At first glance, Paul's words to the Corinthians about their being the body of Christ seem simple and straightforward. He compares them with a human body so that they may be encouraged to work together, each member contributing to the good of the whole according to his or her special gift. However, the passage raises several critical questions which point to its deeper implications. Does Paul mean that the community is "like" a body or is he saying that they are in some sense a real body? What is the significance of being specifically the body of *Christ*? Is the primary purpose of the passage to instruct on the correct use of spiritual gifts or is Paul also making a statement about the identity of the Christian community? Michelle Lee examines Paul's instructions in 1 Corinthians 12–14 against the backdrop of Hellenistic moral philosophy, and especially Stoicism.

MICHELLE V. LEE is Assistant Professor of Biblical Studies and Theology at Biola University.

SOCIETY FOR NEW TESTAMENT STUDIES

MONOGRAPH SERIES

General editor: John Court

137

PAUL, THE STOICS, AND THE BODY OF CHRIST

SOCIETY FOR NEW TESTAMENT STUDIES:

MONOGRAPH SERIES

Recent titles in the series

124. God and History in the Book of Revelation
MICHAEL GILBERTSON
0 521 82466 4
125. Jesus' Defeat of Death
PETER G. BOLT
0 521 83036 2
126. From Hope to Despair in Thessalonica
COLIN R. NICHOLL
0 521 83142 3
127. Matthew's Trilogy of Parables
WESLEY G. OLMSTEAD
0 521 83154 7
128. The People of God in the Apocalypse
STEPHEN PATTEMORE
0 521 83698 0
129. The Exorcism Stories in Luke–Acts
TODD KLUTZ
0 521 83804 5
130. Jews, Gentiles and Ethnic Reconciliation
TET-LIM N. YEE
0 521 83831 2
131. Ancient Rhetoric and Paul's Apology
FREDRICK J. LONG
0 521 84233 6
132. Reconstructing Honor in Roman Philippi
JOSEPH H. HELLERMAN
0 521 84909 8
133. Theological Hermeneutics and 1 Thessalonians
ANGUS PADDISON
0 521 84983 7
134. Greco-Roman Culture and the Galilee of Jesus
MARK A. CHANCEY
0 521 84647 1
135. Christology and Discipleship in the Gospel of Mark
SUZANNE WATTS HENDERSON
0 521 85906 9
136. The Judaean Poor and the Fourth Gospel
TIMOTHY J. M. LING
0 521 85722 8

Paul, the Stoics, and the Body of Christ

MICHELLE V. LEE

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo, Delhi

Cambridge University Press
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 8RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521864541

© Michelle V. Lee 2006

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception
and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,
no reproduction of any part may take place without the written
permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2006
Reprinted 2008
This digitally printed version 2008

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

ISBN 978-0-521-86454-1 hardback
ISBN 978-0-521-09143-5 paperback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or
accuracy of URLs for external or third-party Internet websites referred to in
this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is,
or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

To my mother, Mrs. Grace K. Lee
and in memory of my father,
Dr. William C. Lee 1926–2002

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This project is a revision of my doctoral dissertation, which was accepted by the University of Notre Dame in April 2001. I am extremely grateful for the support of the many people who have worked with me in this endeavor. Not only would this project have been impossible without them, it would have been much less rewarding.

Thanks first of all go to my dissertation director at the University of Notre Dame, Dr. Harold W. Attridge, now Lillian Claus Professor of New Testament at Yale. I have benefited immeasurably from his unique ability to critique and guide me, while at the same time encouraging me to pursue my own creative instincts. More than anyone else, he has challenged and inspired me as a scholar.

Dr. Mary Rose D'Angelo also served as my dissertation director at Notre Dame and was influential in the formation of the original project. She has been a constant source of advice and encouragement. I am particularly grateful for her exhortations to trust my instincts and to think creatively as well as analytically.

Many thanks go to the other members of my dissertation committee, Drs. Jerome H. Neyrey, Gretchen Reydams-Schils, and Gregory Sterling, who contributed greatly to the dissertation through their careful readings of the project, stimulating conversations, and incisive comments. I am extremely grateful to all of these people for their influence on both this project and my time at Notre Dame.

I would like to thank Dr. John M. Court for agreeing to include this work in the SNTS Monograph Series. I am grateful to Dr. Troels Engberg-Pedersen for his willingness to read the manuscript and offer his insightful comments during the revision process. He provided me with a copy of his manuscript while I was finishing the dissertation. Drs. Joseph H. Hellerman and Gretchen Reydams-Schils were also kind enough to let me view advance copies of their works so I could incorporate them into this book.

Biola University was very helpful in providing a grant to allow me some release time to work on the book. I am very appreciative for the support of my deans, Drs. Dennis Dirks and Michael Wilkins, for granting me a research leave to work on revising the project. My department chairs, Drs. Walter Bo Russell and David Talley, were gracious and flexible in accommodating my need for extra time. Dr. Kenneth Berding had the unenviable but invaluable task of reading through the entire manuscript. His comments were much appreciated. My research assistants, Jeannine Hanger and Geoff Smith, provided invaluable help in compiling the indexes.

Flo Ellis and Robert Krauss at the Biola library provided much appreciated help throughout the process, particularly in fulfilling my many requests for books and articles.

Lastly, I want to thank my family for all of their support. None of this would have been possible without the love and example of my parents, Dr. William and Mrs. Grace Lee, although sadly, my father passed away in the spring of 2002 and was not able to see this in its final form. For all that they have done and sacrificed for me, my gratitude is beyond words.

ABBREVIATIONS

AB	Anchor Bible
AnBib	Analecta biblica
ANRW	*Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*. Edited by H. Temporini and W. Haase. New York, 1992
BAGD	Bauer, W., W. F. Arndt, F. W. Gingrich, and F. W. Danker. *A Greek–English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 2nd edn. Chicago, 1979
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
CQ	*Classical Quarterly*
EvQ	*Evangelical Quarterly*
GRBS	*Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*
HR	*History of Religions*
HTR	*Harvard Theological Review*
ICC	International Critical Commentary
Int	*Interpretation*
JAAR	*Journal of the American Academy of Religion*
JB	*Jerusalem Bible*. Edited by A. Jones. Garden City, NY, 1966
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JETS	*Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*
JSOT	*Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series
JTS	*Journal of Theological Studies*
LSJ	Liddell, H. G., R. Scott, and H. S. Jones. A Greek–English Lexicon. 9th edn. with revised supplement. Oxford, 1996
NAB	New American Bible
NEB	New English Bible

NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament
NIGTC	New International Greek Testament Commentary
NIV	New International Version
NovT	*Novum Testamentum*
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
NTS	*New Testament Studies*
OCD	*Oxford Classical Dictionary*
RelSRev	*Religious Studies Review*
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLRBS	Society of Biblical Literature Resources for Biblical Study
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
ST	*Studia theologica*
SVF	*Stoicorum veterum fragmenta*. H. von Arnim. 4 vols. Leipzig, 1903–24.
TDNT	*Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Edited by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich. 10 vols. Grand Rapids, 1964–76
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
ZNW	*Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche*

Titles of ancient sources are abbreviated as listed in *The SBL Handbook of Style*, ed. Patrick H. Alexander *et al*. (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1999).

1

INTRODUCTION

At first glance, Paul's words to the Corinthians about their being the body of Christ in 1 Cor. 12 seem simple and straightforward. He compares them with a human body so that they may be encouraged to work together, each member contributing to the good of the whole according to his or her special gift. However, the passage raises several critical questions which point to its deeper implications. Does Paul mean that the community is only "like" a body or is he saying that they are in some sense a real body? What is the significance of being specifically the body of *Christ*? Is the primary purpose of the passage to instruct on the correct use of spiritual gifts or is Paul also making a statement about the identity of the Christian community? The goal of this work is to present fresh answers to these questions by examining more closely the evidence from others who also spoke about the importance of being a body, specifically the Stoics, and how their conception of bodily unity was critical for social ethics. In doing so, I hope to shed new light on both the content and the purpose of Paul's description of the body of Christ in 1 Cor. 12 and also as it relates to the rest of his instructions in 1 Cor. 13 and 14.

Key issues

The body of Christ: physical body or metaphor?

One of the key questions is whether Paul was speaking of a literal or a figurative body, a question represented in the exchange between J. A. T. Robinson and Robert Gundry. Robinson contends that Paul was referring to Christ's actual physical body; he argues that the term must be understood in light of Paul's "Christology" instead of linguistic sources.[1] The church is "in literal fact the risen organism

[1] John A. T. Robinson, *The Body* (London: SCM Press, 1966) 48.

of Christ's person in all its concrete reality" and the individuals are members of Christ's person.[2] Although this constitutes a "very violent use of language," Paul intended it to be so. Robinson explains that it was meant to be "offensive" and "It is almost impossible to exaggerate the materialism and crudity of Paul's doctrine of the Church as literally now the resurrection *body* of Christ."[3] However, the difficulty for Robinson is that he is not able to give a satisfactory explanation of how this "real" connection could exist.

Gundry rightly objects to the equation of believers with the physical body of the risen Christ. He explains, "To equate the present physical body of Christ with believers wreaks havoc with the temporal distinction Paul carefully makes between the pastness of Christ's resurrection and the futurity of believers' resurrection."[4] However, he does not deny some sort of equation between Christ and the believers, for he also states, "On the other side, not to equate believers with a body of Christ, merely to attach them sacramentally and mystically, would fail to do justice to Paul's statement ... that the Church *is* the Body of Christ and that individual believers make up the specific organs and limbs."[5] He only denies that the church can be identified with Christ's glorious and risen body.[6]

Furthermore, Gundry notes that the "body of Christ" image appears solely in paraenetic passages for the purpose of exhortation and deals primarily with the working relationships among the Christians. The ethical nature of the passage implies that the phrase is not to be taken physically.[7] The ecclesiastical body is metaphorical because it equates members with the eyes, and the like, in only a figurative way.[8] Gundry

[2] Ibid., 50–51. [3] Ibid.

[4] Robert Gundry, *SOMA in Biblical Theology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976) 228.

[5] Ibid., 228.

[6] Andrew Perriman argues that the problem lies in a misunderstanding of the nature of metaphor. He says that one cannot distinguish precisely between metaphor and "literal" language since the very use of metaphor implies a "real" state ("'His Body, Which Is the Church ...' Coming to Terms with Metaphor," *EvQ* 62 [1990] 123–42).

[7] Although there may be an equation between Christ and the church, it is not necessarily physical, despite the physical language. For example, in Gal. 3:16, 29 the Christians are Abraham's offspring, with "offspring" denoting something definitely physical. But being Abraham's offspring is a matter of faith alone (Gundry, *SOMA*, 23–32). Or as Ernest Best states, while "body" may be a physical term, since it is used as a metaphor, "that does not imply that the reality behind (the metaphor) need necessarily be considered as physical" (*One Body in Christ* [London: SPCK, 1955] 16).

[8] Gundry, *SOMA*, 230. As mentioned, Gundry still states that the church is Christ's body in a very real way. He distinguishes between the individual body of Christ, which arose and ascended, and an "ecclesiastical body, consisting of believers, in which he

asserts that Robinson emphasizes the "extreme violence and crudity" of the expression because Robinson himself recognized "the impossibility of its making good literal sense."[9]

But if the primary purpose of the metaphor is comparative, why did Paul use the phrase "body of Christ"? It would have been easier for him to discuss the "body of the church." We come to the significance of naming the church the body of *Christ*. To say the phrase is "metaphorical" or the passage is "paraenetic" does not fully answer these questions, and perhaps the answer lies in finding an alternative way of explaining how the church can be Christ's body in other than the literal physical sense.

Some within the Roman Catholic tradition have attempted to preserve the real connection between Christ and the church through the use of terms such as "supernatural" and "mystical." For many of these scholars, the Spirit's role has led them to search for new ways of defining the union beyond "physical," "figurative," and "metaphorical."

For example, Alfred Wikenhauser asserted that the reception of the Spirit brought the believers into the "mystischen Einheit."[10] In this way the church becomes the "mystical" body of Christ. L. Cerfaux sought to modify this definition so that it was not so much a "mystical body," but a "mystical theory of life in Christ."[11] For Cerfaux, Christians were still a "spiritual organism . . . mystically identified with the body of Christ"[12] although not a "mystical body" as a collective person forming the church.[13]

In the end, the use of terms such as "mystical" prove not very illuminating in terms of how Paul actually conceived of this relationship.[14] A historical explanation for the content of this relationship is needed.

dwells on earth through his Spirit" (*SOMA*, 228). Other studies have emphasized the comparative aspect of the metaphor more exclusively than Gundry, e.g. Brian Daines, who says "'Body of Christ' is used in the New Testament essentially to make practical points and to turn it into a mystical concept relating to the aggregate of individual believers rather than to congregations is to turn it into something completely different" ("Paul's Use of the Analogy of the Body of Christ," *EvQ* 50 [1978] 78). Also, Gosnell L. O. R. Yorke, "The human σῶμα and *not* Christ's σῶμα is used consistently as the term of comparison for the church as σῶμα" (*The Church as the Body of Christ in the Pauline Corpus* [Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1991] 10).

[9] *SOMA*, 235.

[10] Alfred Wikenhauser, *Die Kirche als der mystische Leib Christi nach dem Apostel Paulus* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1937) 92.

[11] L. Cerfaux, *The Church in the Theology of St. Paul* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1959) 267.

[12] Ibid., 282. [13] Ibid., 283.

[14] In general, the lack of a historical explanation for the terms has led to a great deal of confusion about terminology. For example, Ernst Käsemann said that the body of

Indeed, part of the problem may lie in the limitations of contemporary definitions of what it means to be a body.

Albert Schweitzer's work highlighted this problem. He emphasized the importance of bodily union with Christ in *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*.[15] He even stated that "shared corporeity" between Christ and the church was the central idea of Paul's thought.[16] While stated most explicitly in ch. 12, this "shared corporeity" was also the best way to explain such passages as 1 Cor. 6.

Schweitzer pointed out that the explicit nature of the church as Christ's body was a significant part of Paul's beliefs and ethics, even though it is difficult to conceptualize this type of bodily unity. Paul's language virtually demands a corporeal relationship between Christ and the church, even if it is not at all clear how this relationship could exist.

Jewett calls Schweitzer's work "extraordinary" because it "accepts and makes sense out of the Pauline understanding of the body in a way which no earlier interpretation could match."[17] Although Schweitzer could not explain the content of this bodily unity, he did point to the possibility that Paul may have intended a literal corporeal relationship which went beyond the intellectual categories available to him in the twentieth century. As Jewett summarizes, "modern man does not appear to possess the philosophical assumptions to grasp such ideas of somatic unity."[18]

Dale Martin specifically argues that modern readers have been misled by a Cartesian construction of a body–soul dualism as an ontological dualism which cannot adequately accommodate the

Christ was a "mythological" conception that Paul viewed "realistically" (*Perspectives in Paul* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971] 104 n. 9). Cerfaux argued that it was a "real" body as opposed to a "mystical" body, but one which nevertheless created a "mystical" union between Christ and the believers (*Church*, 280–81). Current scholars are more wary of speaking of a "mystical" body, but still have not found a satisfactory way of describing the connection. For example, Ben Witherington says, "[The body metaphor] is not merely an analogy, since he believes that it describes a real supernatural entity: Christ's people bound to him and to each other by God's Spirit" (*Conflict and Community in Corinth* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995] 255).

[15] Albert Schweitzer, *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle* (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1956).

[16] Ibid., 110. It is called the body of Christ on account of Christ being "the most exalted personality which shares in it, and because its special character was first consummated and made manifest in Christ."

[17] Robert Jewett, *Paul's Anthropological Terms: A Study of Their Use in Conflict Settings* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1971) 215.

[18] Ibid., 215. Similarly, Käsemann notes that "what seems to us mythological was viewed by Paul quite realistically" (*Paul*, 104).

ancient conception of corporeality. For example, whereas Descartes distinguished the body as material and the soul as immaterial, Aristotle viewed the soul as incorporeal but not as what the modern reader would call "immaterial."[19] As a result of the differences in conceptual categories, Martin asserts that interpreters need to "wipe clean our slate of corporeal vocabulary" and "take an imaginative leap into the past" in order to reconstruct how the ancients understood corporeality.[20] A goal of this study is to yield some of these categories with which to understand the image by examining the significance of being called a "body" in Paul's culture.

I will attempt to show that the Stoics provide the means for understanding Paul's concept of bodily unity, including how this affects his ethics. I will attempt to show that Schweitzer was correct, and that the main part that was missing from his solution was a historical *and* philosophical explanation for the content of "somatic union."

Naming the body: the body of Christ as a statement of identity

In addition to understanding Paul's use of "body," it is necessary to consider the significance of Paul's naming the Corinthians as Christ's body specifically. According to Käsemann, the phrase "body of Christ" is primarily a statement of identity and the stress lies on the genitive.[21] Paul does not simply say that the church is a body but that it is so "in Christ." His argument is ultimately a "Christological one."[22]

[19] Dale Martin, *The Corinthian Body* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995) 8.
[20] Ibid.
[21] Käsemann, *Paul*, 102–21. Several scholars have asked whether the very characterization of a group as σῶμα has pre-Christian precedent. For example, A. E. J. Rawlinson asserted that "(σῶμα) does not appear in pre-Christian Greek usage to denote the idea of a 'society,' a 'body corporate,' with 'members'" ("Corpus Christi," in *Mysterium Christi*, ed. G. K. A. Bell and Adolf Deissmann [London: Longmans, 1930] 226). See the discussion in Jewett, *Terms*, 229–30. Jewett denies that there are any pre-Christian examples. W. L. Knox proposed the phrase ὡς ἑνὸς σώματος in Philo, *Spec.* 3.121 ("Parallels to the N.T. Use of σῶμα," *JTS* 39 [1938] 243–46); and T. W. Manson τῷ τῶν Ἑλλήνων σώματι in an inscription dating to 7/6 BCE ("A Parallel to a N.T. Use of σῶμα," *JTS* 37 (1936) 385). Jewett points out that the latter is based upon a mistranslation because σώματι should be connected with λειτουργεῖν, resulting in the phrase "to perform bodily service." Jewett dismisses the example from Philo as being "speculative," but I will examine the passage in more depth below.
[22] Käsemann, *Paul*, 103.

Like Gundry and others, Käsemann notes that Paul uses the body of Christ in a paraenetic context. However, he makes a more explicit connection between "theology" (or Christology) and "ethics" when he says that the passage gives the "theological reason" for unity in the midst of diversity.[23] He asserts that one must go beyond comparison to understand the significance of the very real "body of Christ." Since the church was baptized into one body by the Spirit, the phrase is not a metaphor but rather reflects the transformation that occurs at baptism "in which the old man dies and a new creature comes to life."[24] Thus, the comparative aspect must be understood in the perspective of the entire exhortation with the result that "the comparison brings out the reality which is intended through the concrete application of the statement of identity to the life of the Christian community."[25] A critical part of Paul's argument is his identification of the church as the specific body of Christ and how this provides a foundational element in his exhortation.[26]

The relationship between identification and exhortation in Paul's method has been noted by other commentators, especially those who describe it as "indicative-imperative."[27] Paul's ethics are inseparably

[23] Ibid., 118.

[24] As Käsemann explains, the "sacrament" involves the person in Christ's death, incorporates him or her "in Christ" and allows the person to participate in the "Divine Spirit." Thus the person's identity "in Christ" exists first. Christ has a heavenly body that fills and embraces the earth, a body which is then identified with the church. Only after this idea is established does Paul use the idea of the organism for paraenetic purposes. Christ exists before the church, and people become members of the church only because they first partake in Christ (*Paul*, 103–104, 116). Similarly, Rudolf Bultmann explains that it is what happens to the believer in Christ that determines the application of "body" language. "Paul explains the inner unity of believers with each other and with the Redeemer by using the Gnostic term 'body' (i.e. in the phrase 'body of Christ,' Rom. 12:4f.; 1 Cor. 12:12–27; also 1 Cor. 6:15–17) and in so doing very materially determines *the development of the Church-concept*" (*Theology of the New Testament*, trans. Kendrick Grobel [2 vols.; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1954] I:178).

[25] Käsemann, *Paul*, 104.

[26] Indeed, those who support the theory of the Stoic metaphor will often note the way in which Paul seems to depart from normal usage by identifying the body with Christ, although in general they do not pursue an in-depth explanation. Wayne A. Meeks, for example, notes Paul's use of a rhetorical commonplace and adds that the specification of the body as Christ's "makes the usage extraordinary" (*The First Urban Christians* [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983] 89).

[27] Victor Paul Furnish states, "The relation of indicative and imperative, the relation of 'theological' proclamation and 'moral' exhortation, is *the* crucial problem in interpreting the Pauline ethic" (*Theology and Ethics in Paul* [Nashville: Abingdon, 1968] 9). Research on the indicative and imperative in Paul can be divided into three

related to the content of his preaching, in particular what it means to be "in Christ" and to "belong" to him. Victor Furnish states,

> The study of the Pauline ethic, therefore, is not the study of his ethical theory, for he had none, nor of his code for Christian living, for he gave none. It is the study, first of all, of the theological convictions which underlie Paul's concrete exhortations and instructions and, secondly, of the way those convictions shape his responses to practical questions of conduct.[28]

In a somewhat similar manner, I will argue that we must understand the convictions underlying Paul's "indicative" in ch. 12 before we can understand how they shape his "imperative" in what follows. Specifically, Paul's method of linking community identity as a body and corporate ethical exhortation is similar to what is found in Stoic paraenesis. This identification sheds light both on Paul's ethical method and on how he conceives of the nature of the eschatological community.

Methodological considerations

Theological interests have often influenced the contours of the discussion about the body of Christ. For example, Jewett notes the tendency to read a church tradition back into the text. Referring to a portion of the Roman Catholic debate, he observes, "There

categories: (1) the two are separated from and not related to each other (C. H. Dodd, *Gospel and Law* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963]); (2) the two are so closely related that they are virtually indistinguishable (Rudolf Bultmann, "Das Problem der Ethik bei Paulus," *ZNW* 23 [1924] 123–40; trans. Christoph W. Stenschke, "The Problem of Ethics in Paul," in *Understanding Paul's Ethics*, ed. Brian S. Rosner [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995] 195–216; *Theology of the New Testament*, vol. I, trans. Kendrick Grobel [New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1955] 315–32; Furnish, *Paul*); (3) the two are closely related but maintain their distinctiveness (G. Bornkamm, *Paul* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1971] 201–203; T. J. Deidun, *New Covenant Morality* [Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1981] 78; L. Goppelt, *Theology of the New Testament*, vol. II [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982] 136; W. G. Kümmel, *Theology of the New Testament* [London: SCM Press, 1980] 227; R. N. Longenecker, *Paul: Apostle of Liberty* [Grand Rapids: Baker, 1977] 179; C. E. Braaten, *Eschatology and Ethics* [Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1974] 121; Michael Parsons, "Being Precedes Act: Indicative and Imperative in Paul's Writing," in *Understanding Paul's Ethics*, ed. Brian S. Rosner (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995) 217–47 (reprinted from *EvQ* 60 [1988] 99–127). See Parsons for a more detailed discussion of the positions.

[28] Furnish, *Paul*, 211–12.

appears to be a minimum of wrestling with the historical intention of (Paul); instead one scheme is set up against the other with the claim that it provides a more satisfactory compromise between the text and the theological tradition."[29] Gundry's denial that the believers are attached "sacramentally and mystically" to the body of Christ reflects a different aspect of the theological debate, specifically the arguments against the "mystical" body of Christ. The present inquiry will, as much as possible, approach the text from the standpoint of the ancient philosophers and not from a concern to support a specific contemporary theological position. The hope is to discover new categories for thinking about both the content and function of "body" language in 1 Corinthians.

Identifying the "source" of the metaphor: potential and problems

One of the key issues for scholars has been the "source" for Paul's use of the "body of Christ" phrase. The proposals are numerous,[30] including the Jewish concept of corporate personality,[31] the gnostic Redeemer myth,[32] the body of Adam from rabbinic Judaism,[33] and the temple of Asclepius in Corinth.[34] Some scholars have looked to Paul's own experience to provide the explanation. The Damascus

[29] Jewett, *Terms*, 205.

[30] For a detailed analysis of the source theory of the metaphor see ibid., 200–304. Other, more brief surveys can be found in Robinson, *Body*, 55; Josef Hainz, *Ekklesia* (Regensburg: Pustet, 1972) 260, n. 2; Yorke, *Church*, 1–10.

[31] According to this theory, Christ incorporates the church within himself analogous to the way in which a Hebrew Bible figure incorporated ancient Israel within himself as their inclusive representative (Best, *Christ*; Schweitzer, *Mysticism*).

[32] The Urmensch consisted of a gigantic body which came to earth and was incarcerated in the material world. Although the Urmensch escaped, fragments of his body remained imprisoned on earth (Ernst Käsemann, *Leib und Leib Christi* [Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1933]; Bultmann, *New Testament*, I:175–83; Walter Schmithals, *Gnosticism in Corinth*, trans. John E. Steely [Nashville: Abingdon, 1971]).

[33] In the opinion of W. D. Davies, Paul derived it from the rabbinic doctrine of the unity of humanity in Adam. According to this doctrine, Adam's body was symbolic of humanity's oneness. Paul simply adapted the idea to the new humanity which was "in Christ" and animated by the Spirit (*Paul and Rabbinic Judaism* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980] 55–57; also Jewett, *Terms*, 239–50).

[34] The idea is derived from votive offerings in the form of body parts found in the temple (Andrew E. Hill, "The Temple of Asclepius: An Alternative Source for Paul's Body Theology?" *JBL* 99 [1980] 437–39; Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, *St. Paul's Corinth* [Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1983] 165–67).

Road theory[35] and the Eucharist[36] have been proposed as ideas for the bodily unity between Christ and his church.

None of these ideas, however, has gained a scholarly consensus. Numerous scholars have also suggested a combination of theories rather than a single "source."[37] This work will not attempt to examine all of the possible "sources," but rather will focus upon the potential of Stoic philosophy as a backdrop.

Probably the most enduring "source" is the political/philosophical image of the cosmos or state as a body.[38] The image was widespread in antiquity, with its best-known form that of the Menenius Agrippa fable, in which Agrippa persuaded the plebeians to cease their rebellion against the senate by arguing that since the state, like a body, is made up of a number of diverse parts, all of the parts perform a necessary function, including the senators, for the good of the whole.[39] Conzelmann notes, "[The figure of the body as an organism] was to begin with a popular figure; it was then taken over by philosophy, especially by the Stoa."[40]

Perhaps the most thorough application of this theory is the important study by Margaret Mitchell in *Paul and the Rhetoric of*

[35] Seyoon Kim argues that Paul's concept of the solidarity of the people with Christ came from his conversion experience when he encountered the risen Christ, who says, "Saul, Saul, Why do you persecute me? . . . *I am Jesus whom you persecute*" (*The Origin of Paul's Gospel* [Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1984] 252–56; also Robinson, *Body*, 58).

[36] Rawlinson suggested that bodily union between Christ and the believer took place through the Eucharist as a communion with the Lord's Body and Blood and a participation in Christ's sacrifice ("Corpus Christi," 225–44. Also Cerfaux, *Church*, 262–82).

[37] E.g. Käsemann who sees the influence of the Stoic notion of the organism, the Jewish idea of "corporate personality," and the Anthropos myth (*Paul*, 103).

[38] Others who have held similar views include: Traugott Schmidt, *Der Leib Christi* (Leipzig: A. Deichert, 1919) 193–248; W. L. Knox, *Paul and the Church of the Gentiles* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961) 160–65; G. Johnston, *The Doctrine of the Church in the New Testament* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1943) 85–99; Cerfaux, *Church*; C. K. Barrett, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1968) 287; Hans Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, trans. J. W. Leitch (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975) 210–16; Meeks, *Urban Christians*, 89–90; Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987) 600–603; Witherington, *Corinth*, 258–59; Robert M. Grant, "Hellenistic Elements in 1 Corinthians," in *Early Christian Origins*, ed. Allen Wikgren (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1961) 63; Wikenhauser, *Kirche*, 130–43.

[39] Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. rom.* 6.83.2; also Livy, *History of Rome* 2.32.8–12.

[40] *1 Corinthians*, 211. This will be demonstrated in more detail in chapter 2. Unfortunately, this idea was not treated in Max Pohlenz, *Paulus und die Stoa* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1956).

Reconciliation.[41] Her overall thesis is that the entire epistle is an example of deliberative rhetoric, specifically, a "concord" speech in which Paul is arguing for unity. 1 Cor. 12 then forms a significant section of his overall argument.

She documents how the metaphor was used for the society or state in ancient political literature to show the need for cooperation among all the parts or members of society. It was specifically used to combat factionalism, such as that which is evident in 1 Corinthians, beginning with the thesis statement in 1:10. Thus, the metaphor in 1 Cor. 12 is a primary part of Paul's argument for the community to end their factionalism by working for the "common good." Mitchell further supports her claims by showing that the similarities extend beyond the thematic connection to include specific terms and motifs. These include the appeal to cooperation for the "common good" (συμφέρον) as well as details such as specific body parts (e.g. eyes and ears), the reference to "necessary" parts (ἀναγκαῖα), and even the personification of body parts.[42]

Mitchell's identification of the political background is significant not only because of her close identification of the image and its "source" but also because she moves beyond "source" to examine closely its function. In light of the preceding discussion on the various issues which interpreters encounter in analyzing the "body of Christ," it seems that a proper methodology would need to take into account the integration of the "source" and its function. A full understanding of 1 Cor. 12 must link the identification of the community as the body of Christ (content), and its paraenetic purpose (ethics).

In spite of Mitchell's detailed study, however, an understanding of the body as a metaphor for the political organism could be greatly enhanced by a deeper knowledge of the philosophical background to the image. Conzelmann notes the relationship of the metaphor to politics, while also noting its close association with the Stoics.[43] Barrett compares Paul's metaphor to the Menenius Agrippa fable with its political purpose, but also sees a connection with Stoic speculation on the nature of the universe as a body.[44]

[41] *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1991).

[42] Such correspondence in detail gives Mitchell's hypothesis another advantage over the proposals mentioned above.

[43] Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 211.

[44] Barrett, *Corinthians*, 287.

There are many areas in which the philosophical context can potentially shed light on Paul's use of the image. For example, Mitchell notes that Paul "Christianizes" the metaphor.[45] Understanding the philosophical context may reveal some important insights on how Paul might have viewed the nature of the Christian community to which he transferred the image.[46] Additionally, as Käsemann pointed out, Paul's identification of the body as Christ's body is a significant aspect of his argument. The way in which the philosophers might have named the "political organisms" and other groups to which they applied the metaphor may reveal much concerning the significance of Paul's naming of the Christian community.

While Mitchell has laid some significant groundwork in terms of seeing the importance of unity for Paul's argument and the rhetorical background of the body image, there is additional work that can be done in terms of understanding more fully the implications of 1 Cor. 12.

Understanding the body of Christ in the context of Hellenistic moral philosophy

The relationship between Hellenistic moral philosophy and the New Testament, or more specifically between Stoicism and the New Testament, has been examined since late antiquity. The Latin apologists and Church Fathers such as Augustine and Jerome noted parallels with the Stoics. Perceived affinities in the thoughts of Paul and Seneca led to speculation that the two had a personal relationship, perhaps even that Paul had converted Seneca, and an anonymous writer even produced a set of letters supposedly written between the two. Marcia L. Colish has documented the contours of this debate from this early period to the present.[47]

[45] Mitchell, *Paul*, 160.

[46] Thus, it is possible to expand upon Robert Grant's basic observation that "Paul has simply taken over the contemporary picture of the body politic as consisting of many members with different functions and has applied it to the body politic of the Church" ("1 Corinthians," 63).

[47] Marcia L. Colish, "Stoicism and the New Testament: An Essay in Historiography," *ANRW* 26.1 (1992) 334–79; *Stoicism in Christian Latin Thought through the Sixth Century* (vol. II of *The Stoic Tradition from Antiquity to the Early Middle Ages*; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1990); notably, she concludes that despite the intense interest in the topic, scholarship has not gained much ground in terms of an overall, cumulative understanding of the relationship between the two. Rather, "The views of the relations

Scholars have long attempted to understand the extent to which we can say that Paul has "borrowed" from other ancient sources and what the implications of this "borrowing" are. But the point of this study is not to put Paul in line with some tradition, but rather to see what traditions he may have adapted to proclaim his unique message and the way in which he adapted these cultural resources for his own ends. To this end, several methodological points must be kept in mind in order to evaluate as carefully as possible both the correspondences and differences between Paul and the moralists and, consequently, their significance for understanding Paul.

Avoiding "parallelomania": Samuel Sandmel

One pitfall is to assume too great a correspondence between Paul and an alleged "source." Samuel Sandmel warns against this tendency, which he calls "parallelomania" and defines as "that extravagance among scholars which first overdoes the supposed similarity in passages and then proceeds to describe source and derivation as if implying literary connection flowing in an inevitable or predetermined direction."[48] He cautions against making Paul's context conform to the content of the alleged parallels. It is critical to evaluate the significance of the parallels rather than simply list excerpts since two passages may sound the same in isolation, but their contexts may reveal their differences rather than their similarities. The interpreter must carefully examine the specific use which the author makes of the alleged "parallel."[49]

The assumption in this study is that Paul was both a product of his environment and an individual thinker. In speaking to his first-century Greco-Roman audience, Paul would have needed to use

between Stoicism and the New Testament have been notably fluid, and the approaches taken to it highly subjective, as each successive group of commentators has reinvented the topic and used it to mirror its own contemporary concerns" ("New Testament," 379). See also, G. M. Ross, "Seneca's Philosophical Influence," in *Seneca*, ed. C. D. N. Costa (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1974) 116–65. For the possibility that Seneca and Paul may have been personally acquainted, see Claude W. Barlow, *Epistolae Senecae ad Paulum et Pauli ad Senecam <quae vocantur>*, Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome 10 (Horn, Austria: Ferdinand Berger, 1938) 1–7. For a broader perspective on Hellenistic philosophy and the New Testament, see Gregory E. Sterling, "Hellenistic Philosophy and the New Testament," in *Handbook to Exegesis of the New Testament*, ed. Stanley E. Porter (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1997) 313–58; Abraham J. Malherbe, "Hellenistic Moralists and the New Testament," ANRW 26.1 (1992) 267–33.

[48] Samuel Sandmel, "Parallelomania," *JBL* 81 (1962) 1.

[49] Ibid., 2–5.

terms and ideas that would have been readily understandable to them. But at the same time, he may have adapted them in order to proclaim his unique message. It will be important to examine not only the similarities between Paul and the Stoics, but also the differences in order to comprehend better both the relevance and the distinctiveness of Paul's message.

Contrasting Paul and Seneca: J. N. Sevenster

Opposed to the problem of drawing too great a relationship, there is the problem of being too quick to dismiss any significant correspondence because of differences. So, although J. N. Sevenster notes similarities between Paul and Seneca, his conclusion is ultimately negative because of what he perceives to be significant differences. Sevenster has been quick to point out the disparities,[50] almost to the point of seeing nothing meaningful in the correspondence. Thus he ultimately concludes that Paul's concept of fellowship and the church is radically different because Seneca's is universal whereas Paul's is limited to the believers. "For Paul continually, or at all events primarily, has in mind the Church, while Seneca is thinking of that vast organic whole in which men are united not as believers but as human beings. Is not fellowship in Paul restricted in a way that is alien to Seneca's broad cosmopolitanism?"[51]

But the differences may not be as great as Sevenster suggests. While it is true that Seneca speaks of a universal society whereas Paul speaks of the believers only, Sevenster does not seem to notice that for Paul the Christian community is a type of universal society, descended from the last Adam, just as all humanity is descended from the first Adam (1 Cor. 15:45–50).[52] Furthermore if, as Abraham Malherbe suggests, Sevenster had extended the scope of his study to include other Stoics, indeed other philosophical traditions, he might have been able to nuance the comparison. While Stoic

[50] But numerous scholars have noted the similarities between Paul and the Stoics. For a summary of the issue, see Sterling, "New Testament." For a list of previous studies, see J. N. Sevenster, *Paul and Seneca* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1961) 1. A more recent study is David deSilva, "Paul and the Stoa: A Comparison," *JETS* 38 (1995) 549–64.

[51] Sevenster, *Paul*, 173.

[52] This type of modification does not seem so difficult to make. Davies could easily see Paul making a similar adaptation with regard to the body of Adam theory. For Davies, Paul modifies the rabbinic theory from a unity of all humanity in Adam to the Christians as a "new humanity" belonging to Christ (*Paul*, 55–57).

humanity is indeed universal, it is "exclusive" in its own particular way, in that it excludes those who do not participate in reason, namely all other living creatures. This provides a striking similarity with Paul's method of defining the community because both are composed of those who partake of reason, although for the Christians it is a specific type of reason, the νοῦς Χριστοῦ. Paul's and Seneca's notions of fellowship are more similar than may appear at first glance, so we see the need for a detailed examination of how the evidence fits into the author's larger worldview. Rather than holding a radically different conception of fellowship, Paul adapts Stoic language and concepts in his definition of the Christian community.

Evaluating differences and similarities: Abraham J. Malherbe

Although Malherbe concludes that Sevenster was too inclined to find differences between Paul and Seneca, he praises him for "[alerting] us to think more carefully about the nature of parallels, and, indeed, about the desire to find them – or not to find them."[53] He stresses the potential of the Hellenistic moral philosophers for New Testament interpretation, while at the same time warning of the importance of a judicious methodology that can not only find parallels but also carefully evaluate their significance.[54]

Malherbe advocates an approach that understands individual differences along with similarities. He proposes a comparative method that takes into account differences among the individual philosophers. To observe a parallel between two philosophers does not necessarily mean equivalent usage. Malherbe especially draws attention to conceptual differences:

[53] "New Testament," 278.

[54] Dale Martin utilizes a different way of applying the philosophical writings in examining 1 Corinthians. Rather than exploring a more direct connection between the philosophical teachings and Paul, he attempts to discover the underlying "ideologies" of the Greco-Roman concept of the body in order to discern the "unspoken assumptions" that Paul and the Corinthians held regarding the body: "I am certainly not arguing that philosophical writings . . . had any direct influence on Paul's theology or ideology of the body. I concentrate on that literature merely in an attempt to discern the different ideologies of the body at work in Greco-Roman culture. My goal is to sketch the logic underlying these ancient discourses about the body and see how the different Greco-Roman concepts of the body and its components relate to one another" (*Body*, xiii).

> Quite often, scholars have operated on the supposition that we have to do with philosophic teachers who gathered whatever they thought potentially useful and stuffed it in their own grab-bags of teachings. The philosophers did so, it is assumed, without recognizing conceptual differences between their own views and those of the people from whom they borrowed.[55]

He goes on to state that it is erroneous to assume that the philosophers did not modify or adapt what they borrowed and that scholars who do not take this into consideration obscure the nuances of their teachings. Instead, he proposes to recognize this diversity by reading each philosopher "with the intention of respecting the coherence and integrity of each author's thought." This allows one to see both the similarities and the differences among the different philosophers. By seeing this interaction, the interpreter can more properly place the writings of the New Testament in their cultural context.

Malherbe states that philosophers could borrow from one another while maintaining their distinct teachings. By borrowing he does not mean a concept or teaching had to be taken over wholesale: the philosophers could modify what they borrowed. From this perspective, the differences between Paul and Seneca that Sevenster observes may be the result of such modification. Malherbe urges a more nuanced approach to the philosophers, one that neither dismisses any correspondence due to modifications, nor exaggerates the significance of the "parallels."[56]

Determining the significance of a parallel must involve a careful examination of the similarities and differences.[57] While one could use

[55] Malherbe, "New Testament," 277.

[56] Ibid., 276–78. Gregory E. Sterling raises the important point that use of a certain philosophical tradition is not the same as saying that the tradition was important for that person's self-identity. For example, even though Philo was a witness to Middle Platonism, one may not automatically conclude that Philo himself was a professional philosopher working in the Platonic tradition. In another way, Paul's use of hardship lists in 1 Corinthians might impinge upon his self-understanding. But his essential self-understanding was as an apostle of Jesus Christ and not as a sage (Sterling, "New Testament," 327–28). Thus the popularity of Stoicism in the Roman Empire would make it natural for Paul to shape his letter to the Corinthians in that way. But, taking into account the essential divergences from Stoic thought that I will outline below, it would be hard to say that Paul imagined himself a Stoic philosopher.

