability to protect its holder from floggings and undue bodily harm.

Conclusion

In light of this paper it is clear that Roman citizenship in the ancient world was a coveted treasure that afforded its possessor numerous rights and privileges that were unattainable by the typical provincial. It is these rights that Paul utilizes during his arrests by the Roman soldiers by making the claim that he is a Roman citizen. Paul's claim to citizenship has been rejected by a number of scholars, however, they are based on a possible unreasonable distrust of Acts, as well as a number of arguments from silence. Consequently, they discard the claim of Paul's citizenship too quickly and, correspondingly, fail to gain some of interpretive insight of this understanding. Although some of the interpretive payoff of this perspective was not advanced in this paper, this study has potentially furthered the path for a more in-depth application.

⁷¹ These large tablets and albums would be housed at their respective city. See Schulz, "Roman Registers of Births and Birth Certificates, part I and II"; Henry A. Sanders, "The Birth Certificate of a Roman Citizen," *CP* 22 (1927): 409–13.

⁷² Jeffers, *The Greco-Roman World of the New Testament Era*, 201–202; Sherwin-White, *The Roman Citizenship*, 247–49.

INDEX OF ANCIENT SOURCES

OLD TESTAMENT

Genesis		4:19	183
1–2	29	5:29	225
1:27–28	161	6:5	45
1:27	219	6:6	225
1:31	285	7:5	183
2:7	34, 35	10:12	45
2:15	285	13:1–5	19
2:24	20, 21, 161	13:5	19
3:17–19	285	13:12–18	19
6:3	215	14:22–26	183
27:16	106	15:2–3	204
35:18	32	15:11–12	204
		17	19
Exodus		17:2–7	19
2:11	204	17:7	18–20
15:11	183	17:13	19
20:2–6	183	19:13	19
20:17	235	19:16–19	19
21:6	55	19:19	19
22:8	55	21:9	19
22:9	55	21:18–21	19
22:28	183	21:21	19
23:24	183	22:21–22	19
24:11	183	22:21	19
32	24, 183	22:30	19
32:6	24	23:19	204
32:27	204	24:6–7	22
		24:7	19, 204
Leviticus		24:10–22	22
7:7–12	235	25	22
12:3	1	25:1–3	22
15:24	162	25:4	21–23
17:7	27	29:26	183
18:5	235	30:6	225
18:22	162	32	26, 27
19:17	204	32:1–43	25
19:18	45	32:16–17	27
20:13	162	32:4	26, 27
20:21	162	32:8–14	26
		32:8–9	183
Numbers		32:8	56
25	183, 196	32:15	27
		32:17	26, 27
Deuteronomy		32:18	27
3:18	204	32:21	27, 183

Deuteronomy (<i>cont.</i>)		24:3–4	29
32:30	27	45:10	55
32:31	27	78	25
32:36–38	27	80:18	32
		82:1	183
Joshua		82:2	55
1:8	225	82:6	55
		94	17
Judges		94:1–3	17
20:13	19, 204	94:8–10	17
21:6	204	94:10	15
		94:11	17, 18
1 Samuel		94:12–23	18
9:13	183	94:12–15	18
		94:13	17
1 Kings		94:14	18
1:25	183	94:23	17
2:19	32	104:24	29
		106	25
2 Chronicles		106:28	183
19:10	204	106:36–39	183
28:15	111	106:37	27
		110	32
Esther		110:1	31, 32, 108
1:20	107	110:2–3	32
		110:2	32
Nehemiah		110:3	32
5:1	204	110:5–6	32
9:5–37	25	110:5	32
		110:6	32
Job		119:1–3	214
5:13	15–17	119:5	214
22:6	111	119:15	225
24:7	111	119:23	225
24:10	111	119:48	225
30:29	204	119:78	225
31:19	111	119:148	225
38:3–13	17		
42:7–9	17	Proverbs	
		12:9	107
Psalms		14:18	136
1:2	225	14:24	136
2:4	32	16:31	136
4:5	55	18:24	204
4:9	55	23:31	111
8	32		
8:3–5	32	Song of Solomon	
8:4–5	33	3:11	136
8:5–8	33		
8:7	31–33	Ecclesiastes	
8:10	32, 33	10:2	32
22:22	204		
24	29	Isaiah	
24:1	27–29	6:9–10	10

Isaiah (<i>cont.</i>)		61:1	15
8:19	183	63:10	15
9:5	10	63:17	10
15	34	64:3	13, 14
19:3	183	65:17	13, 14
19:14	8	66:20	204
22	33, 34		
22:11	33	Jeremiah	
22:13	33	3:17	226
22:14	34	8:9	12
24:23	35	9:18	12
25	35	9:22	12
25:1	35	9:23–24	11, 12
25:4	36	9:24	12
25:6	35	22:18	204
25:8–9	35, 224	31:31–34	221
25:8	35, 36, 85	31:32–34	226
26:3	224, 229		
26:12	224	Ezekiel	
26:19	224	16:7–8	111
27:5	224	16:39	111
28	30	18:7	111
28:1–10	30	18:16	111
28:7	30	23:29	111
28:10	30	36:26–27	221
28:11–12	29, 30	36:27	225
28:29	10		
29:9–10	10	Daniel	
29:14	8–10, 12	4:31	111
32:11	111		
40	15	Hosea	
40:5	15	2:3	111
40:12	15	8:13	183
40:13	14, 15, 225	13	36
40:14	15	13:14	36
40:23	15		
40:28	29	Amos	
42:1	15	2:16	111
42:5	29	4:3	111
42:18–20	10	4:13	29
44:18	10		
45:12	29	Micah	
48:16	15	1:8	111
54:1	61, 62	4:5	183
54:2–3	61		
54:10	61	Zechariah	
58:7	111	11:14	204
59:30	90		

OLD TESTAMENT APOCRYPHA

Bar		3:32	29
3:20–28	16	4:7	27
3:29–37	17		

Bel		15:29	135
1:5	29	17:11–16	135
		24:22	236
Sus			
42–43	17, 18	Sir	
		1:11	136
Jdt		1:18	136
2:2–3	16	6:31	136
7:30	204	16:17–20	33
8:14	15, 204	17:1	29
9:12	29	18:29	129
13:18	29	19:6	129
		26:15	129
1 Maccabees		38:4	29
1:11–15	54	40:2	222
2:61–64	17, 18	40:5	222
5:16	204	49:14	29
11:30	204		
12:10	204	Tob	
12:17	204	1:3	204
		1:10	204
2 Maccabees		1:16	111, 204
1:1	204	4:16	111
7:37	216	5:3	127
11:5	131	5:10–14	204
11:12	111	7:1–12	204
12:29	131	9:5	127
14:38	216	10:6	204
		14:4	204
3 Maccabees			
1–2	16	Wisdom	
1:3	128	1:14	29
6:19–29	10	4:2	136
13:54–55	15	5:16	136
		6:15	213
4 Maccabees		7:26	227
1:1	218	7:27	219
1:9	218	8:17	213
1:29	218	8:21	129
2:6	236	9:10	227
2:18	218	9:13–18	17, 18
2:21–22	218	9:13–17	15
3:2–5	218	9:13	14
5:1–4	183	9:15	76
5:34	129	9:17	14
7:10a	235	13–16	183
10:2	128	13:1–2	17
11:20	135	14:12	162
13:1–2	218	14:26–27	162
13:15	135	17:7–11	16

OLD TESTAMENT PSEUDEPIGRAPHIA

1 Enoch		4:1–12	17
5:9	226	4:10–11	15
19	183	5:9–13	10
22:7	217	5:33–40	15
41:1–3	13	6:38ff.	29
51:3	32	6:38–59	33
52:1–4	13	7:78	217
55:4	32	13:29–32	10
61:8	32		
62:2	32	Apoc. Ezek.	
91:8–11	226	1–2	216
91:14–15	10		
91:17	226	Apocalypse of Moses	
92:5	226	13:6	217
93:8	10	32:4	217
93:11–14	15	33:2	217
102:5	211, 216		
107:1	226	Jos. Asen.	
108:3	226	27:10/8	217
1 Esdras		Jubilees	
1:5–9	204	7:7–9	111
4:61	204	11:4–6	183
8:77	204	15:33–34	54
		20:6–8	162
2 Barnabas		22:22	162
14:8–11	15	50:5	226
48:31–37	10		
70:3–6	10	Pss. Sol.	
75:1–5	15	8:20	16
		14:6–10	17, 18
2 Enoch		17:32	226
9:1–4	111		
33:4	15	Sib. Or.	
42:8	111	3:8–10	17
		3:24–35	17
4 Ezra		8:45	128
3:1–5	33		

RABBINIC LITERATURE AND OTHER JEWISH LITERATURE

'Abot R. Nat.		b. B. Mesi'a	
16A	217, 218	89a	23
16, §36 B	217		
35, §77	214	b. Git.	
		62a	23
Aristobulus			
frag. 4	126	b. Ketub.	
frag. 4:6	129	30b	35
frag. 4:8	125		
		b. Mak.	
b. Ber.		23a	23
10a	216		
60b	216	b. Pesah	
		68a	35

b. Sanh.		m. Sota	
19ab	23	7.8	204
b. Yebam.		m. Yad.	
4a	23	4.7	23
bar. Yoma		Mek. Shirata	
20b	216	3.43–44	227
Eccl. Rab.		Pes. Rab Kah. Sup.	
1:7	35	3:2	217, 218
6:6–7, §1	216	<i>Sifra Qed.</i>	
<i>Exod. Rab.</i>		Par. 1.195.1.3	227
15:21	35	<i>Sipre Deut.</i>	
30:3	35	45.1.2	218
Gen. Rab.		306.28.2	211, 217
14:3	216	306.28.3	216
14:9	217	t. Aboda Zara	
<i>L.A.B.</i>		6.4–6	194
3:10	216	T. Abr.	
28:6	219	1:24–25A	217
40:4	10	4:9	217
49	17, 18	9:10B	217
Lam. Rab.		T. Ash.	
1:41	35	1:7–9	213
<i>Let. Aris.</i>		2:6	216
139	216	4:3	139, 227
227	213	Tg. Qoh.	
236	211, 213, 216, 236	on Eccl 10:4	218
237–38	213	T. Iss.	
243	213	4:3	213
244	213	4:4	213
278	129	T. Jacob	
Lev. Rab.		2:23	111
22.8	27	7.20	162
<i>m. Aboda Zara</i>		7:25	111
1.4–5	183	T. Job	
2.3	183	4:7–11	136
3.4	183	20:3	216
4.3–6	183	48:2	221
5.1	183	T. Jud.	
m. B. Mesi'a		14:3	217
7.2	23	19:4	215
m. Mo'ed Qat.			
3:9	35		

T. Moses		t. Sanh.	
10:1	226	13:2	216
T. Naph.		T. Sim.	
2:2–3	216	2:5	216
3.2–4	162	4:4	219
3.3–4	161	4:8	216
8:8	129		
T. Reub.		T. Zeb.	
4:8	213	7:1	111
		9:7	215

QUMRAN LITERATURE

1Q34bis		5.18b–20	17
f3i.5	214	5.25	204
		6.10	204
1QH		6.22	204
7.32–33	15	8.25	214
9.14–16	215	10.22	215
10.1–4	15	11.9	215
10.19	30	11.12	215
12.16	30	11.18–20	15
1QHa		1QSa	
8.35	215	1.18	204
9.38	215		
12.30–31	215	4Q	
17.13	215	184 1–3	17
22.33	215	184 8–11	17
		184 13–15	17
1QM		255 f2.1	214
1.11	214	403 f1i.22	215
13.16	214	404 f2.3	215
14.7	215	405 f3ii.13; f13.6	215
		491	32
1QS		491 f8–10i.5	215
1.9	204		
3.7	226	11QTgJob	
2.24–25	204	30.1–10	17
4.18–20	226		
4.21	214	CD	
4.22	214	6.20	204
4.23	226	7.1	204

NEW TESTAMENT

Matthew		19:28–30	159
5:27–30	168	22:44	31
5:33–37	166	25:36	111
5:38–48	169	25:38	111
14:24	131	25:43	111