[57] As Malherbe does in his comparison of Paul's use of military imagery in 2 Cor. 10:3–6 and the application of this imagery by Stoic and Cynic philosophers ("Antisthenes and Odysseus, and Paul at War," *HTR* 76 [1983] 143–73).

a tradition to make a rhetorical point, including a statement about one's self, it does not follow that all the connotations associated with the use of image in a certain tradition must carry over into every use.[58]

We can expect Paul to use terms that fit in the context of the discussion. It would not be surprising for Paul to have drawn upon a Roman Stoic tradition, given that Corinth was a Roman colony.[59] The question is not only what in Paul's background would cause him to use the image, but what in his audience's background would lead him to believe that they would understand and accept the image.

Therefore, differences with the identified tradition need not signify the lack of any significant correlation. While Sevenster attributes little significance to the Stoic parallels due to the different presuppositions behind the terminology, other interpreters find a significant relationship despite these differences.[60] Paul would not be the first to take a traditional image and use it creatively to serve his own purposes. Indeed, the point at which Paul departs from common usage may ultimately prove most helpful for comprehending his worldview. A crucial example is the way in which Paul reverses the normal hierarchy of the body in 12:22–24a. The metaphor was commonly used to illustrate how the superior parts of the body deserved more honor, but Paul says precisely the opposite. Why does Paul choose to include this provocative piece of information if ch. 12 is merely an argument for unity? What does this divergence from the common conception of the hierarchy of the body signal concerning the nature of the eschatological body of Christ? Both affinities and differences must be carefully taken into account in understanding the significance of Paul's statements.

Therefore, it is not only a question of whether there is a correspondence between Paul and the moral philosophers, but what type of correspondence there could be. Finding the "source" is inadequate for understanding the more precise nuances of Paul's application of the terminology. Paul presumably used terminology that would be

[58] This could be Sevenster's error in assessing the relationship between Paul and Seneca. To see differences does not mean that the tradition has little if any contribution to make to our understanding. Although Sevenster is correct in cautioning us against drawing hasty parallels, this does not preclude a nuanced examination of the relationship between Paul and the Stoics. Rather, the interpreter should determine how it was appropriated and the way in which it should affect our understanding of the passage.

[59] Nor should it surprise us that Paul uses essentially the same image in his letter to the Romans.

[60] E.g. deSilva, "Paul," 549–64.

familiar to his audiences in order to communicate his convictions about Christianity in a relevant way. But at the same time, he was describing something that he believed was fundamentally distinct from the ideas and philosophies of the "world."

Finding the deep structure: Troels Engberg-Pedersen

The recent significant work by Troels Engberg-Pedersen, *Paul and the Stoics*, has added a new dimension to the discussion of the relevance of Stoicism for understanding Paul.[61] Engberg-Pedersen argues for a similarity in the deep structure of Stoic and Pauline ethics. In his model, the individual begins at the basic "I-level," where one sees oneself as an embodied individual but is primarily concerned with what is good for oneself as an individual. However, one's sense of identity and center of concern changes if one is "struck" from something above and outside oneself at the "X-level." Furthermore, one may come to identify with X, and even go so far as to see oneself as belonging to it. A person then begins to identify himself or herself as one who shares with all others who likewise identify with X. As a result, the person's focus changes from the individual at the I-level to the group at the S-level. In terms of consciousness the change is one from self-awareness to group-awareness. Morally the change is one from egoism to altruism, as the center of concern shifts from the "I" to the "We."

Engberg-Pedersen presents the model as a way of more fully comprehending the deep structure of Stoic and Pauline ethics. He asserts that his model is not intended to be an abstraction, but rather a "map of reading the two bodies of thought in their *own* particularity."[62] Thus, while he sees Paul and the Stoics sharing a similar deep structure in their ethics, particularly in the movement from "I" to "We," he also sees some important variations. Most significantly, whereas the Stoic is struck by reason at the X-level, for Paul X stands for God and Christ. Where the Stoics speak of reason as that which causes the individual to move from the individual or I-stage to the community or S-stage, Paul understands Christ as the factor behind the change.

[61] *Paul and the Stoics* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2000). I first became aware of Engberg-Pedersen's work as I was completing the original dissertation, and he graciously provided me with a copy of his manuscript.

[62] Ibid., 33.

The following argument about the body of Christ corresponds well to Engberg-Pedersen's abstract model because in 1 Cor. 12 there is a movement from "I" to "We" based upon identification with an external factor "X." In this sense, the present work will provide an example of a more concrete understanding of Engberg-Pedersen's basic structure. However, I will argue that it is not only the basic structure but the type of content of this model which helps us understand Paul, specifically the significance of bodily unity in understanding the moral agent's identification with the "We." Furthermore, "reason" still plays a vital part in Paul's ethical model, the main difference being that he speaks of the "mind of Christ." Therefore, the X-level represents not only God and Christ, but the unique eschatological type of "reason" found in the mind of Christ. The study will endeavor to explain more precisely how Paul modifies some traditional Stoic concepts according to his understanding of the crucified and risen Christ.

Paraenesis and the resocialization of the Corinthian community

As noted earlier, scholars such as Gundry have traditionally classified ch. 12 and most of 1 Corinthians as "paraenesis."[63] In addition, some recent works by Abraham Malherbe[64] on paraenesis in general and by Clarence Glad[65] on the psychagogic aspects of 1 Corinthians help to establish the designation of ch. 12 and possibly the entire letter as "paraenesis."

If, as Glad claims, Paul is acting as a psychagogue, he sees it as his duty to take an active role in the moral formation of his students.[66] In epistolary psychagogy the written medium forms a compromise between the need for instruction in the absence of personal presence and the desirability of intimate personal contact. The Stoic philosopher Seneca is considered the prime example of a philosopher

[63] See the excursus on pp. 24–26.

[64] In addition to "Hellenistic Moralists," see also Abraham Malherbe, "Exhortation in First Thessalonians," *NovT* 25 (1983) 238–56; *Paul and the Popular Philosophers* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989); *Paul and the Thessalonians* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987).

[65] Clarence Glad, *Paul and Philodemus: Adaptability in Epicurean and Early Christian Psychagogy* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1995).

[66] Glad defines psychagogy as "a mature person's leading of others" (ibid., 17).

engaged in epistolary psychagogy and will provide the primary point of comparison with Paul.[67]

We will see how 1 Cor. 12 affects both the convictions and the behavior of the recipients. However, the ethical nature of 1 Cor. 12 does not mean that it could not also function as a statement of identity and the nature of the community. Robinson insists upon a distinction between the analogy of the human body and the identification of the body of Christ so that the analogy points to another reality, the Christians as the actual body of Christ. Through the analogy Paul instructs the Corinthians in their behavior, but he can do so because they are in "literal fact" the risen body of Christ.

Although Robinson's literal physical identification of the believers with Christ's risen body has been rejected, his observation is an important consideration. The community, which is Christ's "body," is also like a human body. In this study I will likewise distinguish between Paul's comparison with the human body in verses 14–26 and the statement that the Corinthians are the body of Christ in verses 12–13 and 27 and how this combination of bodily identification and comparison finds precedent in Stoicism.

It is also important to take into account the role of paraenesis in the socialization of a person. Indeed, the moral and social functions of paraenesis are inseparable. Leo Perdue describes paraenesis as "a means by which an individual is introduced to the group's or role's social knowledge, including especially norms and values pertaining to group or role behavior, internalizes this knowledge, and makes it the basis for both behavior and the meaning system by which he interprets and orders his world."[68]

Understanding the social function of paraenesis in this way means that the purpose of Paul's instruction may not be simply didactic in terms of stating beliefs and commands. Paul may be shaping the group's understanding of themselves, particularly in relation to the "world." The connection between group identity through the application of "body" language and the way in which Paul uses the language as a basis for ethics makes 1 Cor. 12 a potentially fruitful point of entry for understanding the nature of Paul's paraenesis.

[67] This epistolary psychagogy was carried out primarily through his letters to Lucilius. For more on this evaluation, see Martha C. Nussbaum, *The Therapy of Desire: Theory and Practice in Hellenistic Ethics* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994) 337–38.

[68] Leo Perdue, "Paraenesis and the Epistle of James," *ZNW* 72 (1981) 251.

John Elliot states that the meaning of the text lies not only in the ideas represented, but in the way the text was intended to function and the impact it was supposed to have on the hearers.[69] Elliot proposes going beyond the purpose and occasion of texts, which he says are usually conceived in purely "theological" terms, such as "heresies." This project will examine the way in which Paul uses "ideas" for social purposes, or rather, the way in which the social aspect of the "idea" forms an important component of its meaning.

The early Christians constructed an alternative social world apart from the larger society. This social world applied not only to the physical structure of the Christian communities, but to the ways in which they perceived themselves and their relationship to the world. Thus, sociological interpretation may include "an interpretation of early Christianity as a *social world*, as the creation of a world of meaning which provided a plausibility structure for those who chose to inhabit it."[70] In other words, Christianity needed to provide a meaningful explanation for the convert's existence as a substitute for the world he or she had left.[71] Paul's instructions to the Corinthian community are significant not only for the specific ethical commands, but also for the way in which he creates and/or reinforces the converts' plausibility structure.

But the goal of this study is not a sociological or anthropological analysis of the Corinthian community. That has already been achieved by scholars such as Wayne Meeks,[72] Jerome

[69] "Sociological exegesis asks not only what a text said 'then and there' but also how and why that text was designed to function, and what its impact upon the life and activity of its recipients and formulators was intended to be" (John Elliot, *A Home for the Homeless* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981] 8).

[70] Jonathan Z. Smith, "The Social Description of Early Christianity," *RelSRev* 1 (1975) 21.

[71] Sociologists Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckmann discuss the need for a "plausibility structure" for the convert to remain converted. In other words, he or she must have some means of understanding the plausibility of their new reality. It is the function of the religious community to provide this structure. It often takes the form of physical segregation, but can also be mental segregation. This segregation allows the convert to find a place in the alternative world, and outsiders are looked upon as threats (*The Social Construction of Reality* [New York: Anchor Books/Doubleday, 1966] 158–59). The need for the converts' complete identification with the community is also covered in the work of David A. Snow and Richard Machalek, "The Convert as a Social Type," in *Sociological Theory*, ed. Randall Collins (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1983) 259–89; Nicholas H. Taylor, "The Social Nature of Conversion in the Early Christian World," in *Modelling Early Christianity*, ed. Philip F. Esler (London: Routledge, 1995) 128–36.

[72] Meeks, *Urban Christians*.

H. Neyrey,[73] and Gerd Theissen.[74] The purpose of the present study is to analyze the content and function of the language which Paul uses in 1 Cor. 12 within the context of Hellenistic moral philosophy, a task which will include a critical social aspect. Paul was writing to a group of converts who were still dealing with the implications of their new identity. As Meeks describes, conversion for Pauline Christians was "an extraordinarily thoroughgoing resocialization, in which the sect was intended to become virtually the primary group for its members, supplanting all other loyalties."[75] In addition, it entailed "strong symbolic and social boundaries separating the group of converts from the macrosociety."[76] This study will show how Paul uses "body of Christ" language to facilitate this resocialization process.[77] The identification of the community as Christ's body both identifies the group and separates it from those who are not part of the "body."

The Christian communities lived with a tension between forming tight group boundaries and maintaining ties with the greater society.[78] The communities' separation from the world is seen, for example, in the use of dualistic language which describes the outside world in negative and hostile terms. On the other hand, Paul allows interaction with the world (1 Thess. 4:11–12) and is very aware of the opinions of unbelievers (1 Cor. 14:23). This leads to the question of how the community maintains its distinctive identity if it does not have physical separation.[79] Meeks has discussed the many ways in which Paul uses language to distinguish the Christians from everyone else, such as the terms *eklektoi, agapētoi, hagioi*, and *adelphoi* and *adelphai*. "Body of Christ," therefore, may serve as another way in which the Pauline communities formed their identities as separate from, but still involved with, the world.

[73] Jerome H. Neyrey, *Paul, In Other Words: A Cultural Reading of His Letters* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1990) 102–46.

[74] Gerd Theissen, *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity: Essays on Corinth*, ed. and trans. John H. Schütz (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982).

[75] Meeks, *Urban Christians*, 78.

[76] Wayne A. Meeks, "'Since Then You Would Need to Go Out of the World': Group Boundaries in Pauline Christianity," in *Critical History and Biblical Faith*, ed. Thomas J. Ryan (Villanova, PA: College Theology Society, 1985) 7.

[77] The use of "body" language corresponds to the first of Meeks' five indicators of group boundaries, "special language involving separation." The others are rules and rituals of purity, membership sanctions, the development of autonomous institutions, and reports of specific kinds of interaction with the macrosociety ("Pauline Christianity," 8).

[78] Ibid., 4–29.

[79] The way in which the group maintains its identity in the absence of physical separation is one of the functions of the "plausibility structure."

Furthermore, the question of community identity must also be understood in relation to the political context. James D. G. Dunn comments on the political importance of the body of Christ metaphor.[80] He views it primarily as an adaptation of the Stoic use of the imagery of the body for the state. But since Paul uses it for the smaller community of the Christians within the Roman Empire, this is "a striking assertion of ecclesiological self-understanding."[81] In other words, Paul is setting forth the Christian gatherings as substitutes for the state. This leads to issues of loyalty and identity, with the result that "the sense that the church in this city or that region was the body to which believers belonged carried with it the implication that this belonging was more fundamental than any other citizenship."[82] Thus, the image takes on even greater significance within the political context of Paul's writing. If Paul is defining the community as distinct from the greater society, the use of a political metaphor could mean he is making a statement about the status of the Christian community in relationship to the Roman state. This is the view taken by Richard A. Horsley, who argues that 1 Corinthians is Paul's attempt to persuade the community to maintain "group discipline and solidarity over against the imperial society."[83]

The popular and political nature of Roman Stoicism in this time makes it more likely that Paul may be using this language to engage directly the current culture. Paul may be defining the Christian community in contrast to the Roman state, and his use of body language may carry more political and social implications beyond an exhortation for unity. Leo Perdue describes the potentially subversive nature of paraenesis: "Paraenesis may also be subversive in positing a new, though not fully realized, social order which calls for its own code of behavior (e.g. the 'Kingdom of God' in Q and Luke)."[84]

[80] James D. G. Dunn, "'The Body of Christ' in Paul," in *Worship, Theology and Ministry in the Early Church*, ed. Michael J. Wilkins and Terence Paige (JSNTSup 87; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992) 160–62.

[81] Ibid., 161.

[82] Ibid. In a similar manner, Dieter Georgi, speaking of Paul's use of politically loaded terminology in Romans, such as πίστις and εἰρήνη, says it would have "evoked associations to Roman political theology," and Paul's gospel would "be understood as competing with the gospel of the Caesars" (*Theocracy in Paul's Praxis and Theology* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991] 83–88).

[83] Richard A. Horsley, "1 Corinthians: A Case Study of Paul's Assembly as an Alternative Society," in *Paul and Empire: Religion and Power in Roman Imperial Society*, ed. Richard A. Horsley (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity, International, 1997) 252.

[84] Leo Perdue, "The Social Character of Paraenesis and Paraenetic Literature," *Semeia* 59 (1990) 9.

Thus, an assessment of 1 Cor. 12 should include an examination of the way in which Paul defines the identity and boundaries of the community. The social and ethical functions of the body of Christ language are intertwined. This work will investigate how Paul, like the Stoics, uses "body" language to develop the sense of community identity and then how this affects his ethical injunctions.

Conclusion

When scholars focus on the metaphor's "source," they tend to focus upon discovering the main "idea." Function then tends to be a direct result of the significance of the "idea." But approaching the text from this standpoint is not enough to bring out the full purpose of a passage such as 1 Cor. 12.

The significance of the image lies not only in the "idea" of the body of Christ, but also in its place in the overall purpose of Paul's argument, and an investigation into a Stoic background can shed much light on our understanding of the apostle's presentation. This is not to say that Stoicism is the only context for Paul's thought here, but that it is an extremely important one.

Rather than "source," it is probably better to speak of "background" or "context" because of the likelihood that Paul adapted whatever "source" he used for his own purposes. It is not just the identification that is important, but the way Paul uses the image to convey his message to his audience. The impact of Paul's convictions in influencing his use of the image must be taken into account. Charles Cousar describes the importance of recognizing Paul's focus upon Christ in shaping 1 Corinthians:

> The letter in fact primarily seeks to influence the minds, dispositions, intuitions of the audience in line with the message Paul had initially preached in the community (2:2), to confront readers with the critical nature of God's saving action in the crucified Christ in such a fashion that it becomes the glasses to refocus their vision of God, their own community, and the future.[85]

[85] Charles Cousar, "The Theological Task of 1 Corinthians: A Conversation with Gordon D. Fee and Victor Paul Furnish," in *Pauline Theology* (vol. II; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993) 90–102.

I will examine the way in which Paul may have appropriated certain philosophical images and ideas in his letter to the Corinthians. But I will also show how he molded these ideas for his specific purposes. Paul did not have to be a Stoic philosopher to use the language of the Stoics to speak to a community familiar with these ideas to convey his own message about Christ and the eschatological community.

As those who were "in Christ" and lived by the Spirit, the believers were fundamentally different from those who were of "the world." Paul uses "body of Christ" language to redefine, not just a different social order, but a different type of existence altogether. In his view, the community not only exists in opposition to current society but also transcends that order, particularly in being descended from the "last Adam" (1 Cor. 15:45) in addition to the "first" Adam. Paul's alternative worldview is centered upon being a "new creation" in Christ as well as providing a new way of evaluating the world.[86]

This study will be an exegetical examination of 1 Cor. 12 based upon a philosophical understanding of the image and its ethical application. The second chapter will examine the Hellenistic philosophical background of the use of "body" language, specifically among the Stoics. The third chapter will analyze Paul's argument in 1 Cor. 12 in light of this philosophical context. I will take into account both the identity of the community as the body of Christ and the function of the passage. This study will also examine the passage in light of the rest of the section on spiritual gifts, chs. 13 and 14. A brief examination of 1 Cor. 1–4 will also be necessary in order to establish how Paul's definition of the community at the beginning of the letter sets the stage for his application of the body of Christ in ch. 12. The last two topics will be the subject of chapter four. In the end I hope to show that such an investigation is justified because of the method that Paul himself has adopted from the Roman Stoics, the combination of physics and ethics, which is applied as principles and precepts based upon the bodily unity of "humanity."

Excursus: paraenesis, rhetoric, and 1 Corinthians

Many interpreters see 1 Corinthians as rhetoric rather than paraenesis.[87] Mitchell in particular does a fine job of demonstrating that the

[86] Perdue, "James," 252.

[87] Most see it as deliberative rhetoric, e.g. Mitchell, *Paul*; George A. Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism* (Chapel Hill: University of

images and terms employed in 1 Corinthians, including ch. 12, are similar to those used by the orators. But the presence of rhetorical categories or forms in 1 Corinthians does not necessarily mean that the entire work was conceived as a formal epideictic, forensic, or deliberative rhetorical discourse.[88] R. Dean Anderson, Jr. correctly notes that Mitchell has not proven that 1 Corinthians is a sustained argument for concord. Paul gives advice on several topics which sometimes, but not always, deal with concord.[89]

Furthermore, Jeffrey T. Reed concludes that while rhetorical conventions can be found in letters, they rarely governed an entire letter. Thus, "the rhetorical and epistolary genres were not readily merged, either in theory or in practice."[90] On the other hand, Pseudo-Libanius explicitly mentions "paraenetic" as an epistolary style.[91] Seneca's epistles to Lucilius are generally regarded as paraenetic letters, and Seneca himself says that his advice of principles and precepts relates to "paraenesis."[92]

A difficult and unresolved question is the relationship between rhetoric and paraenesis. Mitchell distinguishes the two by saying that rhetoric is concerned with advice about specific situations, whereas paraenesis is general moral exhortation which is universally applicable.[93] Stowers says the two are not so easily separated and that paraenesis "transcends the rhetorical categories."[94] Pogoloff offers a third way of viewing the situation by focusing on the historical

North Carolina Press, 1984) 87; E. Schüssler Fiorenza, "Rhetorical Situation and Historical Reconstruction in 1 Corinthians," *NTS* 33 (1987) 389; D. Martin, *Body*, 39. W. Wuellner, "Greek Rhetoric and Pauline Argumentation," in *Early Christian Literature and the Classical Intellectual Tradition: In honorem Robert Grant*, ed. W. F. Schoedel and R. L. Wilken (Paris: Editions Beauchesne, 1979) 184, classifies the letter as epideictic rhetoric. J. M. Smit, "Argument and Genre of 1 Corinthians 12–14," in *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht (JSNTSup 90; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993) 222, focuses upon 1 Cor. 12–14 as deliberative rhetoric.

[88] Stephen M. Pogoloff, *LOGOS AND SOPHIA: The Rhetorical Situation of 1 Corinthians* (SBLDS 134; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992) 37–69; also George Kennedy, *The Art of Persuasion in Greece* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963) 89–91, and Witherington, *Corinth*, 75 n. 10.

[89] *Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Paul* (Kampen: Kok Pharos Publishing House, 1996) 229–38.

[90] "The Epistle," in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period: 330 B.C.–A.D. 400*, ed. Stanley E. Porter (Leiden: Brill, 1997) 191.

[91] Pseudo-Libanius, "Epistolary Styles," in Abraham J. Malherbe, *Ancient Epistolary Theorists* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988) 66–67. See also the discussion in Stanley Stowers, *Letter Writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986) 94–96; Malherbe, "New Testament," 284.

[92] *Ep.* 95.1. [93] *Paul*, 52–53. [94] *Letter Writing*, 93.

tension between philosophy and rhetoric as competing disciplines. Plato, Quintilian, and others spoke of the need to combine the two, but in general there was more conflict than overlap, and by Paul's time rhetoric had become dominant.[95] Stowers notes that the two shared categories: "There is much overlapping and ambiguous terminology, which is partly due to the fact that exhortation was never systematically treated by the rhetoricians."[96] For example, B. Fiore[97] and Mitchell[98] have both made convincing arguments for the use of "examples" as characterizing paraenesis and deliberative rhetoric, respectively.

Although I consider 1 Corinthians to be paraenesis, at the same time I expect to find Paul following many of the conventions of the rhetoricians in his attempt to persuade the Corinthians to his point of view. As Stowers states, "What all complex letters of moral exhortation have in common is an explicit or implicit model of what it means to be a good person in general or a good person in a certain role. The rhetoric of exhortation, then, attempts to persuade and move the audience to conform to that model and to elicit corresponding habits of behavior."[99] H. Marrou also describes, "Whether they admitted it to themselves or not the Hellenistic philosophers were orators themselves. They too 'declaimed', and taught their pupils to declaim. They too knew all the rhetorical processes, and used all the rhetorical tricks ... There was not only hostility between the two types of culture, but an inextricable interweaving, knitting the classical tradition into an ever-closer unity."[100] I do not propose to solve this dilemma but hope to shed some light on the relationship between the two in Paul's own strategy.

[95] *LOGOS AND SOPHIA*, 321–30; George A. Kennedy, *Classical Rhetoric and Its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1980) 89–90.

[96] *Letter Writing*, 91.

[97] *The Function of Personal Example in the Socratic and Pastoral Epistles* (AnBib 105; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1986).

[98] *Paul*, 39–60. [99] *Letter Writing*, 94.

[100] *A History of Education in Antiquity*, trans. George Lamb (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1956) 212.

PART I

Background: the Stoics, body, and ethics

2

THE BODY METAPHOR

I will look first at general uses of the body metaphor, or in some cases, the body analogy. As several scholars have noted, the body was a common *topos* in antiquity in political speeches arguing for unity in the form of *homonoia*, or "concord" speeches.[1] Martin contends that these speeches were so common that they were practically a genre unto themselves.[2] Some famous examples of these speeches include Antiphon's Περὶ ὁμονοίας and Isocrates' *Panegyricus*.

The *homonoia* speeches often had predictable patterns and examples, and rhetoricians employed common *topoi* such as the body or the household to argue for political unity. According to this use, the group, which was not limited to formal political associations, was like a body in that it was composed of various parts which needed to cooperate in order to survive, or for the "common good."

But the metaphor was not limited to *homonoia* speeches. Its significance varied according to its use by orators of different philosophical backgrounds. Even in the context of the *homonoia* speeches, there was a multiplicity of uses. It will be helpful to begin the present study by delving deeper into the different ways in which the orators applied it.

Basic structure

The image was often used to make a simple and direct statement. The following passage is from Cicero, using an example from rhetoric: "In an enumeration we have, as it were, parts, as (*ut*) for example a body has head, shoulders, hands, sides, legs, feet and so forth."[3]

[1] E.g. D. Martin, *Body*, 38–47; Mitchell, *Paul*, 157–64.
[2] D. Martin, *Body*, 38.
[3] Cicero, *Top.* 6.30. Enumeration and analysis are the two parts of definitions. Enumeration is "when the thing which has been set up for definition is divided into members," for example the civil law being composed of statutes, decrees of the Senate,

Cicero makes the point that an enumeration is divided into parts, and does so by comparing it to the parts of the body. He does not dwell on the point and makes no more mention of it. It has accomplished its goal, to demonstrate that a whole is divided into distinct but related parts.

In such cases, the comparison was particularly easy to follow. The orator was brief, succinct, and direct. There was no doubt as to what items were being compared. The use of particles, such as *ut*, *sic*, οὕτως, and καθάπερ, often signaled the presence of comparison. Thus, when Dio Chrysostom compares the difficulty of eradicating strife to the elimination of disease from the body, the point is clear. "Now I understand how difficult it is to eradicate strife from human beings, especially when it has been nurtured for a fairly long period of time, just as (ὥσπερ) it is not easy to rid the body of disease that has long since become a part of it, especially in case one should wish to effect a painless cure."[4] The structure of the passage is easily outlined. Dio begins by making his point: the difficulty of eradicating strife from humans. He further describes the situation by saying that the strife is long-standing, making it especially difficult to eliminate. Then he makes the comparison. Dio's example is slightly more detailed than Cicero's, and yet easy to follow. Strife is to society as disease is to the human body because when it is allowed to exist for a long period, it is even more difficult to "cure."

A couple of points emerge from these comparisons. First, the comparison was clear and direct. Clarity, in particular, was one of the requirements.[5] Furthermore, as will become more important when examining extended uses, there was a specific purpose for the comparison. The author of *Ad Herennium* states, "The resemblance between the two things need not apply throughout, but must hold on the precise point of comparison."[6] In addition, a comparison "carries over an element of likeness from one thing to a different thing."[7] The thing being compared need not be like a body in every way. The

judicial decisions, etc. Definition by analysis "includes all the *species* that come under the *genus* which is being defined," such as the transfer of property under civil law being either a transfer with legal obligation or cession at law (fictitious suit) between those who can do this in accordance with the civil law (*Top.* 6.28–29). All texts and translations, unless otherwise indicated, are taken from the Loeb Classical Library (LCL).

[4] Dio Chrysostom, *Apam.* 41.9. [5] Aristotle, *Rhet.* 3.2.6; 3.2.8.

[6] *Rhet. Her.* 4.48.61. This anonymous first-century treatise was once attributed to Cicero (Kennedy, *Persuasion*, 12).

[7] *Rhet. Her.* 4.45.59.

purpose was to support the author's argument by making a specific point.

Second, the use of the comparative particles delineated the two items being compared: an enumeration has parts as (*ut*) a body has members; or, strife is as difficult to eradicate from human beings as (ὥσπερ) disease is difficult to cure in the body. The particles brought out the analogous quality. Aristotle stated that metaphors by analogy were the most "popular" (εὐδοκιμοῦσι μάλιστα).[8]

Sometimes the orator would expand upon the image. The famous Menenius Agrippa fable provides a prime example. The situation is the need to quell the revolt by the plebeians. Agrippa argues on numerous points, such as reforming the exaction of debts.[9] But he concludes with a fable about the human body. In the story, the other parts of the body revolt against the belly, a situation which Agrippa compares to the revolt of the people against the senate. He uses the fable to illustrate his final argument, that the "common good" demands mutual assistance. The fable is effective, and becomes the primary means by which he persuades the people.[10] The following version is told by Dionysius of Halicarnassus.[11]

> A commonwealth resembles in some measure a human body (Ἔοικέ πως ἀνθρωπείῳ σώματι). For (γάρ) each of them is composite and consists of many parts; and no one of their parts (τῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς μερῶν) either has the same function or performs the same services as the others.[12]

He begins by stating the comparison. A commonwealth resembles a human body (Ἔοικε). The sentence introduced by γάρ further explains the reason for the comparison, the composite natures of the commonwealth and the human body in which each part has a necessary and unique function. The main point of the introductory comparison is the nature of the commonwealth as being composed of many parts with different functions.

[8] Aristotle, *Rhet*. 3.10.7.

[9] Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. rom*. 6.83.4.

[10] "And at the end of the speech he is said to have related a kind of fable that he composed after the manner of Aesop and that bore a close resemblance to the situation of the moment, and by this means chiefly to have won them over" (Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. rom*. 6.83.2).

[11] The account by Livy (*History of Rome* 2.32.8–12) is similar, although Livy summarizes Agrippa's speech.

[12] Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. rom*. 6.86.1.

Next Agrippa moves to the particular situation he is dealing with, the revolt of the plebeians. His goal is to describe the disastrous results when the body's parts do not cooperate with one another.

> If, now, these parts of the human body (τὰ μέρη τοῦ ἀνθρωπείου σώματος) should be endowed, each for itself, with perception and a voice of its own and a sedition should arise among them ... and then all these should say to the belly, "And you, good creature, which of these things do you do? What return do you make and of what use are you to us? Indeed, you are so far from doing anything for us or assisting us in accomplishing anything useful for the common good (τῶν κοινῇ χρησίμων) that you are actually a hindrance and a trouble to us and – a thing intolerable – compel us to serve you and to bring things to you from everywhere for the gratification of your desires. Come now, why do we not assert our liberty and free ourselves from the many troubles we undergo for the sake of this creature?" If, I say, they should decide upon this course and none of the parts should any longer perform its office, could the body possibly exist for any considerable time, and not rather be destroyed within a few days by the worst of all deaths, starvation?[13]

He describes the proper working of the body, making the point that all parts work for the common good (τῶν κοινῇ χρησίμων). Therefore, the other parts cannot disparage the role of the seemingly useless belly. As the distributor of nutrients, the belly performs a crucial function, and the entire body cannot survive without it.

Agrippa returns to the comparison with the commonwealth and now makes his specific point.

> Now consider the same condition existing in a commonwealth. For this also is composed of many classes of people not at all resembling one another, every one of which contributes some particular service to the common good (τῷ κοινῷ χρείαν) just as its members do to the body (τὰ μέλη τῷ σώματι) ... If, then, all these different classes of people should rise against the senate, which is composed of the best men, and say, "As for you, senate, what good do you do us,

[13] Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. rom.* 6.86.2–3.

> and for what reason do you presume to rule over others? Not a thing can you name. Well then, shall we not now at last free ourselves from this tyranny of yours and live without a leader?" If, I say, they should take this resolution and quit their usual employments, what will hinder this miserable commonwealth from perishing miserably by famine, war and every other evil?[14]

The same condition exists among the people as in the human body. Within the commonwealth there is a variety of people and each group contributes something particular to the society. Should the populace revolt against the senate, they will face starvation, just like the body. Agrippa then makes a final and forceful statement of the significance of the comparison.

> Learn, therefore, plebeians, that, just as in our bodies (καθάπερ ἐν τοῖς σώμασιν ἡμῶν) the belly thus evilly reviled by the multitude nourishes the body (τὸ σῶμα) even while it is itself nourished, and preserves it while it is preserved itself, and is a kind of feast, as it were, provided by joint contributions, which as a result of the exchange duly distributes that which is beneficial to each and all, so (οὕτως) in commonwealths the senate, which administers the affairs of the public and provides what is expedient for everyone, preserves, guards, and corrects all things.[15]

In this final comparison, he gives the specific point. Just as the belly nourishes the other parts even as it receives the benefit of their work, so too does the senate perform an important work of the "body" by administrating the labor of others. The pairing of the particles καθάπερ and οὕτως succinctly structure the statement and highlight the main point of comparison.

The belly is unjustly reviled by the others, just as the senate is a victim of misunderstanding. Agrippa's fable clarifies this misunderstanding, and he concludes with an exhortation.

> Cease, then, uttering those invidious remarks about the senate . . . For it neither has done you any harm nor can do you any, but of its own accord calls you and entreats you,

[14] Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. rom.* 6.86.4–5.
[15] Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. rom.* 6.86.5.

> and opening all hearts together with the gates is waiting to welcome you.[16]

The people should cease their revolt because they have misunderstood the important function of the senate and because their very survival depends upon these administrators.

We see the way in which Agrippa has tailored his description of the body for his specific purposes. After having begun with a general observation about the composite natures of the body and the commonwealth, he focuses upon the role of a specific part, the belly. His elaboration on the important function of the part forms the basis for his exhortation that the plebeians cease their revolt against the senate.

The following outline clarifies Agrippa's argument:

I. Initial comparison (6.86.1): general statement of resemblance of commonwealth to body.
II. Second comparison (6.86.2–5): detailed description of body and commonwealth.
  A. Body has many parts which all must contribute to the health of the body; it cannot live without belly.
  B. Commonwealth has many kinds of people who all contribute to the common good; it cannot live without senate.
III. Final comparison (6.86.5): specific comparison between role of belly and role of senate – both perform a crucial role.
IV. Application (6.86.5): plebeians should cease their revolt.

Agrippa moves from a general comparison (the corporate natures of the body and commonwealth) to his detailed focus (the roles of the belly and senate), followed by his specific point (the critical roles played by the seemingly useless belly and senate), and his specific exhortation (cessation of revolt).

In another extended comparison, Seneca in *De clementia* uses the body in his discussion of the relationship between Nero and the state.[17] Seneca begins with a general observation concerning the relationship between the emperor and state and the soul and body

[16] Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. rom.* 6.86.5.

[17] Although scholars have noted that Seneca at times diverges from traditional Stoicism in his psychological views, John M. Rist argues that his political views, including the nature of the *clementia* of kings is generally orthodox. See John M. Rist, "Seneca and Stoic Orthodoxy," *ANRW* II.36.3 (1989) 1993–2012. But also see

and then develops the nature of that relationship to the point where he specifically identifies Rome as the body of Nero. This identification is a critical aspect of the passage. Seneca demonstrates that the intimate relationship between body and soul is similar to Nero's relationship to the state. Once the connection between the two parts is established, he attempts to persuade Nero to be merciful on the grounds that in doing so he is actually being merciful to himself. The connection between the two parts provides the proof for the argument that Nero should be merciful to the state as his "body."

The passage's structure is similar to the Agrippa fable:

I. Initial comparison (1.3.5): general statement of the relationship of the mind to the body and the emperor to the state.
II. Second comparison (1.4.1–3): detailed description of the relationship between the emperor and the state in terms of Nero being the soul of Rome.
III. Final comparison (1.5.1–2): specific identification of Rome as the body of Nero.
IV. Application (1.5.2–3): Nero should be merciful to his body.

As in the Agrippa fable, the passage begins with the initial statement of comparison. Seneca then elaborates upon the statement until he makes his final point and application.

The initial comparison, establishing the relationship between the mind/soul and body and then Nero and the state, is more detailed than in the Agrippa fable.

> The whole body (*corpus*) is the servant of the mind (*animo*), and though the former is so much larger and so much more showy, while the unsubstantial soul remains invisible not knowing where its secret habitation lies, yet the hands, the feet, and the eyes are in its employ; the outer skin is its defence; at its bidding we lie idle, or restlessly run to and fro; when it commands, if it is a grasping tyrant, we search the sea for gain; if covetous of fame, ere now we have thrust a right hand into the flame, or plunged willingly into a

Brad Inwood, "Seneca and Psychological Dualism," in *Passions and Perceptions: Studies in Hellenistic Philosophy of Mind*, Proceedings of the Fifth Symposium Hellenisticum, ed. Jacques Brunschwig and Martha C. Nussbaum (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993) 150–83, who says that the apparent relationship between Seneca's and other philosophies, such as Platonism, may reflect more his willingness to entertain the views for the sake of a greater argument rather than actual influence.

> chasm. In the same way (*sic*) this vast throng, encircling the life of one man, is ruled by his spirit, guided by his reason, and would crush and cripple itself with its own power if it were not upheld by wisdom.[18]

Seneca establishes the relationship between the mind and the body. Although the body is larger and more visible than the hidden soul, the parts of the body serve the soul. Indeed, the entire body lies at the command of the mind, whether the soul is a "grasping tyrant" or "covetous of fame." Seneca then makes a comparison with the emperor as the ruling part of the state. The people are ruled by his spirit and guided by his reason. Without his wisdom, the state would crush itself by virtue of its own power.

But Seneca's intentions go beyond making the comparison between the ruling function of the mind and the emperor. In the next paragraph he develops the implications of this connection.

> It is, therefore, their own safety that men love, when for one man they lead ten legions at a time into battle, when they rush to the forefront and expose their breasts to wounds that they may save the standards of their emperor from defeat. For he is the bond by which the commonwealth is united, the breath of life (*spiritus vitalis*) which these many thousands draw, who in their own strength would be only a burden to themselves and the prey of others if the great mind (*mens illa*) of the empire should be withdrawn.[19]

Seneca explains the people's intense loyalty as a result of their realization that in protecting the emperor they are protecting their own interests. Their devotion is not unreasonable because they are dependent on him for their survival. Furthermore, the relationship is based upon Nero's role as the one who unites the commonwealth and gives them life.

He goes on to talk about the consequences of not protecting the emperor:

> Such a calamity would be the destruction of the Roman peace, such a calamity will force the fortune of a mighty people to its downfall. Just so long will this people be free from that danger as it shall know how to submit to the rein;

[18] Seneca, *Clem.* 1.3.5. [19] Seneca, *Clem.* 1.4.1.

> but if ever it shall tear away the rein, or shall not suffer it to be replaced if shaken lose by some mishap, then this unity and this fabric of mightiest empire will fly into many parts, and the end of this city's rule will be one with the end of her obedience.[20]

The continuation of the empire depends upon the unifying role of the emperor. Whereas earlier he was described as the ruler and "breath" (*spiritus*) of the state, now he is also the unifying force. Seneca's argument is that the people should realize they need to protect Nero, as the source and guarantor of the unity. Seneca does not argue for unified behavior, as Agrippa does, but describes a type of unity which already exists through Nero.

Seneca has discussed the dependence of the state upon Nero. But in establishing the connection between the two as body and soul, he also indicates that it is Nero's responsibility to take care of his "body."

> if – and this is what thus far [this discourse] is establishing – you are the soul of the state and the state your body (*corpus*), you see, I think how requisite is mercy; for you are merciful to yourself when you are seemingly merciful to another.[21]

Seneca has moved from his initial comparison of the soul to body and Nero to state to exploit the connotations of a soul–body relationship. Nero may be the "head" or ruler of the body and so enjoy the advantages of the body's protection but, at the same time, as the soul he is intimately connected to the body in such a way that to harm it is essentially to harm himself. The final comparison is a direct identification of the state as Nero's body. He also explicitly says that this is his primary goal when he states, "this is what thus far [this discourse] is establishing." In order to make the application that Nero should be merciful, he must have the emperor realize his identity as the "soul" of the state so that he will be willing to show mercy to his "body."

Varied purposes explain the differences. Agrippa is arguing for a specific action, mutual cooperation to protect the "common advantage." Therefore, he uses the image of the body to illustrate the need for the body parts to work together. But for Seneca, the body illustrates a state of being. His main point is to show that Rome is

[20] Seneca, *Clem.* 1.4.2–3. [21] Seneca, *Clem.* 1.5.1.