Matthew (<i>cont.</i>)		12:21	127
25:44	111	13:14–51	127
26:64	31	13:15	204
27:19	127	13:26	204
27:28	106	13:38	204
		14:1–6	146
Mark		14:11	297
10:6	219	15	51, 56, 61, 64, 187
10:35–45	176	15:7–9	51
12:36	31	15:19–21	51
12:41–44	155	15:20	51
14:62	31	15:29	51
16:19	31	16	51, 56, 306
		16:1–3	51
Luke		16:12–40	130
1:1–4	315	16:37–38	317, 321, 323
2:1	128	16:37	3, 306
4:16–28	146	17	138
12:15	304	17:1–9	146
14:7–11	159	17:7	128
20:42–43	31	17:10–15	146
22:69	31	17:16–31	210
		17:17	146
John		17:18	210
5:21	304	17:23	210
6:19	131	17:29	210
8:43–44	272	17:30–31	210
11:18	131	18:1–17	130
13:1–11	110	18:1–12	146
14:16–17	85	18:11	130
16:13	85	18:12–17	127
		18:19–21	130
Acts		18:19	146
1:1	315	18:22–23	64
2:5	210	18:22	130
2:7	54	19:1–41	130
2:8–9	54	19:9	146
2:14	54	19:16	111
2:15	54	20:1b–2	294
2:29	204	21	306
2:33–34	31	21:8–14	130
3	54	21:17–26	51
3:17	204	21:17–21	57
5:31	31	21:25	189
6:1	291	21:37	3, 290
7:2	204	21:40	149
7:38	55	21:39	317, 321
7:52–53	55	22	306
7:55–56	31	22:1	204
7:58	2	22:2	149, 292
8:1	2	22:3	2, 149, 290
9:1–2	2	22:4–5	2
9:5	2	22:22–29	323, 326
10:35	210	22:25–28	3, 317, 321, 323
11:18	54	22:25	306

Acts (*cont.*)

22:28	317	2:17–24	118
22:37–38	307	2:19–20a	255
23–26	300	2:22–24	255
23:1	204	2:24	13
23:6	2	2:27	54
25	307	2:28	225
25:6	127	3:1–2	152
25:9	307	3:4	13
25:10	127	3:8	255
25:17	127	3:10–18	13
26:4	149	3:10	13
26:5	2	3:13	118
26:10–11	2	3:17	224
26:14	149, 291	3:20	11, 48, 118, 225, 235
26:40	291	3:21–24	118
28:16	146	3:21	47
28:17	204	3:23	118
28:30	146	3:27–31	161

Romans

1:4	81, 160	4	226
1:5	254	4:1–5	153
1:8	268	4:4–5	170
1:13	295	4:13–14	153
1:15	295	4:15	48, 235, 236
1:16	301	4:17	13
1:17	13	5–8	239, 253
1:19–23	162	5:1–11	118
1:19–21	118, 218	5:1–10	118
1:19	118	5:1	86, 224
1:20	118	5:2	304
1:21	219	5:3–4	118
1:22	118	5:5	86
1:23	219	5:6–10	198
1:24–28	161	5:6	167
1:24–27	219	5:7	118
1:24	162, 237, 218	5:12–21	118
1:25	162	5:12–19	210
1:26–27	118	5:13–14	235
1:26	161, 162	5:13	236
1:27	112, 161	5:20	235, 236
1:29–31	118	6:1–10	118
2:1	118	6:1–2	226
2:4	118, 168	6:1	255
2:5	118	6:2–11	226
2:10	118	6:3–11	88
2:11	157	6:3–4	226
2:12–14	235	6:3	226
2:13	49	6:4	226
2:14–15	118	6:6	218, 226
2:15	118	6:7	118
2:16	166	6:9	226
2:17–29	254	6:10	305
		6:11	226
		6:12–23	119, 226
		6:12–13	218

Romans (<i>cont.</i>)		8:3	47, 267, 273
6:12	119	8:4–5	157
6:13	218	8:4	225, 259, 275, 276
6:15	255	8:5–11	259
6:20	305	8:5–7	218
6:23	119	8:6–7	212
7	69, 218, 232, 239, 240, 234, 251–53, 255	8:6	213, 222, 224, 225
7:2–3	119	8:8	218
7:5	215, 218, 225, 252	8:9–26	86
7:6	157, 221, 225, 226	8:9–11	259
7:7–25	231, 235, 237, 251, 254–56	8:9	215, 220, 276
7:7–23	119	8:10	119, 218
7:7–12	234, 236, 237, 256	8:11	86, 224, 227, 276
7:7–11	252	8:12–17	266, 276, 279, 287
7:7	46	8:12–13	226
7:7b	236, 253	8:12	277
7:7c	236	8:13	218, 276
7:8	236	8:13b	276, 277, 287
7:8b–10	237	8:14–23	281
7:9–10	237	8:14	225, 276, 277, 287
7:9a	235	8:15	154, 261, 267, 268, 270, 274, 276, 279, 285–87
7:10	235	8:16–17	86
7:11	237	8:16	119
7:12	47	8:17–18	223
7:13	234	8:17	272, 273, 281
7:14–25	234, 237, 253, 256	8:18–25	260, 266, 279, 281, 285, 287
7:14–17	119	8:19–22	280, 284, 287
7:14	225, 237–39	8:19	280, 282
7:15–24	229	8:20	282
7:15	119, 238	8:21	282
7:16	238, 253	8:22	282
7:16b	238	8:23–25	284, 287
7:17	239	8:23	154, 227, 261, 279, 280, 284–87
7:17b	239	8:24a	280
7:18–19	253	8:26–28	154
7:18	238, 239	8:26–27	167
7:19–21	119	8:27	225
7:19	238	8:28–29	157
7:19a	239	8:28	119
7:20	238, 239	8:29	154, 227
7:21	238	8:31–39	166
7:22–23	119, 229	8:34	31
7:22	47, 238, 239, 251	8:35–39	223
7:23–25	215, 218, 252	8:36	13
7:23	218, 238–40, 251	8:38–39	192
7:24	119, 218	9:3	119, 203
7:24b	240	9:4–5	152
7:25	218, 225, 238, 240, 251	9:4	259, 286
8	275, 286	9:5	153
8:1–17	233, 256	9:6b–18	153
8:2–4	221, 225	9:10	153
8:2	119, 218, 225, 259		
8:3–4	225		

Romans (*cont.*)

9:13	13	13:6–10	170
9:15–16	171	13:7	120
9:18	171	13:7b	159
9:19	119	13:8–10	172
9:23	171	13:9–10	165
9:25–26	13	13:11–14	70, 154
9:33	13, 304	13:11	120, 167
10:3–4	152	13:12	120
10:4	153	13:13	161
10:12	176	14:3–4	161
10:15	13	14:10	127, 133, 161
11:1	152	14:13	161, 161
11:2	18	14:17	90
11:5–6	170	14:19	120, 161, 224
11:8	13	15:1b	157
11:13	254	15:3	13
11:17–24	261	15:5	228
11:18	161	15:7–9	158, 165
11:25–27	90	15:7	161
11:26–27	13	15:9	13, 171
11:26	13, 90	15:13	120
11:28b	152	15:19–26	295
11:34–35	13	15:19	292, 294
11:34	119	15:21	13
11:35	170	15:22–25	295
11:36	119	16	254
12:1–2	165	16:1–23	159
12:1	13, 119, 218, 227	16:1–5	225
12:2–3	218	16:7	225
12:2	226, 275	16:17–20	254, 255
12:3	119, 227, 228	16:17b	254
12:4–8	229	16:20	108, 192
12:4–6	228	16:25	166
12:4–5	119, 149	16:27	120
12:8	171	1 Corinthians	
12:9	156, 169	1:1	9
12:10b	159, 169	1:4–9	168
12:11	119	1:10–18	8
12:14–15	169	1:10–11	10
12:15–16	119	1:10	9
12:16	228	1:11–12	197
12:16b	169	1:11	9, 197
12:17–21	157	1:12–13	161
12:17	119, 168	1:17–18	9
12:17b	157	1:17	16
12:18	119, 224	1:18–3:23	16
12:19–21	169	1:18–2:5	16
12:20	120	1:18–29	162
12:21	156, 169	1:18–25	16, 17, 120
13	254	1:18–19	163
13:1–2	120	1:18	10, 16
13:3b	159	1:19	9–11
13:4	120	1:20	10, 143, 167

1 Corinthians (<i>cont.</i>)		4:10–13	162
1:23–24	15	4:10	115
1:23	160	4:11	115
1:25	163	4:14–20	161
1:26–31	11, 12, 120	4:15	261
1:26–29	159, 167	4:20	90, 167
1:26	9, 11	4:21	143
1:27–29	11	5	18, 19, 194, 208
1:27–28	11	5:1–13	112, 160
1:27	12	5:1–8	207
1:29	11	5:1	197
1:30–32	33	5:2	19
1:30	15	5:3	59
1:31	11	5:6–8	19, 20
2:1	9	5:9–13	199
2:2	15	5:9–12	207
2:3–5	167	5:9	207
2:4	120	5:10	207
2:6–16	16	5:11	20, 161, 203, 207
2:6	15	5:11–12	19
2:7–8	14, 153	5:12–13	207
2:8	15, 192	5:12	18, 19
2:9–10	120	5:13	18, 19, 207
2:9	13, 120	6:1–11	120, 199
2:10	15, 120	6:9–10	90, 160, 161
2:11–12	225	6:5–8	203
2:11	120	6:6–8	197
2:12–16	14, 15	6:9	120
2:14	120	6:10	161
2:16	14, 15, 224, 225	6:12–20	20, 112
3	9, 16, 17	6:12–13	20
3:1–4	143	6:12	120, 161
3:1	9	6:15–20	120
3:3–4	197	6:15–17	20
3:4–9	161	6:15	20
3:5–9	143	6:16–17	21
3:6–8	261	6:16	20
3:6–7	17	6:18	164
3:7–10	166	6:19–20	120
3:10	120, 149	7–11	199
3:13–15	120	7:1–5	177
3:16–22	161	7:1	120, 197
3:16–17	120, 161	7:2	120
3:16	120	7:3	120
3:18–23	16	7:7	120
3:18–19	16	7:9	132
3:18	17	7:10–16	208
3:19	16, 17	7:11	121
3:20	17, 18	7:12–16	121, 161, 199
3:21–23	17	7:12–15	203
3:21–22	17	7:15	224
3:23	16	7:17–24	143
4:6	9, 36, 143, 161	7:18	57
4:7	170	7:21–23	121
4:8–13	15	7:22	161

1 Corinthians (<i>cont.</i>)		10:6	24
7:24	203	10:7–10	24
7:25	171	10:7	24
7:29–31	121	10:10–11	167
7:29	167, 203	10:11–12	24
7:32–35	121	10:11	26, 166, 227
7:35	112	10:11b	167
7:36	112, 113	10:13	26, 26
8	106, 179, 189, 199, 203, 204	10:14–22	160
8:1–11:1	197, 200, 203	10:14	164
8–10	24, 25, 181, 196, 201, 202, 208	10:16–22	196
8:1–13	23, 24, 28, 161	10:19	26, 27
8:1–3	200	10:20	27
8:1	180, 197	10:22	27
8:2	167	10:23–11:1	28, 161
8:4–6	23	10:23–33	24, 121
8:4	26, 121, 180, 198	10:23–31	202
8:5b	192	10:23–30	200
8:6	121, 180, 192, 197	10:23	28, 121
8:7–13	23, 121, 186, 200	10:24	157, 207
8:7	180, 181, 186, 189, 198	10:25	28, 181, 189, 305
8:9–13	192	10:26	27–29
8:10	121, 180, 181, 186, 191	10:27	200, 201
8:11–12	161	10:28–29	201
8:11	161, 180, 186, 192, 198, 203	10:28	200
8:12	180, 198	10:30	29
8:13	23, 195	10:31	29
9	21, 23	10:32–33	207
9:1–7	21	10:33–11:1	165
9:5	204	10:33	157
9:8	21, 23	11:1	121, 158, 207
9:9–13	23	11:2–16	199
9:9	21	11:3	121
9:10–11	23	11:4–16	121
9:10	121	11:6	167
9:13–23	121	11:7	219
9:19–23	189, 199, 209	11:8–9	36
9:22	189	11:11–12	173, 177
9:23	23	11:14	121
9:24–27	130, 143, 146, 149	11:17–34	121
9:24	131	11:17–22	161
9:25	121, 159	11:18–19	197
9:25b	149	11:22–23	114
10	21, 24, 26, 29, 199	11:23	114
10:1–22	192	11:24	113
10:1–10	23, 24, 26	11:25	114
10:1–5	24	11:26	81, 121
10:1	204	11:27–32	121, 199
10:5–22	196	11:27–29	121
		11:29–30	201
		11:29	113
		11:33	113, 204
		12	94, 104, 105, 199
		12:1	204