Nero's body, as characterized by the soul–body relationship. The result of his teaching may be cooperation, but the purpose is to illustrate the underlying relationship. By contrast, Agrippa intends the plebeians to understand that the commonwealth functions like a body. This is seen in the final comparisons. For Agrippa, the plebeians should learn that just as the belly provides an important function, so too does the senate. Therefore, the people need to respect the senate's role just as the body learned that the belly served an important function. Seneca's climactic statement, however, is that the people are Nero's body. The main content of the argument leading up to this statement is that the two parties are interdependent, and only after establishing this mutual relationship, by identifying Nero as the soul/head of Rome, can Seneca make his main point that Nero should be merciful to his body. In other words, Seneca uses the metaphor to establish a type of relationship between Nero and the people so that he can make his argument for a merciful attitude.

From an argumentative standpoint, one of the greatest differences between the two passages just described is that the Agrippa fable uses the image of the body to prescribe a desired type of behavior whereas Seneca utilizes it to describe a type of existence which then results in the desired actions. Seneca can use the connection between soul and body to show Nero that because this relationship exists, it is in his best interests to show mercy to his body. The metaphor primarily illustrates the relationship rather than the desired action, but Seneca hopes that the desired action (mercy) will result from the identification of Rome as the body of Nero.

Another important difference is the type of unity which is being described. Agrippa states that the "common advantage" draws people together.[22] In other words, it provides the goal for bringing people together and causing them to cooperate with each other. The people are united for the purpose of the common advantage. But for Seneca, while the idea of common advantage may help to promote cooperation, it is not what unites the people in the most fundamental sense. Nero himself is the "bond" which unites the empire, as well as the "breath of life" responsible for its existence. When the people risk their lives to save the emperor, their actions preserve a unity which already exists.

[22] Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. rom.* 6.85.1.

The idea of "common advantage" is certainly not absent from the Nero passage since Seneca illustrates how the masses are dependent upon the emperor for guidance and in turn protect him. His main point, however, is not to argue for interdependent behavior, but rather to show how interdependence illustrates the intimate relationship of ruler and ruled. Thus, Seneca uses the body metaphor to make a point on the nature of the unity between Nero and the populace. He argues that the two are so connected that for Nero to show mercy on the state is to show mercy on himself. As I will attempt to show in the remainder of the work, the way in which Seneca and other Stoics argued for "common advantage" based upon an already-existing unity helps us understand Paul's instructions to the Corinthians who are united as the "body of Christ." We see, therefore, that the body metaphor can illustrate "common advantage" in different ways. It can be used to argue for behavior which supports common advantage, or it can demonstrate an intrinsic state of unity which compels people to seek the good of the whole.

Finally, this analysis helps us see how the orators employed the image of the body as a proof. Both simple and extended comparisons helped to prove an argument. Extended comparisons in particular helped the orator develop a specific point of comparison. For both types, it was crucial to determine what the particular comparison was. Because of the numerous ways in which the orators employed the image, it will be necessary to examine carefully the way in which Paul used it. In addition to examining the structure, it will be important to take a more detailed look at uses of the body.

Types of uses

Although the adaptability of the image of the body makes it difficult to separate it into categories, it might be beneficial to identify four types of usage. These are not intended to be rigid distinctions, and a single use might combine two or more of these categories. Nevertheless, a brief discussion should help to clarify the ways in which the orators could apply the idea of the body.

The first type of usage emphasized a particular part of the body and its function. This was often used when the author wanted to make a specific point about one person or part of a group. The person highlighted the function of one particular body part and compared that with the person or group under discussion. The

most well-known example would probably be the belly in the Menenius Agrippa fable, as the distributive part.[23]

A frequently chosen body part was the head, usually displayed as the ruling or superior part of the body.[24] Thus, for example, Philo calls human beings "a kind of ruling head" (ἀρχική τις κεφαλή) of all living creatures.[25] Eyes were frequently used,[26] as were hands,[27] and feet.[28] The parts which are in pairs, such as hands, feet, or eyes, were often used to illustrate the necessity of cooperation, as in Xenophon's assertion that they were formed for mutual benefit.[29]

A second type employed the image of diseases or injuries to the body. Diseases were often associated with *homonoia* speeches, since *stasis* was compared with disease. Both had the potential to spread throughout the entire body or group.[30] Both were difficult to eradicate once they had taken hold.[31] They at least had the capacity to

[23] Livy, *History of Rome* 2.32.12–2.33.1; Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. rom.* 6.86.1–5; Plutarch, *Cor.* 6.2–3.

[24] For the Stoics, however, the heart and not the head was generally considered the focal part of the soul. "The soul's parts flow from their seat in the heart, as if from the source of a spring, and spread through the whole body." So says Chrysippus, according to Calcidius 220 (*SVF* 2.879), translation by A. A. Long and D. N. Sedley, *The Hellenistic Philosophers*, vol. I (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987) 315. Philo, however, is undecided on this point (*Spec.* 1.213; *Sacr.* 136; *Post.* 138).

[25] Philo, *QG* 2.9. Elsewhere he calls the virtuous person the "head" of the human race, the one from whom all other people draw their life force, just as the head is the first and best part of the animal (*Praem.* 125). See also *Praem.* 114, "So then one such man in a city, if such be found, will be superior to the city, one such city to the country around, one such nation will stand above other nations, as the head above the body (ὥσπερ κεφαλὴ σώματι)"; *Somn.* 1.127–28, "The holy land is full of incorporeal 'words'; and these words are immortal souls. Of these words (Jacob) takes one, choosing as the best the topmost one, occupying the place which the head does in the whole body, and sets it up close to his understanding (Gen. xxviii. 11)"; *Abr.* 74, "there is a mind appointed as your ruler which all the community of the body obeys and each of the senses follows." On the superior role of νοῦς in the body, see D. Martin, *Body*, 96–103; "Tongues of Angels and Other Status Indicators," *JAAR* 59 (1991) 547–89; and the discussion in chapter 7 below.

[26] Dio Chrysostom, *1 Tars.* 33.16; *Nicaeen.* 39.5; *In cont.* 48.8; Cicero, *Div.* 1.32.71; Aristotle, *Eth. nic.* 1.7.11–12; Xenophon, *Mem.* 2.3.17–19; Plutarch, *Frat. amor.* 478–79; Plato, *Resp.* 351E–352A.

[27] Plutarch, *Precepts of Statecraft*, 812B–E; *Frat. amor.* 478C–E; Aristotle, *Eth. nic.* 1.7.11–12; Xenophon, *Mem.* 2.3.17–19.

[28] Xenophon, *Mem.* 2.3.17–19; Plutarch, *Frat. amor.* 478C–E; Aristotle, *Eth. nic.* 1.7.11–12.

[29] Xenophon, *Mem.* 2.3.17–19.

[30] Philo, *Decal.* 150; Dio Chrysostom, *2 Tars.* 34.20.

[31] Dio Chrysostom, *Apam.* 41.8–9; Philo, *Ios.* 160; Josephus, *B. J.* 4.406–407.

cause some discomfort and disruption of normal activities.[32] But diseases could also be compared with something like character flaws, which according to Dio Chrysostom must be seen in order to be treated.[33] Philo applies the image to describe famine[34] and desire.[35] Thus, in general, disease was a common way to describe a situation or problem which was pervasive, destructive, and difficult to "cure."

Sometimes the use dealt with types of injuries to the body. Some of these injuries were those resulting from an overweight body[36] or amputation.[37] This use in relationship to injuries often included the treatment. Dio Chrysostom does not specify in his Fiftieth Discourse the type of injury, but he discusses the need to treat whatever the ailing part is and uses the analogy to justify his past behavior to the "commons" as those who were ailing and in need of "treatment."[38]

Related to the idea of injuries and illness, although more implicit in its reference to the body, was the metaphor of the physician treating the person and the cure which the author or orator prescribed.[39] Concord was often presented as the solution to a group's problem,[40] but the image often dealt with other problems. Thus, for example, Dio Chrysostom compares the role of a physician to his task of chastising the people of Tarsus for their moral decay.[41]

A third type of usage distinguished between body and soul or mind.[42] The soul was generally seen as distinct from the body and often was the ruler over the body. Isocrates uses it in his *homonoia* speeches to compare the ruling function of the polity as a "soul" to the function of the mind in the body.[43] Philo uses it to

[32] Dio Chrysostom, *Conc. Apam.* 40.21–22. He seems to have been particularly fond of the metaphor. See also *2 Tars.* 34.17–18, 20*; Nicom.* 38.11–12.

[33] Dio Chrysostom, *Isthm.* 9.1–2. [34] Philo, *Ios.* 160.

[35] Philo, *Decal.* 150.

[36] Josephus, *B. J.* 1.507; Cicero, *On Providence*, 2.6.

[37] Dio Chrysostom, *2 Tars.* 34.18; Epictetus, *Diatr.* 2.5.24–28; Philo, *Aet.* 46–51.

[38] Dio Chrysostom, *Admin.* 50.3–4. For other types of treatment, see *2 Tars.* 34.18; Josephus, *B. J.* 1.507.

[39] The idea of philosophy as therapy of the soul is widespread in antiquity. See for example, Nussbaum, *Therapy*.

[40] Dio Chrysostom, *2 Tars.* 34.18–19; *Nicom.* 38.7; *In cont.* 48.13.

[41] Dio Chrysostom, *1 Tars.* 33.44.

[42] Because of the extensive literature on the soul, I will discuss only those authors who treated the soul as part of the metaphorical complex of the one "body."

[43] "Every polity is the soul (ψυχή) of the state, having as much power over it as the mind (φρόνησις) over the body" (Isocrates, *Panath.* 138); "For the soul (ψυχή) of a state is nothing else than its polity, having as much power over it as does the mind (φρόνησις) over the body" (*Areop.* 14).

describe the superior place of the wise in regard to the rest of humanity.[44]

At other times, an author would use the soul and body connection to describe a close type of connection between two entities. As mentioned above, however, Seneca uses it for the relationship of Nero and Rome. Although he introduces other aspects, such as the ruling and unifying function of the soul, his primary point is to describe the close connection. According to Cleanthes, the soul suffers along with the body.[45] Seneca appears to be relying upon this presupposition when he says that if Nero is the soul of Rome, he is only hurting himself by harming his people.

Finally, the sharing of one soul could illustrate a particular closeness among friends or members of a community. Plutarch explains, "In our friendship's consonance (συμφωνίας) and harmony (ἁρμονίας) there must be no element unlike, uneven, or unequal, but all must be alike to engender agreement in words, counsels, opinions, and feelings, and it must be as if (ὥσπερ) one soul were apportioned among two or more bodies."[46] Dio Chrysostom also applies the sharing of one soul to political language, stating that when a city has concord, the cooperation among the parts on behalf of the whole "is just as if some god had made a single soul (μίαν ψυχὴν) for so great and populous a city."[47]

A fourth type dealt with the body as a unity made up of a diversity of parts. Since this is the more relevant type for the study, it warrants a more detailed treatment. In order to clarify further the different uses of this particular type, I will identify three specific ways in which it was often applied.

The first use often stressed the functions or duties of various parts in relationship to each other and to the whole body. Sometimes it emphasized the general idea that the diverse parts of the body must cooperate for the good of the whole. Each part had a specific function, but the point was not so much the function of a particular part as the cooperation of all the parts.

[44] "For indeed the wise man is the first of the human race, as a pilot in a ship ... or again as a soul in a body (καὶ ψυχὴ μὲν ἐν σώματι) and a mind in a soul" (Philo, *Abr*. 272).

[45] Συμπάσχει δὲ ἡ ψυχὴ τῷ σώματι νοσοῦντι καὶ τεμνομένῳ καὶ τὸ σῶμα τῇ ψυχῇ. Nemesius, *de nat. hom.* p. 32 (*SVF* 1.518).

[46] Plutarch, *Amic. mult*. 96E.

[47] Dio Chrysostom, *Nicaeen*. 39.5; see also *3 Regn*. 3.108.

The effectiveness with which the body could illustrate the need for cooperation made it a popular image in many of the *homonoia* speeches. It was an effective way to promote the benefits which the group obtained through concord. As Dio Chrysostom explains in urging concord among the Nicaeans,

> When a city has concord (ὁμονοούσης), as many citizens as there are, so many are the eyes with which to see that city's interest (τὸ ἐκείνης συμφέρον), so many the ears with which to hear, so many the tongues to give advice, so many the minds concerned in its behalf … Conversely neither abundance of riches nor number of men nor any other element of strength is of advantage to those who are divided, but all these things are rather on the side of loss, and the more abundant they are, so much the greater and more grievous the loss. Just so too, methinks, it is with human bodies (τῶν σωμάτων) – that body which is in sound health finds advantage (συμφέρει) in its height and bulk, while the body which is diseased and in poor condition finds a physical state of that kind to be most perilous and productive of severest risk.[48]

He argues that a city benefits from all of its resources (people, wealth, etc.) when it is unified, but considers all these things lost when it is disunited. Indeed, the loss is greater in proportion to the amount of resources. In the same way, a body in sound health finds advantages in its own resources (height, bulk, etc.), but finds itself at risk from these same resources when it is not functioning properly.

A second way was to emphasize the idea of the body as a complete and unified entity, stressing the oneness of its parts. The difference was mainly a matter of emphasis; rather than focusing upon the body as a working unit made up of a variety of functioning parts, it more generally drew attention to the unified nature of the group. A group was called a body when it had set aside differences and quarrels and acted as a single unit, or when the author wanted to highlight the unified nature of the group in some other way. For example, Josephus describes how the rival Jewish factions came together as "one body" (ἓν σῶμα) to fight the common enemy Rome.[49] Plutarch describes Solon's attempts to make the people sympathize with

[48] Dio Chrysostom, *Nicaeen*. 39.3–7.
[49] Josephus, *B. J*. 5.278–79. See also 3.102–105, 270.

one another's misfortunes, "as members of one body" (ἑνὸς μέρη σώματος).[50]

Nor was this application limited to groups of people. It could be applied whenever a writer wanted to stress the importance of the whole as opposed to the parts. Seneca uses it in his discussions about the need to gain an overall grasp of philosophy rather than scattered maxims. He says of acquiring wisdom, "Examine the separate parts, if you like, provided you examine them as parts of the (philosopher) himself. She is not a beautiful woman whose ankle or arm is praised, but she whose general appearance makes you forget to admire her single attributes."[51] The difference is mainly a matter of emphasis. The focus is upon the unity or state of wholeness as opposed to the relationships among the various parts.

Perhaps the most famous example of this type was Plato's idea of the kinship between the human body and the cosmos. Plato was but one of a line of thinkers who postulated that human beings could be understood in terms of the cosmos and vice versa:[52] The universe is a living creature,[53] composed of a bodily and visible Heaven,[54] through which is woven the invisible Soul;[55] there is also a correspondence between the human body and the cosmos in the fact that both are composed of the same elements. As Plato says in the *Philebus*:

> Soc. When we see that all the aforesaid elements [of a living creature] are gathered together into a unity, do we not call them a body (σῶμα)?
> Pro. Of course.
> Soc. Apply the same line of thought to that which we call the universe. It would likewise be a body, being composed of the same elements [of fire, water, air, and earth].[56]

The concept of "body" in this passage derives from the state of being a unity of parts. Socrates argues that the universe must be called a

[50] Plutarch, *Sol.* 18.5. Also, Philo, *Spec.* 3.131; *Virt.* 103.

[51] Seneca, *Ep.* 33.5. Also, "I have been unable to subjoin a quite appropriate example of [dwelling on the point], because this topic is not isolated from the whole cause like some limb, but like blood is spread throughout the whole body (*corpus*) of the discourse" (*Rhet. Her.* 4.45.58). Also, Cicero, *Top.* 6.30.

[52] E. Schweizer, "σῶμα, κτλ.," in *TDNT* VII: 1029–30; George Perrigo Conger, *Theories of Microcosms and Macrocosms in the History of Philosophy* (New York: Russell & Russell, 1967) 1–7.

[53] Plato, *Tim.* 30B. [54] Plato, *Tim.* 69C, 92C.

[55] Plato, *Tim.* 36E. [56] Plato, *Phileb.* 29D–E.

"body" since it is a unity of the same elements as a human body. The oneness of the many parts makes the universe a "body" as it does in the human being. Thus, as Martin explains, "the human body was not *like* a microcosm, it *was* a microcosm – a small version of the universe at large."[57]

In Plato this use of "body" moves beyond comparison to become a real description of the unit: the universe is not "like" a body; it *is* a body. George Perrigo Conger, however, asserts that Plato's point was still primarily structural and organizational as opposed to biological, since he was concerned with the compositions of the two bodies.[58] Therefore, even though Plato considered the cosmos a living creature, the basis for calling it a body was more its composition, rather than its state as an organism. Plato's idea was later taken up by Zeno and the Stoics, although on slightly different terms.[59]

It is important to note the precise point of connection. The idea of something being a "body" could have many potential connotations. The following chapter will examine the ways in which the Stoics used the metaphor according to their own notions of a universal body. For the Stoics, the universe was not a body only by virtue of being a macrocosm of the microcosmic human body as in Plato. The bodily nature of the universe was also based upon their conception of reality in which everything that existed was a "body." In this sense, they did not just speak of the body "metaphor," for, with them, being a "body" was a fundamental component of the nature of existence. This was a third way, and it will be the subject of the next chapter.

[57] D. Martin, *Body*, 16.

[58] Conger, *Theories*, 8. See also Plato, *Tim*. 31B–32C.

[59] For example, in the *Timaeus* Plato says that there is an ontological distinction between the human body and the universal body. As creations of the lower gods rather than the Divine Demiurge, and thus parts of the whole, human beings cannot attain the same degree of completeness. But the Stoics do not posit such a distinction. For them, all matter owes its qualifications to the structuring, active principle. There is an absolute analogy between the universal and human bodies since they are composed of essentially the same components (Gretchen Reydams-Schils, *Demiurge and Providence: Stoic and Platonist Readings of Plato's Timaeus* [Turnhout: Brepols Publishers, 1999] 22–32, 40–70).

3

THE "BODY" IN STOICISM AND THE RELEVANCE TO UNIVERSAL HUMANITY

Previously I have discussed the diverse ways in which one could apply the image of the body. I will now examine a uniquely Stoic use. Authors such as Seneca and Cicero[1] often compared a human body to a universal humanity which was, for them, another type of body in a very real way. Understanding how the Stoics saw the universe and society as a "body" may help us comprehend what lies behind Paul's statements that the believers are not only "like" a body, but also "are" the body of Christ.

The universe as living creature in Stoicism

The Stoics considered the universe to be a living being.[2] In this context the body could be used to describe some aspect of the universe as being a living creature which grows and develops. Cleanthes says,

> For, just as (ὥσπερ), in the case of the individual, all his bodily parts (τὰ μέρη) take shape in the proper periods of time from the seed, so (οὕτω) all the particular parts of the universe – animals, plants, and so on – take shape at the proper moments.[3]

[1] Cicero's philosophical background is complex and often difficult to determine. For example, he had once been the student of the Epicurean Phaedrus, and his works *De republica* and *De legibus* were modeled upon Plato's *Republic* and *Laws*. But it is generally agreed that Cicero was primarily dependent upon Stoicism for his political and legal theory, particularly in his appropriation of Stoic natural law theory (see, e.g., Colish, *Stoicism*, 89–104).

[2] "The whole world is a living being, endowed with soul and reason (ἔμψυχον καὶ λογικόν), and having aether for its ruling principle: so says Antipater of Tyre in the eighth book of his treatise *On the Cosmos*" (Diogenes Laertius, *Vit. phil.* 7.139). Antipater lived in the first century BCE.

[3] Stobaeus, *Ecl.* I.17.3 (*SVF* 1.497), translation by Edwyn Bevan, *Later Greek Religion* (London: J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd., 1926) 9–10.

For Cleanthes, the way in which the human body develops provides a proper analogy for the growth of various parts of the universe.

Likewise Cicero relates,

> Indeed, how is it possible that the universe, which contains within itself all the other natures and their seeds, should not itself be governed by nature (*natura*)? Thus, if anyone declares that a man's teeth and the hair on his body are a natural growth but that the man himself to whom they belong is not a natural organism, he would fail to see that things which produce something from within them must have more perfect natures than the things which are produced from them.[4]

Cicero utilizes the idea of the body as a living organism which grows and develops.[5] This idea includes the notion of the body's structural composition, but encompasses more. The universe is like the human body in that as an organism it is governed by nature and produces growth from itself.

Nature's role underscores the existence of the universe as a living organism. In the following example, nature structures the earth to resemble the composition of the human body:

> the idea appeals to me that the earth is governed by nature (*natura regi terram*) and is much like the system of our own bodies in which there are both veins (receptacles for blood) and arteries (receptacles for air). In the earth also there are some routes through which water runs, some through which air passes. And nature fashioned these routes so like human bodies that our ancestors even called them "veins" of water.[6]

The role of nature is a key component in the consideration of the universe as a living being and in its structure.

The Stoics appear to have used the macrocosm–microcosm analogy to refer to the universe as an organism in a similar manner to

[4] Cicero, *Nat. d.* 2.33.86.

[5] Philo describes heaven as "a harmony and union and bond of all those things which are in heaven, just as the limbs (*membra*) which are arranged in the body (*corpore*) are all adapted [to one another] and grow together" (*QE* 2.74). Although Philo was not a Stoic, he seems to reflect a Stoic understanding here. See John Dillon's analysis of Philo, in which he concludes that Philo was using Alexandrian Platonism, "which was itself heavily influenced by Stoicism and Pythagoreanism" (*The Middle Platonists* [Ithaca: Cornell, 1977] 182).

[6] Seneca, *Nat.* 3.15.1.

Plato.[7] They also considered the universe to be a body.[8] To see how the Stoics defined the term "body," we must examine the way in which they understood the universe and the nature of existence.

"Body" in Stoicism and the universe as body

The body as an "existent"

For the Stoics, the idea of "body" was critical to their understanding of reality. According to Plutarch, the Stoics believed that only bodies are "existents" or ὄντα.[9] As A. A. Long states, their "general conceptual framework ... denies that anything can exist which is not a

[7] David E. Hahm argues that the Stoic model is distinctly different from the Platonic and Aristotelian. "There seems to be nothing hypothetical about the Stoic use of the biological model. Nor did the Stoics ever suggest that the biological model is in any way analogical. For the Stoics the biological model possessed as much ontological reality as did the phenomena it explains. Thus it not only explains phenomena; it is itself a phenomenon. This makes the Stoic biologistic cosmology quite different from the 'likely tale' of Plato's *Timaeus* or the countless analogies in Aristotle's scientific works. Stoic physics, therefore, does not seem to be an attempt to explain what might be an opaque world by reference to better known phenomena from the world of living things. Rather it seems to be an attempt to describe the nature of a perfectly clear and intelligible cosmos, a cosmos that has a dual nature, physical and biological, both of which must be comprehended if we are to understand the cosmos fully" (*The Origins of Stoic Cosmology* [Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press, 1977] 211). Whether or not he is correct, the connection between nature and the Stoic conception of the cosmos indicates that the Stoic use of the body analogy played upon the idea of the universe as organism.

[8] Chrysippus calls the cosmos a τέλεον σῶμα (Plutarch, *Stoic. rep.* 1054E–F [*SVF* 2.550]). Furthermore, Galen quotes Zeno as saying that God was σῶμα (*Hist. Philos.* 21.2 [*SVF* 1.153]; Plotinus, *Enn.* [*On Matter*] [*SVF* 2.320]). That Zeno considered God to be the same as the cosmos is attested by Diogenes Laertius (*Vit. phil.* 7.148 [*SVF* 1.163]). So Plutarch says of Chrysippus as well (Plutarch, *Comm. not.* 1077D).

[9] ὄντα ... μόνα τὰ σώματα (Plutarch, *Comm. not.* 1073E); so Plotinus also speaks of the Stoics (*Enn.* [*On Matter*, 2.4.1]). But it does not necessarily follow that all incorporeals are "non-existents." Λεκτά, void, place, and time still fall under the higher ontological classification of τί, "something," along with corporeals. Λεκτά were considered the "things meant." This could further be described as "the thing itself revealed by sound which we grasp as subsisting together with our thought" (Sextus Empiricus, *Math.* 8.11–12; 10.218. While not a Stoic, Sextus, who probably lived about 200 CE, is one of our best sources of Stoic logic). Fictional things, such as centaurs, are οὔτι, or "not something" (Sextus Empiricus, *Math.* 10.218 [*SVF* 2.331]; Seneca, *Ep.* 58.15). See Jacques Brunschwig, "The Stoic Theory of the Supreme Genus and Platonic Ontology," in *Papers in Hellenistic Philosophy*, trans. Janet Lloyd (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994) 92–157; J. M. Rist, "Categories and Their Uses," in *Problems in Stoicism*, ed. A. A. Long (London: Athlone Press, 1971) 38–57.

body or the state of a body."[10] There were several definitions for "body." One was that which has three dimensions: length, width, and depth (μῆκος, πλάτος, βάθος).[11] Another was that which is capable of acting or being acted upon.[12] God was considered to be a body, although one "without quality and magnitude."[13]

For the Stoics, the idea of a "body" was more complex than in modern terms. For example, even though the Stoics recognized a distinction between soul and body, the soul also existed as a "body." Body could refer to that part of the human being which is separate from the soul. At the same time, the soul itself, being corporeal and "real," was itself a body in a certain sense.

Seneca demonstrates the varied sense in which the term could be understood when he says, "The goods of the body are bodily (*Quae corporis bona sunt, corpora sunt*); so therefore must be the goods of the soul. For the soul, too, is corporeal (*corpus*)."[14] *Corpus* cannot have the identical sense in every use of the word in this passage, or Seneca's statement, "Quae corporis bona sunt, corpora sunt," would be nonsensical. The meaning of the passage depends upon a distinction between one meaning of the term as the body that is distinct from the soul, and one referring to the quality of "bodiliness" which applies to both soul and "body." The term can refer both to the human body and in a more general sense to the Stoic concept of corporeality. In addition, Seneca felt free to use the same word in two different ways in one sentence and assumed that his audience would be able to make the distinction.

The role of πνεῦμα

To complicate the Stoic conception of corporeality even further, one had to understand what type of body was being discussed. The Stoics distinguished three different types of bodies: (1) bodies composed of

[10] A. A. Long, *Soul and Body in Stoicism* (Berkeley: Center for Hermeneutical Studies, 1980) 3.

[11] Sextus Empiricus, *Math.* 10.7; Diogenes Laertius, *Vit. phil.* 7.135; Philo, *Opif.* 36 (*SVF* 2.358); Plotinus, *Enn.* (*On Matter*) 6.1.26 (*SVF* 2.315); Galen, *De qualitatibus incorporeis* 10 (*SVF* 2.381).

[12] πᾶν γὰρ τὸ ποιοῦν σῶμά ἐστι (Diogenes Laertius, *Vit. phil.* 7.56 [*SVF* 2.140]); πᾶν γὰρ τὸ ὁρῶν ἢ καὶ ποιοῦν σῶμα . . . πᾶν τὸ κινοῦν καὶ ἐνοχλοῦν σῶμά ἐστι . . . πᾶν τὸ κινούμενον σῶμά ἐστι (Aëtius, *Plac.* 4.20.2 [*SVF* 2.387]); *Quod facit, corpusest* (Seneca, *Ep.* 106.4 [*SVF* 3.84]); also Cicero, *Acad.* 1.39 (*SVF* 1.90); Sextus Empiricus, *Math.* 8.263 (*SVF* 2.363), 9.211 (*SVF* 2.341); Plutarch, *Comm. not.* 1084A.

[13] Plotinus, *Enn.* (*On Matter*) 2.4.1 (*SVF* 2.320).

[14] Seneca, *Ep.* 106.4–5.

separated parts (διεστώτων) which are isolated and exist by themselves, an example of this kind being an army or a flock; (2) bodies composed of contiguous or adjacent parts (συναπτομένων) which combine to form one main structure, such as a house or ship; (3) unified bodies (ἡνωμένα), such as stones or people.[15] What allowed the third type to be called "unified" bodies was the presence of a pervasive πνεῦμα (itself a body) which held all of the parts together. Thus, "Bodies are called unified bodies (σώματα ἡνωμένα) if they are governed by a single hexis (μιᾶς ἕξεως), such as stone and wood, whereby hexis is the cohesive pneuma of the body (πνεῦμα σώματος συνεκτικόν)."[16] Chrysippus explains that "the whole of substance is unified because it is totally pervaded by a pneuma through which the whole is held together."[17]

Therefore, "unity" was an important concept in determining the kind of body, and πνεῦμα or *spiritus* was crucial in determining what type of unity was present.[18] Cohesiveness in the human body was also the result of *spiritus*.[19] For the Stoics, the cosmos was a "unified body" through the presence of πνεῦμα which united all of the parts.[20] It was not as important what the parts were, for the Stoics

[15] Plutarch, *Conj. praec.* 142E–143A (*SVF* 2.366) and Achilles, *Isagoge* 14 (*SVF* 2.368); Sextus Empiricus, *Math.* 9.78–79 (*SVF* 2.1013). Plutarch describes this state saying, "In about the same way, the marriage of a couple in love with each other is an intimate union (ὁ μὲν τῶν ἐρώντων ἡνωμένος καὶ συμφυής); that of those who marry for dowry or children is of persons joined together (συναπτομένων); and that of those who merely sleep in the same bed is of separate persons (διεστώτων) who may be regarded as cohabiting, but not really living together" (*Conj. praec.* 142E–143A). Plutarch appears to be reflecting a view of Roman Stoicism in which the traditional distinctions between the three "bodies" are applied more loosely. A key characteristic of organic bodies is extended to social bodies. Thus Seneca can apply the concept to the Roman state because Nero is the *spiritus* of the body (*Clem.* 1.3.1–5.3).

[16] Achilles, *Isagoge* 14 (*SVF* 2.368), translation by S. Sambursky, *Physics of the Stoics* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1959) 118–19.

[17] Alexander of Aphrodisias, *Mixt.* 216.14–16, translation by Robert B. Todd, *Alexander of Aphrodisias on Stoic Physics* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976) 115.

[18] The concept of a unified body allowed the Stoics to express their concern for unity and oneness. The concern for unity can be seen elsewhere. As Seneca states, "whatever is an inborn part of anything has unity (*unitatem*). Nothing is born without unity." Furthermore, "effect can never exist in a body unless the body is held together by unity, since the components need to work in harmony and to assemble their strength for tension." The unity presumed in the last passage is the result of tension in air (*spiritus*) (Seneca, *Nat.* 2.6.6).

[19] "That there is unity in air (*in aere*) can be realized also from the cohesiveness of our bodies. What holds them together? Air (*spiritus*)" (Seneca, *Nat.* 2.6.6).

[20] Chrysippus seems to have developed the doctrine of the cosmic *pneuma* (Alexander of Aphrodisias, *Mixt.* 223.25, 224.14. Plutarch, *Comm. not.* 1085C–D;

considered all parts, including plants and rocks, to be part of the universal body.[21]

The Stoic poet Manilius, writing in the beginning of the first century CE, further describes the work of spirit in unifying the universe.

> This fabric which forms the body (*corpore*) of the boundless universe, together with its members (*membraque*) composed of nature's diverse elements, air and fire, earth and level sea, is ruled by the force of a divine spirit (*animae divinae*); by sacred dispensation the deity brings harmony and governs with hidden purpose, arranging mutual bonds between all parts (*partes*), so that each may furnish and receive another's strength and that the whole may stand fast in kinship despite its variety of forms.[22]

He speaks of the "divine spirit," which he also identifies with God, as forming the essence of the universe. The work of the spirit is to create bonds among the diverse elements of the universe so that they may be brought into a harmony. The mutual support of the parts is vital to the existence of the whole. Furthermore, Manilius draws a connection between the universe as "body" and the work of the spirit as unifying force. In another passage he explicitly states the work of the spirit as making the universe a living "body": "The entire universe is alive in the mutual concord of its elements ... since a single spirit (*spiritus unus*) dwells in all its parts and ... shapes it like a living creature (*corpusque animale figuret*)."[23] Perhaps the most important function of the spirit in Stoic cosmology was to unify the universe, specifically as a "body."[24]

Plutarch, *Stoic. rep.* 1053F, 1054A. See the discussion in Michael Lapidge, "Stoic Cosmology," in *The Stoics*, ed. John M. Rist [Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978] 168–76).

[21] Diogenes Laertius, *Vit. phil.* 7.139; Sextus Empiricus, *Math.* 9.130; Philodemus, *Piet.* 11 (*SVF* 2.1076). As A. A. Long explains, "[A human being] is a part of the universal stock of matter pervaded through and through by a part of god ... All things in the Stoic universe are combinations of god and matter, stones no less than men" ("Soul and Body in Stoicism," *Phronesis* 27 [1982] 36).

[22] Manilius, *Astronomica* 1.247–54. [23] Manilius, *Astronomica* 2.63–68.

[24] In *Ad Helviam* Seneca speaks of a "divine Spirit (*spiritus*) pervading all things from the smallest to the greatest with uniform energy" (8.3). In Cicero's *De natura deorum*, Balbus says that there could be no connections among the processes and things of the physical world "were they not maintained in unison by a single divine and all-pervading spirit (*spiritu*)" (2.19).

The concept of "sympathy" (συμπάθεια) was one of the most significant aspects of being a unified body. "Sympathy" can be defined as "the interaction and affinity of different parts of a unified structure."[25] The parts would "sympathize" (συμπάσχει) with each other so that all the members of the body would be affected by what happened to an individual part. Thus Sextus Empiricus says, "In the case of unified bodies there exists a certain 'sympathy' (συμπάθεια), since when the finger is cut, the whole body shares in its condition."[26] This is in contrast to a non-unified body, such as an army, in which a single surviving soldier would not be said to have suffered through transmission even if the rest of his company were killed.[27] The sympathy of the universe created a relationship between heavenly and terrestrial events. For example, the waxing and waning of the moon caused the land and sea animals to wax and wane as well.[28]

Cicero explains the connections between sympathy and the unifying work of the spirit: "Consider the sympathetic agreement, interconnexion and affinity of things ... [The] processes and ... musical harmony of all the parts of the world assuredly could not go on were they not maintained in unison by a single divine all-pervading spirit (*uno divino et continuato spiritu*)."[29] The spirit not only unifies the various parts, but creates a connection by which each member has an effect on the whole.[30]

In addition, the role of the spirit in holding the universe together must be seen in the context of the Stoic view of total blending or κρᾶσις. The theory of blending allowed for the cohesiveness of the whole without sacrificing the individual natures of the constituent parts. The nature of such blending was that two bodies permeated each other while preserving their distinct substances. Thus, the two

[25] Sambursky, *Physics*, 41. [26] Sextus Empiricus, *Math*. 9.80.

[27] "For in the case of bodies formed from conjoined or separate elements the parts do not 'sympathize' with one another, since if all the soldiers, say, in an army have perished (save one) the one who survives is not seen to suffer at all through transmission (κατὰ διάδοσιν)" (Sextus Empiricus, *Math*. 9.80).

[28] Sextus Empiricus, *Math*. 9.79. As Michael Lapidge notes, this gives theoretical justification for astrology, since it connects events in a person's life with astral movement ("Stoic Cosmology," 175).

[29] Cicero, *Nat. d.* 2.19.

[30] Also, "For if the whole material world were not completely grown together, the cosmos as it is could not be kept together and administered by nature, nor would there exist a mutual sympathy of its parts; nor could we see and hear if the cosmos were not held together by one tension and if the pneuma were not cohesive throughout the whole being" (Cleomedes, *De motu circulari corporum caelestium*, I.1, translation by Sambursky, *Physics*, 128–29 [*SVF* 2.546]. Cleomedes lived in the late second century CE).

"mutually coextended in their entirety so that each of them preserves its own nature."[31] Furthermore, the blended bodies could be separated from one another.[32] This composition was distinguished from bodies which were merely juxtaposed and those which were fused together in such a way that the individual substances were destroyed, for example in the mixing of drugs.[33]

Alexander of Aphrodisias cites several examples of how the Stoics considered the extension of bodies through one another. A cup of wine can be mixed with a large amount of water;[34] fire can be passed through iron;[35] and the soul pervades the whole body.[36] Through the agency of the πνεῦμα, various elements were made to cohere to produce a unified body. But this did not entail the destruction of the individual nature of the elements. Rather, as supported through the idea of "total blending," each element maintained its individual substance.

Not only was the individuality of the elements retained, but the πνεῦμα itself also served as a differentiating force. Interestingly, this was explained in terms of its cohesive function. The πνεῦμα provided the cohesion for the unified body, but as the unified body was itself made of other bodies, the cohesive force in the individual bodies provided for their distinct qualities. According to Chrysippus, "The physical states (τὰς ἕξεις) are nothing else but spirits (ἀέρας), because the bodies are made cohesive by them. And the binding air is the cause for those bound into such a state being imbued with a certain property which is called hardness in iron, solidity in stone, brightness in silver."[37] He describes πνεῦμα as being responsible for the definite form of matter: "Matter, being inert by itself and sluggish, is the substratum of the properties, which are *pneumata* (πνεύματα) and air-like tensions (τόνους) giving definite form to

[31] Alexander of Aphrodisias, *Mixt*. 217.6–7, 216.28–31; Diogenes Laertius, *Vit. phil*. 7.151. Thus, as G. Verbeke describes, Chrysippus thought that the πνεῦμα could cause the universal "sympathy" of the cosmos without resulting in the individual parts losing their particular natures (*L'évolution de la doctrine de pneuma* [Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1945] 62–71).

[32] Alexander of Aphrodisias, *Mixt*. 216.33–217.2.

[33] Alexander of Aphrodisias, *Mixt*. 216.22–25; 217.2–12.

[34] Alexander of Aphrodisias, *Mixt*. 217.30–31; see also Diogenes Laertius, *Vit. phil*. 7.1; Plutarch, *Comm. not*. 1078A.

[35] Alexander of Aphrodisias, *Mixt*. 218.1–2.

[36] Alexander of Aphrodisias, *Mixt*. 217.33–35.

[37] Plutarch, *Stoic. rep*. 1053F, translation by Sambursky, *Physics*, 7.

those parts of matter in which they reside."[38] The Stoics believed in two universal principles, the active, which was God or the πνεῦμα, and a passive, which was matter (ὕλη). God as πνεῦμα pervaded the universe, composed of ὕλη, in various strengths, resulting in the different shapes and kinds of things. Thus, Alexander of Aphrodisias reports that "[the Stoics say] that God is mixed with matter and pervades the whole of it, in this way shaping and forming it and creating the universe. For if God is on their view body – an intelligent and eternal pneuma – and matter is body, first there will again be body going through body."[39]

For the Stoics, the doctrine of the πνεῦμα qualified the type of body and the nature of that body. Πνεῦμα made a body a unified body. As a result, not only were the members combined to form a whole, the parts demonstrated "sympathy" towards each other. Πνεῦμα also allowed for the differentiation of the parts which composed the larger body. The theory of blending meant that these parts, also bodies, did not lose their individuality even as they became parts of the larger whole. On the contrary, spirit was responsible for differentiating the parts even as it unified them.

God as νοῦς

It is also important to consider the way in which the Stoics understood God as the νοῦς, or mind of the world.[40] Νοῦς, like πνεῦμα, pervaded the universe. Its role was seen in light of the function of the soul in the body. Diogenes Laertius reports the views of Chrysippus, Posidonius, and Antipater of Tyre in this way: "The world, in [the Stoics'] view, is ordered by reason (νοῦν) and providence ... inasmuch as reason pervades every part (μέρος) of it."[41] Νοῦς pervades the cosmos, holding it together like πνεῦμα at some points, and

[38] Plutarch, *Stoic. rep.* 1054A–B, translation by Sambursky, *Physics*, 7–8. Tension served other functions as well. In some places it was explained as the tension, or τόνος, of the pneuma which held the universe together (Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 5.8 [*SVF* 2.447]; Galen, *De mult.* 3 [*SVF* 2.439] who refers to a "pneuma-like" [τὴν πνευματικὴν οὐσίαν] substance which provides the cohesion).

[39] Alexander of Aphrodisias, *Mixt.* 224.32–225.4 (*SVF* 2.310).

[40] According to Diogenes Laertius, the Stoics called God Reason (νοῦν), Fate (εἱμαρμένην), and Zeus (Δία), along with "many other names" (*Vit. phil.* 7.135). Cicero reports Cleanthes' connection of God with the mind of the universe (*mens*), along with the soul (*animus*) and aether (*Nat. d.* 1.37). Similarly Chrysippus calls the intellect (*mens*), reason (*ratio*), and soul of the universe divine (*Nat. d.* 1.39). Also Aëtius, *Plac.* 1.7.33 (*SVF* 2.1027).

[41] Diogenes Laertius, *Vit. phil.* 7.138–39.

ruling it at others.[42] Indeed, for Chrysippus, πνεῦμα becomes equivalent to God and divine reason.[43] The body analogy shows how the νοῦς functions like the soul in the body.

To discuss the immanent rationality of the world was for the Stoics to discuss God. Their theological language was rich and somewhat ambiguous. On the one hand, physics and metaphysics provided categories for identifying the "real" references of traditional religious language. On the other hand, traditional religious connotations provided an emotional depth to Stoic language about the natural world.[44]

As the mind (also referred to as λόγος, *mens*, or *ratio*), "God" was responsible for the order and continued harmony in the universe. One well-known aspect of "God" was the concept of fate, or εἱμαρμένη.[45] It has been described as "the concatenated causality of things, or the scheme (λόγος) according to which the kosmos is directed."[46] Εἱμαρμένη was seen as equivalent to "God."[47] Zeno called it the "power which moves Stuff," and the same thing as "providence" (πρόνοια) and "nature" (φύσις).[48] As destiny or providence "God" gave a definite order to the universe. The order mainly had to do with causality, and in this the Stoics were determinists.

"God" was seen as the governor of the universe.[49] If "God" as πνεῦμα was responsible for the universe being a cohesive whole, "God" as νοῦς was responsible more specifically for its governing

[42] See also Aëtius, *Plac*. 1.7.33 (*SVF* 2.1027).

[43] Diogenes Laertius, *Vit. phil*. 7.138 (*SVF* 2.634); Aëtius, *Plac*. 1.7.33 (*SVF* 2.1027). Lapidge, "Stoic Cosmology," 170–71.

[44] Thus the personal tone of Cleanthes' *Hymn to Zeus* (Stobaeus, *Ecl*. I.1.12 [*SVF* 1.537]) expresses the personal prayers of a Stoic to his god. Although J. Mansfeld observes "It cannot, indeed, be denied that there is an element of personal feeling in the hymn" and concludes that "the Stoic concept of god is tolerant of a theistic approach" ("Providence and the Destruction of the Universe in Early Stoic Thought," in *Studies in Hellenistic Religions*, ed. M. J. Vermaseren [Leiden: Brill, 1979] 131) and Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff notices "die wärmsten Töne hellenischer Frömmigkeit" in the hymn (*Der Glaube der Hellenen* [Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1955] 288), the Stoic "God" is not personal. The relationship remains primarily rational and intellectual, for all Cleanthes requests is a share of the divine insight (γνώμη) which rules the universe. See also Keimpe Algra, "Stoic Theology," in *The Cambridge Companion to the Stoics*, ed. Brad Inwood (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003) 168–69, who notes the Stoics' "rather fluid conception of god."

[45] Cicero, *Div*. 1.50.125–26.

[46] Diogenes Laertius, *Vit. phil*. 7.149 (*SVF* 1.175), translation by Bevan, *Religion*, 4.

[47] Diogenes Laertius, *Vit. phil*. 7.135.

[48] Theodoret, *Graec. Aff. Cur*. VI 14 (*SVF* 1.176).

[49] Epictetus, *Diatr*. 2.14.23–28.

and continued orderly functioning. In fact, at one point Chrysippus equates ὁμόνοια with "God."[50]

But it is also important to note "God's" activity as the "craftsman" of the universe.[51] As such, "God" was responsible for the orderly arrangement of the universe or διακόσμησις.[52] According to Diogenes Laertius, the Stoics called "God" the "artificer of this orderly arrangement," or δημιουργὸς ὢν τῆς διακοσμήσεως.[53] Seneca called "God" the "organizer" or *dispositor* of the universe.[54] The idea of "God" as "artificer" was held by Zeno, Cleanthes, Chrysippus, Archedemus, and Posidonius.[55]

[50] Philodemus, *Piet*. 11 (*SVF* 2.1076), translation by Bevan, *Religion*, 18.

[51] ". . . as, when we behold some very beautiful piece of bronze-work, we are anxious to know who the craftsman (τεχνίτην) is, since the material is of itself motionless, so also when we behold the matter of the Universe moving and existing in definite shape and orderly arrangement (διακοσμήσει) we shall naturally look for the cause which moves it and shapes it into various forms" (Sextus Empiricus, *Math*. 9.75; Aëtius, *Plac*. 1.7.33 [*SVF* 2.1027] where god is described as πῦρ τεχνικόν). According to Lactantius, Zeno described divine reason (λόγος) as "craftsman of the universe (*artificem universitatis*)" (*De vera sap*. 9; *SVF* 1.160).

God's role as "craftsman" was also seen in the doctrine of the conflagration (ἐκπύρωσις) of the universe. According to this doctrine, after a certain period of time the universe would be destroyed by fire. The world was then renewed and the cycle continually repeated. "The Stoics say that when the planets return, at certain fixed periods of time, to the same relative positions, in length and breadth, which they had at the beginning, when the kosmos was first constituted, this produces the conflagration and destruction of everything which exists. Then again the kosmos is restored anew in a precisely similar arrangement as before" (Nemesius, *de nat. hom*. p. 277 [*SVF* 2.625], translation by Bevan, *Religion*, 30–31; also Cicero, *Nat. d*. 2.118 [*SVF* 2.593]; Plutarch, *Stoic. rep*. 1052C, 1053B [*SVF* 2.604–605]).

For the history of the concept of God as "craftsman," including the influence of Aristotle and Plato, see Friedrich Solmsen, "Nature as Craftsman in Greek Thought," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 24 (1963) 473–96.

[52] "Again, (the Stoics) give the name of cosmos to the orderly arrangement (τὴν διακόσμησιν) of the heavenly bodies in itself as such" (Diogenes Laertius, *Vit. phil*. 7.138; see also Sextus Empiricus, *Math*. 9.75). In this arrangement, the earth, as the "most solid part," is the center and remains stationary. The rest of the cosmos revolves around the earth. The earth itself is spread with water, with certain "projections" known as "islands" or "continents." "The kosmos produced by a *diakosmesis* is distributed in this order of primary substances. The substance which revolves around it by a circular movement is the aether. In this the stars are situated, the fixed stars and the planets, being divine in their nature, endowed with soul-life and governed according to Providence" (Stobaeus, *Ecl*. I. 184.8 [*SVF* 3.527], translation by Bevan, *Religion*, 28–29).

[53] It is not clear which Stoics Diogenes is discussing here. But earlier he spoke of Zeno's, Chrysippus', and Archedemus' (third century BCE) works on the four elements of the universe (Diogenes Laertius, *Vit. phil*. 7.137–38).

[54] Seneca, *Nat*. 5.18.5.

[55] Diogenes Laertius, *Vit. phil*. 7.134. Archedemus, who is not as well known as the other philosophers, was probably a pupil of Diogenes of Babylon (*SVF* 3.262–4).

Conclusion

We can make several general conclusions about the Stoic universe, while keeping in mind the variety among individual thinkers. The universe is a body and a living being. It becomes a unified body through πνεῦμα and is governed by νοῦς. Both πνεῦμα and νοῦς are equivalent terms to "God," and in some respects, are interchangeable. Thus, at some points νοῦς can be viewed as holding the world together, although this role is primarily given to πνεῦμα. The πνεῦμα has both unified and differentiated the parts of the body. "God" is also viewed as the one who "crafts" the universe, that is, the one who arranges the parts as well as governs the whole. The cohesive function of the πνεῦμα is vital for the continued functioning of the universe. If not for the πνεῦμα, the universe would be scattered into its various parts. In fact, the need for the cohesive πνεῦμα presupposes the diverse members of "God's" universe. Πνεῦμα also creates "sympathy" in the universe as a part of its unifying role. "Sympathy," as mentioned above, describes a state in which the parts come together as a unified body through the work of the πνεῦμα.

The following passage from Manilius summarizes the preceding ideas well.

> I shall sing of God . . . who permeating sky and land and sea, controls with uniform compact the mighty structure; how the entire universe is alive in the mutual concord of its elements and is driven by the pulse of reason, since a single spirit (*spiritus unus*) dwells in all its parts and, speeding through all things, nourishes the world and shapes it like a living creature (*corpus animale figuret*). Indeed, unless the whole frame stood fast, composed of kindred limbs (*membris*) and obedient to an overlord (*magistro*), unless providence directed the vast resource of the skies, the Earth would not possess its stability, nor stars their orbits, and the heaven would wander aimlessly or stiffen with inertia . . . In this due order over the whole universe do all things abide, following the guidance of a master. This God and all-controlling reason (*deus et ratio*), then derives earthly beings from the signs of heaven.[56]

[56] Manilius, *Astronomica* 2.60–83.

As Manilius describes the movement of the entire universe, including the relationship between the earthly and heavenly spheres, he speaks of a universe controlled by reason and united by spirit. The spirit also makes it into a *corpus*. The stability of the whole, composed of many limbs (*membris*) is obedient to a *magistro* and follows an "all-controlling reason." Both reason and *spiritus* are pervasive, although *spiritus* is what makes the universe a "body."

Thus we see that the identification of the universe as a "body" has significant ontological implications. In the following chapter I will examine how this characterization of the universe related to the Stoics' conception of universal humanity and, consequently, the ethical expectations for a united, bodily humanity.

4

STOIC UNIVERSAL HUMANITY AND ETHICS

In the preceding chapter I attempted to demonstrate that the Stoic identification of the universe as a "body" was a statement about the unified and organic nature of the universe. In this chapter I will examine the relationship of this conception of the universe to Stoic ethics. We will see that the idea of a bodily universe was applied to a universal and bodily humanity and that Stoic social ethics was based upon the ability to understand the consequences of the nature of a unified humanity. The role of the moral teacher was not simply to instruct the student, but to help him or her grow in reasoning ability so that the student would understand the basic connection between one's relationship to the whole and subsequent ethical behavior. Understanding corporate identity, specifically bodily unity, was the critical component in social ethics.

The goal of ethics

Like many other Greek philosophers such as the Aristotelians, Platonists, and Epicureans, the Stoics considered happiness or εὐδαιμονία to be the goal or τέλος of life.[1] For the Stoics, happiness consisted in "living in accordance with nature," or the order of the universe. This is the virtuous life.[2] To live in accordance with virtue or nature is to live in accordance with a universal law or right

[1] E.g. Plato, *Symp*. 205a; Aristotle, *Eth. nic*. 1.4.1–2; Epictetus, *Diatr*. 4.1.46. The content of εὐδαιμονία, however, varied. For example, Aristotle rejected the idea that virtue is happiness (Aristotle, *Eth. nic*. 1.5.5–6). For a discussion on the differences between the Stoics and Aristotelians on εὐδαιμονία see T. H. Irwin, "Stoic and Aristotelian Conceptions of Happiness," in *The Norms of Nature*, ed. Malcolm Schofield and Gisela Striker (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986) 205–44.

[2] Diogenes Laertius, *Vit. phil*. 7.87 (*SVF* 3.4) attributed this view to Zeno, Cleanthes, Posidonius, Hecato, and Chrysippus.

reason.[3] The virtuous life becomes equated with life according to nature because virtue becomes "the goal towards which nature guides us."[4] According to Chrysippus, this is because "our individual natures are parts of the nature of the whole universe," and so the virtuous life promotes the harmony of the life of the individual with the order of the universe.[5]

The Stoics' definition of the virtuous and happy life as the life lived according to nature and reason has several implications for this study. First, for the Stoics, reason was a critical aspect of what it meant to be human, since reason was important for understanding and living the life according to nature. Furthermore, the ability to reason separated humanity from the animals, thus forming a significant aspect of a person's identity as a human being. Second, according to Cicero all humans possess reason. Although reason needs to be developed in each individual, all adult humans naturally have the reasoning constitution. Third, Cicero uses the universal possession of reason as the foundation for political communities and concepts of justice within these communities. Moral education, therefore, consisted in training the person how to use this reasoning constitution correctly.

The role of reason in understanding and identity

A person could only live properly through the application of the reasoning constitution. According to Diogenes Laertius, "But when reason (λόγου) by way of a more perfect leadership has been bestowed on the beings we call rational, for them life according to reason rightly becomes the natural life. For reason rightly supervenes to shape impulse scientifically."[6] Human beings, like animals, have

[3] "We refrain from every action forbidden by the law common to all things, that is to say, the right reason (ὁ ὀρθὸς λόγος)." So Chrysippus says in *On Ends* (Diogenes Laertius, *Vit. phil.* 7.88). "To the rational creature the same act is at once according to nature and according to reason (λόγον) (Marcus Aurelius, *Med.* 7.11).

[4] Diogenes cites Zeno as the first to make this connection. Cleanthes, Posidonius, Hecato, and Chrysippus are also said to have made the same observation (Diogenes Laertius, *Vit. phil.* 7.87).

[5] Diogenes Laertius, *Vit. phil.* 7.87.

[6] Diogenes Laertius attributes this idea to "the Stoics," but does not specify which ones (*Vit. phil.* 7.86). "Impulse" is that which regulates the life of the animal (ὁρμή). He explains, "And nature, [the Stoics] say, made no difference originally between plants and animals, for she regulates the life of plants too, in their case without impulse and sensation ... But when in the case of animals impulse has been superadded,

impulse, but humans also have reason, which allows them to shape impulse in order to live the virtuous life.

Through reason people gain a sense of and appreciation for order and harmony.

> And it is no mean manifestation of Nature and Reason that man is the only animal that has a feeling for order, for propriety, for moderation in word and deed. And so no other animal has a sense of beauty, loveliness, harmony in the visible world; and Nature and reason ... find that beauty, consistency, order are far more to be maintained in thought and deed.[7]

Cicero argues that through common participation in reason, humans should live a life of order, propriety, and harmony which is markedly different from that of the animals.

For the Stoics, reason distinguished humans from animals, who did not have the rational capacity.[8] It was not just the possession but the correct use of reason which mattered. Reason was not important for its own sake as much as for allowing one to grasp the universal order so that the person could act virtuously.[9] If a person did not use reason to act accordingly through the contemplation of the universal nature, such a person was no better than an irrational animal. As Epictetus describes,

> But God has brought man into the world to be a spectator of Himself and of His works, and not merely a spectator, but also an interpreter. Wherefore, it is shameful for man to begin and end just where the irrational animals do; he should rather begin where they do but end where nature

whereby they are enabled to go in quest of their proper aliment, for them, says the Stoics, Nature's rule is to follow the direction of impulse" (*Vit. phil.* 7.86). But in humans, reason is added to impulse in human beings to become the basis for the natural life. Cicero also states, "That animal which we call man ... has been given a certain distinguished status by the supreme God who created him; for he is the only one among so many different kinds and varieties of living beings who has a share in reason and thought (*rationis et cogitationis*), while all the rest are deprived of it" (*Leg.* 1.7.22).

[7] Cicero, *Off.* 1.4.11–14; *Leg.* 1.10.28–30.

[8] What distinguished a human action from an animal action was that whereas the animal could only act according to the immediate perception of the senses, a human being was able to make a choice based upon his or her analysis of the entirety of an event, including relationships between past, present, and future and cause and effect (Cicero, *Off.* 1.4.11).

[9] Nicholas P. White, "The Basis of Stoic Ethics," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 83 (1979) 176.

> has ended in dealing with us. Now she did not end until she reached contemplation and understanding and a manner of life harmonious with nature. Take heed, therefore, lest you die without ever having been spectators of these things.[10]

Only humans could interpret correctly the nature of the universe and act accordingly.

To be a reasoning creature, and thus to be human, was an important part of one's identity. Epictetus reflects the value the Stoics placed upon the superior place of humanity in the universe when he warns that one must take care not to live like an animal, or else one would "destroy the man in you."[11]

Reason and universal humanity

Reason was important because it enabled the person to comprehend the order of the universe and thus live virtuously. But while for Zeno right reason is limited to the sage, for Cicero and the Roman Stoics all human beings have the faculty of reason and so belong to universal humanity. Cicero explains in *De legibus*:

> The first common possession of man and God is reason. But those who have reason in common must also have right reason in common. And since right reason is Law, we must believe that men have Law also in common with the gods. Further, those who share Law must also share Justice; and those who share these are to be regarded as members of the same commonwealth.[12]

The possession of reason unites humanity and the gods and also provides a common foundation for a just and orderly society.

According to Cicero, the whole universe is governed by a single mind (*mens*).[13] But human beings participate in this mind and the ability to comprehend the order of the universe. Thus they share reason with the gods. Reason unites all human beings with each other, forming the basis for society. Cicero calls it the "ultimate source" of the "principles of fellowship and society that Nature has established among men."[14]

[10] Epictetus, *Diatr*. 1.6.19. [11] Epictetus, *Diatr*. 2.9.2–3.
[12] Cicero, *Leg*. 1.7.23. Also *Resp*. 1.8.19; *Fin*. 1.19.64.
[13] Cicero, *Resp*. 1.36.56; *Nat. d*. 2.53.132; *Div*. 1.49.110.
[14] Cicero *Off*. 1.16.50.

The idea of natural law, or κοινὸς νόμος, is helpful here. For Zeno, this is identified with the sage's right reason and prescribes his conduct accordingly.[15] According to Diogenes, Chrysippus describes it as follows:

> The end may be defined as life in accordance with nature, or, in other words, in accordance with our own human nature as well as that of the universe, a life in which we refrain from every action forbidden by the law common to all things (ὁ νόμος ὁ κοινός), that is to say, the right reason (ὁ ὀρθὸς λόγος).[16]

A life in accordance with nature is thus a life in accordance with the κοινὸς νόμος. Κοινὸς νόμος, however, corresponds more to a mental disposition than to a set of moral rules. The sage's perfectly rational disposition allows one to make exceptions to the moral code depending on the circumstance. Even cannibalism is allowed under special circumstances.[17] But only a few, if any, could ever hope to attain the status of a sage.[18] Therefore, Zeno's cosmic city is essentially a utopian ideal.[19]

For Cicero, however, all human beings are capable of living according to the κοινὸς νόμος. He states,

> there is no difference in kind between man and man . . . indeed reason, which alone raises us above the level of the beasts and enables us to draw inferences, to prove and disprove, to discuss and solve problems, and to come to conclusions, is certainly common to us all, and, though varying in what it learns, at least in the capacity to learn it is invariable.[20]

[15] Diogenes Laertius, *Vit. phil.* 7.88. Also Cicero, *Leg.* 1.18–19, 2.8 ("Law . . . rules the whole universe by its wisdom in command and prohibition"); Plutarch, *Stoic. rep.* 1038A; Cicero, *Nat. d.* 1.36.

[16] Diogenes Laertius, *Vit. phil.* 7.88.

[17] Diogenes Laertius, *Vit. phil.* 7.121, 188. See also Brad Inwood, "Rules and Reasoning in Stoic Ethics," in *Topics in Stoic Philosophy*, ed. Katerina Ierodiakonou (Oxford: Clarendon, 1999) 95–127.

[18] E.g. "This sage does not exist, however, and has not existed anywhere on earth." Plutarch cites this view of the Stoics in *Comm. not.* 1076B–C; also Plutarch, *Stoic. rep.* 1048E; Sextus Empiricus, *Math.* 7.432–35; Cicero, *Nat. d.* 3.79.

[19] Although see Dirk Obbink, "The Stoic Sage in the Cosmic City," in *Topics in Stoic Philosophy*, ed. Katerina Ierodiakonou (Oxford: Clarendon, 1999) 178–95, who argues that the cosmic city is not utopian but reflects the world as it actually is for the Stoic wise man.

[20] Cicero, *Leg.* 1.10.29–30.

Cicero states that reason in humanity implies the "capacity" to learn, and whether or not this potential is realized, it remains the distinct possession of the person. A person belongs to the community simply by virtue of being a reasoning human being. The goal is still to become a sage, but those who fall short of becoming a sage, which would be almost everyone, are not excluded from the universal community.[21]

This slight shift in ideas has more implications beyond those stated above because the different ideas on the rational potential of human beings influenced the philosophers' concepts of the relationship between the universal community and concrete political entities. Since for the earlier Stoics κοινὸς νόμος was not a series of enactments and customs regulating citizens' social lives, but rather the correct moral reasoning of the sage, the community formed by the sage transcended conventional boundaries. Since the Stoic search for *eudaimonia* took place in this context rather than the context of conventional communities, the early Stoics took little interest in the relative merits of different types of regimes and found little need to discuss actual political communities. The only acceptable participation of the sage in politics was to promote virtue.[22] There was a wide gulf between the community of the wise and conventional political regimes.[23]

But with Cicero we find a different situation.[24] Cicero now argues that all human beings are capable of living in accordance with the

[21] For a discussion of this issue, see Dirk Obbink and Paul A. Vander Waerdt, "Diogenes of Babylon: The Stoic Sage in the City of Fools," *GRBS* 32 (1991): 355–96.

[22] Diogenes Laertius, *Vit. phil.* 7.121. He cites Chrysippus and Zeno as two examples of Stoics who hold these views.

[23] For a more detailed look at the relationship between the Stoic sage and conventional political communities in the thought of the Roman Stoics, see P. A. Brunt, "Stoicism and the Principate," in *Papers of the British School at Rome* 43 (1975) 7–35; and Gretchen Reydams-Schils, *The Roman Stoics: Self, Responsibility, and Affection* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005).

[24] Scholarship has previously noted the change in the translation of Stoic philosophy to Rome. The dominant hypothesis has been that the earlier Stoics' philosophical concerns gave way to the practical needs of the Roman Empire. This hypothesis has been challenged by the idea that the dominant force behind the change was not so much practical and political as philosophical, and further that this change did not occur in the second half of the first century, but rather in the first half of the second century BCE. According to this hypothesis, Diogenes of Babylon is seen as the primary force behind this change. Whereas the earlier Stoics took little interest in the discussion of actual political communities because they found their context solely in the transcendent community of the sage bounded by reason, Diogenes attempted to draw a closer connection between the two types of communities. Specifically, he attempted to

κοινὸς νόμος. The philosopher's role is to train people in the correct way of thinking. Whereas previously there had been an unbridgeable gulf between the cosmic city and existing communities on earth, now the transcendent, universal community becomes the basis for formulating a concrete set of moral rules for political communities. Cicero, in particular, uses this concept as the foundation for his discussions of justice.[25]

Reason and justice

In *De officiis*, Cicero explores the role of philosophy in the determination of duties.[26] Written in 44 BCE, the work is addressed to his son Marcus in order to give advice on a career, and to provide guiding principles for life.[27] But Cicero also makes it clear that he is writing to Marcus' generation as well.[28]

Cicero states that duties cannot be understood apart from the idea of virtue and that one must have a moral standard in positing the Supreme Good.[29] Cicero explicitly connects the morally right with the four cardinal virtues: wisdom, justice, courage, and temperance. He defines them, respectively, as (1) the full perception and intelligent development of the true; (2) the conservation of organized society, rendering to every person their due, with the faithful discharge of obligations assumed; (3) the greatness and strength of a noble and invincible spirit; and (4) the orderliness and moderation of everything that is said and done, in which consist temperance and

show how the sage's membership in the community shared with the gods and governed by natural laws may guide political practice in conventional regimes composed mainly of those who are incapable of virtuous action (Obbink and Vander Waerdt, "Diogenes," 355–96; their assessment is based upon a new critical edition and translation of *P. Hercul.* 1506 col. 8 [*SVF* fr. 117]).

[25] Chrysippus also attests to the significance of the universal nature for the beginnings of justice, although he does not attempt to apply it to actual communities: "It is not possible to discover any other beginning of justice (δικαιοσύνης) or any source for it other than that from Zeus and from the universal nature, for thence everything of the kind must have its beginning if we are going to have anything to say about good and evil" (*Stoic. rep.* 1035C). And "For there is no other or more suitable way of approaching the theory of good and evil or the virtues or happiness [than] from the universal nature and from the dispensation (διοικήσεως) of the universe" (*Stoic. rep.* 1035C).

[26] The Middle Stoic Panaetius provided the source for Books 1 and 2, e.g. *Off.* 1.3.9; 2.5.16. See also the discussion by Andrew R. Dyck, *A Commentary on Cicero, De Officiis* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996) 17–29.

[27] Cicero, *Off.* 1.1.1; 2.1.1; 3.1.1.

[28] Cicero, *Off.* 2.14.45. For Cicero's desire to influence Rome's youth, see Dyck, *Cicero*, 10–16.

[29] Cicero, *Off.* 1.2.5.

self-control.[30] According to Cicero, everything that is morally right comes from one of these four sources.

Cicero identifies the two fundamental principles of justice as (1) that no harm be done to anyone, and (2) that the common interests be conserved.[31] Justice, therefore, deals with the social relations among humanity. It functions to promote and strengthen society.[32] Justice does not simply ensure that no one actively wrongs another person; it also deals with the obligations people have toward one another. Therefore, it can be both passive and active. One can commit an injustice toward another by not shielding them from being wronged as much as by inflicting the wrong oneself.[33]

The basis for justice deals with what Cicero calls "the ultimate sources" of the principles of fellowship and society which Nature has established among humanity. This is the connection among all the members of humanity based upon reason and speech, which unites humanity in "a sort of natural fraternity."[34] The consequence of this "natural fraternity" is that everyone should contribute something to the common good (*ad communem utilitatem*).[35] One should help another simply because he or she is a fellow human being.[36]

The universal bond forms the foundation for human relationships. It is one's fundamental duty to respect, defend, and maintain the bonds of humanity which exist among all members of the human race.[37] One should treat all people, not only the "best," with a reverent attitude.[38]

Furthermore, the duty to maintain the social bonds is considered by Cicero to be the highest duty. He defines wisdom, or *sapientia*, as "the knowledge of things human and divine, which is concerned with

[30] Cicero, *Off*. 1.5.15. [31] Cicero, *Off*. 1.10.31; also 1.7.20.
[32] Cicero, *Off*. 1.28.100. [33] Cicero, *Off*. 1.7.23.
[34] Cicero, *Off*. 1.16.50. Or κοινωνίαν δ' ὑπάρχειν πρὸς ἀλλήλους διὰ τὸ λόγου μετέχειν (Arius Didymus in Eusebius, *Praep. Evang*. XV 15 [*SVF* 2.528]).
[35] Cicero, *Off*. 1.16.52.
[36] Cicero, *Off*. 3.6.27. It is interesting to compare Cicero's universal humanity to Aristotle's *polis*. As Martha Nussbaum explains, Aristotle thought of the basic unit as the *polis*. "He did believe that one account of the good human life was valid for all human beings; but this account included no obligations to promote the good of the entire human species as such." Rather he envisaged the good person as achieving "self-sufficiency" along with parents, children, wife, friends, etc. (*Eth. nic*. 1.7.6). The parts on friendship do speak in passing of a broader sense of recognition and affiliation that links every human being to every other (*Eth. nic*. 8.1.3–4) but this does not generate any moral obligation, and "certainly no sense that one's ends include the good of all humanity" (Nussbaum, *Therapy*, 343).
[37] Cicero, *Off*. 1.41.149. [38] Cicero, *Off*. 1.28.98.

the bonds of union between gods and men and the relations of man to man." This leads to the observation that, "if wisdom is the most important of the virtues . . . that duty which is connected with social obligation is the most important duty."[39] In choosing between conflicting duties, those which are demanded by the interests of human society take precedence.[40]

In summary, reason, which was important in distinguishing humans from animals, gave the person the ability to comprehend the moral order. In Cicero, reason was the property of all humanity and not just of the sage. The universal reasoning ability of humanity was the basis for justice in society, including specific political communities. But the person needed to be trained in the correct use of reason. Moral education consisted in teaching the person both the nature of the universe and the way in which this knowledge should be applied in concrete situations.

The process of moral reasoning in social ethics

The student who was taught the basic conception of universal humanity still needed to learn what specific ethical actions were in line with one's nature as a member of universal humanity. However, moral education was not as much a matter of listing expected behaviors as of making the critical link between ontological identity and subsequent actions.

In Cicero's universal fellowship, all humans are to benefit from justice, including slaves, whom he considers to be occupying the humblest station.[41] At the same time there are different degrees of closeness which regulate the priority of one's social obligations. To belong to the same "people, tribe, and tongue" is a close relationship, to be a citizen of the same city-state closer still, and so on through kindred, children, and finally husband and wife as the "first bond of union."[42] Cicero confuses the matter a bit when he goes on to state that the dearest and closest social relation is that with one's country, superseding that with parents, children, and friends. As a result,

[39] Cicero, *Off.* 1.43.153.

[40] Cicero, *Off.* 1.45.160–61. Cicero explains that justice concerns "the welfare of our fellow-man; and nothing ought to be more sacred in men's eyes than that" (1.43.155). Even knowledge which does not help maintain society is "isolated and barren" and courage if unrestrained by the uniting bonds of society would be brutality and savagery (1.44.157).

[41] Cicero, *Off.* 1.13.41. [42] Cicero, *Off.* 1.17.53–54.

one's moral obligations are primarily towards one's country, then parents, children, family, and kinsmen.[43] The two lists are similar, except that in regard to duties the state suddenly acquires prominence over one's parents and spouse. Otherwise the lists move from close family relations, to broader kin relations, to fellow citizens, and ultimately to all humanity. This inconsistency may reflect the view that Cicero is ultimately more concerned with reinforcing the *status quo* than with any ontological speculation since he seems to give priority to maintaining loyalty to one's country over all other types of relationships.[44] Nevertheless, the passages represent Cicero's attempt to demonstrate that the natural fellowship of human beings forms the basis for more concrete social unions.[45] Similarly, Hierocles in the second century CE discusses the concentric circles by which people should understand their relationships with each other. The person stands at the center. The second circle contains one's parents, siblings, wife, and children. The circles continue outward to encompass various kinship relations, fellow citizens, and finally the entire human race. The goal is to try to draw the outermost circles inward in order to reduce the distance of one's relationship to each person.[46] But again, the most basic relationship includes all humanity.

[43] Cicero, *Off*. 1.17.57–58.

[44] E.g. Reydams-Schils, who discusses the influence of socially defined roles in *De officiis*. She sees a readjustment to more philosophically defined roles in Seneca and Epictetus, although they also reflect the influence of Cicero and Roman social values (*Roman Stoics*). E. M. Atkins argues that Cicero's comments about justice and society are ultimately not based upon a Stoic metaphysical framework, at least not to the extent that it affects the works of Seneca and Epictetus ("'Domina et Regina Virtutum': Justice and Societas in De Officiis," *Phronesis* 35 [1990]: 258–89). See also Christopher Gill, "Personhood and Personality: The Four-*Personae* Theory in Cicero, *De Officiis* I," *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 6 (1988) 169–99, who says that Cicero is simply reproducing the Greco-Roman competitive ethos. On the other hand, Blundell locates Cicero within the Stoic tradition in regard to his thoughts on οἰκείωσις (see more on this below) and justice (Mary Whitlock Blundell, "Parental Nature and Stoic οἰκείωσις," *Ancient Philosophy* 10 [1990] 221–42, esp. 229).

[45] While the Roman Stoics were more positive in terms of the participation of the philosopher in public life, there remained tensions and potential conflicts. Philosophy, however, provided the means with which to deal with this conflict, and commitment to philosophy remained the priority. For example, Epictetus explains, "Remember this – that if you are going to honour anything at all outside the sphere of the moral purpose, you have destroyed your moral purpose. And outside the sphere of moral purpose lie not merely office, but also freedom from office; not merely business, but also leisure" (*Diatr*. 4.4.23–24). For more on this see Brunt, "Stoicism"; Reydams-Schils, *Roman Stoics*.

[46] Stobaeus, *Flor*. 84.23.

The Stoics, and in particular Cicero and Seneca, taught people to develop the rational capacity and to live virtuously by basing specific rules upon the foundational principle of unity.[47] The Stoic concept of οἰκείωσις connected the Stoic concern to live according to nature or virtue and the obligation to take care of one's fellow human beings by making the person's identity as part of universal humanity the starting point for social ethics.

Οἰκείωσις

Οἰκείωσις teaches the student what "belongs" to him or her and how to value these things. Striker defines οἰκείωσις as the "recognition and appreciation of something as belonging to one."[48] Several aspects about this definition stand out. First, the critical notion of "belonging" refers to an implicit condition. Someone or something already is a part of itself. Nothing needs to be changed because the state or condition already exists. Second is the idea of recognition. The condition exists, but the student may or may not recognize it. Thirdly, the person must appreciate what "belongs." This concept implies that one will take care of what belongs to oneself. At the most basic form of οἰκείωσις an infant instinctively seeks to preserve its own life through the attachment it has for its own constitution.[49] For an infant, this act is instinctive. But οἰκείωσις in another form

[47] It was not always easy, however, to move from speculation about the nature of humanity to specific duties. The question was further clouded by the belief that the rational constitution was not similar in every human being. For example, it varied according to one's age. A child was not considered to be a rational being. When the question arises as to how a child can adapt itself to a reasoning constitution when he or she is not yet gifted with reason, Seneca answers that an adult simply has a more developed constitution than a child, and each adapts to their particular constitution. He uses the body analogy to illustrate this idea: "The child is toothless, and he is fitted to this condition. Then his teeth grow, and he is fitted to that condition also" (*Ep*. 121.14–15). Nussbaum explains, "The orthodox Stoic view (insofar as we may reconstruct it, for example, from the accounts in Cicero's *De finibus* 3 and Seneca's Letter 121) is that the sense of what is appropriate to one's nature as a rational being evolves gradually, beginning from the child's orientation to self-preservation, and culminating in the mature adult's grasp of moral order. The awareness of one's own constitution and what it requires matures as the constitution itself matures" (Nussbaum, *Therapy*, 333).

[48] Gisela Striker, "The Role of *Oikeiosis* in Stoic Ethics," *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 1 (1983) 145. Blundell provides another helpful definition which captures better "the process by which we recognize our natural affinity first to ourselves and subsequently to various features of our environment, which we pursue as being οἰκεῖος, or 'belonging' to us" (Blundell, "Stoic οἰκέιωσις," 221).

[49] Cicero, *Fin*. 3.5.16.

involves a conscious and cognitive recognition of what "belongs" to one. Thus, moral education aims to bring the person to a state of conscious awareness and appreciation.

Οἰκείωσις implies that each creature has or should have an awareness of its constitution. Seneca describes this awareness through the example of the use of the body. Each creature instinctively knows how to use the parts of its body. "No animal is at a loss how to use its body ... So all these animals have a consciousness (*sensus*) of their physical constitution, and for that reason can manage their limbs as readily as they do; nor have we any better proof that they come into being equipped with this knowledge than the fact that no animal is unskilled in the use of its body."[50] The consciousness of one's constitution enables one to act to preserve this constitution.[51]

Οἰκείωσις further implies a self-love in that a creature desires to take care of what belongs to itself. This tendency to take care of oneself is given by Nature; otherwise the animal would not be able to survive. An animal's first impulse is self-preservation because Nature from the start endears the creature to itself. As Chrysippus explains, it would not make sense for Nature to produce a creature without either an affinity toward itself or the ability to preserve itself through rejecting what is injurious and seeking what is beneficial.[52]

The important thing to a creature is its own constitution, and the creature's primary instinct is to preserve itself. This does not mean, however, that goals are chosen only to promote physical self-preservation. Rather, they are chosen for their own sake because of their affinity to the animal's nature. In other words, the goals entail not only the preservation of one's life, but the preservation of what belongs to oneself. This is what it means to recognize and appreciate what belongs to oneself. Cicero explains this concept by using the example of a person's affinity to his or her own body, regardless of the usefulness of the individual parts: "the fact of our affection for the objects first adopted at nature's prompting seems to require no further proof than this, that there is no one who, given the

[50] Seneca, *Ep.* 121.6–10.

[51] Cicero's argument for the living creature's awareness of its constitution is illustrated by the way infants desire that which is conducive to their health and reject that which is destructive, all this before they have felt either pleasure or pain. They would not be able to do so, he reasons, unless they first had an awareness of their constitution and an affection for it (*Fin.* 3.5.16).

[52] Diogenes Laertius, *Vit. phil.* 7.85.

choice, would not prefer to have all the parts of his body (*omnes partes corporis*) sound and whole, rather than maimed or distorted although equally serviceable."[53]

Thus a person's affection for his or her body parts extends beyond their usefulness. Because they are a part of oneself, the members are desired in their own right. A person desires to keep them in good condition, not only that they may be useful but also because of a natural affection to what belongs to him or her.

It is imperative, then, to determine what fits with one's constitution. An infant's primary object of affection is itself, and it recognizes this instinctively. This type of οἰκείωσις is primarily self-centered and subjective. But the Stoics discuss another type of οἰκείωσις which is more objective and other-centered. Brad Inwood named the two "personal" and "social" οἰκείωσις.[54] The primary example of social οἰκείωσις is the love of a parent for a child since a parent's love for his or her offspring is not explicable in terms of the parent's physical survival.[55] Social οἰκείωσις is significant because it seems to go beyond self-preservation to the care of another for their sake.

Social οἰκείωσις is seen in the care of parents for their children and in the behavior of animals who take care of their young.[56] Cicero also explains that nature has implanted a similar affection in all humanity for each other. "From this impulse is developed the sense of mutual attraction which unites human beings as such; this also is bestowed by nature. The mere fact of their common humanity requires that one man should feel another man to be akin to him."[57] The basis of this concern for the whole stems from the

[53] *Fin.* 3.5.17. One of the difficulties with this understanding is that a shift seems to take place in which the agent no longer prioritizes self-preservation through conformity with the natural order, but the order and harmony itself. He explains this as an insight generated by the agent's use of reason and intelligence to conclude that this itself is the Supreme Good (*Fin.* 3.6.21). For a discussion of Cicero's method, see Striker, "*Oikeiosis*," 151–61.

[54] Brad Inwood, "Comments on Professor Görgemanns' Paper: The Two Forms of *Oikeiōsis* in Arius and the Stoa," in *On Stoic and Peripatetic Ethics: The Work of Arius Didymus*, ed. W. W. Fortenbaugh (New Brunswick: Transaction Books, 1983) 193.

[55] So Plutarch reports of Chrysippus (*Stoic. rep.* 1038B).

[56] Plutarch, *Stoic. rep.* 1038B; Cicero, *Fin.* 3.62, 66. In order to resolve any potential conflict between self-interest and altruism in the two types of οἰκείωσις, Cicero tries to explain parental affection as a provision of nature to ensure the survival of the species. "It could not be consistent that nature should at once intend offspring to be born and make no provision for that offspring when born to be loved and cherished . . . Hence as it is manifest that it is natural for us to shrink from pain, so it is clear that we derive from nature herself the impulse to love those to whom we have given birth" (*Fin.* 3.19.62).

[57] Cicero, *Fin.* 3.19.63.

recognition of the united nature of the universe as the common home of the gods and people. "Again, [the Stoics] hold that the universe is governed by divine will (*numine deorum*); it is a city or state of which both men and gods are members, and each one of us is a part of this universe; from which it is a natural consequence that we should prefer the common advantage (*communem utilitatem*) to our own."[58] Thus a person preserves his or her natural state through recognizing and maintaining the harmony of the universal order.[59]

When Cicero goes further to explain how one moves away from a self-centered to an other-centered approach, he brings forward harmony with nature as a goal in itself. One explanation is that when a child receives the love of the parents, the child will some day recognize having been the recipient of other-regarding attitudes and will notice that he or she has all the time been caring for other beings because they in some way "belonged" to him or her. As one continues to grow, one sees oneself as a rational being, with the consequence that whatever else is rational belongs to that person and is likewise an object of concern.[60]

[58] Cicero, *Fin.* 3.19.64.

[59] While this idea may not completely solve the problem of the tension between self-interest and altruism, it does help to explain how the Stoic concern for the "common good" is compatible with the impulse for self-preservation.