1 Corinthians (<i>cont.</i>)		15:1	204, 304
12:2	277	15:3	198
12:6	121	15:6	204
12:12–31	112	15:9	1
12:12–27	121	15:12–34	31
12:12–13	149	15:12	31
12:12	93, 94, 98	15:13	31
12:13	95, 110, 177	15:14–19	31
12:14	97	15:18	1, 22
12:15–16	97	15:20	85
12:15	109	15:21–22	34
12:17	97	15:21	31
12:18–20	97	15:22	122
12:18	304	15:23	89
12:21	97, 98, 109	15:24	32
12:22–25	114	15:24–27	192
12:22–24	97, 98	15:24–26	31
12:22	99, 104	15:24–25	90
12:23–24	108, 112, 113	15:24	90
12:23	106, 107	15:25–28	33
12:24–26	97, 98	15:25	31, 32, 108
12:24	110, 159	15:27–28	219
12:26	98	15:27	31, 32, 108
12:27	98	15:28	122, 160
12:28	304	15:31	204
12:29–30	98	15:33	122
13:1–13	121	15:34	33, 34
13:2–4	121	15:35–54	122
13:5	113	15:35–36	34
13:9–12	121	15:37–44	87
13:11	121	15:42	219
13:12	121	15:44–45	34
13:13	122	15:45–49	210
14	29, 30, 199,	15:47–48	35
	199	15:49	35
14:2	199	15:50–57	77
14:6–20	30	15:50–53	35
14:6	204	15:50	35, 90, 204, 219
14:11	305	15:51–52	35, 76
14:16–17	121	15:52b–53	133
14:16	30	15:53–54	219
14:20	204	15:54–55	13
14:21	29, 30, 47	15:54	36
14:22–25	193, 199, 200	15:55	36
14:22	30	15:56	36, 235
14:23–25	30	15:57	35, 36
14:23	30	15:58	204, 223
14:25	166	16:9	305
14:26	204	16:10	159
14:33	224	16:11–12	204
14:34	122	16:11	224
14:39	204	16:15	204
15	31–33, 35, 77, 85,	16:20	204
	86	16:21	290
15:1–11	62	16:22	81

2 Corinthians

1-9	69	7:10	168
1:3-11	122	8:1-5	158
1:9	303	8:1-3	155
1:17-20	157, 166	8:9	123, 155, 158, 160,
1:17-23	169		167
1:22	85, 227	8:9a	163
1:23	157, 166	8:15	13
2:5	304	8:16-24	159
2:13	303	8:21	168
2:14	122, 305	8:23	153
3:3	122, 221	9:7	123
3:6	221	9:8	129
3:17-18	167	9:9	13
3:18	149, 153, 154, 219,	9:10-11	156
	227	9:14	156
4:1	171	9:15	123, 155
4:2	122	10:4	123
4:4	122, 153, 192, 219,	10:10	161
	227	11:2	1
4:5	122	11:6	161
4:6	122, 153	11:7	163
4:7-12	162, 167	11:14	123
4:8	122	11:16-12:10	163
4:10-12	122	11:21-12:10	153, 167
4:13-14	223	11:21b-23a	152
4:14	86	11:22	149
4:15	155	11:24	57
4:16	122	11:25	303
4:17	122, 281	11:26	123
4:18	122, 168	11:30-33	157, 166
5:1-10	70, 76, 77, 80, 86	11:30	167
5:1-8	122	12:2	303
5:1	77, 78, 122	12:9b-10	167
5:2-4	122	12:10	123
5:2	77	12:21	168
5:3	87, 122	13:4	155, 163, 167
5:4	88	13:4a	160
5:5	85	13:11	224
5:6-8	223		
5:8	88, 167	Galatians	
5:10	122, 127, 133	1:1	53, 123, 268, 269
5:14-15	198	1:3	268, 269
5:17	122	1:4	81, 123, 227, 268, 269
6:2	167	1:6-9	268
6:4-10	167	1:6	63, 268, 269
6:8-10	163	1:7	62
6:10	122, 158	1:8-10	160
6:14-7:1	160	1:10	123
6:16b	155	1:11-24	59
7:3	122	1:13-14	2
7:4	122	1:14	43, 50, 149, 152
7:9	168	1:15	268
		1:17	3

Galatians (<i>cont.</i>)		4:3	56
1:23	2	4:4–6	267
2	60, 62	4:4	167
2:1–10	59, 64	4:5	259, 273, 274, 286,
2:2–3	59		287
2:4	62	4:6	267, 272
2:7–9	51	4:8	53, 55
2:10	303	4:11	63
2:11–14	59, 64, 161	4:12	63
2:13	62, 123	4:19	154, 268, 283
2:14–3:1	60	4:20	63
2:14	154	4:21	55
2:15	2, 60	4:24	303
2:16	11, 48	4:27	62
2:19	88, 123	5:1	47
2:21	48	5:2	57, 58, 268
3	61	5:8	268, 269
3:1–14	60	5:12	268
3:1–5	268	5:14	165
3:1–2	270	5:15	123
3:1	54, 168	5:16–23	225
3:2	225	5:16	123, 237
3:3–7	270	5:17	11, 123
3:3	270	5:18	225
3:4–5	270	5:19–23	123
3:5	225	5:21	90, 161
3:8	61	5:22–23	129
3:10–14	13	5:23	225
3:10–13	62	5:24	123, 237
3:10	61	6:2	165
3:11	48	6:3	123
3:13	47, 60	6:4	123
3:13b	160	6:7	123
3:14	60, 61	6:10	271
3:15–29	236	6:11–17	290
3:15–20	47	6:12–15	62
3:15–18	153	6:12–13	53
3:19–25	55	6:12	55, 57
3:19	47	6:13	268
3:21	47	6:15	161
3:22	123, 235	6:16	171
3:23–25	48	6:17	159
3:23	270	6:18	290
3:24–25	128		
3:24	123	Ephesians	
3:26–29	55	1:5	123, 259, 271, 286
3:26	270	1:11–12	271
3:27	57	1:12–14	85
3:28	123, 161, 173, 177	1:18	167, 168
4	61	1:19–21	166
4:1–2	123, 269	1:20–22	32
4:1–7	55, 266, 269	1:20–21	160
4:2b	270	1:20	31
4:3–7	269	1:22	219

Ephesians (<i>cont.</i>)		5:25a	170, 173
2:2	271	5:25b	170
2:3	237	5:27	124
2:4	171	5:29b	174, 176
2:5–7	88	5:30	176
2:6	154, 166, 221	5:32	176
2:7	88	5:33	176
2:8–10	154	5:33b	173
2:11–3:13	177	6:1–2	124
2:11–22	161	6:4	169
2:11–19	58	6:7	170
2:14–17	123	6:18–19	154
2:14	123, 169		
2:15	128	Philippians	
2:18	86	1:3	268
2:20–21	154	1:6	168
2:22	86	1:9–11	154
3:3	166, 271	1:13	305
3:6	166	1:20–21	223
3:14	123	1:21	124, 167
3:16–17	123	1:23	81, 88, 124
3:16	123	1:24	124
3:18	305	2:3–5	165
3:19a	170	2:4–5	159
3:20	123	2:4	157
4:1–6	177	2:5–8	155
4:2	123	2:7	163
4:11–16	149	2:6–11	124
4:15–16	154	2:7–8	159, 160
4:14	123	2:8–9	124
4:18	123	2:9–11	152, 160
4:22–24	154	2:10	192
4:22	275	2:12–13	168
4:28	157	2:16	134
4:29	123	2:27	171
5:1–2	159	3:4b–6	152
5:5	90	3:5–6	1, 50
5:6	271	3:5	149, 291
5:12–13	166	3:7–11	152
5:16	167	3:8–10	154
5:18–33	177	3:10	167
5:18	161	3:12–13	124
5:18b–20	176	3:13–14	133
5:18b	176	3:17	159
5:20	123	3:19–30	159
5:21–6:9	177	3:19–20	90
5:21	176	3:19	124
5:21b	176	3:20–4:1	149
5:22	176	3:20–21	81, 153, 154
5:23–24	176	3:20	124
5:23b	174	3:21	219
5:24	176	4:1	159
5:24b	176	4:2–3	224
5:25–27	174, 176	4:4	124
5:25	176	4:5	81

Philippians (*cont.*)

4:6	124
4:7	224
4:8-9	154
4:8	169
4:11-13	124
4:11	124, 129
4:12	167
4:18	124

Colossians

1:9-12	214
1:13	90
1:15-16	124
1:17	124
1:18	124
1:26	124
1:27-28	154
1:29	134
2:6-8	154
2:8-23	55
2:12	88
2:14	124, 127, 128
2:15	127, 305
2:16	29
2:18	124
2:19	154
3:1-4	88
3:1-2	154, 221
3:1	31, 124
3:2	124
3:4	90
3:5	237, 275
3:9-10	154
3:11	154, 161, 177
3:16-17	154
3:16	124
3:18-4:1	124
3:18	173, 174
3:19a	173
3:19b	170, 174
4:5-6	168
4:5	167
4:7-17	159, 168
4:11	90
4:16	165
4:18	290

Philemon

15-16	161
19	290

1 Thessalonians

1:3-7	90
1:6-7	159

1:9-10	81, 190
2:3-4	80, 81
2:5-6	124
2:5	124, 167
2:7	154, 283
2:8	154
2:9	163
2:11	154
2:12	90
2:14	159
2:15	124
2:19	133, 159
2:20	153
4	75
4:5	237
4:6	124
4:9	124
4:11	124, 163
4:13ff.	81
4:13-18	76, 89, 124
4:13-17	90
4:13	87, 124, 223
4:14	86
4:17	90
5:1-10	75, 90
5:10	88
5:15	157
5:18	124
5:21	156, 169
5:27	165

2 Thessalonians

1:9	303
2:3	89
2:6	89
2:7	89
2:8	89
2:16-17	154
3:3	304
3:6-7	154
3:7-8	163
3:7	159
3:9-10	154
3:17	290

1 Timothy

1:10	125
1:13	2
1:17	125
2:1-2	125
3:4-5	125
3:4	125
3:16	125
4:2	125
4:4	29

1 Timothy (<i>cont.</i>)		2:5	125
4:7–8	146, 149	2:6	125
4:7	138	2:9–10	125
4:8	142	2:12	125
4:10	134	3:2	125
5:1	125		
5:18	125	Hebrews	
6:3	125	1:3	31
6:6	129	1:13	31
6:7	125	2:14–15	222
6:8	125	4:13	111
6:10	125	8:1	31
6:12	134	10:12f	31
6:15	125	12:2	31
6:16	125		
		James	
2 Timothy		1:12	159
2:5	149, 159	2:15	111
2:7	125	2:19	183
2:22	125		
2:25	168	1 Peter	
3:2	125	2:14–16	159
3:5	125	3:22	31, 32
3:8–9	125	5:4	159
3:16	169		
4:3	125	Revelation	
4:8	159	2:10	111
4:10	295	2:14	189
4:13	305, 306	2:19–20	189
		3:11	159
Titus		3:17	111
1:2	304	14:20	131
1:9	125	16:15	111
1:12	125	17:16	111
2:1–8	125	21:4	35

EARLY CHRISTIAN AUTHORS

2 Clement		Clement of Alexandria,	
7:3–4	132	<i>Paedagogus</i>	
		2.11	111
Ambrose, <i>Books on the Duties</i>		3.3.17	111
of the Clergy		3.3.25	111
1.18	111		
Augustine, <i>C. Jul.</i>		Clement of Alexandria, <i>Stromata</i>	
70	217	5.14	119, 126
		Eusebius, <i>Praep. Ev.</i>	
Augustine, <i>Reply to Faustus the</i>		3.9.2	124
<i>Manichaeae</i>		6.7.36	119
29	110	9.8	125
		13.12.6–7	126
Augustine, <i>Contin.</i>			
10.24	217		

Ignatius, <i>Eph.</i>		<i>Mart. Pol.</i>	
15:3	85	6:2	131
		8:3	131
Ignatius, <i>Magn.</i>		9:1–2	131
8–10	189	12:1	131
Jerome, <i>Ol.</i>		Nicetas, Bishop of Heraclea,	
173.4	312	<i>Catena on Job</i>	
		1	111
Justin, 1 <i>Apol.</i>		Origen, <i>Against Celsus</i>	
1.69	127	3.44	120
Justin, 2 <i>Apol.</i>		3.59	120
12	138	3.64	120
Justin, <i>Dial.</i>		Polycarp, <i>Phil</i>	
35	189	1:1–2	32
Lactantius, <i>Inst.</i>		Tertullian, <i>Apol.</i>	
7.21.3–6	120	9.13–14	189

HELLENISTIC JEWISH LITERATURE

Josephus <i>Ag. Ap.</i>		2.163	217
2.199	161	2.224	111
2.203	211, 216	3.372	216
2.273	161	7.340	216
2:273–275	162	7.341–348	217
		7.348	216
Josephus <i>Ant.</i>		Philo, <i>Abr.</i>	
1.140	111	38	227
12.241	111	56	34
14.137	313	57	221
14.188	128	80	221
14.221	128	133–136	161
14.223–227	318	164	217
14.228–232	318	258	217
14.234	318		
14.236–240	318	Philo, <i>Agr.</i>	
14.338	128	64	217
15.196	128	112	135
15.270	111	119	135
16.137	111		
17.353	216	Philo, <i>Cher.</i>	
17.354	217	80	135
18.14	217		
18.16	217	Philo, <i>Contempl.</i>	
18.18	213, 217	7	205
		42	135
Josephus, <i>War</i>		Philo, <i>Decal.</i>	
1.84	217	142–153	235
1.650	216		
2.122	204		
2.154	217		

Philo, <i>Det.</i>		Philo, <i>Opif.</i>	
2	135	78	135
40	205	139	227
66	205		
140	204	Philo, <i>Plant.</i>	
145	128	43	217
Philo, <i>Deus</i>		Philo, <i>Post.</i>	
111	217	61	124
46–48	220	96	217
Philo, <i>Ebr.</i>		100	205
70–71	205	155	217
Philo, <i>Flacc.</i>		Philo, <i>QG</i>	
92	131	1.65–77	204
Philo, <i>Fug</i>		2.12	205
90–91	205	2.60	204, 205
Philo, <i>Gig</i>		3.43	205
29–31	216, 217	3.52	57
Philo, <i>Her.</i>		3.56	205
295	128	4.138	221
Philo, <i>Leg</i>		Philo <i>Sacr.</i>	
1.1	217	51	128
1.8	205	48	217
1.31	34	Philo, <i>Prob.</i>	
2.10	220	26	135
2.16.60–62	111	Philo, <i>Somn.</i>	
2.23	220	1.138–39	217
2.28	217	92	221
3.156	218	109	205
Philo, <i>Legat.</i>		1.171	227
26–27	128	Philo, <i>Spec. Leg.</i>	
53	128	2.5–6	255
Philo, <i>Migr.</i>		2:21–3:2	255
133	135	2.61–62	255
Philo, <i>Mos.</i>		2.162–163	255
2.24	217	2.233	128
Philo, <i>Mut.</i>		2.246	135
3–6	221	3.39	161
92	221	Philo, <i>Virt.</i>	
146	221	180	129
		67	216
		82	204

GRECO-ROMAN LITERATURE

Achilles Tatius 8.9	126	Archilochus Frag. 57	119
Aelian, <i>Var. Hist.</i> 12.49 12.59	119 118	Aristophanes, <i>Nub.</i> 225	124
Aelius Aristides, <i>Or.</i> 2.409–10, §139D 4 46.42	220 124 125	Aristotle, <i>De an.</i> 1.4 408b	216
Aeschylus, <i>Ag.</i> 922 1623–24	123 126	Aristotle, <i>Eth. eud.</i> 2.7 10.9	129, 216 125
Aeschylus, <i>Eum.</i> 1014–15 690–92 647–48	124 126 126	Aristotle, <i>Eth. nic.</i> 1.7 1.12.6 1102a 4.8.8–10 6.7 7.1–11 8.9 9.8	124 216 118 120 129, 130 118 125
Aeschylus, <i>Persians</i> 93	119	Aristotle, <i>Pol.</i> 1.2.1–4 1.2.3 1.2.10 1254a 1.4 3.8.2 5.10	124 123 216 125 118 134
Aeschylus, <i>Prom.</i> 323	126	Aristotle, <i>Rhet.</i> 1.15.3–8 3.10 1410b 3.2 1405a	118 97 96
Aeschylus, <i>Sept.</i> 230–32 605	122 122	Arius Didymus, <i>Epit.</i> 2.7.5a, pp. 10–11, lines 7–9 2.7.5a, p. 10.11 2.7.5b, pp. 10–11. 16–21 2.7.5b, pp. 10–11.21–25 2.7.5b, p. 12.1–2 2.7.5b, pp. 12–13.6 2.7.5b1, p. 12.31–33 2.7.5b1, pp. 12–13. 13–22 2.7.5b1, pp. 12–13. 27–29 2.7.5b1, pp. 12f., lines 13–22	222, 228 222 212, 228 228 228 222 222 228 222 212
Aeschylus, <i>Supp.</i> 524	125		
Ammianus Marcellinus 19.12 25.3	120 124		
<i>Anthologia Latina</i> 1.13	122		
Appian, <i>Civil Wars</i> 1.35–53	311		
Apuleius, <i>Metam.</i> 11.2 11.4 11.21–24 11.24–25	126 118 118		
Aratus, <i>Phaen.</i> 5	126		

Arius Didymus, <i>Epit. (cont.)</i>		2.7.11s, pp. 100f., lines 7–10	223
2.7.5b1, pp. 12f., lines 13–16	213	5i, p. 32, lines 25–32	226
2.7.5b1, pp. 12f., lines 22–25	213	5i, p. 32, lines 25–26	227
2.7.5b1, pp. 12f., lines 31–33	223	6, p. 54.2–25	228
2.7.5b2, pp. 14–15.1–4	228	Arrian, <i>Anab.</i>	
2.7.5b2, pp. 14–15.3	228	4.9	127
2.7.5b2, pp. 14–15, line 6	228	7.2.4	216
2.7.5b2, pp. 14–15.15–16	226	Augustus, <i>Res Gestae</i>	
2.7.5b2, pp. 14–15.31–35	226	2.8	312
2.7.5b2, pp. 14f., lines 1–4	212	Aulus Gellius	
2.7.5b2, pp. 14f., lines 4–5	213	19.1.4–21	223
2.7.5b2, pp. 14f., lines 12–14	213	Aurelius Victor, <i>De Caesaribus:</i> <i>Aurelius</i>	
2.7.5b2, pp. 14f., lines 20–22	226	35	119
2.7.5b2, pp. 166–17.1–3	228	Callimachus, <i>Ceres</i>	
2.7.5b5, pp. 18–19.21–26	228	137	123
2.7.5b5, pp. 18–19.27–31	228	Callimachus, <i>Zeus</i>	
2.7.5b5, pp. 18–19.32–35	228	8	125
2.7.5b5, pp. 18f., lines 21–26	213	Catullus	
2.7.5b5, pp. 18f., lines 17–20	213	64.385	126
2.7.5b5, pp. 18f., lines 21–35	212	Cicero, <i>Acad.</i>	
2.7.5b7, pp. 20f., lines 25–26	213	1.7	123
2.7.5b7, pp. 20f., lines 28–30	218	2.8	123
2.7.5b8, pp. 22–23.5–14	213	Cicero, <i>Amic.</i>	
2.7.5b10, pp. 24–25.5–17	213	22.84	223
2.7.5b12, pp. 24–25.28–30	213	Cicero, <i>Brutus</i>	
2.7.5c, pp. 28f., lines 3–16	213	69.243	132
2.7.5c, pp. 28–29.14–15	222	Cicero, <i>Deiot.</i>	
2.7.5c, pp. 30–31.5–6	212	9.26	111
2.7.5f, pp. 30–31.23	227	Cicero, <i>Dom.</i>	
2.7.5h, pp. 32f., 19–24	226	35	264
2.7.5k, p. 34.1–4	222	Cicero, <i>Fam.</i>	
2.7.5 L, pp. 34f., lines 17–20	227	1.7	121
2.7.5 L, pp. 36–37.3–5	228	Cicero, <i>Fin.</i>	
2.7.11g, pp. 72–73.15	227	1.14.47	228
2.7.5k, pp. 34–45.1–3	223	1.7.24	265
2.7.5m, pp. 36f., lines 10–12	227	1.14.47	222,
2.7.6d, pp. 38.34–41.3	227		223
2.7.7, pp. 42–43.26	214	1.18.60	222
2.7.7g, 23–26	227	2.30.96–98	222
2.7.10a, pp. 56–57.24–30	218	4.5.11	222
2.7.10a, pp. 58–59.5–6	218		
2.7.11c, pp. 68f., lines 12–16	228		
2.7.11c, pp. 68–69.12–16	228		
2.7.11g, pp. 72f., lines 5–24	213		
2.7.11i, pp. 78f., lines 12–14.213	228		
2.7.11k, pp. 84–85.23–24	225		
2.7.11k, pp. 84–85.27–28	225		
2.7.11k, pp. 84–85.29	225		
2.7.11k, pp. 84–85.33	225		
2.7.11k, pp. 84f., lines 4–6	225		
2.7.11s, p. 100.7	223		

Cicero, <i>Fin.</i> (<i>cont.</i>)		Cleanthes, <i>Hymn to Zeus</i>	
4.24.66	214	3	126
4.24.67	214		
5.15	121	Corpus Hermeticum	
5.23	120	1.12–15	118, 124
		1.15	119
Cicero, <i>Flac.</i>		1.24–26	122
21.51	111	1.30–32	119
		7.2–3	122
Cicero, <i>Inv.</i>		9.3–4	123
2.54.164	218	10.17–18	122
		11.15	121
Cicero, <i>Leg.</i>		13.2	122
1.23.60	218, 222	13.7	119
		13.9–10	118
Cicero, <i>Nat. d.</i>		13.15	124
1.17	118	13.18	119
1.20.56	222		
1.22	119	Crates, <i>Ep.</i>	
2.4	118	4	119
3.2.5	126	7	122, 222
		34	121
Cicero, <i>Off.</i>			
1.29	119	Curtius Rufus Quintus	
1.29.102	223	4.10.21	119
1.38.136	223		
1.41	120	Demosthenes, <i>De Cor.</i>	
		92–93	159
Cicero, <i>Pis.</i>			
10.22	111	Demosthenes, <i>Philippic I</i>	
		1.10	126
Cicero, <i>Rosc. Amer.</i>			
45	126	Dio Cassius, <i>Roman History</i>	
		6	122
Cicero, <i>Resp.</i>		42.27	120
3.25.37	218	54.7.6	313
6.26.29	221	57.24.6	313
		60.24.4	313
Cicero, <i>Sen.</i>			
20.78	216	Dio Chrysostom, <i>Or.</i>	
		1–4	144
Cicero, <i>Tusc.</i>		1.13	222
1.13	118	1.45	120
1.14.31	216	3.7	212, 228
1.16	126	3.34	222
1.26	122	3.58	212
1.31.75	221	4.42–43	219
1.74	118	4.115	218
4.5	123	8.6–14	130
		8.12	130
Cicero, <i>Verr.</i>		9.10–22	130
2.5.62–63	314, 325	9.10–22	133
2.5.158–165	314	13.11–12	122
3.9.23	111		

Dio Chrysostom, <i>Or.</i> (<i>cont.</i>)		1.3.5	119
13.13	218, 223	1.4.1	222–24
14.17–18	119	1.4.3	224
32.37	212	1.4.23	119
35.2	228	1.6.14	129
56	144	1.6.40	123
62	144	1.8–9	216
80.1	288	1.9.4–6	206
		1.9.7	123
Diodorus Siculus		1.9.11–12	216
12.12	122	1.9.16	216
12.84	118	1.12.23	212
		1.13.4	206
Diogenes, <i>Ep.</i>		1.14.12–14	120
28	222	1.14.13–14	219
39	216	1.15.6–8	214
45	124	1.16.10–14	121
47	120	1.16.16	123
		1.16.20–21	119
Diogenes Laertius		1.17.25	222
1.33	123	1.18.21–23	131
1.88	118	1.24.1–2	131
1.91	120	1.29.22–29	212
1.110	126	2.1	206
2.24	129	2.1.13	222
2.71	223	2.5.4	212
3.63	216	2.8.2	219
3.92	128	2.8.9–14	120
5.52.3	145	2.8.10–11	219
7.1.25	214	2.8.14	219
7.1.110	212	2.9.19–22	123
7.1.125	214	2.10.4–5	94
7.87–103	123	2.14.7–8	212
7.92	130	2.16.11	223
8.1.28	216	2.16.28	121
8.5.83	216	2.16.42	123, 219
10.16–18	145	2.17.29	223
10.123	125	2.17.39–40	214
10.124–25	216	2.18.27–29	131
10.125	222	2.18.30	222
10.130	129	2.19	223
10.131	223	2.19.26–27	219
10.144.17	222, 223	2.19.32	212
		2.20.13	130
Dionysius of Halicarnassus, <i>Ant. Rom.</i>		2.23.30	216
5.20	312	2.24.19	226
8.62.1	216	2.24.24	122
9.52.6	217	2.26.1	119
		2.26.4	119
Empedocles		3.4.11	131
Frag. 1.2	120	3.10.8	131
		3.13.6–7	129
Epictetus <i>Diatr.</i>		3.13.17	216
1.1	216	3.21.14	121