[60] Troels Engberg-Pedersen, *The Stoic Theory of Oikeiosis* (Denmark: Aarhus University Press, 1990) 125. The strength of this explanation is that it remains consistent with the notion of οἰκείωσις as recognizing and taking care of what "belongs" to oneself. One's concern for another may seem altruistic in that it is other-regarding, but at the same time, one's motivation is not completely disinterested, for it is based upon the degree to which one regards the other as "belonging" to oneself in some way. Thus care for others comes to be self-preservation in another sense.

One problem, however, is that this explanation accounts for the origins of the other-regarding attitudes based upon the receipt of such attitudes from one's parents, but then does not explain how one's parents gained the altruistic attitudes which then set the process in motion. Furthermore, this does not explain how the person sees other rational beings as "belonging" to him or her.

According to Cicero, one begins with the preservation of one's self as the primary motivation. This then progresses to the desire to retain the things which are in harmony with nature. But as one matures, one's attractions are less to those things which are in accordance with nature, and more to the order and harmony of nature itself. "Man's first attraction is towards the things in accordance with nature; but as soon as he has understanding, or rather becomes capable of 'conception' – in Stoic phraseology *ennoia* – and has discerned the order and so to speak harmony that governs conduct, he thereupon esteems this harmony far more highly than all the things for which he originally felt an affection, and by exercise of intelligence and reason infers the conclusion that herein resides the Chief Good of man" (*Fin.* 3.6.21). Therefore, one realizes that the value of one's former actions was not so much for

Furthermore, the need to recognize what "belongs" to one affects the method of moral education. Although the instinct for self-preservation is natural, the recognition and application of the adult rational constitution is not.[61] Whereas the infant automatically recognizes its constitution and acts accordingly, a person does not automatically recognize his or her own rational constitution, nor what is necessary to preserve it. Rational people are immature or mature depending upon how much they are aware of their constitution, including their participation in universal humanity, and how well they know how to act accordingly.[62]

In *De finibus* 5 Cicero argues for the importance of self-knowledge in the quest for moral perfection. As stated earlier, the basic idea is that one needs to know one's self and one's nature before that self can

self-preservation itself, but because they were in accordance with nature. As a result, one's values shift from self-preservation to harmony with nature instead. As Gisela Striker explains, "Once we have come to realize that what makes our natural, instinctive behavior good or right is its accord with nature, we will come to care more about accordance with nature than about the results of our various activities" ("*Oikeiosis*," 159). The development of the rational capacity means one recognizes and comes to value the order of the universe for itself.

[61] Although, as noted earlier, Cicero speaks of different constitutions for different ages in humans, at other points he talks as if the rational capacity is present even in infants, although it is "hidden." "If, as I said at the outset, every man as soon as he is born could know himself and could appreciate the powers of his nature as a whole and of its several parts, he would at once perceive the true essence of the thing that is the subject of our inquiry, namely the highest and last of the objects of our desires, and he would be incapable of error in anything. But, as it is, our nature at all events at the outset is curiously hidden from us, and we cannot fully realize or understand it; yet as we grow older we gradually or I should say tardily come, as it were, to know ourselves" (*Fin.* 5.15.42). Despite Cicero's apparent inconsistency, for present purposes it is more important to remember that in either case he speaks of the need to develop and apply the rational capacity to fulfill one's nature.

[62] Seneca raises the question of the difference between an instinctive perception, which the infant has, and a reasoned and logical perception, which only adults can potentially perform (*Ep.* 121.10). Furthermore, Chrysippus uses οἰκείωσις to refer both to the abilities of the sage to live according to virtue and to the instinctual actions of the new-born (Plutarch, *Stoic. rep.* 1038A–C; see also the comments by Brad Inwood, "Hierocles: Theory and Argument in the Second Century AD," *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 2 [1984] 172). Both of these types of perception would seem to come under the Stoic definition of οἰκείωσις. Thus it does not seem to be as much the case, as one scholar observes, that "our perception of self becomes more accurate and thorough as we mature" (Inwood, "Hierocles," 157). Rather, at different stages of life, there are different perceptions of self based upon our particular constitution. Therefore, the goal of living according to nature means different things for different creatures, and consequently, for an infant as opposed to a rational adult. The Supreme Good of humanity is "life in accordance with human nature developed to its full perfection," i.e. as a rational being (Cicero, *Fin.* 5.9.26).

be perfected and preserved. As I will demonstrate in the next section, moral education involved teaching the student the nature of his or her identity and then how to move from identity to behavior.

There are several important implications of the doctrine of οἰκείωσις. First, οἰκείωσις presumed that choices are made according to the nature of the human being and according to nature.[63] The person must have self-knowledge or self-awareness in order to make the correct choices. Moral education involved teaching a person the nature of one's own existence in addition to specific precepts. Thus, οἰκείωσις meant that a person had to be taught both to recognize and appreciate what "belonged" to him or her before moving on to specific instructions.

Second, a person understood the nature of his or her existence in a social manner. A person desired to take care of what belonged to himself. But this concern extended to include all humanity as well as the individual. Self-awareness entailed understanding oneself as part of a greater social whole according to the concept of social οἰκείωσις.

Third, moral behavior meant preserving the harmony of the universe. This was living in accordance with nature. The Stoics did not seek to create a moral order as much as to teach people how to recognize and preserve the order which already existed. Thus, the primary means by which the philosopher would argue for social behavior would be by appealing to the universal nature of humanity and the need to recognize that all humanity "belonged" to oneself.

Moral education: the function of principles and precepts

The Stoic doctrine of οἰκείωσις had a significant impact upon Stoic ethics. It drew attention to one's existence as a part of universal humanity and the need to preserve this whole. It meant that the student must learn his or her identity as part of universal humanity as the starting point for social ethics. Therefore, the student had to learn more than specific precepts for particular situations. The student needed to have a firm grasp of the foundational principles of his or her universal existence.

[63] Plutarch, *Comm. not.* 1069E.

Thus in theory, at least, the Stoics based their ethical philosophy upon an ontological system.[64] The philosopher's task was to educate people so they understood this order and its ramifications. In particular, there was a need to teach people how to bridge the gap between their rational potential and precise actions. The overall goal was to train people to understand the reason behind proper actions so that in the future they might be able to discern correct behavior themselves as each situation arose. Two sets of ideas in particular illustrated these goals. For Cicero, ethical training involved the difference between a "right act" (*recte factum*, *perfectum officium*, or κατόρθωμα) and an "appropriate act" (*officium*, καθῆκον). Seneca outlined a specific model in which a person needed to be trained in both foundational "principles" (*decreta*) and specific "precepts" (*praecepta*).[65]

"Right acts" and "appropriate acts" in Cicero

For Cicero, the difference between a "right act" (*recte factum*, *perfectum officium*, or κατόρθωμα), which was "perfect," and an "appropriate act" (*officium*, καθῆκον), which was "imperfect," was

[64] As A. A. Long states, "Stoic ethics is ultimately parasitical on physics" ("The Stoic Concept of Evil," *Philosophical Quarterly* 18 [1968] 329–43).

According to Plutarch, Chrysippus asserts that students should learn logic first, followed by ethics and then physics, with "theology" being the last of the physical speculations. In practice, however, he begins from the area of physics and "theology," including the concept of the universe being a single and united entity. "Yet this very doctrine, theology, which [Chrysippus] says must be put last he habitually puts first and makes the preface to every ethical inquiry, for it is plain to see that . . . he makes no remark about it at all unless in the same fashion in which the movers of public decrees prefix the phrase 'Good Fortune' he has prefixed Zeus, Destiny (Εἱμαρμένην), Providence (Πρόνοιαν), and the statement that the universe, being one (μιᾷ) and finite, is held together by a single power, – none of which can carry any conviction for anyone who has not been thoroughly steeped in physical theory. Hear what he says about this in the third book on the Gods: 'It is not possible to discover any other beginning of justice or any source for it other than from Zeus and from the universal nature, for thence everything of the kind must have its beginning if we are going to have anything to say about good and evil.' Again in his *Physical Propositions* he says: 'For there is no other or more suitable way of approaching the theory of good and evil or the virtues or happiness (than) from the dispensation of the universe'" (*Stoic. rep.* 1035A). Chrysippus, like Cicero and Seneca, appears to make the physical understanding of the universe, including its existence as a "whole," essential for a proper conception of virtue.

[65] Seneca states that his discussion of precepts, to which he adds the importance of studying "principles," is part of the department of philosophy which the Greeks call "paraenetic" (*paraeneticen*) (*Ep.* 95.1).

that a person performing the former correctly understood the principle behind the action. This person was morally more advanced than the person who knew the act but not the rationale and so performed only an "appropriate act."[66] An example of a *perfectum officium* was to return a trust "justly" or "on principle" (*iuste*). Merely to return the trust counted as an *officium*.[67] Thus, after one attained the insight or wisdom of the *telos*, one also needed to have the knowledge of correct actions which corresponded to the *telos*. Only the wise man could perform the correct acts.[68]

Diogenes Laertius records the definition of an appropriate act as "that for which, when done, a reasonable defence can be adduced" or "an action in itself adapted to nature's arrangements."[69] Similarly, Cicero defines *officium* as "an act so performed that a reasonable account can be rendered of its performance."[70] An *officium* was useful because it was an act that could be performed by those who were not considered to be wise.

Whereas a *katorthoma* was an act which perfectly bridged the gap between one's recognition of the *telos* and concrete action, *kathekonta* were useful for the person still seeking to bridge that gap. One who had attained knowledge of the *telos* would still need help to acquire the insight into right action. *Kathekonta* produced "a fit between on the one hand the empty account of the good as living in accordance with virtue and nature and on the other hand the factual world." In this way, "they are elements in the progressive clarification of what the good actually consists in."[71] In other words,

[66] Cicero, *Fin*. 3.18.59.

[67] As Cicero explains, "The addition of the qualification 'on principle' (*iuste*) makes it a right action: the mere restitution in itself is counted an appropriate act" (*Fin*. 3.18.59. Also 4.6.15).

[68] *Fin*. 3.18.59. Similarly, Seneca explains, "Conduct will not be right unless the will to act is right; for this is the source of conduct. Nor, again, can the will be right without a right attitude of mind; for this is the source of the will. Furthermore, such an attitude of mind will not be found even in the best of men unless he has learned the laws of life as a whole and has worked out a proper judgment about everything, and unless he has reduced facts to a standard of truth." (*Ep*. 95.56–57). Furthermore, according to Plutarch, the Stoics (most likely Chrysippus) say that natural law in particular prescribes *katorthomata* (*Stoic*. *rep*. 1037C–D, 1041A).

[69] He cites Zeno as the first to use the term in regard to conduct (Diogenes Laertius, *Vit*. *phil*. 7.107–8).

[70] *Fin*. 3.17.58.

[71] Troels Engberg-Pedersen, "Discovering the good: *oikeiōsis* and *kathēkonta* in Stoic ethics," in *The Norms of Nature: Studies in Hellenistic Ethics*, ed. Malcolm Schofield and Gisela Striker (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986) 171.

even if they were not morally perfect actions, performing the act could help the person move toward acquiring the insight into what makes such an act appropriate. As Troels Engberg-Pedersen describes, once the person grasps the "what" he may understand better the "why."[72]

Moral development for Cicero was based upon a two-tiered understanding of foundational principles and concrete actions. In *De officiis* he advises Marcus, "My dear son Marcus, you have now been studying for a full year under Cratippus ... And you should be fully equipped with the practical precepts and principles of philosophy."[73] By understanding both the *telos* and how this led to the assessment of correct acts, one was able to perform *katorthomata* as opposed to *kathekonta*.

"Principles" and "precepts" in Seneca

Seneca also believed that one needed to comprehend basic moral principles before one could make decisions about individual situations. His *Epistles* 94 and 95 provide the most detailed account of his conception of moral rules.[74] Although it is uncertain whether the letters are real correspondence or a general set of moral discourses, they represent Seneca's attempt to present himself as a teacher who guides his student, Lucilius, in moral progress.[75]

Seneca explains that both universal principles (*decreta*) and precepts (*praecepta*) are needed for proper moral development. In *Ep*. 94 he discusses the necessity of precepts, and in *Ep*. 95 he explains the role of principles. Principles are needed to provide the proper foundation while precepts are necessary to train the person in right

[72] Engberg-Pedersen, *Stoic Theory*, 138. [73] Cicero, *Off*. 1.1.1.

[74] The letters were part of a collection of 124 Moral Letters (*Epistulae Morales*), probably written during Seneca's retirement from political life (62–65 CE. For a brief summary of Seneca's life and chronology of his works, see Anna Lydia Motto, *Seneca: Moral Epistles* [Chico: Scholars Press, 1985] 12–15). The 94th and 95th *Epistles* are particularly valuable to us as an explanation of Seneca's methodology of moral education (Hildegard Cancik, *Untersuchungen zu Senecas Epistulae morales* [Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1967] 42–45).

[75] D. A. Russell notes, among other things, that the correspondence in interests between Seneca and Lucilius "make (Lucilius) seem a reflection of Seneca himself; and this, we may well think, is the key fact that brings the correspondence to life ... Seneca writes to an *alter ego*" ("Letters to Lucilius," in *Seneca*, ed. C. D. N. Costa [London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1974] 70–79).

conduct. The two work together in order to form a complete philosophy of moral conduct.[76]

A principle provides "a rule by which (a person) may regulate his acts, and which he may trust to tell him whether that which he has done is right."[77] Doctrines have their own root in the nature of the universe. In fact, philosophy promises a person the secrets of the universe.

> You are indeed mistaken if you think that philosophy offers you nothing but worldly assistance; her aspirations are loftier than that. She cries: "I investigate the whole universe, nor am I content, keeping myself within a mortal dwelling, to give you favourable or unfavourable advice." Great matters invite and such as are set far above you. In the words of Lucretius:
>
> > To thee shall I reveal the ways of heaven
> > And of the gods, spreading before thine eyes
> > The atoms, – whence all things are brought to birth,
> > Increased, and fostered by creative power,
> > And eke their end when Nature casts them off.[78]

Seneca seems to assume that doctrines are given and not deduced because they come from the nature of the universe. Whereas precepts result from reasoning upon correct doctrines, the doctrines themselves must be learned or perceived.[79]

[76] Philip Mitsis points out the uniqueness of the Stoic emphasis upon the sufficiency of reason. Aristotle, for example, denied that moral development was solely the province of reason and included the "ability to internalize from a scattered range of particular cases a general evaluative attitude which is not reducible to rules or precepts" ("Seneca on Reason, Rules, and Moral Development," in *Passions & Perceptions: Studies in Hellenistic Philosophy of Mind*, ed. Jacques Brunschwig and Martha C. Nussbaum [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993] 287).

[77] Seneca, *Ep.* 95.39. Furthermore, philosophy is not the only "art" which is concerned with doctrines. The medical profession provides another prominent example of a field which depends both upon precepts and principles.

[78] Seneca, *Ep.* 95.9–11.

[79] Seneca explains the difference between principles and precepts as that between hidden and manifest, and so between the revealed and the familiar. He says that it is the function of reason to deal with the "hidden things" (*in occultis*) (*Ep.* 95.61). Doctrines represent the "hidden" or concealed part of wisdom whereas the precepts are manifest. "But the heart, the source of the hands' growth and power and motion, is hidden. And I can say the same thing about precepts: they are manifest, while the doctrines of wisdom are concealed" (*Ep.* 95.64).

Principles form the foundation of ethical conduct because one must have these general beliefs in order to make correct judgments in specific areas.[80] Seneca explains:

> But one cannot attain the truth without doctrines (*sine decretis*); for doctrines embrace the whole of life. Things good and evil, honourable and disgraceful, just and unjust, dutiful and undutiful, the virtues and their practice . . . – all these qualities call for one who is able to appraise them . . . You will never understand this unless you have investigated the actual standard by which such conditions are relatively rated. As leaves cannot flourish by their own efforts, but need a branch to which they may cling and from which they may draw sap, so your precepts, when taken alone, wither away; they must be grafted upon a school of philosophy.[81]

One must understand the whole of life in order to have correct precepts, and doctrines provide this fixed standard for moral judgments.[82] Without principles, precepts will have no lasting effect and will instead "wither away." For example, a miser cannot be taught the proper use of money unless he or she is first shown that money is an evil. Or, the coward must be shown that the things which frighten him or her are more rumor than reality if one would instruct him how to scorn danger.[83]

Therefore, *decreta* are primary in moral education. As Brad Inwood describes, "Genuine stability of moral action can come only if there is a clear way to connect the point of the action to the goal of life, to which all actions are to be referred."[84] The moral agent has to understand the nature and purpose of his or her life in order to make correct decisions about actions.

As long as the soul is filled with wrong opinions, one applies precepts in vain.[85] The teacher's role was to remove the conditions

[80] Seneca, *Ep.* 95.58. [81] Seneca, *Ep.* 95.58–60.

[82] Thus, in speaking about virtue, Seneca states that knowledge about the virtues themselves is not enough to ensure proper behavior. Virtuous conduct depends upon the right attitude of mind. But "such an attitude of mind will not be found even in the best of men unless he has learned the laws of life as a whole and has worked out a proper judgment about everything, and unless he has reduced facts to a standard of truth. Peace of mind is enjoyed only by those who have attained a fixed and unchanging standard of judgment; the rest of mankind continually ebb and flow in their decisions, floating in a condition where they alternatively reject things and seek them" (*Ep.* 95.57).

[83] Seneca, *Ep.* 94.6–7. [84] Inwood, "Rules and Reasoning," 117.

[85] Seneca, *Ep.* 95.4–5.

which stand in the way of receiving precepts so that the soul may be "set free."[86] Philosophy served to "root out" wrong beliefs and replace them with proper ones.[87] Doctrines helped to ensure more permanent moral growth by enabling the person to understand the reason behind the precept.[88]

At the same time, Seneca realized that correct beliefs were not enough to ensure proper conduct.[89] Even when false opinions are removed, "insight into practical conduct" does not immediately follow. The person who has been purged of false opinions still needs advice in applying the doctrines to know what to do in a given situation.[90] Precepts, then, fill this gap until the soul is ready to guide itself.[91] One should eventually reach the point of being able to guide oneself without the help of an instructor. But until this occurs, one who has learned the correct doctrines will still need guidance.[92]

Rather than subverting the importance of principles, precepts act as supplements.[93] Seneca explains, "For we are hindered from accomplishing praiseworthy deeds not only by our emotions, but also by want of practice in discovering the demands of a particular situation. Our minds are often under good control, and yet at the same time are inactive and untrained in finding the path of duty, – and advice makes this clear."[94] He compares precepts to the advice a physician gives to the patient after treatment:

[86] Seneca, *Ep.* 95.38–39. [87] Seneca, *Ep.* 95.34.

[88] Even if a person were able to act correctly, he or she would not be able to keep up this behavior. "Suppose that a man is acting as he should; he cannot keep it up continuously or consistently, since he will not know the reason for so acting" (Seneca, *Ep.* 95.39).

[89] "It is only when we add precepts, consolation, and encouragement to (doctrines), that they can prevail; by themselves they are ineffective" (Seneca, *Ep.* 95.34).

[90] Seneca, *Ep.* 94.32, 35–36. [91] Seneca, *Ep.* 94.48–51.

[92] "Just as the student of javelin-throwing keeps aiming at a fixed target and thus trains the hand to give direction to the missile, and when, by instruction and practice, he has gained the desired ability, he can then employ it against any target he wishes . . . so he who has equipped himself for the whole of life does not need to be advised concerning each separate item, because he is now trained to meet his problem as a whole" (Seneca, *Ep.* 94.3). As I. G. Kidd describes, "The good man could only define his target by 'reducing (or referring) the circumstances of the case to truth or reality.' That could only be done with certainty and infallibility, if at all, through complete knowledge of the rational laws and principles of the universe and in relation to them, that is, by what Stoics called philosophy of nature" ("Moral Actions and Rules in Stoic Ethics," in *The Stoics*, ed. John M. Rist [Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978] 257).

[93] Seneca, *Ep.* 94.20–21. [94] Seneca, *Ep.* 94.32.

> But Nature does not teach us our duty in every case . . . The mind, on the other hand, needs many precepts in order to see what it should do in life; although in eye-treatment also the physician not only accomplishes the cure, but gives advice into the bargain. He says: "There is no reason why you should at once expose your weak vision to a dangerous glare; begin with darkness, and then go into half-lights, and finally be more bold, accustoming yourself gradually to the bright light of day . . . The physician's art supplements remedies by advice."[95]

Decreta may be compared to the physician's cure, *praecepta* to the advice he gives following the treatment. Although the treatment comes first, the advice is also needed for a full recovery.

Correct behavior depended upon a person's making the "critical transition from moral principles to moral particulars."[96] It was the teacher's role to train the student in both principles and precepts and how to make the transition.

A deeper examination into the function of principles and precepts in moral reasoning yields even more insights. In one sense, the relationship of the two is the universal to the particular. Seneca states, "What difference, indeed, is there between the dogmas of philosophy and precepts, unless it be this – that the former are general and the latter special? Both deal with advice – the one through the universal, the other through the particular."[97]

But the relationship of *decreta* to *praecepta* is more complex than the simple classification of general to special or universal to particular. Seneca compares the relationship of precepts and doctrines to the leaves and branches of a tree.[98] In another passage he describes doctrines as precepts' hidden "source . . . of growth and power."[99] More than a comparison of general to specific, it is a

[95] Seneca, *Ep.* 94.19–20. [96] Mitsis, "Seneca," 290.

[97] Seneca, *Ep.* 94.31. But, as Mitsis notes, by Seneca's definition *decreta* are often more than "general" or "inclusive" *praecepta*. *Decreta* can imply an organic connection in which the *praecepta* are the leaves which are attached to the *decreta* as the branches from which they draw their life (*Ep.* 95.59); the *praecepta* are the hands and the *decreta* the hidden source of growth, power, and motion of the heart (*Ep.* 95.64); they provide reasons and justifications for actions (*Ep.* 95.5); they enable one to understand the universe as a whole (*Ep.* 95.12); they give stability and coherence to life (*Ep.* 95.44–46) ("Seneca," 299).

[98] Seneca, *Ep.* 95.59. [99] Seneca, *Ep.* 95.59.

dynamic relationship in which doctrines are the life source for precepts.[100]

Understanding the more complex functions of *decreta* and *praecepta* provides insight into the process of moral decision-making and moral training because the role of the moral teacher was to train the pupil to be a moral agent and not just give instructions.[101] Principles allow a person to evaluate a situation in general moral terms whereas precepts advise the specific course of action. For example, in regard to how one should make use of "things" (*res*), Seneca states that it is "useless" to give precepts "unless we begin by reflecting what opinion we ought to hold concerning everything – concerning poverty, riches, renown, disgrace, citizenship, exile."[102]

As Mitsis explains, *decreta* provide the standards for "articulating and guiding ... moral perceptions." *Praecepta* on the other hand, "enable [a person] to grasp morally salient features of individual situations."[103] *Decreta* provide the foundation for the formulation of specific *praecepta*.[104]

Moreover, it is not clear that principles must be in the form of imperatives.[105] Seneca says that the rule for human relationships is "all that you behold, that which comprises both god and man, is one – we are the parts of one great body."[106] Seneca implies that social ethics depend upon respecting other persons "as mutually related parts of God and nature."[107] The statement on the nature of humanity as a "bodily" whole provides the standard and guide for precepts for social relations.

In summary, *decreta* provide the means by which a person can reason correctly about a situation. These principles are not arbitrary, since the *telos* provides the ultimate starting point for determining what these principles will be. *Praecepta* describe the concrete actions demanded by the situation. As situation-specific rules, they must be connected to one's goal of life, as represented by principles. Whereas

[100] Mitsis, "Seneca," 300.

[101] The use of a moral guide was of course not exclusive to the Stoics. Glad outlines the practice of "psychagogy" or the care of souls, particularly by the Epicureans (*Paul*, 17–23).

[102] *Ep.* 95.54. [103] Mitsis, "Seneca," 304.

[104] "The Stoics ... are convinced that moral development depends solely on a deepening cognitive grasp of both universal and more determinate moral principles; they hold, moreover, that moral rules can structure our understanding of a particular moral situation in ways that guarantee our sensitivity to its specific demands" (ibid., 290).

[105] Ibid., 301. [106] Seneca, *Ep.* 95.51–52. [107] Mitsis, "Seneca," 303.

on one level the relationship between the two might be described as general to special or universal to particular, the significance of principles and precepts is primarily in their functions in moral reasoning.[108] Both *decreta* and *praecepta* train the student how to reason ethically. The way in which the student views the world is the key to making correct decisions in specific situations.

The teacher's job was to train the student how to recognize these connections. In order to appreciate fully the significance of Seneca's principles and precepts and Cicero's "right acts" and "appropriate acts" we must realize how important Seneca and Cicero believed it to be to train the student in the process of moral reasoning.[109] Moral education went beyond specific advice and sought to make the student an independent moral being. It included, indeed depended upon, the recognition and appreciation of one's fundamental identity and the ability to reason correctly about specific moral situations, beginning with the understanding of basic principles. The principles enabled the student to understand the nature of the universe and the nature of life. In terms of social ethics, the students specifically had to realize the significance of their universal and bodily existence with all humanity and base their decisions upon this knowledge.

The "bodily" unity of humanity as the key to social ethics

The inherent unity of humanity and its unity with the gods provided the vitally important foundation for both *kathekonta* and precepts. For Cicero, this unity formed the basis of his concept of justice. Seneca similarly says in *Ep.* 95.51–53 that the consideration of the unity of humans and gods, specifically as a body, is the foundational principle for social ethics:

> Then comes the second problem, – how to deal with men. What is our purpose? What precepts do we offer? ... Meantime, I can lay down for mankind a rule (*formulam*),

[108] See also Kidd, "Moral Actions," 253, who discusses the relationship of *decreta* to "truth values" and "judgment of good and evil."

[109] David Sedley says that there is an "exact one-to-one correspondence" between *kathekonta* and *praecepta* because "to every proper action there corresponds a verbalizable rule recommending that action; and vice versa" ("The Stoic–Platonist Debate on *kathêkonta*," in *Topics in Stoic Philosophy*, ed. Katerina Ierodiakonou [Oxford: Clarendon, 1999] 129).

> in short compass, for our duties in human relationships: all that you behold, that which comprises both god and man, is one (*unum*) – we are the parts (*membra*) of one great body (*corporis*). Nature produced us related to one another, since she created us from the same source and to the same end. She engendered in us mutual affection, and made us prone to friendships. She established fairness and justice; according to her ruling, it is more wretched to commit than to suffer injury. Through her orders, let our hands be ready for all that needs to be helped. Let this verse be in your heart and on your lips:
>
> I am a man; and nothing in man's lot
> Do I deem foreign to me.
>
> Let us possess things in common; for birth is ours in common. Our relations with one another are like a stone arch, which would collapse if the stones did not mutually support each other, and which is upheld in this very way.

In dealing with the question of what precepts to offer, Seneca concludes that before he can give specific instructions on "how to deal with men," he must first give a general "rule" (*formula*). This rule is based upon the conception of human nature.[110] Seneca's conception of human nature is that the gods and humanity are a unity, that is, they are "one" (*unum*). The principle of oneness is expressed by being a body (*corpus*), thus, "We are the parts of one great body." The emphasis is upon the whole as opposed to the parts and the individual is seen in relationship to the parts.

Thus Seneca explains that Nature has produced the body so that all the parts are related to one another because they share a common source and a common end. The sense of unity which Nature has established provides the basis for deeper relationships such as friendships. Similar to Cicero's sentiments, the idea of unity leads to a concept of justice in which the good of the whole is the primary consideration. As a result it is more desirable to suffer injury than to harm a fellow member of the body. The idea here seems to be that

[110] "(The Stoics) hold that we do not choose the latter – health, wealth, honoring parents, and so forth – *for themselves*, but rather because the particular choice of one in certain circumstances is right in relation to a whole theory of human and universal nature" (Kidd, "Moral Actions," 256).

after recognizing the oneness of the body and one's place in it, ethical considerations are based upon maintaining this oneness.[111] One of the most grievous acts one can commit is to harm another member. This is similar to Cicero's statement that "the closest bond of this fellowship [among humans] is the conviction that it is more repugnant to Nature for man to rob a fellow-man for his own gain than to endure all possible loss, whether to his property or to his person ... or even to his very soul."[112] For both Seneca and Cicero, maintaining the bond among people takes priority over individual concerns.

Seneca goes on to explain that one must be ready to help in every situation because nothing is "foreign" to a person who belongs to the body. He concludes by stating that the well-being of the body depends upon the mutual support of the members, another appeal for the preservation of the whole as the primary ethical consideration.

Except for the statement about possessing things in common, the passage does not give specific precepts, but rather describes the characteristics of this unity. It is a unity exemplified by friendship, justice, and mutual support. The function of the passage is not to prescribe behavior, but to support Seneca's argument for oneness as the foundational principle for social ethics by examining the characteristics and types of behavior that characterize bodily unity. For example, the statement about not causing injury to another is not a precept but an illustration of the type of unity present in the body. Seneca's position recalls that of Cicero above on οἰκείωσις as the basis for moral behavior. Like Cicero, Seneca believes that human society should be characterized by maintaining the order established

[111] Similarly, Arthur Bodson states that the later Stoics try to situate humans in the universe and to define their position by relationship to the divinity and one's fellow beings. This subsequently dictates a system of ethics which comports with this vision (*La morale sociale des derniers Stoïciens, Sénèque, Epictète et Marc Aurèle* [Paris: Société d'Edition "Les Belles lettres," 1967] 16). In particular, one's existence as part of a bodily unity defines specific ethical precepts. "Les devoirs sont multiples, variés, les préceptes en nombre infini, mais tous convergent vers une seule idée: nous sommes concitoyens des dieux et de tous nos semblables, nous sommes des membres du corps formé par les intelligences raisonnables, nous sommes les frères de nos semblables" (ibid., 129).

[112] Cicero, *Off.* 3.6.28. Earlier he states explicitly, "We are certainly forbidden by Nature's law to wrong our neighbour" (*Off.* 3.6.27). Neither Seneca nor Cicero is the first to claim that it is better to suffer injury than to inflict injury. Socrates makes a similar statement in Plato's *Gorg.* 609C. But the primary point is that both base their view upon the unity of humanity.

by nature. He seeks to get people to recognize the nature of their existence, which is a specifically social one in its relationships with gods and other human beings. He also argues from the standpoint of preserving the order which already exists. Nature created people in this way. Therefore, people should care for one another and treat each other fairly.

The main point of the illustration is the bodily oneness of the group. Although Seneca goes on to describe the types of relationships which compose this "body," those statements function as proof for the principle itself: "all that you behold, that which comprises both god and man, is one – we are the parts of one great body." Seneca emphasizes that they are a unity, "one," and as such are parts of one "body."

The implications of bodily unity may be seen from the Stoic classification of the three different types of bodies described earlier: (1) those made of separate parts, (2) those composed of contiguous parts, and (3) unified bodies. What differentiated the bodies was the type of unity present in each. Most importantly for present purposes, unified bodies were held together by a πνεῦμα which pervaded the whole to give it a greater cohesion than one composed of contiguous or adjacent parts.

In a very intriguing passage, Plutarch takes the Stoic concept of different types of bodies and applies it to marriage. Although not a Stoic, Plutarch apparently felt free to apply the concept to describe different types of unions among couples. He begins by listing the different kinds of Stoic bodies.

> [The Stoics] say of bodies (τῶν σωμάτων) that some are composed of separate elements (διεστώτων), as a fleet or an army, others of elements joined together (συναπτομένων), as a house or a ship, and still others form together an intimate union (τὰ δ' ἡνωμένα), as is the case with every living creature.

He then states his reason for explaining the theory as a way of describing varying degrees of marital unity.

> In about the same way (σχεδόν), the marriage of a couple in love with each other is an intimate union (ὁ μὲν τῶν ἐρώντων ἡνωμένος καὶ συμφυής); that of those who marry for dowry or children is of persons joined together (συναπτομένων); and that of those who merely sleep in the

> same bed is of separate persons (διεστώτων) who may be regarded as cohabiting, but not really living together.[113]

Even though Plutarch was not a Stoic, he apparently believed that the Stoic idea of bodily unity can be applied to different groupings to describe the way in which the group was unified. The important question, therefore, is not simply whether unity is present, but what kind of unity it is and why. Plutarch does not call the unified couple a "body," but he does describe the closest connection as being a type of organic unity.

When Seneca states that the people are one and that they are a body, he is using the significance of bodily oneness to describe the type of relationship. He then uses this oneness as the basis of his ethical precepts. The idea of an inherent unity leads to basic rights and privileges for each person as a human being and a part of the universal fellowship. He explains:

> And no one can live happily who has regard to himself alone and transforms everything into a question of his own utility (*ad utilitates suas*); you must live for your neighbour, if you would live for yourself. This fellowship (*societas*), maintained with scrupulous care ... holds that the human race have certain rights in common ...[114]

One needs to maintain fellowship among people, which means that all have certain rights and one has to consider one's neighbor as much as oneself. It is important to note that the goal is to maintain the bonds which already exist.[115] The purpose of the rights and obligations to one's fellow human beings was to preserve the natural fellowship among humans.

Two points stand out concerning Seneca's ethical model. First, like Cicero's, it is based upon a recognition of unity and thus interconnectedness. Second, the primary ethical goal is the preservation of the unity. Seneca does not advocate a certain type of social behavior in order to create unity, but rather he sees it as inherent, a result of being a human being. Specific social ethics are based upon this inherent unity. But at the same time, his ethical system utilizes

[113] Plutarch, *Conj. praec.* 142E–143A. [114] Seneca, *Ep.* 48.2–4.

[115] This does not mean that these are the only bonds in society. As mentioned above, Cicero speaks of a hierarchy of affections. The context of the current passage is that the common fellowship among all people provides the foundation for an even closer fellowship among friends.

precepts to enable a person to perform correct actions. These precepts are built upon principles, and they train the people so they may eventually be able to make proper judgments on their own.

It is important to note the general sequence for the ethical model of Cicero and Seneca. Their understanding of a unified humanity is the basis for their conception of duties. This is the ontological principle for their ethical precepts. A common phrase is that humans are "born" for fellowship and to help each other. Thus Cicero states, "as the Stoics hold, everything that the earth produces is created for man's use; and as men, too, are born for the sake of men, that they may be able mutually to help one another."[116] Human beings are called "social creatures,"[117] but this is not quite the same as Aristotle's assessment of the human being as a "political animal" in the tendency to form partnerships.[118] In particular, they are not social creatures in that they form these unions in order to survive or even to achieve the "good life."[119] Although these aspects may be implicit in the Stoic notion of communities, it is crucial to recognize the already-existing bond among people prior to the formation of any concrete communities. Cicero calls it the "universal brotherhood of mankind" (*communem humani generis societatem*) and considers this fellowship to have been established by the gods themselves.[120]

Social ethics, in large part, then, deals with the duties among humans to preserve this common bond. Since people are not born for themselves but to be able to help each other, "In this direction we ought to follow Nature as our guide, to contribute to the general good by an interchange of acts of kindness, by giving and receiving, and thus by our skill, our industry, and our talents to cement human society more closely together, man to man."[121]

Once again, the Stoics built upon previously existing ideas. To Plato's idea of one's civic duties the Stoics added the idea of all human beings as born to help each other. Thus, one's obligations

[116] Cicero, *Off.* 1.7.22. Also, Cicero, *Fin.* 3.20.65; 3.20.67; Seneca, *Ben.* 7.1.7; *Clem.* 1.3.2; Lucan, *Pharsalia* 2.383, 390.

[117] Seneca, *Ben.* 7.1.7; *Clem.* 1.3.2.

[118] Aristotle, *Pol.* 1.1.4–12.

[119] Aristotle, *Pol.* 1.1.4–12.

[120] "Others again who say that regard should be had for the rights of fellow-citizens, but not of foreigners, would destroy the universal brotherhood of mankind; and, when this is annihilated, kindness, generosity, goodness, and justice must utterly perish; and those who work all this destruction must be considered as wickedly rebelling against the immortal gods. For they uproot the fellowship which the gods have established between human beings" (Cicero, *Off.* 3.6.28).

[121] Cicero, *Off.* 1.7.22.

were to contribute to the "general good" by following nature. The intended result was to draw even closer bonds among people.

But the Stoics also modified the traditions they used. While they believed in the "common good," the obligation to contribute to the mutual advantage was based upon the necessity of maintaining this already-existing unity. Cicero states in *De finibus*:

> Again, [the Stoics] hold that the universe is governed by divine will (*numine deorum*); it is a city or state of which both men and gods are members (*communem urbem et civitatem hominum et deorum*), and each one of us is a part (*partem*) of this universe; from which it is a natural consequence that we should prefer the common advantage (*communem utilitatem*) to our own.[122]

Rather than attempting to convince his audience of the benefits of working for the common good, Cicero argues that as a rational creature and a part of the universal city of humanity and the gods, one should naturally want to contribute to the common good. Elsewhere he says that people should follow the principles based upon the bond of humanity and "always be contributing something to the common weal (*communem utilitatem*)."[123] He even asserts that it is a person's "duty to respect, defend, and maintain the common bonds of union and fellowship subsisting between all the members of the human race."[124]

Seneca likewise reflects this idea that people form unions not so much for creating the "common good" as to preserve the bonds which nature has already created in society. He says that every person is a "social creature, begotten for the common good."[125] In an especially interesting passage, Seneca explains that the person who has "attained perfect knowledge of what is useful and essential" is the one who "views the world as the universal home of mankind" because every person is a social creature and "born for the common good (*in commune*)."[126] In this brief passage Seneca has once again shown that universal humanity is the foundational principle in his ethical system. Furthermore, he states explicitly that it is every person's duty to contribute to the "common good" by virtue of their participation in this unity. For both Cicero and Seneca, their

[122] Cicero, *Fin*. 3.19.64.
[123] Cicero, *Off*. 1.16.52.
[124] Cicero, *Off*. 1.41.149.
[125] Seneca, *Clem*. 1.3.2.
[126] Seneca, *Ben*. 7.1.7.

ethical systems speak about the need to maintain the "common good," but they do not argue for the benefits of "common good" itself as much as show that it is a natural consequence and responsibility for universal humanity.

Universal humanity, ethics, and the body in the Roman Stoics

The Roman Stoics' idea of a universal humanity was related to the earlier Stoics' concepts of the cosmos. Although the Roman Stoics were not as interested in cosmological speculation as their predecessors, they did use Stoic cosmic imagery to serve political ends. This practice was common in the first century CE. Michael Lapidge has recently argued for the relationship between Lucan and Stoic cosmological theory in the *Pharsalia*.[127] Lapidge further argues that through the writings of Cicero, Seneca, and Lucan, the vocabulary would have been familiar to the Roman audience even if the precise details of cosmological theory were not.[128] In this section, I will examine the ways in which the Roman Stoics used the image of the body to illustrate their concept of a universal humanity.

One of the original contributions of the later Stoics appears to have been the way they utilized the earlier Stoics' cosmological ideas and terminology for more specific groups. For Cicero, the unity of the cosmos became the unity of humanity and the gods. As mentioned above, he based his concept of justice upon the universal, or natural, law.[129]

For Cicero, natural law, which took its starting point from the universal bond in humanity, formed the primary standard for assessing human laws.

> There is a certain true law, right reason in accordance with nature, diffused everywhere, unchanging and eternal, which exhorts us to duty by its commands and deters us from crime by its prohibitions . . . But one, eternal, and unchanging law will be kept by all people and at all times. And there will be, as it were, one common teacher and ruler over all, God, who

[127] Michael Lapidge, "Lucan's Imagery of Cosmic Dissolution," *Hermes* 107 (1979): 344–70.

[128] Ibid., 350.

[129] Colish points out that whereas Cicero did not present a unified opinion of Stoicism, sometimes citing it to support a point but attacking it at others, he was most heavily influenced by the Stoics in his political theory (*Stoicism*, 89).