- | | | | |
|--|----------|--|-----|
| Epictetus <i>Diatr.</i> (<i>cont.</i>) | | Euripides, <i>Iph. Taur.</i> | |
| 3.22.13–15 | 122 | 1395–96 | 126 |
| 3.22.55–56 | 120 | Euripides, <i>Orest.</i> | |
| 3.22.81–82 | 206 | 108 | 125 |
| 3.24.2–3 | 124 | 307 | 122 |
| 3.24.4–5 | 121 | Euripides, <i>Phoen.</i> | |
| 3.24.17 | 124 | 198–201 | 122 |
| 3.24.34 | 123 | Euripides, <i>Rhes.</i> | |
| 3.24.52 | 133 | 161 | 125 |
| 3.24.59–60 | 121 | Firmicus Maternus, <i>Err. Prof. rel.</i> | |
| 4.1.133 | 212 | 22.1–3 | 118 |
| 4.4.1 | 120, 121 | Gaius, <i>Inst.</i> | |
| 4.4.30–31 | 131 | 1.63 | 119 |
| 4.7.9 | 123 | 2.136 | 265 |
| 4.7.15 | 216 | Galen, <i>On Hippocrates' On the Nature of Man</i> | |
| 4.10.21 | 127 | 134–135 | 102 |
| 4.12.19 | 124 | Galen, <i>On the Natural Faculties</i> | |
| 7.22 | 206 | 3.13.187–195 | 102 |
| 9.22–23 | 206 | 135 | 104 |
| Epictetus, <i>Ench.</i> | | Galen, <i>On the Opinions of Hippocrates and Plato</i> | |
| 8 | 224 | 4.6.1–2 | 121 |
| 12–13 | 214 | 4.7 | 120 |
| 26 | 119 | Greek Anth. | |
| 51.2 | 214 | 7.109 | 216 |
| Euripides | | Heliodorus, <i>Aeth.</i> | |
| Frag. 839 | 122 | 3 | 126 |
| Euripides, <i>Bacch.</i> | | Heraclitus, <i>Ep.</i> | |
| 325–26 | 126 | 5 | 227 |
| 325 | 126 | 9 | 216 |
| 443–49 | 126 | Herodotus | |
| 794–95 | 126 | 2.123 | 216 |
| Euripides, <i>Cyclops</i> | | 3.117 | 126 |
| 210 | 124 | 7.619.47–49 | 132 |
| 229 | 132 | 8.75 | 128 |
| Euripides, <i>Daughters of Troy</i> | | 9.33.2 | 132 |
| 651–56 | 122 | Hesiod, <i>Theog.</i> | |
| Euripides, <i>Hec.</i> | | 937 | 175 |
| 331 | 123 | | |
| 903 | 123 | | |
| Euripides, <i>Heracles</i> | | | |
| 474–77 | 122 | | |
| Euripides, <i>Hipp.</i> | | | |
| 379 | 119 | | |

Hesiod, <i>Op.</i>		Justinian, <i>Digest</i>	
105	119	48.19.38.2	314
256	126		
483	119	Justinian, <i>Inst.</i>	
		1.22	123
Hierocles, <i>On Duties</i> "On Marriage"		12.1	125
4.502	175	12.9	125
Homer, <i>Il.</i>		Juvenal, <i>Sat.</i>	
3.108	125	3.61	302
10.251	120	4.196ff.	302
24.305	121	10.346	123
24.304–308	124	13.54	125
Homer, <i>Od.</i>		Leonidas, <i>Anth. Pal.</i>	
1.351	126	3.369	125
5.7	125		
5.222	118	<i>Life of Aesop</i>	
9.114	125	122	127
14.58	125		
22.6	134	Livy	
		2.32	94
Horace, <i>Ep.</i>		2.32.9–12	121
1.18.98	119	3.7	125
		3.24	312
Horace, <i>Carm.</i>		4.1	310
1.12–13	126	9.19	312
3.9.24	122	29.37	312
		30.43.13	315
Horace, <i>Sat.</i>		33.32.1	130
1.9.60–72	121	39.3	310
		39.16	125
Iamblichus, <i>VP</i>		41.8–9	310
1.1	228		
2.10	223	Livy, <i>Ep.</i>	
5.26	221	48	312
8.41	228	60	312
16.70	220	63	312
31.195	228	98	312
31.205	217		
32.220	223	Lucan, <i>Pharsalia</i>	
32.224–25	222	4.377	125
32.225	223		
32.228	217, 222	Lucian, <i>Alex.</i>	
33.240	220	47	223
Isocrates, <i>Demon.</i>		Lucian, <i>Anach.</i>	
32	220	9–10	130
35	125		
		Lucian, <i>Athletics</i>	
Isocrates, <i>Nic.</i>		13	131
6	119		
		Lucian, <i>Hermot.</i>	
		63	214

Lucian, <i>Icar</i>		Martial, <i>Epigrams</i>	
30	227	1.90	120
Lucian, <i>Men.</i>		Maximus of Tyre, <i>Ox.</i>	
4	123	1.13	120
Lucian, <i>Peregr.</i>		7.7	217
13	126	8.6	121
42–44	222	8.7	213
Lucian, <i>Sat.</i>		10	175
3.32	121	11.10	220
Lucian, <i>Cal.</i>		11.11	220
21	126	15	120
Lucian, <i>Vit. auct.</i>		16.3	125
21	212	21.7–8	220
Lucretius, <i>Nat.</i>		33.3	218
1.102–26	222	36.2	222
3.1–30	222	Menander Rhetor	
3.87–93	222	1.3	212
3.370–95	216	1.361, lines 14–15	212
3.417–829	216	2.1–2, 373.7–8	212
4.160ff.	302	2.1–2, 376.13–23	213
5.1198–1206	223	2.3, 380.1–3	212
5.1203	222	2.3, 385.28–386.6	212, 213
Marcus Antoninus		2.5, 397.23	212
1.16.2	129	2.10, 415.24–26	212
Marcus Aurelius		2.10, 415.26–416.1	213
1.17.4	214	Menander, <i>Mon.</i>	
2.2	216	653	133
2.13	220	Menander, <i>Thais</i>	
2.17	220	218	122
3.5	220	Musonius Rufus	
3.6	220, 228	1, p. 34.31–33	222
3.7	216	3, p. 38, lines 26–30	226
3.12	220	3, p. 40.17–18	228
3.16.2	220	3, p. 40.20–22	228
4.5	216	3, p. 40.20	228
4.23	119	3, p. 40.35–42.3	222
4.41	216	3, p. 40.35–p. 42.13	222
5.10.2	220	3, p. 42, line 3	213
5.13	216	3, p. 42.26–28	228
5.27	120	4, p. 44.10–22	228
6.28	216	4, p. 44.11–12	212
6.32	216	4, p. 44.16–22	228
8.1	228	4, p. 44.16–18	228
8.58	222	4, p. 44.18–22	228
9.3	216, 222	4, p. 48.1	212, 228
10.8.2	227	4, p. 48.4	228
12.35	222	4, p. 48.5–6	222
		4, p. 48.8	228
		4, p. 48.13	228

Musonius Rufus (<i>cont.</i>)		Ovid, <i>Am.</i>	
6, p. 52.15–17	228	1.8.104	118
6, p. 52.15	228	2.4.7	119
6, p. 52.17	228	3.4.17	119
6, p. 52.19	228		
6, p. 52.21	212, 228	Ovid, <i>Fasti.</i>	
6, p. 54.35–p. 56.7	222, 223	6.5–6	220
6, p. 54.35–p. 56.2	222		
7, p. 58.25–26	228	Ovid, <i>Metam.</i>	
8, p. 60.22–64.9	228	8.610–700	126
8, p. 62.10–23	228		
8, p. 62.10–21	228	Pausanias	
8, p. 62.14–17	228	1.1.4	126
8, p. 66.7–8	228	1.44.1	111
8, p. 66.8	228	2.2	130
8, p. 66.10	222	5.15.3	133
9, p. 74.26	212		
10.15–23	120	Philo, <i>Virt.</i>	
12, p. 86.13–16	228	145–147	22
15, p. 96, line 25	226		
16, p. 104.32–34	228	Philostratus, <i>Vit. soph.</i>	
16, p. 104.33–35	228	1.25.3	120
16, p. 104.33	228		
16, p. 106.16	213	Philostratus, <i>Vit. Apoll.</i>	
17, p. 108.9–10	212, 228	1.20	228
17, p. 108.11–14	228	1.23	222, 223
17, p. 108.37–38	212	5.35	228
17, p. 110.1	222	5.36	228
17, p. 110.12–13	222	6.3.5	126
18A, p. 112.6–7	228	6.11	228
18A, p. 112.29	228	7.26	216
18B, p. 116.4–22	228		
18B, p. 116.19–20	228	Phlegon, <i>Ol.</i>	
18B, p. 116.20	228	177.3	312
18B, p. 118.4–7	228		
18B, p. 118.5	228	Pindar, <i>Frag.</i>	
18B, p. 120.2–8	228	121	122
18B, p. 120.6–7	228		
frg. 24, p. 130	228	Pindar, <i>Nem.</i>	
frg. 38, p. 136.1–3	222, 223	1.36	121
frg. 38, p. 136.3	228		
frg. 38, p. 136.4–5	219	Pindar, <i>Nem.</i>	
frg. 41, p. 136.22–24	227	6.27	134
frg. 42, p. 138.9–11	213		
		Pindar, <i>Ol.</i>	
Musonius Rufus <i>Ox</i>		9.72	126
XIV, ll. 9–17	175	9.160	121
XIV, ll. 20–32	175		
		Pindar, <i>Pyth.</i>	
Oppian, <i>Halieut.</i>		2.94–96	126
3.501	123	2.161	126
		2.162	126
Orphic <i>Frag</i>			
6.10	121		

Plato, <i>Apol.</i>		83D	119, 217
17C	120	97C	126
20D	120	97C–D	120, 123
21E–22A	120, 123	99B	126
23A	120		
40CD	124	Plato, <i>Phaedr.</i>	
		237DE	123
Plato, <i>Charm.</i>		245C	216
159B–176C	227	247C	118, 120
165A	163	249AB	122
		250D	250
Plato, <i>Crat.</i>		253D–254E	241
400BC	216	254A–	247
		278D	120
Plato, <i>Crit.</i>			
54B	122	Plato, <i>Prt.</i>	
		343A–B	163
Plato, <i>Gorg.</i>			
313C	125	Plato, <i>Resp.</i>	
456D	132	428–34	228
507D	134	436	241
526B	122	436a6–b7	241
		436b8–9	241
Plato, <i>Hipparch.</i>		436b10–11	241
229A	163	439a–b	247
		439a	252
Plato, <i>Ion</i>		439a8–b6	242
534E	123	439b3–5	247
		439c7–d8	242
Plato, <i>Leg.</i>		439d1–2	243
647D	121	439d7	243
732A	118	439e–440a	243
743A	125	440a3–4	243
828D	216	440c9	244
836ABC	118	441a2–3	243
839E–840C	132	441a7–9	243
841DE	120	441b2–3	243
		441b4–c2	243
Plato, <i>Lysis</i>		441e1	244
208C	123, 128	441e2–4	244
		442a3–6	249
Plato, <i>Phaed.</i>		442c5–6	244
60B3–C7	247	443d1	244
64CE	216	443d6–c3	245
65C5–7	247	476C–D	120, 123
66CD	217	505A–B	121, 253
66DE	122	508a5–b10	249
67E	122	510	121
68E8–69A1	247	518	252
79A–C	122	518b9	249
80A	123	518C	126
80DE	216	519a9–b9	250
81B3–6	247	519a9	250
81C	76	519b9–c4	250

Plato, <i>Resp.</i> (<i>cont.</i>)		Plautus, <i>Pers.</i>	
519b	250	4.4.6	124
519C	134		
529B	122	Pliny the Elder, <i>Nat. hist.</i>	
548b6–7	250	30.2.11	125
554b8–10	250		
556a	250	Pliny the Younger, <i>Ep.</i>	
559a–c	245	4.19	122
559b7–10	250	8.16	119
559c2–d4	245	8.18	126
563d8–9	250		
571b5–6	246	Pliny the Younger, <i>Pan.</i>	
571b6–8	251	1.45.5	125
572c1–4	246	1.67.3	125
572c3	247	45.6	121
573a5–6	246		
573b	252	Plotinus, <i>Enn.</i>	
573b1	246	1.3, ch. 3	214
573b3–6	246	1.5.3	216
573c2–8	246	1.6	220
576a6–7	247	4.7–8	216
576c1–4	247		
576e4–5	247	Plutarch, <i>Alex.</i>	
577c7	247	15.4	111
577c8–d4	247		
577d8–e11	248	Plutarch, <i>Borrowing</i>	
581c7–11	249	7	227
586A	124		
588–91	252	Plutarch, <i>Cat. Min.</i>	
588b–591b	247	65	119
588D–589B	119		
589A	123	Plutarch, <i>Ant.</i>	
589a1–3	247	44.2–5	119
589a9	252	84	122
592A–B	122, 124		
596B–C	121	Plutarch, <i>Art.</i>	
597c2	251	28.3	123
603d–604d	251		
611BC	216	Plutarch, <i>Num.</i>	
612E	119	6.2	120
621C	124		
		Plutarch, <i>Them.</i>	
Plato, <i>Symp.</i>		28.1–2	118
189DE	123		
197A–E	121	Plutarch, <i>Mor.</i>	
211A	121	4A–B	128
		4A	122
Plato, <i>Tim.</i>		5D	121
28C	124, 126	32C	227
40DE	120	37A	222
88b–c	249	88D–89B	118
92E	124	90EF	123
		125BC	119
Plautus, <i>Mercator</i>		140D	121, 175
56	118	142CD	122