> is the author, initiator, and judge of this law. Whosoever seeks to disobey it flees from himself and rejects the nature of man.[130]

For Cicero, natural law meant living in accordance with nature, or right reason. To reject it was to reject "the nature of man." He used it as the basis of his legal and political theory. But as Colish explains, Cicero "develops the Stoic doctrine of natural law well beyond the point to which the Stoics themselves had taken it" by translating natural law as an ethical and cosmic principle into a legal principle.[131]

Natural law was based upon the inherent unity of human beings, and it entailed certain obligations for everyone to take care of the human community as a whole. Although it manifested itself in individual relationships, the overall goal was to maintain the natural bonds of human fellowship.

In the following example, Cicero deals with the question of whether a person may profit from a neighbor's loss. The context of the problem is a discussion of the relationship between expediency and moral rectitude. What does one do when what seems to be profitable for oneself conflicts with moral understanding? Cicero deals with the dilemma by rooting his answer in the understanding of human nature. Nature has created a bond among humans which both draws people together and forbids their taking advantage of each other. He uses the metaphor to prove his argument that to defraud a neighbor is to break the natural bonds of society by comparing the situation to a body whose own bonds between its members would be broken should a member decide to draw its strength from its neighboring member:

> Well, then, for a man to take something from his neighbour and to profit by his neighbour's loss is more contrary to Nature than is death or poverty or pain or anything else that can affect either our person or our property. For, in the first place, injustice is fatal to social life and fellowship between man and man. For, if we are so disposed that each, to gain some personal profit, will defraud or injure his neighbour, then those bonds of human society, which are most in accord with Nature's laws, must of necessity be broken. Suppose, by way of comparison, that each of our bodily

[130] Cicero, *Resp.* 3.22–23. [131] *Stoicism*, 96.

> members should conceive this idea and imagine that it could be strong and well if it should draw off to itself the health and strength of its neighbouring member, the whole body would necessarily be enfeebled and die; so, if each one of us should seize upon the property of his neighbours and take from each whatever he could appropriate to his own use, the bonds of human society must inevitably be annihilated. For, without any conflict with Nature's laws, it is granted that everybody may prefer to secure for himself rather than for his neighbour what is essential for the conduct of life; but Nature's laws do forbid us to increase our means, wealth, and resources by despoiling others.[132]

Cicero grounds his ethical injunction, "Do not defraud your neighbor," in the understanding that all humanity is joined by Nature. One may not harm another because to do so would destroy this bond. The metaphor supports his argument by showing that just as the human body would be destroyed if the parts drew their strength off the other members, so is the bond of humanity broken if people take advantage of one another. Thus when Cicero deals with the specific ethical question of whether one may defraud a neighbor, he bases his answer upon the conception of universal humanity and supports his assertion through an application of the body metaphor.

In the next example, Cicero is more explicit. He applies the body metaphor to make a specific ontological point about the natural unity of humanity.

> And the fact that no one would care to pass his life alone in a desert, even though supplied with pleasures in unbounded profusion, readily shows that we are born for society and intercourse, and for a natural partnership (*naturalem communitatem)* with our fellow men. Moreover, nature inspires us with the desire to benefit as many people as we can, and especially by imparting information and the principles of wisdom ... Therefore just as we actually use our limbs before we have learnt for what particular useful purpose they were bestowed upon us, so we are united and allied by nature in the common society of the state (*ad civilem communitatem*).[133]

[132] Cicero, *Off*. 3.5.21–22. [133] Cicero, *Fin*. 3.20.65.

Cicero uses the metaphor to describe the "natural" inclination of human beings to associate with one another. He compares this natural association with the bonds of the human body. Just as the parts of the human body work together naturally even before the individual purposes are fully known, so too are humans united through nature.

It is important to note that Cicero is not saying what people should do, but rather describing what people naturally do and are. Thus he uses the body metaphor to stress an ontological point by describing the unity of humanity. The point he is illustrating is less a desired behavior or prescribed course of action than a description of who they are and what they are like. Just as a body with its many parts works together even before it fully understands the function of each part, so are people naturally bound together. He is not talking about the advantages or disadvantages of a course of action, but only saying that they are like a body in this way. He does not tell the members to act like a body, but that they are like a body. He wants them to recognize the essence of their unity which is as "natural" as the unity of the body. It is not something that they can accomplish; but rather something they are.

It should also be noted that Cicero blurs the distinction between universal humanity and the state. Although he draws upon the theory of universal humanity, he uses it to show how the natural partnership of all people leads to the society of the state. Both the "natural partnership with our fellow men" and the "common society of the state" occur through "nature." The principles which govern conduct among all people also become the basis for the laws of the state. In another place he simply assumes that the same natural laws apply to both the universe and the state.

> And the nature of man, [Chrysippus] said, is such, that as it were a code of law subsists between the individual and the human race, so that he who upholds this code will be just and he who departs from it, unjust. But just as, though the theatre is a public place, yet it is correct to say that the particular seat a man has taken belongs to him, so in the state or in the universe, though these are common to all, no principle of justice militates against the possession of private property.[134]

[134] Cicero, *Fin.* 3.20.67.

Cicero moves easily from talking about the universal law to the law that applies to the state. This flexibility was not necessarily an indication of carelessness, but rather a reflection of the way in which the state was seen as a microcosm of the macrocosmic universal body. Cicero explains through another use of the body metaphor:

> The mere fact of their common humanity requires that one man should feel another man to be akin to him. For just as some of the parts of the body, such as the eyes and the ears, are created as it were for their own sakes, while others like the legs or the hands also subserve the utility of the rest of the members, so some very large animals are born for themselves alone; whereas the sea-pen (mussel), as it is called . . . and the creature named 'pineoteres' . . . these creatures, and also the ant, the bee, the stork, do certain actions for the sake of others besides themselves. With human beings this bond of mutual aid is far more intimate. It follows that we are by nature fitted to form unions, societies and states.[135]

Cicero is not entirely consistent in saying that some parts of the "body" are born only for themselves since elsewhere he speaks of the need for harmony of the body and the proper use of its parts.[136] Nevertheless, he uses the illustration to show that since common humanity requires one person to have an affinity toward other people, this should result in particular social groupings.

For Cicero and the Stoics, this unity is something all people have simply by virtue of being human and whether or not they act in a unified way is a different matter. One could say that because of their natural unity as human beings, Cicero exhorts them to work for practical unity. He does not tell them that they should consider the common good merely as something that will benefit them (although it will), but first as that which is in accordance with their nature. In the next passage Cicero once again moves easily from talking about principles governing the universal city to those guiding the state.

> For just as the laws [of the universe] set the safety of all above the safety of individuals, so a good, wise and law-abiding man, conscious of his duty to the state, studies the advantage of all more than that of himself or of any single

[135] Cicero, *Fin.* 3.19.63. [136] E.g. Cicero, *Fin.* 3.20.65.

> individual. The traitor to his country does not deserve greater reprobation than the man who betrays the common advantage or security for the sake of his own advantage or security.[137]

Although Cicero begins talking about the universal city, he applies the same principles of fellowship to country.

In this passage Cicero sounds very much like Seneca in *Ep*. 95 in that he begins from the Stoic proposition that all humanity and the gods are united. He describes the universal body as a city or state, and, like Seneca, he says that the logical consequence of this unity is that people should seek the good of the whole before one's own. Although he implicitly means the "common good," he is not so much arguing for the benefits of seeking the common good as saying that one who is born into this universal city, or body, is expected to act for the common good.

Cicero was certainly not the first to state the principle of a universal city of gods and humanity. But he is especially relevant because of how he relates this understanding to his ethics. The individual pursues the common good, not so much because it will benefit himself or herself as because the wise man recognizes his place in the universal city and performs the duties accordingly. Furthermore, he sets his ethical exhortation within the context of the composition of the universe. People should work for each other's benefit and for the common good, not just because it is in their individual interest, but because their citizenship in the universal city demands that they do so.

Similarly, Seneca states that one who pursues individual happiness must necessarily pursue the common good. He does not say that the good of the whole is greater than that of the individual, as Cicero seems to say. But he does argue that since human beings are linked to other humans, the ends of all are intertwined, and one cannot pursue one's own interests without caring for the good of others. One cannot live for oneself alone and consider only utility. Instead, "You must live for your neighbor, if you would live for yourself."[138] As in Cicero, the idea of a universal humanity forms the basis for determining social conduct.

Seneca also uses the metaphor in his ethical arguments about the expected behavior for those belonging to the universal humanity.

[137] Cicero, *Fin*. 3.19.64. [138] Seneca, *Ep*. 48.2–3.

Furthermore, as already discussed, he bases his ethical exhortations on a similar conception of the unity of humanity and the gods as a "body." In one situation he explains that the natural affiliation of humans prohibits their harming one another.

> Above all, bear this in mind, that the power of injury is vile and detestable and most unnatural for man, by whose kindness even fierce beasts are tamed . . . To injure one's country is a crime; consequently, also, to injure a fellow-citizen – for he is a part of the country, and if we reverence the whole, the parts are sacred (*sanctae partes sunt, si universum venerabile est*) – consequently to injure any man is a crime, for he is your fellow-citizen in the greater commonwealth. What if the hands should desire to harm the feet, or the eyes the hands? As all the members of the body are in harmony one with another because it is the advantage of the whole that the individual members be unharmed, so mankind should spare the individual man, because all are born for a life of fellowship, and society can be kept unharmed only by the mutual protection and love of its parts.[139]

Seneca explains this prohibition by referring to the "greater commonwealth." He says that to injure a fellow citizen is considered "unnatural" because every person is connected to each other by virtue of their common citizenship. He directs the audience to consider their actions from the perspective of the "whole." He begins from the proposition that it is a crime to injure one's country. But if the "whole" is sacred, so too are the "parts." Therefore, one may not injure a fellow citizen. Seneca bolsters his argument about the sacredness of the parts by applying the body metaphor. As the body cannot survive if the individual parts harm each other, so too must humanity spare the life of the individual.

As with Cicero, Seneca uses the ontological principle of the unity of humanity to argue that society needs to maintain its natural fellowship and this can only happen if people do not harm each other. He uses the language of "advantage," but it is still advantage based upon a pre-existing connection. The ontological basis is their participation in the whole, which leads to ethics, in this case the prohibition against harming another human being.

[139] Seneca, *Ira* 2.31.6–8.

The body metaphor not only describes a certain type of behavior (harming or not harming the other members), but also describes a certain condition: the natural cohesion of the body. Therefore, in applying the metaphor, Seneca prescribes a certain type of action (sparing the individual) because of the natural connection existing among all people. It is a pre-existing condition in that all human beings are connected whether or not they act in a unified manner. Seneca's goal is to make the people realize a type of morality that is consistent with their already-existing unity. He warns that as citizens of the greater commonwealth, they must protect their fellowship by treating each other properly.

Like Cicero, Seneca conceives of two different communities, one universal and one particular. He says,

> Let us grasp the idea that there are two commonwealths (*duas res publicas*) – the one, a vast and truly common state, which embraces alike gods and men, in which we look neither to this corner of earth nor to that, but measure the bounds of our citizenship by the path of the sun; the other, the one to which we have been assigned by the accident of birth. This will be the commonwealth of the Athenians or of the Carthaginians, or of any other city that belongs, not to all, but to some particular race of men.[140]

But unlike Cicero, Seneca goes on to discuss the potential conflicts between serving the two commonwealths. "Some yield service to both commonwealths at the same time – to the greater and to the lesser – some only to the lesser, some only to the greater." He does not necessarily equate the "laws" of the universal commonwealth with those of one's particular state. Seneca does not draw as great a connection between the laws of the universal and local states. As seen in his comments on principles in *Ep*. 95, one's participation in the universal state is the primary factor in determining proper behavior. It should also be noted that the concept of a universal humanity includes gods as well as people. Although both Cicero and Seneca mainly deal with one's relationships with other people, one still has duties to the gods.[141]

[140] Seneca, *Otio* 4.1.

[141] Thus, Cicero's comment that one's first duties were to the gods (*Off*. 1.45.160–61).

Both Cicero and Seneca argue that social ethics must be built on the foundation of a universal humanity. Both often use the body metaphor and references to humanity as a "body" to make their point. The same use can be found in the later Stoics, Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius, in the first and second centuries CE. They also refer to the body metaphor to make a statement about universal humanity and the ethics derived from the unity.

> But I, in that I have comprehended the nature of the Good that it is beautiful, and the nature of Evil that it is ugly, and the nature of the wrong-doer himself that it is akin to me, not as partaker of the same blood and seed but of intelligence (νοῦ) and a morsel of the Divine, can neither be injured by any of them ... nor can I be wroth with my kinsman and hate him. For we have come into being for co-operation, as have the feet, the hands, the eyelids, the rows of upper and lower teeth. Therefore to thwart one another is against Nature; and we do thwart one another by shewing resentment and aversion.[142]

Marcus Aurelius notes that the connection between the wrongdoer and himself comes about through νοῦς. Both have "come into being for cooperation," and that this state occurs in Nature. The ethical warning against injuring or hindering another is placed in the context of this "natural" unity.

Likewise, Epictetus notes the connection among human beings through reason and its ethical implications.

> Consider, therefore, what those things are from which you are separated by virtue of the faculty of reason (λόγον). You are separated from wild beasts, you are separated from sheep ... What, then, is the profession of a citizen [of the world]? To treat nothing as a matter of private profit, not to plan about anything as though he were a detached unit, but to act like the foot or the hand, which, if they had the faculty of reason and understood the constitution of nature, would never exercise choice or desire in any other way but by reference to the whole.[143]

All people are united to the "whole" by virtue of the faculty of reason and the corresponding ability to understand "the constitution of

[142] Marcus Aurelius, *Med.* 2.1. [143] Epictetus, *Diatr.* 2.10.2–4.

nature." One must therefore act accordingly, that is, to base one's actions in reference to the whole and not to act like a "detached" part, just like a limb of the body.

Epictetus considers the whole to be primary over the parts. That is why he states that the individual should only make decisions with reference to the whole. In the orderly arrangement of the whole (διάταξις), "the whole is more sovereign (κυριώτερον) than the part, and the state more sovereign than the citizen."[144]

Epictetus' discourse, with the subtitle, "How is it possible to discover a man's duties from the designations which he bears?" functions in a similar fashion to Seneca's and Cicero's statements about the unity of humanity being the foundational principle.

Just as people should base their actions on their connection to the whole, conversely one who cuts himself or herself off from humanity is like a limb severed from the body. Marcus states,

> Thou hast seen a hand cut off or a foot, or a head severed from the trunk, and lying at some distance from the rest of the body. Just so does the man treat himself, as far as he may, who wills not what befalls and severs himself from mankind or acts unsocially. Say thou hast been torn away in some part from the unity of Nature; for by the law of thy birth thou wast a part; but now thou hast cut thyself off.[145]

To separate oneself from humanity is to be torn away from the "unity of Nature." One does not become a part of Nature, but is born into this state.[146]

In another instance, Marcus explicitly states the similarity between the human body and the universal body as an organism:

> The principle which obtains where limbs and body (τὰ μέλη τοῦ σώματος) unite (ἐν ἡνωμένοις) to form one organism, holds good also for rational things with their separate individualities, constituted as they are to work in conjunction.

[144] Epictetus, *Diatr*. 2.10.5. [145] Marcus Aurelius, *Med*. 8.34.

[146] In addition, Marcus states that one can cut oneself off from the whole. Although a person is born into humanity, it appears that one can forfeit one's place in the "body." Similarly, Cicero had warned that those who jeopardized the health of the whole should also be cut off. "For, as certain members are amputated, if they show signs themselves of being bloodless and virtually lifeless and thus jeopardize the health of the other parts of the body, so those fierce and savage monsters in human form should be cut off from what may be called the common body (*corpore*) of humanity" (Cicero, *Off*. 3.6.32).

> But the perception of this shall come more home to thee, if thou sayest to thyself, I am a *limb* (μέλος) of the organized body of rational things (τοῦ ἐκ τῶν λογικῶν συστήματος). But if (using the letter R) thou sayest thou art but a *part* (μέρος), not yet does thou love mankind from the heart, nor yet does well-doing delight thee for its own sake. Thou dost practice it still as a bare duty, not yet as a boon to thyself.[147]

Marcus is not only talking about the body as a collection of other elements, but as an organism. Once again, the comparison between the human body and rational humanity is based upon a type of unity. In the same way in which the "limbs" belong to the living body, so too should a person be a "limb" of the universal body.

Finally, Epictetus at one point makes an explicit connection between the human and universal "bodies."

> Do you not know that as the foot, if detached, will no longer be a foot, so you too, if detached will no longer be a man? For what is a man? A part of a state; first of that state which is made up of gods and men, and then of that which is said to be very close to the other, the state that is a small copy of the universal state. "Must I, then, be put on trial now?" Well, would you have someone else be sick of a fever now, someone else go on a voyage, someone else die, someone else be condemned? For it is impossible in such a body (σώματι) as ours, that such things should not happen, some to one man and some to another.[148]

Once again, the identity of the limb depends upon its attachment to the whole body.[149] In the same way, a person must be attached to the universal state as well as that which is a "small copy." Epictetus then makes the point that in accepting one's part in the whole, one also accepts any misfortune that might come upon him or her. There is an explicit connection between one's identity as part of the body, whether universal or human, and one's duties and obligations.

[147] Marcus Aurelius, *Med.* 7.13. [148] Epictetus, *Diatr.* 2.5.24–28.

[149] The importance of the whole and the way in which the individual parts derive their identity from attachment to it is also seen in the following quotation from Chrysippus: "The cosmos is a perfect body, but the parts of the cosmos are not perfect in that they have a relationship to the whole and do not exist by themselves" (*SVF* 2.550).

So, for Marcus and Epictetus, as well as for Cicero and Seneca, obligations to the whole flow out from one's identity as part of the "body." All make it clear that understanding one's place in the universal community is essential for proper behavior and the fulfillment of one's nature as a human being.

Thus, the body metaphor was often used to illustrate an ontological point concerning another "body," the universal body composed of gods and humans. For the Stoics, the concept of "body" was key to the very notion of existence. It is therefore especially interesting that the authors used it to make an ontological statement about human society. Furthermore, both Cicero and Seneca believed in the importance of principles as the foundation for ethical precepts and used the Stoic notion of the bodily unity of humanity as the basis for their evaluation of human conduct. This ethical system is also reflected in the writings of Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius.

Summary and conclusion

The Stoics and Cicero applied the concept of a bodily universe to a bodily unity of humanity and the gods and used this as the basis for their ethical systems. In particular, they used the unity of humanity as the basis for ethical obligations among people. Reason allowed a person to understand this unity and make correct ethical decisions. Thus, moral education entailed teaching a person to understand both one's belonging to this universal humanity and the way to move from this realization to specific ethical decisions. Οἰκείωσις explained the importance of understanding one's identity. The person was to consider the rest of humanity as "belonging" to oneself. Therefore, the basic human impulse to take care of what belonged to oneself extended to include the rest of humanity and not simply the individual.

Thus moral education involved cultivating the reasoning faculty. Through the method of principles and precepts, one eventually learned how to make correct ethical decisions for oneself. Moral training involved teaching everyone their basic identity as a part of universal humanity and a reasoning being and how to move from self-knowledge to correct moral decisions in specific situations.

The next chapters will argue that Paul uses a similar method to train the Corinthians. His use of principles and precepts reminds the Corinthians of their corporate identity in Christ and explains the resulting ethical implications. They are the "body" of Christ because

of their eschatological existence as a new humanity and because of their unity in the Spirit. He also compares the community to a human body. Like the Stoics, he uses "body" in two different ways.

Paul teaches the Corinthians to develop the reasoning capacity of the "mind of Christ" in order to make correct ethical decisions. His method in 1 Cor. 12, combined with 1 Cor. 13–14, is to train the Corinthians as moral agents. The passages reveal both Paul's ethical method and his conception of the new community in Christ.

PART II

1 Corinthians and the body of Christ

5

THE COMMUNITY AS CHRIST'S BODY IN 1 CORINTHIANS 12

The previous chapters have described the Stoic bodily unity of humanity and the way in which this formed the basis for their social ethics. This chapter will demonstrate that in 1 Cor. 12 Paul similarly establishes the identity of the community according to the bodily unity of the community.[1] However, it will also be important to notice the divergence from Stoicism, especially the ultimate source of bodily unity – Christ – and the community's relationship to the eschatological age. Since the coming of Christ has resulted in a new age, Paul is not concerned with the Stoics' universal humanity, but a "new" humanity composed of those who have been transformed through Christ.

As a result, 1 Cor. 12 is primarily a statement of the Corinthians' identity as Christ's body. This identity provides the "principle" on which Paul will base his "precepts" in ch. 14, as similarly seen in the way bodily oneness forms the foundation for Stoic social ethics.

Structure of 1 Corinthians 12

The following proposed structure highlights the relationship between Christ and the Corinthians as his body.

Introduction (12:1–3) – spiritual existence as being under the Lordship of Christ
A (12:4–11) – the Corinthians as recipients of diverse manifestations of the Spirit, to be used for what is advantageous
  B (12:12–26) – Christ/the church as characterized by unity and diversity, just like a human body
A′ (12:27–30) – the Corinthians as diverse members of the body of Christ, appointed by God in the *ekklesia*

[1] The NRSV will be used as the primary translation, unless otherwise noted.

Paul begins in 12:1–3 by making the crucial point that "spiritual existence" is related to Christ's Lordship. 12:4–30 can be outlined according to an ABA′ pattern, a structure which has commonly been found in other sections of Paul's letters.[2]

Text-linguistic methodology, particularly the use of "hooked key words," provides helpful support in outlining the text and indicating transitions between sections.[3] 12:11 and 12 connect sections A and B through the important terms ἕν and πάντα. Μέλη and σῶμα in 12:25–26 and 12:27 join sections B and A′.[4] These terms highlight Paul's emphasis upon unity and diversity in the body of Christ.

The outer sections A (12:4–11) and A′ (12:27–30) refer to the spiritual manifestations (or the people themselves, e.g. apostles, prophets, etc.). The center section B (12:12–26) does not explicitly mention the *charismata* but rather develops the image of the body. By describing the members of a human body and their various relationships, it provides the conceptual center for understanding the body of Christ.

Spiritual existence defined by the Lordship of Christ (12:1–3)

In ch. 12 Paul introduces a new topic as indicated by περὶ δέ.[5] His answer is most probably in response to a Corinthian question

[2] John J. Collins, "Chiasmus, the 'ABA' Pattern and the Text of Paul," in *Studiorum Paulinorum Congressus Internationalis Catholicus* 2 (1963): 575–83; Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians* (Sacra Pagina 7; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1999) 392; Charles Talbert, *Reading Corinthians* (New York: Crossroad, 1987) 81–82; and "Paul's Understanding of the Holy Spirit: The Evidence of 1 Corinthians 12–14," in *Perspectives on the New Testament*, ed. Charles H. Talbert (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1985). Smit sees a concentric structuring with chs. 12 and 14 being "two rounds of argumentation" surrounding the excursus on love in ch. 13 ("1 Corinthians 12–14"); Fee finds the pattern in 1 Corinthians 1:10–3:23; 7:15–40; 8:1–10:22; and 12:1–14:40 (*Corinthians*, 15–16, 571).

[3] A hooked key word is a transition "effected either by (1) a characteristic term used in the second unit and introduced in the conclusion of the first unit, (2) a characteristic term in the first unit used in the introduction of the next, or (3) a combination of the two" (George Guthrie, *The Structure of Hebrews: A Text-Linguistic Analysis* [Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994] 100–102). H. Van Dyke Parunak calls the same technique the "linked keyword" ("Transitional Techniques in the Bible," *JBL* 102 [1983] 532).

[4] The recurrence of ἕν and πάντα (or πολλά) in B (12:13, 14, 18, 19, 20, 22, 26) and μέλη and σῶμα in B (in every verse except 21) indicates that the terms also function as "hooked keywords."

[5] Mitchell, *Paul*, 190–92, and "Concerning ΠΕΡΙ ΔΕ in 1 Corinthians," *NovT* 31 (1989): 229–56.

concerning the things of the Spirit.[6] However, his response is not necessarily limited to a direct response to their question.[7] Furthermore, while 12:1–3 is often seen as disconnected from the rest of the chapter,[8] Paul uses these verses to set the proper perspective for the following discussion. He begins his answer to the Corinthians by stating that the spiritual person is defined not according to spectacular manifestations, but rather submission to Christ's Lordship.

Introduction of the topic through the disclosure formula

The statement οὐ θέλω ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν (12:1) is a disclosure formula, which is a "formulaic phrase conveying either the sender's desire or command that the addressee 'know' something."[9] Analyzing the papyri and the Pauline corpus, John White concludes that the disclosure formula generally contained at least four parts: (1) θέλω,[10]

[6] J. C. Hurd, *The Origin of 1 Corinthians* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1983).

[7] Mitchell, *Paul*, 190–92, and "Concerning ΠΕΡΙ ΔΕ," 229–56. Also E. Baasland, "Die περί-Formel und die Argumentation(ssituation) des Paulus," *ST* 42 (1988) 69–87, who also concludes that the formula does not mean only that Paul is answering questions. The formula also implies that he is introducing the topic in terms preferred by the Corinthians. Although the Corinthians' favored term is *pneumatika*, Paul prefers *charismata*. (D. A. Carson, *Showing the Spirit: A Theological Exposition of 1 Corinthians 12–14* [Grand Rapids: Baker, 1987] 23; Ernst Käsemann, *Essays on New Testament Themes*, trans. W. J. Montague [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982] 66; D. Moody Smith, "Glossolalia and Other Spiritual Gifts in a New Testament Perspective," *Int* 28 [1974] 311); Birger Albert Pearson, *The Pneumatikos-Psychikos Terminology in 1 Corinthians* [SBLDS 12; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1973] 44).

[8] This difficulty is especially evident in those who see the verses as constituting a "test" of true spiritual manifestations. On 12:1–3 as a "test," see below. For these scholars, 12:1–3 is an "introduction" (A. Robertson and A. Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians* [ICC; T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1994] 258) or a "fundamental proposition" (Barrett, *Corinthians*, 281) after which Paul can move on to his primary discussion on spiritual gifts. Some have tried to integrate the verses, although in general their descriptions are somewhat vague. For example, Ben Witherington III says, "Verses 2–3 have been seen by some as an intrusion into the argument. This is unfortunate because these verses are important." Witherington connects the verses to the rest of the chapter by saying, "Throughout this section [ch. 12] Paul stresses the agency of the Spirit and of God over against the agency of the individual human who does the speaking." Thus the verses serve "to deflate the self-estimate of certain members of his audience" (*Corinth*, 256–57). While these observations are most probably correct, the present study will attempt to go further in describing the specific contribution of the verses to the overall argument.

[9] John White, "Introductory Formulae in the Body of the Pauline Letter," *JBL* 90 (1971) 93.

[10] The formula could also include βούλομαι. Ibid.

(2) a noetic verb in the infinitive, (3) the person addressed, and (4) information, usually introduced by ὅτι.[11] Other elements which were sometimes present included a vocative address[12] and the subject of the counsel expressed in the accusative or by a prepositional phrase such as ὑπέρ.[13]

The function of disclosure formulas has been debated. One proposal is that they are a transition from the thanksgiving to the body in the Pauline letters.[14] John White argues that the disclosure formula introduces the body of the letter by establishing the matter of mutual concern after which the details are carried out in the subsequent main argument.[15] In other words, the formula helps to introduce the topic which will then be expanded in the body of the letter. Jack Sanders, however, notes that these types of formulas in general are not confined to letter openings, but could be used "to introduce new material, to change the subject of discussion, or when the argument takes a new tack." He identifies 1 Cor. 12:1–3 as being one of these forms.[16]

[11] Ibid.; J. T. Sanders, "The Transition from Opening Epistolary Thanksgiving to Body in the Letters of the Pauline Corpus," *JBL* 81 (1962) 353; Terence Y. Mullins, "Disclosure: A Literary Form in the New Testament," *NovT* 7 (1964) 46–47.

[12] Mullins, "Disclosure," 46–47.

[13] Sanders, "Transition," 351–53.

[14] E.g. ibid., 348–62; Mullins, "Disclosure"; J. White, "Introductory Formulae."

[15] J. White, "Introductory Formulae," 91–92, 97.

[16] "Transition," 348–62. Although Sanders argues that the formula is not limited to the transition from thanksgiving to body, he attempts to show that it can function as a formal transition. He also adds another element, the subject of the counsel expressed in the accusative or by a prepositional phrase – ὑπέρ, περί, ἐπί. But it could also be eliminated in some circumstances.

Terence Mullins objects to the characterization of the disclosure formula as an introductory formula, although he agrees with Sanders' observation that it may appear in other parts of the letter besides the introduction. Based upon his examination of the papyri, he asserts that the function of the disclosure formula is to indicate "a pause in a communication process, not a development in a literary process ... Wherever and whenever that pause comes, it signals that the writer's attention has shifted from conveying his personal ideas to the reader and that he is now dealing with more formal aspects of the relationship between himself (as writer) and his readers." For Mullins, the formulas are to be understood as a social gesture and not a literary form. He says, "They show the writer's attitude toward the *audience* to which he is writing, not his attitude toward the *material* he is presenting" ("Formulas in the New Testament Epistles," *JBL* 91 [1972] 388). Mullins is probably correct in asserting that the forms need not be understood rigidly. It does not, however, necessarily mean that Paul or other writers did not use them to help structure their correspondence.

Furthermore, Mullins does not take into account the possibility that Paul modified the use of the formula for his own purposes. This is somewhat surprising because earlier he acknowledges Paul's modification of the thanksgiving, not only grammatically, but also functionally. Specifically he says that although it is not in the nature of

In general, Paul uses the formula to introduce and call attention to a specific piece of information. C. E. B. Cranfield remarks that it is a formula which Paul uses when he wants to emphasize something he regards as of special importance.[17] For example, in Rom. 11:25–26a it draws attention to a critical component of his discourse on God's purpose for Israel in Rom. 9–11: "So that you may not claim to be wiser than you are, brothers and sisters, I want you to understand this mystery: a hardening has come upon part of Israel, until the full number of the Gentiles has come in. And so all Israel will be saved." In 1 Thess. 4:13–14 Paul states, "But we do not want you to be uninformed, brothers and sisters, about those who have died … For since we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so, through Jesus, God will bring with him those who have died." The disclosure formula gives specific information to comfort those who are concerned about believers who have died before the Parousia.[18]

But Paul's other uses in 1 Corinthians are even more revealing. The disclosure formula occurs in two other places: 10:1–5 and 11:3.

10:1–5 Οὐ **θέλω** γὰρ ὑμᾶς **ἀγνοεῖν**, ἀδελφοί,
ὅτι οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν πάντες ὑπὸ τὴν νεφέλην ἦσαν καὶ
πάντες διὰ τῆς θαλάσσης διῆλθον, καὶ
πάντες εἰς τὸν Μωϋσῆν ἐβαπτίσθησαν
ἐν τῇ νεφέλῃ καὶ ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ, καὶ
πάντες τὸ αὐτὸ πνευματικὸν βρῶμα ἔφαγον, καὶ
πάντες τὸ αὐτὸ πνευματικὸν ἔπιον πόμα·
ἔπινον γὰρ ἐκ πνευματικῆς ἀκολουθούσης πέτρας·
ἡ πέτρα δὲ ἦν ὁ Χριστός.
Ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐν τοῖς πλείοσιν αὐτῶν εὐδόκησεν ὁ θεός,
κατεστρώθησαν γὰρ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ.

the thanksgiving to introduce, Paul uses it to introduce the body of his letters. If Paul used this form as an introductory formula even though this was not its normal epistolary function, it is possible that he used other forms in this way.

[17] C. E. B. Cranfield, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (2 vols.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1975) I.81; I.573. See similar comments on this and other verses in Joseph A. Fitzmyer, SJ, *Romans* (AB 33; New York: Doubleday, 1993) 249; Ralph P. Martin, *2 Corinthians* (WBC 40; Waco, TX: Word, 1986) 14; Victor Paul Furnish, *II Corinthians* (AB 32A; New York: Doubleday, 1984) 121–22; F. F. Bruce, *1 & 2 Thessalonians* (WBC 45; Waco, TX: Word, 1982) 95.

[18] Other examples include Rom. 1:13, where the formula draws attention to his desire to visit the believers personally. In 2 Cor. 1:8 Paul describes his afflictions to conclude the introductory blessing in which he speaks about the sufferings and consolation he has experienced as a result of the gospel.

11:3 **Θέλω** δὲ ὑμᾶς **εἰδέναι**
ὅτι παντὸς ἀνδρὸς ἡ κεφαλὴ ὁ Χριστός ἐστιν,
κεφαλὴ δὲ γυναικὸς ὁ ἀνήρ,
κεφαλὴ δὲ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὁ θεός.

In both instances, the disclosure formula begins a larger section and draws attention to a significant statement which then sets the stage for the main part of the argument. In ch. 10 Paul uses the formula to present Israel as a negative example to the Corinthians. He reminds the Corinthians that despite the advantages that "all" Israel had, most displeased God and were struck down in the desert. Their privileged station did not protect them from falling into immorality and idolatry and consequently God's judgment. Paul then uses Israel's example to warn the Corinthians to be careful that they too do not fall into idolatry (10:6). The statement introduced by the disclosure formula underscores the seriousness of the need to refrain from eating food offered to idols because it illustrates the dire consequences that follow from idolatry, even for those "called" by God (1:2).

In 11:3 (along with 11:2, his commendation for holding onto the traditions he handed down to them), he introduces the discussion on the women prophets by using the formula to establish the relationships among God, Christ, men, and women. God is the "head" of Christ, Christ is the "head" of man, and man is the "head" of woman. This sets the foundation for the following discussion because the women are to cover their "heads" and the men are not to cover their "heads" so that neither disgraces their respective metaphorical as well as physical "heads."[19] While the precise content of this "headship" is much controverted, the point here is that the disclosure formula in 11:3 provides a vital piece of information for orienting the audience to the ensuing discussion by placing the discussion about the women prophets (11:4–16) in the larger context of the concept of headship, which relates not only to men and women, but to God and Christ as well.

Lastly, although he does not use a disclosure formula in 15:1–2, Paul indicates in this passage as well something that he wants the Corinthians to "know," which then becomes critical for the remainder of his argument.[20]

[19] "He establishes the premise that everyone has a head so that he can set up his argument that what individuals do to their physical heads in worship reflects negative or positively on their metaphorical head" (David E. Garland, *1 Corinthians* [Grand Rapids: Baker, 2003] 513–14).

[20] He uses what Sanders calls a "transition" formula rather than a disclosure formula. Sanders identifies 15:1–3, along with 10:1–5 and 11:3, as a "transition"

15:1 **Γνωρίζω** δὲ ὑμῖν, ἀδελφοί,
τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὃ εὐηγγελισάμην ὑμῖν,
ὃ καὶ παρελάβετε,
ἐν ᾧ καὶ ἑστήκατε,

15:2 δι' οὗ καὶ σῴζεσθε,
τίνι λόγῳ εὐηγγελισάμην ὑμῖν
εἰ κατέχετε,
ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ εἰκῇ ἐπιστεύσατε.

Paul follows 15:1–2 with an elaboration of the content of the gospel in 15:3–11, including Christ's death for sins, his resurrection, and his appearances to the disciples. Paul then uses this statement of the gospel in verses 1–2 as the basis of his discussion of the resurrection of the believers in 15:12–58.[21] There is a resurrection of the dead because Christ was raised from the dead as the first fruits.

There is a pattern in 1 Corinthians for Paul to tell the Corinthians something they should "know" as a foundational piece of information for his more precise instructions. Paul's emphasis upon "knowing" should not be surprising given the Corinthians' high valuation of knowledge.[22] While the Corinthians may think they have knowledge, Paul will show them what true knowledge is. In 12:1–3 he uses the disclosure formula to introduce information critical to his discussion on spiritual manifestations. The spiritual person is not so

formula, which is generally used to introduce new material, to change the subject of discussion, or when the argument takes a new tack." Sanders, "Transition," 351. Actually the formula could extend to 15:11, with 15:3–11 being the content of "the gospel, which you received, in which you stand, by which you are saved" (15:1–2).

[21] Interpreters have commonly seen the beginning verses of ch. 15 as providing the basic foundation for the following discussion of resurrection. For example, Barrett states, "Throughout chapter XV Paul deals with this erroneous opinion (that there is no resurrection of the dead), its presuppositions and its consequences. In doing so he finds it necessary to begin some way back; hence the present paragraph (15:1–11), which is intended to call to mind that the resurrection of Christ played an essential part in Paul's preaching, and indeed in all Christian preaching" (*Corinthians*, 335). Recent research has focused upon 15:1–2 or 15:1–3 as the exordium to 15:1–58 (B. Mack, *Rhetoric and the NT* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990] 58; M. Bünker, *Briefformular und rhetorische Disposition im 1 Korintherbrief* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984] 59–72; J.-N. Aletti, "La *dispositio* rhétorique dans les épitres pauliniennes. Proposition de méthode," *NTS* 38 [1992] 396; Duane Watson, "Paul's Rhetorical Strategy in 1 Corinthians 15," in *Rhetoric and the New Testament*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht [JSNTSup 90; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993] 235–36). The exordium was the initial element of the arrangement and "set forth the rhetor's concern and intention, topics to be discussed, and a call for a hearing" (Watson, "1 Corinthians 15," 235; Aristotle, *Rhet*. 3.14.1415b8; Quintilian, *Inst*. 3.8.6).

[22] As reflected in 1 Cor. 1:18–2:5.

much the one who receives a greater *charisma*, but the one who by the Spirit is able to proclaim Jesus as Lord.

The spiritual person as the one who proclaims "Jesus is Lord!"

In 12:3 Paul wants the Corinthians to "know" that the confession of Jesus as Lord is only possible through the Spirit.

(12:1) Περὶ δὲ τῶν πνευματικῶν, ἀδελφοί, οὐ **θέλω** ὑμᾶς **ἀγνοεῖν**.

(12:2) **Οἴδατε ὅτι** ὅτε ἔθνη ἦτε πρὸς τὰ εἴδωλα τὰ ἄφωνα
ὡς ἂν ἤγεσθε ἀπαγόμενοι.

(12:3) διὸ **γνωρίζω** ὑμῖν **ὅτι** οὐδεὶς ἐν πνεύματι θεοῦ λαλῶν λέγει,
Ἀνάθεμα Ἰησοῦς,
καὶ οὐδεὶς δύναται εἰπεῖν, Κύριος Ἰησοῦς,
εἰ μὴ ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ.

All parts of the disclosure formula are present: θέλω, a noetic verb in the infinitive (ἀγνοεῖν), the person(s) addressed (ἀδελφοί), and information introduced by ὅτι. Paul reminds the Corinthians of their pagan past in which they worshiped mute idols (12:2). He then adds another statement (12:3), introduced by γνωρίζω, stating that the Spirit causes one to make the correct proclamation of Jesus as Lord as opposed to declaring him as cursed.[23]

Paul begins by referring to the Corinthians' concern in 12:1 through the use of an ambiguous term, τῶν πνευματικῶν, meaning either "spiritual people" as a masculine noun,[24] or "spiritual gifts"[25] or "spiritual things"[26] as a neuter. The context clarifies the use of the term in other instances. In 14:1 Paul tells the Corinthians to desire earnestly τὰ πνευματικά, or "spiritual things," but in 14:37 he

[23] Vv. 2–3 together constitute the one subject of disclosure. Some have proposed taking vv. 1 and 2 to contrast v. 3 rather than vv. 2–3 being the content referred to in v. 1. Carson argues that the latter tends to lead to the view that the Corinthians in their former pagan lives were involved in ecstatic frenzies in which they might have actually uttered the curse formula. The result is a misplaced emphasis upon the utterance of Jesus as Lord as a test or criterion for a proper working of the Spirit (*Spirit*, 26). But taking vv. 2 and 3 together does not necessarily lead to a "test" understanding of the passage. Both the use of analogy and the structural analysis, especially in regard to the disclosure formula, support seeing vv. 2–3 as a pair.

[24] E.g. F. F. Bruce, *1 and 2 Corinthians* (London: Oliphants, 1971) 116; Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 204.