Plautus, <i>Mercator</i>		Porphry, <i>Marc.</i>	
166CDE	119	6.103–8	217
179D	132	7.131–34	217
226F–227A	121	9.172–73	217
236BC	120, 121	10.176	217
266C–267C	121	11.199–201	221
321B–324D	118	11.201–2	220
329A–C	123	11.204–220	217
353A	216	13.234–35	217
374CD	123	14.242–44	217
382F	216	14.249–50	217
385D–E	163	16.265–67	220
420AB	121	16.267–68	220
436D	121	19.314–16	220
499D	124	19.318–19	220
551C	119	20.329–30	220
551DE	118	25.394–95	217
560B	216	26.409–10	220
566A	119	29.453–57	217
593E	131	30.470–76	212
613F–614A	121	31.478–83	218
645B–C	129	32.485–95	217
830B	227	33.506–7	217
1002B	216		
1090EF	216	Propertius	
1124DE	123	4.4.13	125
1096E	216		
1122D	217	Prudentius, <i>Peristephanon</i>	
		§10	118
Plutarch, <i>Publ.</i>			
12	312	Ps.-Cicero, <i>Rhetorica ad Herennium</i>	
188	227	4.17	119
190	227		
192	227	Ps.-Lucian, <i>Affairs of the Heart</i>	
208–10	227	19–20	118
254	227		
281	227	Ps.-Phocylides	
		3	162
Plutarch, <i>Quaest. conv.</i>		8	162
5.3.1–3	130	145	129
8.4.1	130		
		Ps.-Plato, <i>Axiochus</i>	
Plutarch, <i>Adv. Col.</i>		365E–366A	122
27	217		
		Ps.-Plato, <i>Def.</i>	
Polybius		415D	129
2.56	120		
3.63.3–4	123	Ps.-Plutarch	
4.2.4–5	122	<i>Cons. Apoll.</i> 13	118
6.47	125		
6.48.7	129	Publilius Syrus, <i>Sent.</i>	
7.8.9	134	149	118
10.19.7	130	295	121
22.20	176	326	123
30.8.4	127	403	123

Publius Syrus, <i>Sent. (cont.)</i>		73.16	220
665	123	75.18	222, 223
707	125	76.17	124
		77.10	123
<i>Pythagorean Sentences</i>		78.16	131
30	123	80.6	222
		81.17	123
<i>Rhet. Alex.</i>		82	222
1, 1421b, lines 25–26	227	87.4–5	214
		87.5	214
Sallust, <i>Bell. Cat.</i>		94.48	227
1.2	216	94.50	214
1.7	216	95.47	126
		95.52	119
Seneca the Elder, <i>Controv.</i>		96.1–2	119
1. preface 15	223	98.6	222
		98.15	124
Seneca, <i>De Otio</i>		98.17	124
5.6	120	99.8	122
		101.7	123
Seneca, <i>Ag.</i>		104.4	124
664	119	117.5	118
		123.3	119
Seneca, <i>Ben.</i>			
1.10.3	118	Seneca, <i>Helv.</i>	
1.10.4	118	12.11.7	216
2.1.3	123		
2.11.1	122	Seneca, <i>Ira</i>	
2.31.3	124	2.28.1–4	118
4.27.1	222	2.28.5–8	118
7.31.1	119	2.31.7	121
		2.32.2–3	119
Seneca, <i>Dial.</i>		2.34.5	119
2.16.1	217	3.8.1–2	122
		4.12.6	222, 223
Seneca, <i>Dral.</i>		4.13.2	222, 223
1.1.5	223	5.6.1	222, 223
2.12.6	223	5.6.9	222
2.13.2	223	9	222
3.6.1	223	44.2	122
		66.50	222
Seneca, <i>Ep.</i>		95.23–24	120
7.7	122		
13	222	Seneca, <i>Marc.</i>	
13.14	124	6.26.7	216
13.16	121		
24.19–20	122	Seneca, <i>Vit. beat.</i>	
51.13	119	7.8.3	212
57.9	216	19.3	124
65.16–18	124		
67.9	124	Seneca, <i>Nat.</i>	
71	226	praef. 1	120
72.12	124	1, praef. 4	222
73.1	125	1, praef. 7, 17	221
73.12–16	213, 220	2.58.3	222

Seneca, <i>Nat. (cont.)</i>		4.1.4	126
3, praef. 11–15	212	6.2.8	125
6.32.4	223	7 frg. 41	299
6.32.12	222	7.7.4	295
6.5	120	8.6.20	130
7.30	125	8.20–23	120
Seneca, <i>Prov.</i>		Suetonius, <i>Claud.</i>	
1.3.1	212	25.3	325
1.5	119	25.4	57
Seneca, <i>Tranq.</i>		Suetonius, <i>Galba</i>	
9	223	9.2	314
9.11.4–5	222		
10.4	124	Tacitus, <i>Agr.</i>	
16.4	122	6	120
Seneca, <i>Sent. Sext.</i>		Tacitus, <i>Ann.</i>	
44–45	227	3.54	123
Sextus Empiricus, <i>Pyr.</i>		4.36.2	312
1.79	216	11.25	312
3.198–200	120	Tacitus, <i>Hist.</i>	
Sophocles, <i>Aj.</i>		1.15	124
292–93	122	3.25	118
660	120	3.68	120
		5.5	124
Sophocles, <i>Antig.</i>		Terence, <i>Phorm.</i>	
461	124	1.2.27	126
Sophocles, <i>Frag.</i>		Theocritus, <i>Id.</i>	
837	122	28.14	125
940	118		
Sophocles, <i>Oed. Col.</i>		Theognis, <i>Elegi.</i>	
1377	127	305	122
Sophocles, <i>Oed. Tyr.</i>		Thucydides	
863	118	2.34.8	127
		2.43.2	122
Stobaeus, <i>Ecl.</i>		3.38.5	126
1.94	120	Valarius Maximus	
2.279	120	1.1	124
III 1.173	163	2.1.3	121
III.1.173	171	2.1.9	125
III.1.175 [37]	172	2.7.12	315
III.1.175 [45]	172	3.3. ext. 1	222, 223
III.1.175 [75]	172	4.1.2	124
III.1.175 [136]	172	6.1	125
3.417	125	7.2	124
Strabo, <i>Geogr.</i>		7.2. ext. 1a	219
3.2.15	296	7.2. ext. 8	220
		9.5.1	311

Valarius Maximus (<i>cont.</i>)		Xenophon, <i>Cyrop.</i>	
9.13. praef.	222	6.1.21	119
9.13.3	222		
Vettius Valens, <i>Anth.</i>		Xenophon, <i>Hell.</i>	
5.9.2	124	3.4.18	120
Virgil, <i>Aeneid</i>		Xenophon, <i>Lac.</i>	
5.375–77	131	3.1	123
6.540	122	Xenophon, <i>Mem.</i>	
6.566	122	1.2.23	227
Virgil, <i>Ecl.</i>		3.2	124
8.63	121	4.2	123
10.69	122	4.4	118
Xenophon, <i>Anab.</i>		Xenophon, <i>Oec.</i>	
1.3.11	120	2.5	119
		7.18–19	176

PAPYRI AND INSCRIPTIONS

Papyri		<i>IG</i>	
PAth.Univ. inv. 2782	164	XII 3.1020	166
P.Colon. 7921	125	XII[3] 1020	163
P.Lond. 358, line 19	127	XII 3.1020 No. 1	165
P.Mich. 577.7–8	12	XII 3.1020 No. 3	165
P.Oxy. 37, col. 1, line 3	127	XII 3.1020 No. 4	165, 167
P.Oxy.		2534	118
110	121		
115	124	<i>IGA</i>	
237, col. 5, line 13	127	2.116 (<i>New Docs</i> 3.121)	126
269, col. 2, line 7	127		
744	124	I. Assos	
745, line 2	127	8 159	
XLII 3069.11–13	80, 81		
P.Tebt. 316, line 11	127	I. Eph.	
		I 6	156
<i>CE</i>		V. 1539	175
185.2	122		
1170.14	122	I. Kyzikos	
1495	122	II 2	166
2071.2	122	II 2 Col. 1	163
		II 2 Col. 1. No. 1	169
<i>CIG</i>		II 2 Col. 1 No. 3	165
1973	124	II 2 Col. 1 No. 4	165
		II 2 Col. 1 No. 5	165
<i>EG</i>		II 2 Col. 1 No. 6	166
101	122	II 2 Col. 1 No. 8	166
236.8	122	II 2 Col. 1 No. 9	169, 170
459.7–8	122	II 2 Col. 1 No. 10	169
463.2	118	II 2 Col. 1 No. 11	167
646	122	II 2 Col. 1 No. 12	169
720	122	II 2 Col. 1 No. 14	172

I. Kyzikos (<i>cont.</i>)		II 2 Col. 2 No. 18	166
II 2 Col. 1 No. 15	169, 170	II 2 Col. 2 No. 19	166
II 2 Col. 1 No. 16	168	II 2 Col. 2 No. 20	166
II 2 Col. 1 No. 17	166	II 2 Col. 2 No. 21	167
II 2 Col. 1 No. 18	169	II 2 Col. 2 No. 22	168
II 2 Col. 1 No. 19	167	II 2 Col. 2 No. 23	167
II 2 Col. 1 No. 20	165	II 2 Col. 2 No. 24	167
II 2 Col. 1 No. 21	169, 172	II 2 Col. 2 No. 26	167
II 2 Col. 1 No. 22	169	II 2 Col. 2 No. 28	164
II 2 Col. 1 No. 23	167	II 2 Col. 2 No. 30	167
II 2 Col. 1 No. 24	170	II 2 Col. 2 No. 31	169
II 2 Col. 1 No. 25	165, 169		
II 2 Col. 2 No. 1	167	<i>MAMA</i>	
II 2 Col. 2 No. 2	169	VIII.569	122
II 2 Col. 2 No. 3	172, 173		
II 2 Col. 2 No. 4	165	<i>OGIS</i>	
II 2 Col. 2 No. 5	167	96 (<i>NewDocs</i> 4.201)	126
II 2 Col. 2 No. 6	168	598	123
II 2 Col. 2 No. 7	167		
II 2 Col. 2 No. 8	168	<i>SEG</i>	
II 2 Col. 2 No. 9	168	571.3–4	122
II 2 Col. 2 No. 10	169	612.4	118
II 2 Col. 2 No. 11	167	1355 (<i>NewDocs</i> 1.25–29)	126
II 2 Col. 2 No. 12	167	1356 (<i>NewDocs</i> 1.25–29)	126
II 2 Col. 2 No. 13	169		
II 2 Col. 2 No. 14	167	<i>SIG</i>	
II 2 Col. 2 No. 16	166	982	120
II 2 Col. 2 No. 17	166		
OTHER			
Confucius, <i>Analects</i>		14.30	214
7.16	214		

INDEX OF MODERN AUTHORS

- Aasgaard, R. 203–206, 266
 Achtemeier, P. J. 70, 74, 76, 85, 154
 Adams, E. 280, 282, 285
 Adams, S. A. 6, 314, 316
 Adewuya, J. A. 275
 Adrados, F. R. 302
 Alexander, L. 315, 316
 Anagnostopoulos, M. 242
 Anderson, J. G. C. 322
 Annas, J. 241
 Arnal, W. E. 137
 Ascough, R. A. 141
 Atkinson, P. 170
 Aune, D. E. 80, 172, 191, 192, 255, 316
 Austin, M. M. 145, 147, 157, 158, 160, 174
 Avis, P. 96, 97

 Baird, W. 197
 Balch, D. L. 136–138, 162, 172, 176, 177, 179
 Balla, P. 269
 Balz, H. 108
 Barclay, J. M. G. 2
 Barclay, W. 144
 Barr, G. K. 138
 Barr, J. 80
 Barrett, C. K. 8, 9, 29, 74, 130, 186, 188, 189, 201
 Bassler, J. M. 48, 49
 Bauckham, R. 316
 Bauernfeind, O. 132
 Baumann, G. 205
 Baumgarten, A. I. 2
 Baur, F. C. 40, 66, 187
 Bawley, R. L. 162
 Beale, G. K. 8, 10
 Beardsmore, H. B. 290
 Becker, J. 70
 Beker, J. C. 74, 83
 Benko, S. 144
 Benoit, P. 70
 Berger, A. 265
 Berger, K. 117
 Bergmeier, R. 108

 Best, E. 93, 172, 176
 Bett, R. 222
 Betz, H. D. 59, 128, 137, 138, 252
 Bevere, A. R. 172, 174
 Billerbeck, P. 110
 Birnbaum, H. 292
 Black, M. 96, 98, 115, 215
 Blass, F. 305
 Blumenfeld, B. 144
 Bobonich, C. 244
 Bonner, S. F. 145
 Borgen, P. 149, 194, 195
 Boring, M. E. 117
 Bornkamm, G. 277
 Bos, A. P. 137
 Bosworth, C. E. 320
 Bowersock, G. W. 137
 Boyarin, D. 233
 Branick, V. P. 16
 Bray, G. 108
 Brenk, F. E. 136, 138
 Brewer, D. I. 23
 Breytenbach, C. 259, 262
 Broneer, O. 127, 130, 133
 Bruce, F. F. 77, 78, 210, 221, 271, 284, 293–96, 299, 306, 307, 317, 318, 320
 Brunt, J. C. 181
 Brunt, P. A. 311
 Buchsel, F. 201
 Buck, C. H. 68
 Buckland, W. W. 265
 Bultmann, R. 72, 232, 238
 Burke, T. 6, 262, 263, 266, 269, 270, 274, 277, 283, 284
 Burkert, W. 137, 252
 Burtchaell, J. T. 141
 Buttmann, A. 303–305
 Byrne, B. 264, 269, 295

 Cadbury, H. J. 313, 324
 Cairns, D. 249
 Callander, T. 320
 Calvin, J. 41
 Cameron, N. de S. 260
 Campbell, D. A. 254

- Campbell, L. 292
 Cancik, H. 222
 Carr, D. M. 13
 Carroll, M. D. R. 274
 Carson, D. 199
 Carson, D. A. 8, 107, 117, 269
 Carter, T. 5
 Castelli, E. A. 141
 Chadwick, O. 65
 Chang, H.-K. 235
 Chapple, A. L. 141
 Charles, J. D. 117
 Charles, R. H. 66, 67, 78
 Cheung, A. T. 180, 183, 188–90, 193, 194, 200
 Chevallier, M.-A. 214
 Chia, P. P. 229
 Chow, J. K. 142, 191
 Christophersen, A. 316
 Ciampa, R. E. 8, 12, 18, 24, 26, 27, 29, 30, 35, 37
 Clarke, A. D. 141
 Clarke, K. D. 88
 Clarke, M. L. 144
 Claussen, C. 316
 Clemen, C. 71
 Collier, M. 26
 Collins, A. Y. 80, 137, 252
 Collins, J. J. 79
 Collins, J. N. 141
 Colpe, C. 117
 Cone, O. 71
 Conzelmann, H. 14, 16, 22, 31, 93, 130, 194
 Cooper, J. M. 241, 243
 Coppens, J. 214
 Cormack, S. 302
 Coutsoumpos, O. 5
 Craigie, P. C. 33
 Cranfield, C. E. B. 48, 272, 278, 294, 295
 Crenshaw, J. L. 145
 Crook, Z. A. 142, 152
 Crouch, J. E. 172
 Croy, N. C. 149
 Cullmann, O. 70, 83, 88

 Dabney, R. L. 260
 Dahl, N. A. 63
 Dahood, M. 32
 Danker, F. W. 147, 152, 154, 156–58
 Das, A. A. 39, 41, 48, 49, 275
 Dautzenberg, G. 137
 Davidson, D. 100
 Davies, W. D. 46, 70, 77, 78, 215
 Davis, S. T. 260
 de Lacy, P. 137
 De Vos, C. S. 184, 202
 De Witt, N. W. 138
 Debrunner, A. 305
 Deines, R. 3, 306
 Delatte, L. 144
 Delorme, J. 146, 151
 DeSilva, D. A. 44, 135, 149, 269, 278
 Dibelius, M. 172
 Dillon, J. 221
 Dodd, B. 231
 Dodd, C. H. 67–70, 75, 76, 78, 84
 Doohan, H. 141
 Dormeyer, D. 138
 Dover, K. J. 161
 Downing, F. G. 138
 du Toit, A. B. 259, 262
 Duncan, S. 69
 Dunn, J. D. G. 18, 41, 44, 45, 48, 49, 95, 127, 128, 176, 188, 211, 215, 221, 229, 235, 239, 261, 274, 277, 294
 Dutch, R. S. 142, 143, 149, 151
 Dyer, K. 275, 279, 286

 Ellens, J. H. 134
 Elliott, J. K. 266, 284
 Ellis, E. E. 16, 22, 71, 73, 117
 Emilsson, E. K. 226
 Engberg-Pedersen, T. 80, 136, 137, 149, 195, 213, 214, 222, 225, 226, 232, 234, 235, 252
 Engels, D. 298
 Esler, P. F. 137, 141, 162, 276
 Evangelos, A. 151
 Evans, C. A. 5, 10, 117, 235, 289, 299
 Everson, S. 250

 Fant, M. B. 174
 Farmer, W. R. 67
 Fassnacht, M. 138
 Faw, C. E. 70
 Fee, G. D. 9, 14, 16, 22, 25, 28, 30, 31, 37, 95, 107, 109, 198, 200, 202, 260, 262, 263, 277
 Feldman, L. H. 148
 Ferguson, S. B. 260, 263, 278
 Ferrari, G. R. F. 242, 245
 Feuillet, A. 13
 Finegan, J. 301
 Fiore, B. 138
 Fiorenza, E. S. 199

- Fisher, F. 107
 Fisk, B. N. 200
 Fitzgerald, J. T. 136, 252
 Fitzmyer, J. A. 43, 289
 Flusser, D. 211, 214, 215
 Forbes, C. A. 151, 155
 Fortna, R. T. 197, 240
 Fotopoulos, J. 138, 185, 188, 191, 200, 201
 Fox, M. 28
 Foxhall, L. 173
 Frank, T. 311
 Frederiksen, P. 57
 Fredrickson, D. E. 137
 Frey, J. 215, 316
 Friesen, S. J. 184, 191, 196
 Fritsch, C. T. 224
 Furnish, V. P. 70, 199, 209
 Fursdon, R. 302

 Gaca, K. L. 253
 Gager, J. G. 71, 72, 82, 83
 Gagnon, R. A. 203
 Gamble, H. 254
 Gardner, J. F. 310
 Gardner, P. D. 186, 199–201
 Garland, D. E. 26, 33, 34, 188, 191, 193, 194
 Garner, D. B. 284
 Garnsey, P. 313
 Garrison, R. 130, 133, 149
 Gasque, W. W. 300
 Gathercole, S. J. 235
 Gaventa, B. R. 197, 240, 282, 283
 Gawlina, M. 137
 Gehring, R. W. 172, 173, 176
 George, T. 271
 Georgi, D. 141
 Geysler, A. S. 295
 Giesen, H. 74, 90
 Gilbert, G. H. 66, 67
 Gill, C. 249, 254
 Gillman, J. 71, 73, 82, 86
 Gitin, S. 289
 Glad, C. E. 142, 185
 Glover, T. R. 297
 Godet, F. 107
 Goesler, K. 176, 177
 Goldstein, J. 2
 Gooch, P. D. 184–86, 188, 189, 191, 202
 Gooch, P. W. 180
 Goodenough, E. R. 144
 Goodfellow, C. E. 309, 311, 313, 314, 319, 322, 323
 Goodman, M. 64
 Goppelt, L. 25
 Gosling, J. C. B. 245
 Goulder, M. D. 187
 Grabbe, L. L. 148
 Grässer, E. 137
 Green, S. G. 305
 Grieb, A. K. 229
 Griffith, G. W. 142
 Griffith, T. 200, 201
 Grosheide, F. W. 107
 Grundmann, W. 130, 132
 Gundry, R. H. 93, 216, 236, 237
 Guthrie, K. S. 173

 Haacker, K. 224, 229
 Haase, W. 80
 Haenchen, E. 3
 Hafemann, S. J. 7, 39
 Hagner, D. A. 42, 221, 237
 Hahn, F. 295
 Hahne, H. A. 280
 Hamerton-Kelly, R. G. 13
 Hammond, M. 321
 Hands, A. R. 147, 148, 152, 153, 155, 158, 174, 177
 Hansen, G. W. 63
 Hanson, A. T. 13, 22, 117
 Hardie, P. 254
 Harland, P. 204, 205
 Harnack, A. 65
 Harris, B. F. 171
 Harris, H. 66
 Harris, H. A. 149
 Harris, M. J. 78, 85, 87, 88, 237
 Harrison, J. R. 5, 142, 150, 152, 153, 155, 158, 159, 167, 171, 172
 Harrison, R. K. 300, 301
 Harrisville, R. A. 18
 Hartog, P. 138
 Hastings, J. 266, 303
 Hawley, R. 174
 Hawthorne, G. F. 7, 39, 45, 129, 273, 291, 318
 Hay, D. M. 31, 173
 Hayes, D. A. 67
 Hays, R. B. 11, 21, 22, 27, 31, 33, 35, 117, 199, 224
 Headlam, A. C. 295
 Helleman, W. E. 137, 255
 Helm, P. 23

- Henderson, B. W. 293, 296
 Hengel, M. 2, 3, 31, 32, 79, 291, 306, 314, 317, 319
 Henten, J. W. van 135
 Héring, J. 13, 24
 Herrmann, F.-G. 249
 Hess, R. S. 274
 Hester, J. D. 266, 267
 Hillard, T. W. 143
 Hobbs, A. 244
 Hock, R. F. 163, 183, 233
 Hodge, C. J. 205
 Hodgson, C. 66
 Hoehner, H. W. 172, 174, 176, 177, 271
 Hockema, A. 260, 261
 Hoffman, P. 77
 Holmberg, B. 141
 Holtzmann, H. J. 66, 71
 Holum, K. G. 300
 Hornblower, S. 151, 265
 Horrell, D. G. 41
 Horsley, G. H. R. 174, 175
 Horsley, R. A. 180, 184, 185, 196
 Hossenfelder, M. 222, 223
 Howell, E. B. 117
 Hubbard, T. K. 160–62
 Hübner, H. 39, 137
 Huggins, R. V. 238
 Hunter, A. M. 70
 Hurd, J. C. 67, 75, 173, 185, 187, 188, 197
 Hurtado, L. H. 273
 Hyldahl, N. 137

 Irwin, T. 241, 246
 Isaacs, M. E. 221

 Jackson, R. 95
 Jaeger, W. 144, 249
 Jasper, D. 137
 Jeffers, J. S. 317, 324, 326
 Jeremias, J. 22
 Jervis, L. A. 254, 285
 Jewett, R. 15, 67, 94, 180, 181, 185, 211, 238, 294
 Jipp, J. 6
 Johnson, A. C. 146
 Johnson, L. 69
 Johnson, M. 108
 Jolivet, I. J., Jr. 137
 Jones, B. W. 158
 Joubert, S. J. 141, 142
 Judge, E. A. 143, 158, 159, 163–66, 170–2

 Käsemann, E. 70, 82, 83, 93, 277
 Kammeler, H. C. 10
 Kearsley, R. A. 158
 Keck, L. E. 3
 Kee, H. C. 137
 Keener, C. S. 6, 131, 214, 219, 221, 227
 Kendall, D. 260
 Kennedy, G. 59
 Kennedy, H. A. A. 71
 Kent, J. H. 298
 Kim, S. 41, 48
 Kinzig, W. 139
 Kirchhoff, R. 95
 Kittel, G. 108, 128, 129
 Klassen, W. 173
 Klauck, H.-J. 138
 Kloppenborg, J. S. 141
 Klosko, G. 248, 249
 Knox, J. 67, 68, 70, 71
 Knox, W. L. 70, 76
 Knuuttila, S. 226
 Koch, D.-A. 8, 9, 13, 16, 28, 33, 117
 Koenen, K. 13
 Kokkinos, N. 300, 301
 Konstan, D. 171
 Koperski, V. 40
 Kosman, A. 245
 Kovacs, J. L. 109
 Kraus, T. J. 290
 Krentz, E. 130, 136
 Kühn, K.-G. 101–104
 Kümmel, W. G. 70, 73, 81, 231, 233

 Labahn, A. 137
 Labahn, M. 137
 Ladd, G. E. 42
 Lake, J. W. 137
 Lake, K. 313, 324
 Lakoff, G. 108
 Lambrecht, J. 284
 Lang, F. G. 8, 9, 14, 16, 28, 29
 Lash, N. 65
 Lattimore, R. 174
 Lee, M. V. 94, 137
 Lefkowitz, M. R. 174
 Lehmann, C. M. 300
 Lehmann, W. P. 293
 Lenski, R. C. H. 22
 Lentz, J. C., Jr. 3
 Lieberman, S. 79
 Liebers, R. 117
 Lietzmann, H. 107, 185, 208
 Liecu, J. 319