[25] E.g. Robertson and Plummer, *Corinthians*, 259. [26] E.g. Carson, *Spirit*, 22.

directs his command to the πνευματικός, or spiritual person.[27] However, the context of 12:1 would allow a reference to either spiritual things or people.[28] Paul's ambiguity in 12:1 could be purposeful. The use of τῶν πνευματικῶν allows him to refer to their questions about spiritual things, but also opens the way for him to talk about spiritual existence.

A common interpretation of 12:1–3 is that it presents a "test" or criterion for understanding true versus false utterances based upon what was actually happening in the assembly.[29] Hypotheses concerning the origin of the "Jesus is cursed" statement are numerous, and proposals include a statement used in a Jewish persecution setting[30] and an actual cry uttered by some Christians in ecstatic worship.[31]

Some interpreters argue that the statement is a hypothetical literary device intended to contrast the true confession.[32] Bassler notes

[27] Other uses include: masculine – 2:13, 15; 3:1; neuter – 2:13; 9:11; 15:46.

[28] Barrett is apparently correct in noting that "it seems impossible to find objective ground for a decision between the two possibilities, and little difference in sense is involved – spiritual persons are those who have spiritual gifts" (*Corinthians*, 278).

[29] According to this hypothesis, the primary problem Paul addresses concerns inspired utterances. Paul wants the Corinthians to know that inspired utterances are not themselves indications of the Spirit. Instead, the true workings of the Spirit will be known by the content of the saying which proclaims Jesus as Lord, e.g. Barrett, *Corinthians*, 281; Paul W. Meyer, "The Holy Spirit in the Pauline Letters," *Int* 33 (1979) 16; Leon M. Morris, *1 Corinthians* (Leicester: InterVarsity, 1985) 164–65; Robertson and Plummer, *Corinthians*, 258; Schmithals, *Gnosticism*, 124–30. But this view has been seriously challenged. It is hard to imagine Paul not taking a harder stance if this were actually happening in the assembly (Fee, *Corinthians*, 581) or that anyone would need instruction to know that cursing Jesus was not inspired by the Spirit. W. C. van Unnik says, "Can it be supposed that the Christians in Corinth were so stupid as to think that 'cursed be Jesus' could be said by the Spirit of God?" ("Jesus: Anathema or Kyrios [1 Cor. 12:3]," in *Christ and Spirit in the New Testament*, ed. Barnabus Lindars and Stephen S. Smalley [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973] 114). Fee says a bit more charitably, "How could a *believer* under any circumstances say such a thing in the Christian assembly, and how is it that he or she would need instruction?" (*Corinthians*, 581; also Hurd, *1 Corinthians*, 193). For a more detailed summary of proposals, see Anthony C. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000) 909–27.

[30] E.g. J. D. M. Derrett, "Cursing Jesus (1 Cor. XII.3): The Jews as Religious 'Persecutors,'" *NTS* 21 (1975): 544–54.

[31] E.g. R. Scroggs, "The Exaltation of the Spirit by Some Early Christians," *JBL* 84 [1965]: 359–73; Margaret Thrall, *I and II Corinthians* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965) 86–87.

[32] E.g. Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 204; Jouettte M. Bassler, "1 Cor. 12:1–3 – Curse and Confession in Context," *JBL* 101 (1982) 417; G. de Broglie, "Le texte fondamentale de Saint Paul: contre la foi naturelle," *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 39 (1951) 261–66; M. Zerwick, *Biblical Greek* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1963) 152. Fee, *Corinthians*, 581; Hurd makes the additional observation that the hypothetical extreme Paul displays here may be similar to another one in 6:15–16. In that instance

that if this is the case, it does not mean that there was no basis to the phrase in either Paul's or the Corinthians' past. Rather, the phrase needs to be interpreted less as a present problem in the congregation than as a literary device intended to emphasize the expression of their current life under the Spirit.[33] Eriksson likewise states that the emphasis is on "speaking in the Spirit of God, not on the curse."[34] Thus, the argumentative purpose of the curse is to emphasize, through contrast, the "Jesus is Lord" statement.

The result of the contrast is to define the spiritual person as the one who makes this correct confession since only the person with the Spirit of God can proclaim Jesus as Lord. In verse 2 Paul has reminded the Corinthians of their former state as pagans when they worshiped mute idols. The Corinthians' former pagan state stands in contrast to their present existence in which they proclaim Jesus as Lord.

In this way Paul provides the proper perspective for thinking about what it means to be "spiritual" for the Corinthians who were arguing over spiritual things. As Jouette Bassler explains, 12:1–3 works analogously to orient the Corinthians to a new perspective, that is, their Spirit-led existence in Christ as opposed to their former pagan lives. Just as they were formerly led away to mute idols, now they are under the control of the Spirit.[35] The "spiritual person" is not just the person who has a spiritual gift, but even more fundamentally, the one who by the Spirit proclaims that Jesus is Lord. As Barrett says, "it is the work of the Spirit to bear witness to the lordship of Jesus Christ."[36] Similar proclamations appear in Rom. 10:9 and Phil. 2:11, and the confessional contexts of those texts support the assertion that the statement is likewise used in a confessional sense here.[37]

But there is the question of why a person would need the Spirit in order to make this declaration in the first place. As Fee rightly points out, it would seem that anyone could literally utter the words, "Jesus

Paul warns the Corinthians of the dangers of their insistence upon freedom "by describing the depths to which such a principle might carry a man"(*1 Corinthians*, 86–89, 164, 193).

[33] Bassler, "1 Cor. 12:1–3," 417.

[34] Anders Eriksson, *Traditions as Rhetorical Proof* (Coniectanea Biblica New Testament Series 27; Stockholm: Almquist & Wiksell International, 1998) 219.

[35] Bassler, "1 Cor. 12:3," 415–18. [36] Barrett, *Corinthians*, 283.

[37] Others, such as Eriksson, *Traditions*, 110; Thiselton, *Corinthians*, 918, also see the utterance as being a confession.

is Lord" at will.[38] Eriksson notes that interpreters often reverse the order of the main and subordinate clauses in 12:3c, so that the confession becomes the criterion for proper spiritual speech. It is better, however, to understand the possession of the Spirit as the cause of the correct confession.

Although the Spirit enables the person to make the proper confession, it is not by compulsion, as when the Corinthians were pagans.[39] Verse 3 speaks more of a new capability, rather than a compulsion. Although the Corinthians were formerly led astray to the idols, they are now enabled or empowered (δύνται), but not "forced" through the Spirit. As will be explained in more detail later, the role of the Spirit in enabling a person to make this radical confession is precisely what Paul explains in 1 Cor. 1:18–2:16, when he speaks of the Spirit as the one who enables a person to understand the wisdom of God as seen in the crucified Christ.[40] The proclamation of the Lordship of Christ can only be done through knowledge given by the Spirit.[41] A person who has the Spirit can proclaim Jesus as Lord, even though he is "foolishness" to the Gentiles and a "stumbling block" to the Jews (1:23). In contrast to the Corinthians' former existence under the "mute" idols, they now have the Spirit who reveals the very thoughts of God (2:10–13), which allows them to make the proper confession (12:3).

The contrast is between involuntary submission to the idols versus voluntary submission to Christ's Lordship made possible through the Spirit. Furthermore, 12:3 is not only about making the correct confession, but about the outworking of that confession in the life of the believer. As Thiselton explains, the confession is "no mere 'floating' fragment of descriptive statement or abstract proposition, but is *a spoken act of personal devotion and commitment which is part and parcel of a Christ-centered worship and lifestyle*."[42] Eriksson states

[38] Fee, *Corinthians*, 581–82.

[39] In other words, vv. 2–3 do not seem to function as an analogy between compulsion to the idols and a similar control by the Spirit (Bassler, "1 Cor. 12:1–3").

[40] Fee states, "As in 2:10–13, only one who has the Spirit can truly make such a confession because only the Spirit can reveal its reality" (*Corinthians*, 582).

[41] Eriksson, *Traditions*, 220.

[42] Thiselton, *Corinthians*, 926. Similarly, Barrett notes, "[The formula] is true not because it is the right or orthodox formula but because it expresses the proper relation with Jesus: the speaker accepts his authority, and proclaims himself the servant of him whom he confesses as Lord (κύριος). It is the relation . . . with which Paul is concerned here" (*Corinthians*, 281). Werner Kramer states, "The title [Lord] signifies the status of honour and majesty which Jesus has *vis à vis* the Church and the world – a status which

that since the primary *Sitz im Leben* of the saying would be the worship setting of the church, those proclaiming it would be publicly acknowledging their subordinate power relationship under Jesus.[43]

The rest of 1 Cor. 12 then presents the outworking of the Lordship of Christ in terms of the Corinthians' existence as his body. 1 Cor. 12:1–3 prepares the way for the remainder of the chapter by relativizing the Corinthians' claims to the Spirit based on the receipt of a particular gift, and instead making the confession of Jesus as Lord the fundamental indicator of the "spiritual" person.[44] The Spirit enables one to know and thus participate in the significance of Jesus. As a result, the Corinthians must understand and practice the χαρίσματα within the context of this new existence under the Lordship of Christ, an existence in which they are his body.

The distribution of gifts (section A: 12:4–11)

The appearances of τό αὐτό in 12:4–6 and 12:11 form an inclusio for the section. Although Paul does not yet discuss the body of Christ, he begins to hint at the larger purpose of the gifts, moving the Corinthians away from their individual perspective to seeing themselves as part of a larger whole.

The significance of the Spirit, Lord, and God (12:4–6)

Paul begins with a threefold statement on the relationship of the "apportionments" or "distributions" to the "same" Spirit, Lord, and

is final and of eschatological import. In the *homologia* the Church acknowleges this status of Jesus and places itself under his rule as the *Lord*" (*Christ, Lord, Son of God* [Naperville: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1966] 75). Vernon Neufeld also draws attention to Christ "as the overruling one to whom the believer is subject in a life of obedience, who is the master of the Christian." This relationship happens as a result of the resurrection and ascension (*The Earliest Christian Confessions* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1963] 42–68).

[43] Eriksson, *Traditions*, 112.

[44] Mitchell, *Paul*, 267; Eriksson explains, "Paul treats the finite question of the pneumatics' spiritual status by redefining all baptized Christians as spiritual" (*Traditions*, 217). This relativism may be directly aimed at the glossolalists. Bassler makes the point that vv. 1–3 present Paul's radically different perspective on the Corinthians' questions about spiritual gifts. "Paul undermines any pneumatic elitism" by showing that all who proclaim Jesus as Lord, and not just the tongues-speakers, are πνευματικοί. Thus the verses are connected with the overall concern to control the tongues-speakers in chs. 12–14. True spiritual existence is indicated by the proper confession of Jesus as Lord. Another way of relativizing the importance of the tongues-speakers is Paul's listing of tongues at the end of the lists of gifts ("1 Cor. 12:1–3").

God (12:4–6).[45] The triad of statements provides the context for what follows.[46] The distributions must be understood in relation to the divine agents, and the many distributions contrast the one Spirit, Lord, and God.[47] The relationship between the divine agents and the Corinthians provides the first model of unity and diversity, or the one and the many.[48]

The verses also highlight the Corinthians' role as recipients of the gifts. Paul describes God as the one "who activates all of them in everyone" (v. 6). In verse 7 he says that the distributions "are given," δίδοται, to each person. He repeats this idea in verse 11, where he says that the Spirit ἐνεργεῖ, or "activates" and distributes, "διαιροῦν," to each according to the Spirit's own will, καθὼς βούλεται.

Thus, the distributions are to be viewed in the context of the one and the many, and also the fundamental roles of the divine agents. From here Paul can move on to talk about the "benefit" of the gifts.

Τὸ συμφέρον and the body of Christ (12:7)

From the three divine agents in 12:4–6, Paul now focuses upon one, the Spirit. He says that the manifestations of the Spirit are given to each person πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον, and he follows this with a list (12:8–11) to illustrate what some of these manifestations are. The

[45] Some (e.g. Fee, *Corinthians*, 586–87; Bruce, *Corinthians*, 118) say that 12:4–6 is simply presenting three different ways of looking at the manifestations of the Spirit.

[46] Fee, *Corinthians*, 586.

[47] Thus, Witherington states, "the allusion to the threefold character and unity of God . . . is another model for unity with diversity in the community of God" (*Corinth*, 261). See also Robertson and Plummer, *Corinthians*, 262; Fee, *Corinthians*, 588). There are some objections to translating διαιρέσεις as "varieties." BAGD notes the meaning of "varieties" is possible (Lucian, *Hermot*. 52; Epictetus, *Diatr*. 2.6.24), but the more usual sense is "apportionment" or "division" (Jdt. 9:4; Sir. 14:15; Philo, *Sacr*. 85.3; 86.2; 87.2; *Post*. 159.3; *Agr*. 129.4. Barrett, *Corinthians*, 281; Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 207). The cognate verb διαιρέω in 12:11 supports this use. This passage speaks of the Spirit's volition in distributing the gifts. In Lk. 15:12, the only other New Testament occurrence, it has the sense of "to apportion and distribute." Διαιρέσεις occurs nowhere else in the New Testament. However, the context of the passage, in particular the listing of various gifts immediately following in 12:8–10, would certainly imply variety (e.g. Barrett, *Corinthians*, 279).

[48] Christian Wolff reflects both the diversity and the unity themes by titling the section, "Die Vielfalt der Gaben des einen Geistes" (*Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther* (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1996). This would seem closer to Paul's overall purpose than those headings which emphasize diversity only, e.g. Fee, *Corinthians*, who titles the section "Diversity in the Godhead and the Gifts," 23; or Carson, "The Bountiful Diversity of the Grace-Gifts," in *Spirit*, 15.

phrase πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον has often been translated as "for the common good" or "for the common advantage."[49] The implication is that Paul is telling the Corinthians that in contrast to their use of the gifts for personal aggrandizement, the gifts are intended for the good of the whole.[50]

The problem with this interpretation is that τὸ συμφέρον literally means "profit" or "advantage" and did not necessarily refer to corporate gain.[51] It was a general term, the meaning of which could then be made more specific, such as by adding πόλει in referring to a city,[52] or ἑμαυτῷ for personal advantage.[53] When it referred to corporate "advantage," it was usually qualified by κοινός. Thus, Josephus says that Ananus put public welfare above his own interests, πρό τε τῶν ἰδίων λυσιτελῶν τὸ κοινῇ συμφέρον.[54] Aristotle asserts that the political association, through justice, aims at the "common advantage," τὸ κοινῇ συμφέρον, whereas all other associations are formed for "particular" advantages, κατὰ μέρη τοῦ συμφέροντος, such as that of sailors who seek profits through trade.[55]

[49] E.g. Carson, *Spirit*, 34–35; Bruce, *Corinthians*, 119–20; Paul Ellingworth and Howard Hatton, *A Translator's Handbook on Paul's First Letter to the Corinthians* (London: United Bible Societies, 1985) 242–43; Fee, *Corinthians*, 589; Mitchell, *Paul*, 38; Thiselton, *Corinthians*, 936. Barrett translates it as "mutual profit" (*Corinthians*, 284). "Common good" is the translation in the NRSV and NIV. The NEB translates the phrase as "for some useful purpose," the JB "for a good purpose," and the NAB, "for some benefit." Conzelmann notes that πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον literally means "with a view to what is for the best" and translates the phrase as "in order to make use of it" (*1 Corinthians*, 208).

[50] Witherington, *Corinth*, 257 also says that the gifts are "for the common good."

[51] BAGD.

[52] Dio Chrysostom, *Conc. Apam.* 40.16, who says that concord is what is advantageous to the city; Plutarch, *Crass.* 15.2; Thucydides 3.82.2.

[53] Aristotle, *Eth. nic.* 8.9.2.

[54] Josephus, *B. J.* 4.320. Dionysius of Halicarnassus describes how Brutus accused Collantinus of considering his "private advantage instead of the public good," πρὸς αὐτοὺς καὶ ἀντὶ τῶν κοινῇ συμφερόντων (*Ant. rom.* 5.10.2). He later compares those who prefer τὰς αὐτῶν ὠφελείας to τοῦ κοινοῦ συμφέροντος (*Ant. rom.* 10.60.2). For additional comparisons of public vs. private interests, see Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. rom.* 9.8.1–5; 10.51.3; 11.8.3; Plato, *Leg.* 9.875A-B; Demosthenes, *Ep.* 1.10.

[55] Aristotle, *Eth. nic.* 8.9.4–5. In other instances, τὸ κοινῇ συμφέρον or τὸ κοινὸν συμφέρον is used without an explicit comparison to individual benefit to designate the particular quality of the state or city as being concerned with the good of the whole. Yet it is still clear that the "common advantage" is being compared with the individual or divided state. Thus Aristotle discusses how humans, being "political animals," are brought together by "common interest," τὸ κοινῇ συμφέρον (Aristotle, *Pol.* 3.4.2). As Aristotle continues, he compares τὸ κοινῇ συμφέρον with the ruler's own advantage and the private interest (Aristotle, *Pol.* 3.4.7–5.1. Also Dionysius of Halicarnassus,

Another indication of the term's general nature can be seen in its use in rhetoric.[56] It was the goal of deliberative rhetoric[57] since the orator attempted to persuade the audience to a course of action by appealing to what was advantageous, or dissuading them by what was not beneficial.[58] The speaker assumed that the audience would be moved by appealing to gain what is beneficial and avoid what is harmful. In many political speeches, the orator would cite the good of the state as being the "advantage." But even in these cases, τὸ συμφέρον itself did not mean "common good," but an "advantage" which was often further defined in reference to the common good.[59]

Thus, one cannot presuppose that τὸ συμφέρον means "common good" but rather should examine how the author defines the content of the "advantage." As Stephen Halliwell states, the open-ended nature of τὸ συμφέρον means the term "is itself of basic ethical significance."[60] What the author defines as advantageous can be a critical component of the overall argument.

Ant. rom. 7.39.3, and Demosthenes, *Ep.* 1.5, 9–10, who are arguing for an end to factionalism). The phrase is common in *homonoia* speeches in which the orator is arguing for unity in the midst of factionalism. In Demosthenes' first epistle, "ΠΕΡΙ ΤΗΣ ΟΜΟΝΟΙΑΣ," we note the explicit connection of concord with the common good. He states, 'First of all, men of Athens, it is necessary that you bring about harmony among yourselves for the common good of the State (ὁμόνοιαν εἰς τὸ κοινῇ συμφέρον τῇ πόλει)" (*Ep.* 1.5).

[56] On the relationship between rhetoric and paraenesis, see ch. 1.

[57] "The end of the deliberative speaker is the expedient (τὸ συμφέρον) or harmful (βλαβερόν); for he who exhorts recommends a course of action as better, and he who dissuades advises against it as worse" (Aristotle, *Rhet.* 1.3.5. Also 1.6.1; *Rhet. Her.* 3.2.3; 3.4.8; Cicero, *Inv.* 2.51.156; 2.52.157–58; Quintilian, *Inst.* 3.8.22–42). In *Rhet.* 1.8.2 Aristotle states that expediency is the means by which "all men are persuaded."

[58] Mitchell concludes that the term was a part of the technical vocabulary of deliberative rhetorical texts (*Paul*, 25–39). The use of τὸ συμφέρον as a technical term in deliberative rhetoric seems to be assumed in Stephen Halliwell, "Popular Morality, Philosophical Ethics, and the *Rhetoric*," in *Aristotle's Rhetoric*, ed. David J. Furley and Alexander Nehamas (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994) 211–30.

[59] For example, in a speech on concord, Dio Chrysostom argues, "For truly it is a fine thing and profitable (καλὸν . . . καὶ συμφέρον) for one and all alike to have a city show itself of one mind, on terms of friendship with itself and one in feeling, united in conferring both censure and praise, bearing for both classes, the good and the bad, a testimony in which each can have confidence" (*In cont.* 48.6). In this case, συμφέρον is not a technical term for "common good," any more than καλόν is. But Dio uses both terms in his deliberative speech to argue that unity is good and beneficial.

[60] Stephen Halliwell, "The Challenge of Rhetoric to Political and Ethical Theory in Aristotle," in *Essays of Aristotle's Rhetoric*, ed. Amélie Oksenberg Rorty (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996) 181.

The difference is subtle but critical for understanding the function of ch. 12 and its relationship to chs. 13 and 14.[61] 1 Cor. 12 is Paul's explanation of how the Corinthians should evaluate what is advantageous. He does not tell the Corinthians that spiritual things are given for the common good and then describe the body to demonstrate how to use what they have been given. Instead, he appeals to their self-interest by telling them that the manifestations are given for what is advantageous. After this pronouncement he will teach them how to define what is advantageous in the context of their new life in Christ, which is their corporate existence as his body. Paul does not argue from the concept of the common good as much as teach the Corinthians to value the common good. After illustrating to the Corinthians that their existence as Christ's body entails obligations to the whole, he will present specific instructions in ch. 14. But he can only give specific precepts regarding prophecy and speaking in tongues after showing them how to think of themselves properly. As Seneca states, precepts must be founded upon principles, and in social ethics, the primary principle is bodily oneness.

In other words, Paul is not saying in 12:7 that the gifts are given for the "common good" but rather that they are given for what is "advantageous." What is in their self-interest must be considered in light of their participation in the whole. The point of ch. 12 is to show the Corinthians how to evaluate what is beneficial to them, which Paul then defines as corporate, that is, related to their membership in the body of Christ.[62]

Furthermore, for the Stoics, τὸ συμφέρον is especially relevant because of the unique way in which they combined "advantage" with virtue and one's obligations to universal humanity. Andrew R. Dyck comments on the importance of τὸ συμφέρον in Panaetius, as viewed

[61] Therefore, for example, Carson notices the difference but misses this important point when he says that the expression is literally translated "with a view to profiting," but that "the context makes it clear" that Paul means "for the common good" (*Spirit*, 34–35).

[62] Mitchell rightly and insightfully notes that Paul has been redefining "advantage" throughout 1 Corinthians from individual to corporate advantage (e.g. 6:12–20 and 10:23–11:1). However, she also argues that in 12:7 Paul's redefinition is "complete" so that τὸ συμφέρον may now be translated "common good" (*Paul*, 35–39). However, I maintain that Paul still uses the term in the general sense and uses ch. 12 to demonstrate specifically that the "advantage" the Corinthians seek must be understood corporately.

primarily in Cicero's *De officiis* Book 2.[63] In Panaetius τὸ συμφέρον and not just the "good" becomes a criterion for judging actions.[64] But there need not be any conflict between the two. The existence of a universal humanity and the Stoics' appeal for each person to act in accordance with one's nature meant that what was beneficial for the individual would necessarily be that which benefitted the whole and therefore would be considered virtuous.

In *De officiis*, Cicero explains the significance of *utile*, the Latin equivalent of τὸ συμφέρον.[65] Both *utile* and moral rectitude figure in the determination of duties. In dealing with the question of how to resolve any conflict between moral rectitude and expediency, Cicero says that the morally right cannot be inexpedient.[66] What is particularly significant is the way in which Cicero reaches his conclusions by appealing to universal human nature.

Cicero lays down a general rule for deciding proper action when what is expedient seems to clash with the morally right, and that rule is in harmony with Stoic doctrines.[67] It is contrary to Nature for a person to gain personal advantage at the expense of a neighbor because such injustice is "fatal to social life and fellowship between human beings." To injure another in order to gain personal profit is to break "those bonds of human society, which are most in accord with Nature's laws."[68] Like Seneca, Cicero appeals to a preexisting unity among all people as the basis for human social behavior.

There are several important points to note. First is Cicero's identification of public and private interest. He concludes, "This, then, ought to be the chief end of all men, to make the interest of each individual and of the whole body politic (*universorum*) identical."[69] In contrast Plato sees the two as opposed. "The public

[63] *Cicero*, 353–54. The term is also found in Panaetius' teacher, Diogenes of Babylon, *De rhet*. III 15–16. See Obbink and Vander Waerdt, "Diogenes."

[64] Dyck, *Cicero*, 354. [65] Along with ὠφέλιμον (ibid., 353).

[66] "Let it be set down as an established principle, then, that what is morally wrong can never be expedient – not even when one secures by means of it that which one thinks expedient" (Cicero, *Off*. 3.12.50).

[67] Cicero, *Off*. 3.4.19–20. [68] Cicero, *Off*. 3.5.21.

[69] Cicero, *Off*. 3.6.26. Cicero uses an example to demonstrate the connection between the honorable and the advantageous. The more noble a person's character, the more this person will prefer a life of service to personal pleasure. Hercules is one who underwent great trials for the sake of humanity and at the sacrifice of pleasure and wealth (*Off*. 3.5.25).

interest binds States together, whereas the private interest rends them asunder."[70]

A second point is that Cicero is able to reconcile the honorable and the advantageous. In other words, what is beneficial is also virtuous. Quintilian speaks of the difficulty of understanding the compatibility of the two. Although he says that the honorable should be the goal of deliberative rhetoric,[71] he is not able to reconcile completely the honorable with the expedient. "Often again we shall urge that honour must come before expediency ... At times on the other hand we prefer expediency to honour."[72]

A third point is that Cicero reaches both of these conclusions through his understanding of human nature. The inherent connectedness among people leads to their moral obligations toward each other. One should not take advantage of a neighbor, because doing so would uproot the fellowship which the gods have established among humans. The sovereign mistress and queen of all the virtues is justice, and justice is based upon recognizing and acting in line with Nature's bond.[73]

Cicero's belief in the unity of humanity leads him to a social ethic in which morality is based upon a "natural" connection with other humans. The true "benefit" of every person is that which is in the interest of the whole because Nature demands the maintenance of human fellowship, and only the one who lives in accordance with Nature is virtuous.[74] Cicero cites Antipater, the student of Diogenes

[70] Plato does equate public and private interests to a certain degree. "It benefits both public and private interests alike when the public interest, rather than the private, is well enacted." But he is not arguing for the identification of the two, as Cicero does. Rather he is saying that it benefits private interests when the public interests are first considered, although the converse is not necessarily true. Therefore, the ruler must maintain "the public interest in the State as the object of first importance, to which the private interest is but secondary." Plato associates public interest with "justice and goodness." On the other hand, private interest corresponds to the person's "mortal nature [which] will always urge one on to grasping and self-interested action (Plato, *Leg*. 9.875A–C).

[71] Quintilian, *Inst*. 3.8.1.

[72] Quintilian, *Inst*. 3.8.30. Aristotle states that advantage is the prime goal of deliberative rhetoric, while other factors such as the honorable (δίκαιος) are incidental (Aristotle, *Rhet*. 1.3.5). He also says, "Rhetoric then may be defined as the faculty of discovering the possible means of persuasion in reference to any subject whatever" (*Rhet*. 1.2.1). The relationship between morality and Aristotle's *Rhetoric* has been a matter of debate. For a summary of positions, see Forbes Hill, "The Amorality of Aristotle's Rhetoric," in *GRBS* 22 (1981) 133 n. 2.

[73] Cicero, *Off*. 3.6.28. [74] Cicero, *Off*. 3.6.26.

of Babylon, on the relationship between ethics and the corporate nature of human beings:

> It is your duty to consider the interests of your fellow human beings and to serve society; you were brought into the world under these conditions and have these inborn principles which you are in duty bound to obey and follow, that your interest (*utilitas*) shall be the interest of the community and conversely that the interest of the community shall be your interest as well.[75]

Individual and community interests are the same because it is in the nature of the person as a human being.[76]

As Halliwell states, "*Sumpheron* ... represents ... an evaluative mode of bringing conceptions of 'good' to bear on the situation of an individual agent or group: perceiving the good."[77] The advantageous is that which is in accordance with the common good because of the nature of universal humanity. It is impossible to have an individual good that is in conflict with the universal good because to act according to personal gain while violating the universal fellowship is to act "in defiance of Nature" and is an "injustice."[78] In Cicero, public and private interest coincide, allowing the person to act honorably and beneficially.

In 1 Cor. 12 Paul will similarly demonstrate that τὸ συμφέρον is that which reconciles individual and corporate interest. The remainder of the chapter is his explanation of how the beneficial must be understood in light of the whole community, the body of Christ.[79] The Corinthians are part of a new humanity, so their ethics

[75] Cicero, *Off.* 3.12.52.

[76] At one point Cicero explicitly connects *utilitas* and the body. He says in *De inventione* 1.56.168, in speaking about deliberative rhetoric, "Advantage lies either in the body (*in corpore*) or in things outside the body. By far the largest part of external advantages, however, results in advantage of the body. For example, in the state there are some things that, so to speak, pertain to the body politic (*ad corpus pertinent civitatis*), such as fields, harbours, money, a fleet, sailors, soldiers, and allies."

[77] Halliwell, "Popular Morality," 223–28. [78] Cicero, *Off.* 3.6.26.

[79] Since the Corinthians are still immature, as seen by their strife (3:1–5), it may be the case that Paul cannot begin by appealing to the higher motive of virtue, but rather to expediency. Cicero acknowledges the need to argue from expediency despite the primacy of moral worth. "In an advisory speech nothing is more desirable than dignity (*dignitas*); for a man who demands mere expediency does not see his adviser's main purpose but only his more immediate aim for the time being. For there is nobody ... who does not think that moral worth is the highest object of ambition ... But for the

flow out of this new, corporate identity, just as Cicero defines correct actions in reference to universal humanity.

The listing of gifts (12:8–11)

Paul continues in verses 8–11 with a list of various spiritual gifts which have been given for the Corinthians' benefit. As a concrete illustration of the "manifestations of the Spirit," the list is not exhaustive but representative. The way in which Paul constructs the list provides insight into the Corinthians' particular situation. "Speech" is a primary focus of the entire section on spiritual gifts (chs. 12–14). Paul opens with a description of the correct confession (12:1–3). Paul's direct address to the Corinthians in ch. 14 concerns two forms of speaking: prophecy and in tongues. In 12:8–11 he includes the gifts of prophecy and tongues, another gift related to speaking in tongues (interpretation of tongues) and describes two other gifts as "utterances" (the utterance of wisdom and the utterance of knowledge; λόγος σοφίας, λόγος γνώσεως). In 12:28–30, the corresponding list at the end of the chapter, he also mentions prophets and the gifts of tongues and the interpretation of tongues. In addition, he places tongues and the interpretation of tongues last in both lists. This most probably reflects his effort to deemphasize the gift.[80] Ch. 14 reveals that the Corinthians were probably exalting this gift over the others.

We may recall that in Stoicism the πνεῦμα, through *tonos*, was responsible for the differentiation of parts as well as the unity. Paul's πνεῦμα plays a similar role. The distinction of gifts (12:8–10) and the distinction of spiritually gifted people (12:28–30) is, of course, a primary topic of the chapter. The idea that the specific presence of the

most part expediency wins the day when there is a covert fear lest if expediency be neglected worth (*dignitatem*) will also have to be abandoned" (*De or*. 2.82.334). Cicero explains the different rhetorical strategies behind a speech guided primarily by expediency as opposed to one which appeals to moral worth. "The champion of expediency (*utilitatem*) will reel off a list of the advantages of peace and wealth and power and revenue and military strength and all the other things whose value we measure by expediency, and also the disadvantages of their opposites, whereas one who urges us on the path of moral worth (*dignitatem*) will collect examples of our ancestors' achievements that were glorious even though involving danger, and will magnify the value of an undying memory with posterity and maintain that glory engenders advantage and moral worth is invariably linked with it" (*De or*. 2.82.335).

[80] "Probably, since the Corinthians put a top priority on speaking in tongues, Paul puts this gift last and next to last (respectively) on the two lists on which it appears" (John Ruef, *Paul's First Letter to Corinth* [Philadelphia: Westminster, 1977] 128).

πνεῦμα in the person was responsible for distinct qualities may have led Paul to characterize the gifts as "manifestations" of the Spirit.

Overall, the argument in section A moves from the introduction of the theme of unity and diversity characterized by the three divine agents and the many gifts, services, and workings (vv. 4–6), to a focus upon the Spirit and the gifts. The gifts are given for what is "advantageous." In the following sections, he returns to God and Christ, explaining what "advantage" means in terms of the σῶμα Χριστοῦ and God's ἐκκλησία.

Comparison of Christ and a body (section B: 12:12–26)

Paul now explains that "advantage" is to be understood corporately, that is, according to the significance of being one body, the body of Christ. In 12:12–26 (section B), he does not mention the distributions of the Spirit, but rather focuses upon the image of the body. 12:12–13 presents the main idea of the section, the unity and diversity of the body of Christ. The remainder of the chapter, 12:14–26, explains and expands upon the idea of bodily diversity and unity.

Initial comparison (12:12)

In 12:12, Paul provides an analogy between a body and Christ. He makes two points, which he then applies to Christ: (1) the one body has many members (12:12a), and (2) the many members form one body (12:12b). Paul does not emphasize either diversity or unity, that is, one aspect over the other. Rather, the two statements *together* make a comprehensive description of the body/Christ as being both diversified and unified without necessarily giving priority to one aspect over the other. In other words, Paul simply states that as a body is characterized by both unity and diversity, so also is Christ. The passage could be rendered:

For just as (Καθάπερ)
the body is one and has many members,
and
all the members of the body, though many, are one body,
so (οὕτως)
it is with Christ (*that he is one and has many members*
and
all the members of his body, though many, are one body)

The paired comparative particles καθάπερ/οὕτως make the comparison clear: that which characterizes the body characterizes Christ. As noted in chapter 2, the rhetoricians often used particles such as ὥσπερ, οὕτως, καθάπερ, *ut* and *sic* to make comparisons. The paired use of particles was especially helpful in an extended comparison to help the orator highlight the main point of the comparison.[81] Thus, in the Menenius Agrippa fable, the orator summarizes his comparison of the state and the body by stating,

> Learn, therefore, plebeians, that, just as in our bodies (καθάπερ) the belly thus evilly reviled by the multitude nourishes the body even while it is itself nourished ... so (οὕτως) in commonwealths the senate, which administers the affairs of the public and provides what is expedient for everyone, preserves, guards, and corrects all things.[82]

Agrippa has compared the body to the commonwealth throughout the fable, but he finishes his speech by making clear an explicit point of comparison between the two through the use of καθάπερ/οὕτως: the Senate is like the belly in nourishing the "body" through its administrative role.

In a similar way, 12:12 states the main point of the comparison, that is, how Christ is like a body. As will be shown below, the rest of the section, 12:14–26, will expand upon the comparison and explain in greater detail what the two aspects of being a body – unity and diversity – entail. Paul does not at this point say that Christ/the church is a body, but that Christ is like a body and so exhibits these two primary qualities.

However, the phrase "so it is with Christ," is unexpected and significant. As several commentators have noted, it would have been more logical for Paul to conclude, "so it is with the church."[83] The reference to Christ in 12:12 may be metonymy.[84] Still, why does

[81] The paired use of particles would have been a helpful signal to the main point of the orator's composition. The use of such particles would help to provide balance and rhythm to aid in retention. As Walter Ong states, the key to retaining thought in an oral culture is "Think memorable thoughts" (*Orality and Literacy* [London: Methuen, 1982] 34). Whereas the detailed parallel would vividly depict the comparison to the audience, the orator could also state the main point in a succinct statement signaled by the particles.

[82] Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. rom.* 6.86.5.

[83] Barrett, *Corinthians*, 287. Carson comments, "The metaphor takes a strange twist at the end of the verse" (*Spirit*, 42).

[84] E.g. Fee, *Corinthians*, 603.

Paul make this statement? The question is not whether Paul has the believers in mind – the "we" (ἡμεῖς) in verse 13 answers that question, but why he refers to Christ and not the church directly at this point. If he had simply wanted to encourage cooperation, it would have been enough to apply the comparison in a generic fashion – as the parts of the body need to work together, so do the members of the Christian community. Paul draws attention to the connection between Christ and the Corinthians. In this way, the identification of the Corinthians with Christ appears to be a significant part of his strategy.

The relationship between Christ and the believers and the implications of this relationship appear in other parts of 1 Corinthians as well. In these passages, Paul describes how the Corinthians' behavior affects not only each other, but also Christ. Some, such as Conzelmann, suggest that Paul's rhetorical question in 1 Cor. 1:13, "Has Christ been divided?" could prefigure the church as the body of Christ in ch. 12.[85] In 6:12–20, Paul warns against prostitution on the grounds that the Corinthians' bodies are "members of Christ" which should not be made "members of a prostitute." Whether or not this particular passage reflects the corporate body of Christ, the point is that Paul uses the Corinthians' relationship to Christ as the basis for ethical behavior. Additionally, in 8:12, he gives the principle for relating to weaker believers in terms of not sinning against Christ. Through this language Paul emphasizes that his instructions to the Corinthians are connected to their relationship with Christ.

His use of κοινων– terms also emphasizes the Corinthians' relationship with Christ. Although the meaning of the terms in reference to the assembly is highly debated, the basic meaning is "to share with someone in something."[86] In 1 Corinthians Paul especially utilizes the term and its cognates in regard to the relationship of the believers (or Israel) with Christ or a competing deity. In the thanksgiving he speaks of the Corinthians' being called into κοινωνίαν τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν (1:9). Here κοινωνία probably refers to the Corinthians' relationship both with Christ and, through Christ, with each other.[87] In 10:16 he speaks of the

[85] Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 35.

[86] F. Hauck, "κοινός, κτλ.," in *TDNT* III: 804. Similarly, J. Y. Campbell defines κοινωνός as "one who has *something* in common with *someone* else" ("Κοινωνία and Its Cognates in the New Testament," *JBL* 51 [1932] 353).

[87] Campbell suggests that the phrase may mean participation in the spiritual blessings available through Christ ("Κοινωνία," 380). Some scholars stress the

Lord's Supper as being κοινωνία in the body and blood of Christ. He uses the cognate term κοινωνός in terms of the sharing of Israel with the "altar" (θυσιαστηρίου)[88] and the warning not to be partners (κοινωνούς) with demons (10:18, 20). Thus, Paul continually points to the Corinthians' proper κοινωνία with Christ, in contrast to Israel's disobedience to YHWH, and he warns them against similarly falling into fellowship with demons.

The significance of Paul's explicit references to fellowship with Christ in 1 Corinthians is especially evident when comparing his uses of κοινων– terminology in his other letters. Nowhere else does he specifically mention "sharing" with Christ, or with God, or demons. Rather, he speaks of "sharing" in other, related aspects of the believer's life in Christ. For example, in Phil. 3:10 he speaks of participating in Christ's sufferings, and in Phil. 2:1 and 2 Cor. 13:13 he mentions the fellowship of the Spirit. The other passages generally refer to contributing to the needs of the saints or the poor (Rom. 12:13; 15:26), partnership with Paul (Gal. 6:6; Phil. 4:15; 2 Cor. 1:7; 8:23; Phlm. 17), partnership in the gospel (Phil. 1:5), sharing in spiritual blessings (Rom. 15:27), and so on. The passages do not focus attention on the believers' relationship with Christ himself as in 1 Corinthians.

We have already seen that Paul introduces the discussion on spiritual gifts with the Spirit-enabled proclamation of Jesus as Lord (12:1–3). Now in 12:12 he again identifies the Corinthians with Christ. In the next verse (12:13), Paul goes even further by stating

Corinthians' relationship to Christ. "The calling *to* Christ is a calling to be in *fellowship with Christ* through the Spirit ... Thus in all likelihood this language is to be understood not only positionally, but also relationally" (Fee, *Corinthians*, 45; see also G. Panikulam, *Koinonia in the New Testament, a Dynamic Expression of Christian Life* [AnBib 85; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1979] 13–15). But this does not mean that fellowship among the Corinthians themselves is excluded. Rather, both senses may be in view here. As P. T. O'Brien states, "One corollary of the Corinthians' participation in God's Son is that they have been called into a community in which they are 'brethren' who stand under the Lordship of Christ." He further points out that Paul's reference to factionalism in the following verse (1:10) is another indication the Corinthians' *koinonia* is both horizontal and vertical (*Introductory Thanksgivings in the Letters of Paul* [Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1977] 132; Witherington, *Corinth*, 89–90; Hauck, "κοινός, κτλ.," 804).