- Lightfoot, J. B. 66, 67, 128, 132, 273
 Lincoln, A. T. 71, 73, 80
 Lindars, B. 13
 Litfin, D. 142
 Livingstone, E. A. 137
 Lloyd, G. E. R. 101
 Loane, M. L. 280, 281
 Lockwood, W. B. 293
 Lohse, E. 74, 78
 Long, A. A. 233
 Longenecker, B. W. 285, 316
 Longenecker, R. N. 66, 67, 71, 72, 128
 Lovering, E. H. 74, 85
 Lovibond, S. 250
 Lowe, J. 71
 Lüdemann, H. 66
 Lührmann, D. 43
 Lung-Kwong, L. 229
 Luther, M. 40, 41
 Lutz, C. E. 212, 228
 Lyall, F. 266, 272, 278

 Malherbe, A. J. 80, 81, 136, 146, 151, 173, 175, 233
 Malina, B. 52–54
 Marksches, C. 2
 Marrou, H.-I. 144, 291
 Marshall, I. H. 315
 Marshall, L. H. 278
 Marshall, P. 183
 Martens, J. W. 137
 Martin, B. L. 40, 46, 47
 Martin, D. B. 20, 99, 112, 143, 150, 162, 184, 191, 233
 Martin, R. P. 7, 107, 129, 273, 291, 318
 Martin, T. W. 138
 Martyn, J. L. 3, 40, 137, 239, 268–70
 Matheson, G. 66, 67
 Matlock, R. B. 68, 69, 82, 83
 Maurer, C. 180
 May, M. T. 105
 McDonald, L. M. 293, 296, 299
 McGrath, A. 261
 McRay, J. 131, 299
 Mearns, C. L. 75
 Meeks, W. A. 24, 136–38, 150, 188, 214, 274, 275
 Meggitt, J. J. 184, 184
 Mell, U. 14
 Melugin, R. F. 13
 Mendelson, A. 2, 148
 Menken, M. J. J. 15, 18, 19

 Merk, O. 137
 Metzger, B. M. 13, 87
 Meyer, B. F. 71
 Meyer, P. 240
 Michaelis, W. 281
 Michel, O. 13, 117
 Millar, F. 64
 Millard, A. 289
 Miller, S. G. 146–48, 151, 157, 160, 161
 Milns, R. D. 158
 Minear, P. S. 67
 Mitchell, M. M. 25, 94, 197
 Mitchell, S. 302
 Moessner, J. S. 285
 Moffatt, J. 37
 Mommsen, T. 318
 Moo, D. J. 235, 272, 275
 Moore, A. L. 71, 73
 Moore, G. F. 214
 Morris, L. 107
 Morris, M. 244
 Moss, J. 249
 Motto, A. L. 214
 Moule, C. F. D. 67, 305
 Moulton, J. H. 289, 296, 297, 307
 Moulton, W. F. 303, 304
 Moxnes, H. 264
 Moyise, S. 15, 18, 19
 Müller, M. 232
 Munck, J. 83
 Murphy-O'Connor, J. 23, 95, 130, 182, 186, 187, 296, 298, 299, 315

 Nanos, M. D. 5, 57, 63, 196, 203, 210, 211
 Newman, J. H. 65
 Newsome, J. D. 2
 Newton, D. 191
 Neyrey, J. H. 138
 Nicholas, B. 265
 Niebuhr, R. R. 67
 Ninan, I. 276
 Nock, A. D. 220
 North, H. F. 228
 North, J. 319
 Nussbaum, M. C. 233
 Nutton, V. 101, 103

 O'Brien, P. T. 1, 127, 171, 269, 291
 O'Collins, G. 260
 O'Day, G. 11, 12
 Oehler, J. 146, 151
 Oikonomides, A. N. 164

- O'Keefe, T. 222
 Olbricht, T. H. 136, 137, 252
 Omerzu, H. 129
 O'Rourke, J. J. 144
 Orr, W. F. 107
 Ortony, A. 96
 Oss, D. A. 224
 Owen, P. L. 48
 Owens, E. 302
 Öztürk, J. 302
- Paige, R. 137
 Palmer, L. R. 293
 Parry, R. D. 246, 248
 Patrich, J. 130
 Patterson, S. J. 13
 Pearson, B. A. 13
 Peel, M. L. 76
 Pelser, G. M. M. 211
 Penna, R. 138
 Penner, T. 249
 Perriman, A. 94-6
 Peterlin, D. L. 154
 Peterson, B. K. 142
 Peterson, D. G. 143, 171
 Petit, P. 4
 Pfitzner, V. C. 130, 149
 Pfeiderer, O. 66, 71, 75
 Philip, F. 86
 Picirilli, R. 320
 Pickett, R. 184
 Pilch, J. 52-4
 Pilhofer, P. 299
 Pitts, A. W. 3, 5, 66, 80, 291, 324
 Plant, I. M. 173-75
 Plevnik, J. 71, 73, 86
 Plummer, A. 8, 16, 31, 107, 130
 Pogoloff, S. M. 142
 Pohlenz, M. 136, 137
 Pokorný, P. 127
 Polomé, E. G. 292
 Pomeroy, S. B. 173, 174, 176
 Porter, F. C. 67
 Porter, S. E. 3, 6, 21, 66, 74, 85, 117, 136, 138, 139, 203, 254, 262, 274, 289-91, 293, 294, 296, 297, 299, 303, 314, 324
 Pouilloux, J. 147, 157
 Price, A. W. 242, 245, 247, 248
 Pringent, P. 13
 Prior, J. 143
 Puhvel, J. 292
- Räsänen, H. 45, 47, 236
 Rajak, T. 319
- Ramage, C. T. 117
 Ramsay, W. M. 296-98, 306, 307, 316, 317, 320, 323
 Rapske, B. 313
 Rauer, M. 190
 Reasoner, M. 231
 Reese, B. 320
 Reeve, C. D. C. 242
 Reid, D. G. 273, 318
 Reumann, J. 70, 74
 Reuss, E. G. E. 71
 Richards, K. H. 181, 274
 Richardson, P. 173, 254
 Ricoeur, P. 96
 Ritschl, A. 39
 Robert, L. 164
 Robertson, A. T. 8, 16, 31, 107, 130, 297, 304-306
 Robinson, J. A. T. 70, 93, 216
 Roetzel, C. J. 317
 Rollins, W. G. 274
 Rosner, B. S. 7, 8, 12, 18-20, 23, 24, 26, 27, 29, 30, 35, 37, 226
 Roussel, P. 313
 Rowe, C. 249
 Rudolph, D. J. 183, 188, 194
 Rutenbar, C. G. 227
 Rutgers, L. V. 130
- Sabatier, A. 66
 Saddington, D. B. 301
 Sampley, J. P. 129, 130, 213, 218, 233, 256, 269, 270
 Sanday, W. 295
 Sandelin, K.-G. 191, 196
 Sanders, E. P. 2, 39-41, 44, 45, 47-50, 71, 72, 82, 236
 Sanders, H. A. 326
 Sanders, J. A. 117
 Sandys, J. E. 293
 Santas, G. 242, 249
 Satterthwaite, P. E. 26, 139
 Saunders, R. 143
 Schaff, P. 183, 206, 207
 Schaller, B. 127
 Schmidt, K. L. 132
 Schmiedel, P. W. 71
 Schnabel, E. J. 95, 98
 Schneider, A. M. 127
 Schneider, G. 108
 Schneider, H. 222
 Schnelle, U. 42, 43, 70, 71, 76, 77, 80, 117
 Schoeps, H.-J. 70, 83
 Schowalter, D. N. 184, 191, 196

- Schrage, W. 9, 14, 15, 22, 31, 107
 Schreiner, T. R. 41, 44, 47, 48, 272,
 277, 281, 284
 Schürer, E. 64
 Schulz, F. 317, 326
 Schutz, J. H. 141
 Schwartz, J. 134
 Schweitzer, A. 41, 68–73, 82
 Scott, C. A. A. 261
 Scott, J. M. 270, 284, 294
 Sedley, D. N. 233
 Segal, A. F. 43, 44
 Seifrid, M. A. 234, 269
 Selby, D. J. 70, 73
 Sellin, G. 24
 Sevenster, J. N. 138
 Sherk, R. K. 148
 Sherwin-White, A. N. 4, 129, 307,
 310–313, 317–19, 321, 322, 325,
 326
 Shires, H. M. 83
 Siegel, R. E. 101
 Sihvola, J. 222, 226
 Sijpesteijn, P. J. 151
 Simpson, E. K. 271
 Smalley, S. S. 70
 Smallwood, E. M. 312, 318, 319, 324
 Smit, J. 181, 183, 188, 197, 200
 Smith, D. M. 117
 Smith, W. D. 100
 von Soden, H. F. 204
 Soggin, A. 32
 Sokoloff, M. 289
 Souter, A. 307
 Spawforth, A. J. S. 151, 265
 Spicq, C. 170
 Stanley, C. 8, 9, 11, 14, 25, 28, 30, 36
 Stark, R. 51, 52
 Stauffer, E. 132, 133
 Steck, O. H. 13
 Stegemann, W. 315, 319
 Stegner, W. R. 45
 Stendahl, K. 231
 Sterling, G. E. 136
 Stevens, G. B. 75, 77
 Stevenson-Moessner, J. 263
 Still, E. C. III 188, 200
 Still, T. D. 81, 90
 Stowers, S. K. 162, 179, 218, 226,
 232, 234, 238, 252, 255, 256
 Strack, H. 110
 Strecker, G. 117
 Strijdom, J. 137
 Stuhlmacher, P. 254
 Suggs, M. J. 67
 Sumney, J. L. 74, 85
 Sweeney, M. A. 13
 Swete, H. B. 289
 Tajra, H. W. 4, 129, 307, 318
 Tanner, R. G. 137
 Tarn, W. W. 317
 Taylor, C. C. W. 245
 Taylor, G. 68
 Tcherikover, V. 290
 Teichmann, E. 66, 71
 Temporini, H. 80
 Thackeray, H. St. J. 66, 67
 Thayer, J. H. 303, 304
 Theissen, G. 100, 141, 183–86
 Thielman, F. 40, 45
 Thiselton, A. C. 12, 15, 18, 21, 28,
 30, 31, 33, 34, 36, 107, 112, 180, 183
 Thompson, J. B. 96
 Thompson, M. 165, 166
 Thorsteinsson, R. M. 138
 Tobin, T. H. 211
 Tolmie, D. F. 259, 262
 Tomlin, G. 138
 Tomson, P. J. 23, 180, 183, 188, 189,
 193, 194
 Toussaint, C. 149
 Townsend, J. T. 144
 Tregarri, S. M. 265
 Tronier, H. 232
 Trueman, C. 23
 Trumper, T. 261
 Tsang, S. 265
 Turretin, F. 260
 Tzachou-Alexandri, O. 146
 Van der Horst, P. W. 135
 Van der Watt, J. G. 259, 264, 271,
 274
 Van Groningen, B. A. 151
 Van Minnen, P. 319
 Van Os, B. 5
 Vanhove, D. 146, 161
 Vermes, G. 64
 Verner, D. C. 172, 176
 Vielhauer, P. 3
 Vogel, C. J. de 211
 Vos, G. 71, 73
 Wagner, J. R. 12, 117, 224
 Wallace, D. B. 282
 Wallace, R. 1, 3
 Walters, J. C. 269, 270

- Walther, J. A. 107
 Warner, M. 137
 Warren, J. 222
 Wasserman, E. 232, 237, 239, 252
 Watson, F. 40, 234
 Watson, G. R. 301
 Weber, F. 41
 Weiss, B. 66
 Weiss, J. 24, 107, 185, 186, 188, 189
 Weiss, K. 108
 Welborn, L. L. 143, 163
 Wendland, H.-D. 107
 Wengst, K. 4
 Westerholm, S. 45
 Whitby, Mary 254
 Whitby, Michael 254
 White, J. L. 269
 White, L. M. 136, 252
 Whiteley, D. E. H. 93
 Wikenhauser, A. 82, 93
 Wilckens, U. 231, 234
 Wilcox, M. 22, 215
 Wiles, G. P. 154
 Wilk, F. 15, 30, 34, 35
 Wilkins, M. J. 137
 Williams, D. J. 272
 Williams, H. H. D. 4, 10, 12, 13, 15-8
 Williams, M. H. 149
 Williams, W. 1, 3
 Williamson, H. G. M. 117
 Willis, W. L. 185, 188-91, 194, 199, 201
 Wilson, S. G. 141
 Windisch, H. 66, 76
 Winer, G. B. 303, 304
 Winger, M. 235
 Winter, B. W. 136, 142, 159, 173
 Witherington, B. III 7, 128, 183, 200, 278, 318, 320, 324, 159
 Wolff, C. 94
 Wood, I. F. 67
 Woodbridge, P. 71
 Woodhouse, W. J. 266
 Wrede, W. 40, 41
 Wright, D. F. 26
 Wright, N. T. 7, 235, 279
 Wuellner, W. 9
 Yeo, K. 24, 185, 229
 Yorke, G. L. O. R. 95
 Young, B. H. 42
 Young, E. J. 10
 Zetterholm, M. 183, 196
 Zevit, Z. 289
 Ziesler, J. A. 74, 235