[88] Paul probably means that the Israelites were "sharers in the altar," instead of "altar" being a circumlocution for God (Campbell, "Κοινωνία," 376; Wendell Lee Willis, *Idol Meat at Corinth* [Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1985] 184–88; in opposition to H. Gressman, "Ν ΚΟΙΝΩΝΙΑ ΤΩΝ ΔΑΙΜΟΝΙΩΝ," *ZNW* 20 [1921] 224–30). But as in 1:9, the κοινωνία is both vertical and horizontal. "Israel as κοινωνοὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου refers to [the Corinthians'] relationship as worshippers bound together in common sacrifice to YHWH" (Willis, *Corinth*, 187).

that Christ/the Corinthians are not only *like* a body in having unity and diversity, but *are* a body in the Spirit. Christ's Lordship over the Corinthians is now seen in the implications of their being his body.

Being a body (12:13)

Up to this point, Paul has only compared Christ/the church with a body. In the next statement, introduced by γάρ, he explains why the comparison is valid.[89] In the Spirit, the Corinthians actually are a body: "For in one Spirit we were all baptized into one body." 12:13, then, provides a pivotal point in Paul's argument. Christ/the church is *like* a body (v. 12) because they *are* a body (v. 13). Furthermore, this bodily existence is another aspect of the Spirit's role.

Thus, Paul uses the image of the human body to describe the body of Christ.[90] Understanding 12:12–13 entails seeing this double use of σῶμα. Seneca's use of *corpus* in the following passage provides an example of how this could be done:

> The goods of the body are bodily (*Quae corporis bona sunt, corpora sunt*); so therefore must be the goods of the soul. For the soul, too, is corporeal (*corpus*).[91]

[89] Cicero demonstrates how comparisons were often followed by an explanation introduced by γάρ or *nam*. "Suppose, by way of comparison (*ut*), that each of our bodily members should conceive this idea and imagine that it could be strong and well if it should draw off to itself the health and strength of its neighbouring member, the whole body would necessarily be enfeebled and die; so (*sic*), if each one of us should seize upon the property of his neighbours and take from each whatever he could appropriate to his own use, the bonds of human society must inevitably be annihilated. For (*Nam*), without any conflict with Nature's laws, it is granted that everybody may prefer to secure for himself rather than for his neighbour what is essential for the conduct of life; but Nature's laws do forbid us to increase our means, wealth, and resources by despoiling others" (Cicero, *Off*. 3.5.21–22). For another example, Philo states, "And just as (ὥσπερ) diseases of the creeping type, if not arrested in time by the knife or cautery, course round all that unites to make the body and leave no part uninjured, so (οὕτως) unless philosophical reasoning, like a good physician, checks the stream of desire, all life's affairs will be necessarily distorted from what nature prescribes. For (γάρ) there is nothing so secreted that it escapes from passion, which when once it finds itself in security and freedom spreads like a flame and works universal destruction" (*Decal*. 150).

[90] Paul may also have the understanding of Christ being a body in 12:12b. Conzelmann notes a break between 12a and 12b, in which Paul turns from talking about the human body, which is one though it is composed of many parts, and the body which is Christ, into which the Corinthians have been baptized in the Spirit. He states, "the *figure* of *one* body seems to be replaced by the thing itself, *the* body of Christ" (*1 Corinthians*, 211).

[91] Seneca, *Ep*. 106.4–5.

Corpus refers to the human body as distinct from the soul, but it also describes a state of existence since the soul exists as a "body." Seneca can describe both the "body" and the soul as being bodily or corporeal. Paul has moved from σῶμα as the basis for an analogy for describing the composition of Christ/the church to σῶμα as a statement of the Corinthians' new state of being. As Robinson states, "Paul uses the analogy of the human body to elucidate his teaching that Christians form Christ's body."[92]

Interpreting 1 Cor. 12 entails seeing both aspects: comparison with a body and identification as a body. Just as Paul explicitly calls Christ/the church a body, so does Seneca state that the principle for social ethics is that humanity is "one great body."[93] Seneca says the identification of humanity in this way provides the basic "rule" for social ethics. Paul's identification of Christ/the church as a body is also a foundational principle that he will use for his ethics in regard to the use of gifts in the community.

In addition, the statement that the believers are a body makes Paul's puzzling use of "Christ" rather than "the church" in 12:12 even more significant. According to Aristotle, "In the state it is the sovereign that is held in the fullest sense to *be* the state, and in any other composite whole it is the dominant part that is deemed especially to be that whole."[94] We have seen that Seneca says both that Nero is the one who leads Rome and ensures her safety[95] and that Rome is his body.[96] The identification of a person with a body (or simply the state) is a statement of that person's leadership of the body (or state). This highlights the significance of the confession in 12:3 since we now see that Jesus' Lordship is manifested in his rulership over his body. While the use of "Christ" rather than the "church" may have seemed odd initially, it now appears to be crucial for Paul to move beyond use of the analogy of the body as a way of describing the function of the believers to a statement of the Corinthians' identity as the body of their Lord.

Another implication of the verse is that it makes yet another connection between the Spirit and Christ as well as Christ and the

[92] Robinson, *Body*, 51. Similarly Herbert Gale states, "Christian community . . . is not *like a* body; it *is* a body. This does not alter the fact, however, that Paul nevertheless draws a comparison between the two (actual) bodies – the human body and the body of Christ" (*The Use of Analogy in the Letters of Paul* [Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1964] 117).

[93] Seneca, *Ep.* 95.52. [94] *Eth. nic.* 9.8.6.

[95] Seneca, *Clem.* 1.3.5. [96] Seneca, *Clem.* 1.5.1.

Corinthians. Whereas Paul begins the chapter by stating that the spiritual person is the one who declares Jesus as Lord, now this person is the one who belongs to the Lord's body. It is in this context that one understands the spiritual manifestations.

More importantly, it is in the Spirit that Christ/the church can be one body. Paul refers to the result of the Spirit's work ontologically, citing the Spirit's agency in causing the believers to become parts of the body. This ontological implication is similar to that in Stoic physics, where only those bodies held together by a pervasive πνεῦμα can rightly be called unified bodies. For Paul as in the Stoics, πνεῦμα is essential for authentic bodily existence.

Paul additionally describes the role of the Spirit in terms of baptism and drinking. It is particularly enlightening to analyze how Paul uses this sacramental language to define the community, especially in regard to previous uses in the epistle. In both 1 Cor. 12:13 and 10:2 Paul uses baptismal language in a strikingly similar way to define the respective communities of the church and Israel.

10:2 καὶ **πάντες εἰς** τὸν Μωϋσῆν ἐβαπτίσθησαν **ἐν** τῇ νεφέλῃ καὶ
ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ,

12:13 καὶ γὰρ **ἐν** ἑνὶ πνεύματι ἡμεῖς **πάντες εἰς** ἓν σῶμα
ἐβαπτίσθημεν,
εἴτε Ἰουδαῖοι εἴτε Ἕλληνες,
εἴτε δοῦλοι εἴτε ἐλεύθεροι,

In 10:2 "all" (πάντες) Israel was baptized into Moses. In 12:13 "all" (πάντες) believers are baptized into one body, that is, Christ.[97] Both groups are also baptized "in" (ἐν) something: Israel in the cloud and in the sea, and the believers "in" the Spirit.[98]

[97] Most probably, the reference to baptism "into Moses" means "sharing the destiny of a leader." As Barrett points out, there is no Jewish parallel, and the phrase was perhaps composed by Paul on the basis of the formula "into Christ." Consequently, there is no need to try to explain "into Christ" on the basis of a parallel Jewish formula "into Moses" (*Corinthians*, 221). Similarly, G. R. Beasley-Murray states, "Baptism 'to Moses' is modeled on baptism 'to Christ' (εἰς Χριστόν); the latter is the clue to understanding the former, not vice versa" (*Baptism in the New Testament* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981] 185).

[98] In 12:13a Paul indicates that the Spirit is the location in which the Corinthians become one body. Carson notes that in the New Testament, whenever ἐν is used with "baptize," it never expresses the agent of baptism (*Spirit*, 47. E.g. Luke 3:16, where John the Baptist compares his baptism ὕδατι with Jesus' ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρί). Fee notes that "in the Spirit" is locative, since nowhere else in the New Testament does this dative imply agency (*Corinthians*, 605). I would add that the parallel sentence in

Both passages use baptism to indicate the group's corporate identity. In ch. 10 baptism is something "all" Israel undergoes, an inclusive concept which contrasts the failure of some to refrain from idolatry (12:5–10). In ch. 12 all the believers have been baptized, and their baptism ἐν ἑνὶ πνεύματι makes them one body.

Paul goes on in both cases to speak of drinking as something that is also shared by "all" the members of the respective communities:

10:3 καὶ **πάντες** τὸ αὐτὸ **πνευματικὸν** βρῶμα ἔφαγον,
10:4 καὶ **πάντες** τὸ αὐτὸ **πνευματικὸν** ἔπιον πόμα·

12:13c καὶ **πάντες** ἓν **πνεῦμα** ἐποτίσθημεν.

The Israelites "all" (πάντες) shared in the eating and drinking of spiritual food and drink.[99] In 12:13 the Corinthians were "all" given to drink of the one Spirit.[100] While there is no mention of spiritual food here, Paul has mentioned in 10:17 that the Corinthians "all" (πάντες) partake of the one bread.[101] As a result, both communities,

10:2 of Israel's baptism "in the cloud and in the sea" would indicate location as opposed to agency. Whether or not baptism in the cloud and in the sea is meant sacramentally (e.g. Barrett, *Corinthians*, 221) or typologically (e.g. Fee, *Corinthians*, 445), it provides further evidence that baptism ἐν refers to location or sphere and not agency. Therefore, Paul's statement can be understood as "The Spirit is the element in (ἐν) which the baptism takes place, and the one body is the end to (εἰς) which the act is directed" (Robertson and Plummer, *Corinthians*, 272).

[99] This is also probably a type of the Lord's Supper (Fee, *Corinthians*, 446–47) or, as Conzelmann states, a "prefiguration" (*1 Corinthians*, 166).

[100] The term ποτίζω in 12:13 is the causative of πίνω, which Paul uses in reference to the Lord's Supper in 11:17–34 and Israel's spiritual drinking in 10:3–4. According to BAGD, the word can mean "to give to drink," or "to water." The latter is often used in terms of animals or plants. Paul knows both uses. He applies the first definition in 1 Cor. 3:2, and as an agricultural metaphor in 1 Cor. 3:6–8. But Paul uses the term in the sense of causing to drink in 12:13. G. J. Cuming argues for the definition "we were watered" as a reference to water being poured over the convert at baptism ("ΕΠΟΤΙΣΘΗΜΕΝ (1 Corinthians 12,13)," *NTS* 27 [1981] 205). Others see a pouring out in reference to the Spirit (Rudolf Schnackenburg, *Baptism in the Thought of St. Paul*, trans. G. R. Beasley-Murray [New York: Herder and Herder, 1964] 84–86; James D. G. Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit* [London: SCM Press, 1970] 130–31; Ralph P. Martin, *The Spirit and the Congregation: Studies in 1 Corinthians 12–15* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984] 24). A primary argument in favor of the translation "watered" or "poured out" is the Hebrew Bible motif of the "pouring out" of the eschatological Spirit, as in Isa. 29:10. See also E. R. Rogers, "ΕΠΟΤΙΣΘΗΜΕΝ Again," *NTS* 29 (1983) 139–42. Witherington suggests that the verse creates both external and internal images: "The Spirit works on believers to unite them to the body and works in them as an ongoing source of life and spiritual sustenance" (*Corinth*, 258).

[101] Paul also presupposes the importance of the unified community in the Lord's Supper in 11:17–34. He calls the bread Christ's body and the cup the new covenant. He warns the Corinthians not to partake of the Lord's Supper "in an unworthy manner" (11:27), which means not dividing the eschatological community according to

Israel and Christ's body, consist of those who have partaken of spiritual sustenance.[102]

Fee states that the two clauses referring to baptism and drinking are an example of Semitic parallelism, and so they make the same point. Therefore, since the second clause is metaphorical, the first is equally metaphorical rather than "literal."[103] But I would also suggest that the issue is not so much whether the clauses are to be understood "literally" or metaphorically. Rather, their significance lies in their sacramental connotations because of the way the sacraments define the community of God. In other words, it is the social significance of the language as related to the sacraments rather than the actual sacramental value of the actions described which is important for understanding the text.

The socializing function of such language would be to identify the Corinthians as a new covenant community, providing another way for Paul to mark the boundaries of the group. As will be explained in more detail in the following chapter, Paul has been marking the boundaries of the group since the beginning of the letter, when he identifies the believing community as those who are able to understand Christ as the wisdom and power of God, in distinction from the Jew and Gentiles, who cannot (1:18–2:16).

Furthermore, Paul may not only be referring to the Corinthian community but also be stating a general principle of unity, which he then applies to the Corinthian congregation. One cannot say that σῶμα strictly defines the Corinthian community only. Strikingly, Paul both includes (12:13 – ἡμεῖς, "we") and excludes (12:27 – ὑμεῖς, "you") himself from the "body," indicating that he exercises flexibility in his references to the body. In section B (12:12–26), which contains Paul's general description of the body, he uses "body" to

conventional status and socioeconomic distinctions. See, e.g., Witherington, *Corinth*, 241–52; S. C. Barton, "Paul's Sense of Place: An Anthropological Approach to Community Formation in Corinth," *NTS* 32 (1986) 225–46; Theissen, *Pauline Christianity*, 145–74; Meeks, *Urban Christians*, 67–70, 157–62; Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 533–57. One difficulty in identifying 12:13b with the Lord's Supper is the reference to drinking only, and not eating. But Paul has already mentioned the unifying effect of the bread in 1 Cor. 10:17, where the Corinthians also become one body through the partaking of the one bread. Thus, the overall rhetorical effect of the passages (10:2–4; 10:17; 12:13) is to associate unity with "spiritual" food and drink.

[102] Interestingly, Paul identifies both communities in close relationship to God, Christ, and the Spirit in ch. 10 as well as in ch. 12. Israel eats and drinks *spiritual* food and drink, receives spiritual drink from the rock which is *Christ*, but *God* is not pleased with them (10:1–5).

[103] Fee, *Corinthians*, 604–605. Dunn, *Baptism*, 127–31; Talbert, "1 Corinthians 12–14," 95–108.

speak of an inclusive body of all believers, and in section A′ when he returns to the topic of spiritual gifts, he speaks of a more specific body of Christ comprising the Corinthian congregation.

W. Wuellner's study on the typology of audiences/readers using modern rhetorical theory will be helpful in understanding the communicative dynamics of Paul's change in referents. Wuellner has argued that Paul uses the second person when addressing his "empirical audience"[104] but the third person or "we" referent when speaking of the "universal audience."[105] One of the primary differences is in the function of the arguments to "persuade" or to "convince." The appeal to the empirical audience uses arguments which are only valid for the real readers and is aimed at persuasion to a course of action.[106] In contrast, one who appeals to the universal audience aims to convince people of a truth by appealing to common sense and timeless truths and values.[107] Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca explain, "Argumentation addressed to a universal audience must convince the reader that the reasons adduced are of a compelling character, that they are self-evident, and possess an absolute and timeless validity, independent of local or historical contingencies."[108]

Wuellner does not deal with verse 13, since his study is on rhetorical questions only. But he does view the questions in 12:15–19 as aimed at a universal audience.[109] Paul attempts to convince the universal audience through an appeal to a cultural value. Wuellner,

[104] W. Wuellner defines the empirical audience as the historical Corinthians or the "real reader of any given time." These are the people to whom a writer or speaker, like Paul, must adapt ("Paul as Pastor. The Function of Rhetorical Questions in First Corinthians," *L'apôtre Paul: personnalité, style, et conception du ministère*, ed. A. Vanhoye [Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1986] 54–55; Ch. Perelman and L. Olbrechts-Tyteca, *The New Rhetoric*, trans. John Wilkinson and Purcell Weaver [Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1969] 19).

[105] "This type of reader is envisioned by Paul, whenever he addresses explicitly or implicitly all believers, or the church at large" (Wuellner, "Paul," 56; Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, *New Rhetoric*, 31–35; Ch. Perelman, *The Realm of Rhetoric*, trans. William Kluback [Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1982] 17–18).

[106] Wuellner, "Paul," 54; Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, *New Rhetoric*, 29.

[107] Perelman puts the philosopher in this category. He states, "[The philosopher] searches for facts, truths, and universal values that, even if all the members of the universal audience do not explicitly adhere to them – an impossibility – are nevertheless supposed to compel the assent of every sufficiently enlightened human being. Thus the philosopher appeals to common sense or common opinion, to intuition or to self-evidence, presuming that each member of the universal audience is part of the community to which he alludes, sharing the same intuitions and self-evident truths" (*Realm of Rhetoric*, 17).

[108] Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, *New Rhetoric*, 32.

[109] Wuellner, "Paul," 57.

therefore, observes, as I do, that Paul is referring to the universal audience of the entire body of Christ rather than the Corinthian congregation only. Furthermore, Paul's universal arguments are not geared to influence behavior, but to influence perspective. Paul is using a general argument about the unified nature of the body of Christ in section B as a model for the specific body of Christ in Corinth in sections A (12:4–11) and A′ (12:27–30).

It should be kept in mind, however, that Wuellner and Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca are using modern definitions of "persuade" and "convince." The ancient rhetoricians would probably not have made the same distinction.[110] Thus, I would argue that rather than "you" being an indication of a persuasive strategy and "we" an attempt to convince, Paul uses a universal argument in 12:13 as an illustration of a larger truth in order to support a point he wants to apply to his empirical audience. Wuellner's overall point, that third person and "we" referents make an appeal to a universal audience, is helpful for understanding the difference between the two references to the body of Christ in 12:12–26 and 12:27–30. The Spirit unites all believers into the body, transcending social and ethnic distinctions of slave/free and Jew/Greek. In the same way, the Corinthians are to see their different gifts as also being aspects of this transcendent unity.

Paul takes the truth as seen in the universal body of Christ ("For in the one Spirit we were all baptized into one body," v. 13) and applies it to the specific body of Christ in Corinth ("Now you are the body of Christ," v. 27). He uses the language with some flexibility according to his purpose. He can say that he and the Corinthians are all parts of the body of Christ when he wants to demonstrate the general unifying work of the Spirit (12:13). But he can also say that the Corinthians are the body of Christ to emphasize the need to maintain their unity as a local congregation in regard to the use of spiritual gifts (12:27). In other words, by demonstrating the bodily unity of believers through the Spirit (12:12–26), he can then apply the idea to the Corinthian congregation (12:27–30).

Such comparisons between the macrocosmic and the microcosmic were common in antiquity.[111] We recall the ease with which the

[110] The goal of rhetoric was simply persuasion, whether to a course of action or to a truth (Aristotle, *Rhet*. 1.2.1).

[111] I. e. Plato's comparison between a human being and the state (*Resp*. 434–35; 441; 462 C, D; 544D, E; 556E; 576C; 557D; 580D, E; *Leg*. 628D; 636A; 735D; 829A; 906C; 964D–965A; *Tim*. 30B; 39E). Others compared the cosmos and the state (Aelius

Stoics would move between universal humanity and the state, such as when Epictetus says that the state is a "small copy" of the universal state.[112] In a similar manner, Seneca says there are "two commonwealths," the first "a vast and truly common state, which embraces alike gods and men," and the second, any city "that belongs, not to all, but to some particular race of men."[113]

Thus, it is not difficult to imagine that Paul moves from the universal to the specific body of Christ of the Corinthian congregation. The Corinthian body would similarly be a "small" copy of the macrocosmic body of Christ. The unity of the universal body of Christ, joined in the Spirit, establishes a new set of relationships among the parts, which Paul can apply to the Corinthian congregation struggling with the issue of spiritual gifts.

That Paul speaks of the general nature of the unified body is further supported by the way in which he speaks of baptism effecting a unity that transcends traditional ethnic and social distinctions. He does not speak of the relationship between bodily unity and spiritual gifts at this point, but rather the oneness of the body composed of Jews and Greeks, slaves and free. Paul uses a baptismal formula that declares the believers' unity in Christ,[114] which Wayne Meeks has argued reflects a reunified humanity.[115] This is further reflected in Paul's comments in 1 Cor. 15. Although the Corinthians are a part of

Aristides, *Concerning Concord* 23.77; Dio Chrysosotom, *Nicom.* 38.11; *Conc. Apam.* 40.35. Conger, *Theories*, 7–8; Eduard Schweizer, "σῶμα, κτλ.," in *TDNT* VII: 1028–32; D. Martin, *Body*, 40–41).

[112] *Diatr.* 2.5.24–28. See chapter 4 above. [113] Seneca, *Otio* 4.1.

[114] The baptismal formula in Galatians also maintains that this distinction is "in Christ Jesus." Likewise, the use of the formula in Col. 3:11 is in the context of the believer's new existence in Christ. Similar formulas are found in both Jewish and Greco-Roman literature. Hermippus refers a similar saying to Thales (sixth century BCE), who states that he is grateful for three things, "that I was born a human being and not one of the brutes; next that I was born a man and not a woman; thirdly a Greek and not a barbarian" (Diogenes Laertius, *Vit. phil.* 1.33). The saying is also attributed to Plato (Plutarch, *Mar.* 46.1; Lactantius, *Inst.* 3.19.17). The affirmation corresponds to a Jewish formula in which the male Jew thanks God that he was not made a Gentile, a slave, or a woman (*The Authorised Daily Prayer Book*, trans. S. Singer [New York: Bloch Publishing Co., 1962] 6–7). The thanksgiving can be traced back to R. Judah b. Elai, *c.* 150 CE (*t.Ber.* 7.18) or his contemporary R. Me'ir (*b.Men.* 43b). For a summary of the proposed "sources," see Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979) 184–85. For the argument that Gal. 3:27–28 and similarly 1 Cor. 12:13 as well as Col. 3:11 were part of the early Christian baptismal liturgy, see Betz, *Galatians*, 181–85; Wayne A. Meeks, "The Image of the Androgyne: Some Uses of a Symbol in Earliest Christianity," *HR* 13 (1974) 165–208.

[115] See Meeks, "Image." Robin Scroggs states, "Certainly baptism is that event in which the believer, by participating in the resurrection of Christ, enters the new creation" (*The Last Adam* [London: Basil Blackwell, 1966] 108).

all humanity in being descended from the first Adam, they also belong to Christ, the last Adam (15:45). Through Christ the Corinthians gain life (15:22, 50–57), as opposed to death for those who are descended only through the first Adam (15:22).[116] Whereas the Stoics considered the unity of humanity to be bodily through πνεῦμα, for Paul the new humanity in Christ is a body through the Spirit.

Finally, it is important to note that even though 1 Cor. 12:13 defines the solidarity of the community in several ways, Paul maintains some important distinctions. Paul states that whether one is "Jew or Greek, slave or free," all belong to one body. But the seeming irrelevance of these distinctions stands in contrast to his earlier statements. He distinguishes between Jew and Greek in his discussion about wisdom (1:22–25). In 7:17–24 he says that the call of God transcends circumcision and slavery, but he does not deny the existence of either, nor call for their eradication.

On the surface, Paul's position appears contradictory because he both makes distinctions irrelevant and maintains them. However, Stoicism similarly spoke of the unity of humanity in a way that transcended traditional racial and status distinctions but did not advocate overturning the current social order.[117] As discussed above, the Stoic concept of the unity of humanity was not intended

[116] Paul makes a similar point in Rom. 5:12–21, where Adam's transgression leads to sin and death, but Christ's obedience leads to righteousness and life.

[117] The Stoics have been criticized for not working for practical equality among people. Brunt, for example, speaks of the inconsistency of "the Stoic belief in the common humanity of all men, irrespective of their status," which nevertheless resulted in "their failure to challenge the institution of slavery, or indeed to promote strict equality before the law among free men" ("Stoicism," 26). But it must be kept in mind that within the Stoic system, internal acceptance of the universal order, and not external change, was the key to the happy life. The proper application of reason involved the correct discernment of the providential order of the world, not a reform of the world. The Stoics did not abolish slavery because their view of determinism and providence concluded that slavery was a part of the universal order. This was possible because the good of the individual was identical to the good of the whole. As A. A. Long explains, "From (the principle of determinism) . . . it follows that the state of the world at any one time 'had to be' just as it is. There was no way, given the antecedent conditions, that life would not be lush in California and harsh in Ethiopia. From (the principle of providence) . . . it follows that the state of the world at any one time is the best possible. This may not be apparent from the viewpoint of the Ethiopians, but if it were possible for a human being to observe the global economy from the divine perspective, reason would constrain him or her to acknowledge the fact . . . In order to develop a theory of happiness which does justice to both of these principles, the Stoics need to show that the good for man is entirely compatible with the way things are" ("Stoic Eudaimonism," in *Proceedings of the Boston Area Colloquium in Ancient Philosophy*, vol. IV, ed. John J. Cleary [Lanham: University Press of America, 1988)] 90). Therefore, Stoicism did less to influence the current social structures than to teach

to produce structural change within the current social system. Rather it provided a means for a person to achieve happiness no matter what one's circumstances were.

The Stoics' unity was a oneness that pronounced all humans part of the whole by virtue of their participation in reason. As a result, all people had certain ethical obligations to take care of the whole, which meant each other. In this way the concept of universal humanity was used as the basis for determining proper human behavior.

For the Stoics, happiness consisted of living in harmony with the universal order, not changing the social structure, and all were subject to this universal order in determining their obligations. Whatever one's role in life, one must perform that function according to nature, specifically as related to the whole. Likewise Paul's comments about all being of the one body "whether Jew or Greek, slave or free," describe the unified nature of the believers' existence as Christ's body and so the necessity of seeing their social ethics as that which relates properly to the whole. In this context the traditional distinctions of Jew/Greek and slave/free are less relevant than the immediate contribution and belonging of each member to the whole.

In 12:12–13 Paul makes his initial statement on corporate life in Christ, reflecting the believers' eschatological existence in the Spirit. He compares Christ/the church with a body and says that they are both many and one. Then he says the comparison is valid because Christ/the church is a body. In what follows in verses 14–26, Paul presents an extended description of a human body, thus providing the means for the Corinthians to understand in more detail the nature of their bodily unity and diversity.

Extended description of the body (12:14–26)

Paul now expands upon what bodily existence is. We have seen that each orator could modify the image according to a particular goal. Likewise Paul develops the image according to his specific purpose. In his initial statement of the analogy, he presents diversity and unity as two key characteristics of a body. Now he explains in greater detail and through various illustrations how these aspects are seen in the

people how to behave within these structures. Seneca described the function of precepts as advising, for example, "how a husband should conduct himself towards his wife, or how a father should bring up his children, or how a master should rule his slaves" (*Ep.* 94.1). See also Reydams-Schils, *Roman Stoics*, for the Stoics' use of the self as a mediator between philosophical norms and the society.

body. In other words, 12:14–26 develops his main point from 12:12–13 that the body is both many and one.

According to the author of *Ad Herennium*, the functions of comparison are "to embellish or prove or clarify or vivify." These four aims have four corresponding types of presentation: contrast, negation, abridged comparison, and detailed parallel.[118] A comparison used for vividness is set forth as a detailed parallel.[119] In a detailed parallel, the rhetorician embellishes both terms to "set the subject vividly before the eyes of all."[120]

The passage on Rome as the body of Nero in *De clementia* would probably fall under the category of a detailed parallel. Seneca, in describing the body of Rome as the servant of Nero, the mind and soul, goes into an extended description of the sacrifices the people would make to protect their leader, just as the parts of the body would sacrifice themselves to protect the mind.[121] He makes the point to illustrate the intimate connections between the parts and their leader, so he can later make his more practical point that if they are so connected, then Nero should show mercy to the parts of his body.

In 12:14–26, Paul presents the diversity and unity of the body "vividly" before his audience. After this he can make his more explicit identification of the Corinthians as Christ's body (12:27) and his specific point about how this type of existence applies to the proper use of prophecy and speaking in tongues in the assembly.

First example: 12:14–19 and the diversity of the one body

As argued above, in 12:12 Paul explicitly states that two characteristic aspects of the body are the diversity of members (12a) and unity (12b) and that these two aspects together describe the body. Now Paul

[118] *Rhet. Her.* 4.45.59.

[119] *Rhet. Her.* 4.47.60. Although the author earlier identifies "to clarify" with detailed parallel, and "to vivify" with abridged comparison, the subsequent presentation discusses clarity with the abridged form and "to vivify" with detailed parallel. "[Comparison] is used to embellish or prove or clarify or vivify (*aut ornandi causa aut probandi aut apertius dicendi aut ante oculos ponendi*). Furthermore, in correspondence to these four aims, it has four forms of presentation: Contrast, Negation, Detailed Parallel, Abridged Comparison (*per contrarium, per negationem, per conlationem, per brevitatem*)" (*Rhet. Her.* 4.45.59). But the author later states, "A Comparison will be used also for greater clarity (*apertius dicendi*) – the presentation being in abridged form (*per brevitatem*)," and "A Comparison will be used for vividness (*oculos ponendi*), and be set forth in the form of a detailed parallel (*per conlationem*)" (*Rhet. Her.* 4.47.60).

[120] *Rhet. Her.* 4.47.60. [121] Seneca, *Clem.* 1.3.5.

launches into a more detailed description of these two aspects. Verses 14–19 discuss the significance of diversity and verses 20–26 the implications of unity. In this way, the two parts of the initial comparison between Christ and a body are the programmatic statements which Paul further develops through his description of the body.[122]

In 12:12a, the first part of the initial comparison, Paul focuses on the fact that the one body has many members:

> Καθάπερ γὰρ τὸ σῶμα ἕν ἐστιν καὶ μέλη πολλὰ ἔχει

Similarly, in 12:14 Paul emphasizes that the body is characterized by having many members:

> καὶ γὰρ τὸ σῶμα οὐκ ἔστιν ἕν μέλος ἀλλὰ πολλά.

Following this observation, which is essentially a restatement of 12:12a, he continues in 12:15–19 to show the implications of the many-membered body. The foot does not need to be a hand, nor the ear an eye, in order to be a part of the body (12:15–16).[123] Paul's rationale is that the body needs a variety of parts. If all were one part, important functions would be absent (12:17).

The idea that each has a distinctive function was common in rhetoric. Agrippa's fable, for example, deals with the necessary role of the belly.[124] In the following passage, Dio Chrysostom argues that one should not attempt to perform the function of another member:

> [The eyes] believed themselves to be the most important organs of the body, and yet they observed that it was the mouth that got the benefit of most things and in particular of honey ... So they were angry and even found fault with their owner. But when he placed in them some of the honey, they smarted and wept and thought it a stinging, unpleasant substance. Therefore, do not you yourselves seek to taste the words that philosophy has to offer, as the eyes tasted honey; if you do ... not only will you be vexed when they cause a smart, but perhaps you will even say that such a thing cannot possibly be philosophy, but rather abuse and mischief.[125]

[122] This observation is similar to that of Matthias Walter, although he sees 12:12a as corresponding to 12:14–18 and 12:12b to 12:19–24 (*Gemeinde als Leib Christi* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001] 126–38).

[123] From a social aspect, this part of the image may reflect the voices of those in the congregation who believed their gifts were not as valuable as others.

[124] Aristotle, *Eth. nic.* 1.7.11–12. [125] Dio Chrysostom, *1 Tars.* 33.16.

Since each is designed for a particular role, every member and therefore every person should remain in their particular place and not try to fulfill a role that is not theirs. Paul also dwells upon the idea of the distinctive role of each member, stating that this variety is essential for the body to be complete.

Paul goes beyond function, however, by connecting identity with belonging to the body. He says that even if a member, because it disparages its own place in the body, believes that it does not belong to the body, it is not, by virtue of not believing this, any less a member of the body. For example, if the foot believes it does not belong because it is not a hand, it remains a member of body. Each is needed, but Paul emphasizes not only the necessity of diverse members, but also the fact that each belongs to the body, despite its evaluation of its role. All should recognize their identity as members of the one body.

For Epictetus as well, being a member of the body is an essential component of identity. He states,

> Do you not know that the foot, if detached, will no longer be a foot, so you too, if detached will no longer be a human being?[126]

Being a member of the body has more implications than simply describing one's function. He continues,

> If you regard yourself as a man and as a part of some whole, on account of that whole it is fitting for you now to be sick, and now to make a voyage and run risks, and now to be in want, and on occasion to die before your time ... Well, would you have someone else be sick of a fever now, someone else go on a voyage, someone else die, someone else be condemned? For it is impossible in such a body (σώματι) as ours, in this universe that envelops us, among these fellow-creatures of ours, that such things should not happen, some to one man and some to another."[127]

Epictetus describes the attachment of the individual member to the whole, which he describes as a body (σώματι). As a foot must be attached to the body to be a foot, so must a human being be attached to the universal body of humanity.

[126] Epictetus, *Diatr*. 2.5.24. [127] Epictetus, *Diatr*. 2.5.28.

For both Paul and Epictetus, one's being a member of the body and one's identity are integrally related. Epictetus says that one who is separated from the body ceases to be that part, thus stating the necessity of attachment and identity. Paul says that a member does not cease to belong to the body, no matter how that member considers itself. Paul is not commanding the members to perform their functions, but rather explaining identity as it is related to the members of the body which have different functions. In other words, his point is ontological, describing how they are to think of themselves as distinctive members of the one body, rather than functional, instructing them on what to do.

That Paul's point is ontological is further evident in what follows. In verse 17 he discusses how the whole body cannot be a single member (the eye) because then other functions would be missing (hearing, sense of smell). He then poses the rhetorical question, "If all were a single member, where would the body be?" (12:19). He does not say that the body would die, as in the Agrippa story when one member does not perform its function, but rather that without all of the parts, "It would simply not exist as a body."[128] The very existence of the body as a body depends upon having a variety of members.

Thus, in this first half of the extended comparison, Paul makes the point that each member performs a unique function. But more importantly, he illustrates that the implication of this uniqueness is that each must realize that it is a member of the body, no matter what its function or its assessment of the value of its function, and that variety is important for the sake of the body to be a body. Paul's concern for diversity in these verses is essentially a statement on the nature of the existence of the body and the members that belong to it.

Paul continues by explaining, "But as it is, God arranged the members in the body, each one of them, as he chose." Paul's statement challenges the Corinthians to see that their place is the result of God's activity. In 12:24b he further explains that God's arrangement is for the purpose of precluding dissension and promoting mutual care instead.[129] In 12:28 Paul brings up the idea again, this time in reference to God's appointment of various members in the church,

[128] Barrett, *Corinthians*, 290.

[129] When Paul says in 12:24a that God "arranged" (συνεκέρασεν) the body, he could also mean "mixed" or "blended"(LSJ, BAGD). Marcus Aurelius uses the term in reference to the blending of humanity by nature. "Nature did not make so intimate a blend (συνεκέρασε) in the compound as not to allow a man to isolate himself and keep his own things in his own power" (*Med.* 7.67).

pointedly mentioning tongues last while giving a prominent place to prophets.

As discussed in the previous chapter, the Stoics believed that "God" arranged the universe. "God's" role as "organizer" or "craftsman" reflected the universe's existence as an orderly, functioning whole. As a result, each part was considered in terms of the connections to other parts and to the whole. Although Paul is not referring to causality, nonetheless for him God's role in arranging means that the Corinthians need to see themselves in terms of the whole. Thus, they are to understand their gifts not according to their personal benefit alone, but in regard to their placement in the one body. For both the Stoics and Paul, God's role in arranging the members reflects their existence as members of one body.

Second example: 12:20–26 and the unity of the body

In 12:20–26 Paul expands upon the second part of the comparison presented in 12:12, the unity of the body. Once again, his point is not so much to prescribe specific actions as to describe the nature of the unified body and the relationships among the members.

The second part of the initial comparison in 12:12b states:

> πάντα δὲ τὰ μέλη τοῦ σώματος (πολλὰ ὄντα) ἕν ἐστιν σῶμα

Paul then says in 12:20:

> νῦν δὲ πολλὰ μὲν μέλη, ἓν δὲ σῶμα.

Despite the variety of members, there is ultimately only one body. What follows in 12:21–26 is an elaboration on this second half of the principle of bodily existence.

The effects of this oneness are many. Paul begins by saying that no member can be independent and say it does not need another member, and so the eye cannot say that it does not need the hand, nor the head that it does not need the feet (12:21). Again, this is not an instruction for the eye or head to cease disparaging the hand or foot, but rather a description of what it cannot do because of the composition of the body. Because of the oneness of the body, all are necessary.

His statement on interdependence may be aimed particularly at those Corinthians who believed that their gifts were superior and set them apart from the rest of the congregation. But Paul also discusses

the relationships among the members in a way that goes beyond interdependence. He reverses the expectations so that the parts that appear to be lesser are actually to be considered greater. He states that in God's arrangement the weak parts are necessary, the less honorable ones are given greater honor, and the less respectable are treated with greater respect (vv. 22–24).

Dale Martin has shown that the body was commonly used to reinforce the traditional hierarchy.[130] As mentioned in chapter 2 on the general use of the body metaphor, the ruling part, usually designated as the head, was often deemed more necessary than the other parts. Polyaenus in *Stratagems of War* states, "Iphicrates used to resemble an army marshalled for action to the human body. The phalanx he called the breast, the light armed troops the hands, the cavalry the feet, and the general the head. If any of the inferior parts were wanting, the army was defective; but if it wanted a general it wanted every thing."[131] Philo calls the virtuous person the "head" of the human race, the one from whom all other people draw their life force, just as the head is the first and best part of the animal.[132]

As a result, a common use was to argue for the cessation of strife through the acceptance of one's place in the body. The strife was often between the lower-status members, or "have-nots," who composed most of the population, and the small group of higher-status members or "haves."[133] The "haves" were urged to rule benevolently, and the "have-nots" to submit to their rule. On occasion those in authority might be urged to yield to the lower class on some point in

[130] D. Martin, *Body*, 29–34, 39–47.

[131] Polyaenus, *Stratagems of War* 3.9.2. Text from D. Martin, *Body*, 93–94.

[132] *Praem*. 125.

[133] D. Martin, *Body*, 40. For example, in Aristides' 24th Oration, he praises Solon because "he brought the people together with the rich, so that they might dwell in harmony in their city, neither side being stronger than was expedient for all in common" (24.14, translation by Charles A. Behr, *P. Aelius Aristides: The Complete Works, vol. II: Orations XVII–LIII* [Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1981]). Martin notes that the basic conflict could be described in general as between the strong and the weak. For example, in his 34th Discourse, Dio Chrysostom speaks of the conflict between Tarsus and the smaller, neighboring towns. D. Martin justifies his use of "class" terminology by saying that it does not refer to wealth *per se*, but rather relationships and power structures, which may involve economics. He says, "Those who live off the surplus labor value of others (no matter how wealthy or otherwise they are) are members of the propertied, or upper, class, whereas those whose labor provides the surplus value that supports the livelihood of others are members of the exploited class or classes" (*Body*, xvi). Throughout the book he appears to use "class" and "status" terminology interchangeably. In this study I will refer to status when discussing my own observations.

a form of "benevolent patriarchalism," but this was not the same as a status reversal. The upper class remained firmly in control.[134]

In contrast, in Christ's body there is an actual reversal in status. The weak are indispensable, the less honorable are given more honor, and the less respectable are treated with more respect. Because the reversal stands in opposition to the traditional use, it makes a significant statement about Christ's body.

Paul's thoughts about reversal are striking in the way in which they correspond to his conception of the eschatological reality. The term "status reversal" itself can be misleading if understood in the strict anthropological sense. Status reversal is defined by anthropologist Victor Turner as when "groups or categories of persons who habitually occupy low status positions in the social structure are positively enjoined to exercise ritual authority over their superiors; and they, in turn, must accept with good will their ritual degradation."[135] It is an imaginary or symbolic elevation of the lower to positions of authority.[136] Those of low status act as if they are in authority, but in reality, no such change has taken place.[137] The purpose of rituals of status reversal is to reinforce the hierarchical principle "by making the low high and the high low."[138] But since no real change has occurred, the rituals reinforce the hierarchical principle in favor of the high-status members who retain and actually solidify their authority.

But Paul does not speak of an imaginary change in status in which the end result is the reaffirmation of the current hierarchy. Rather he is talking about two different ways of viewing status. The less

[134] D. Martin, *Body*, 38–68. He describes "benevolent patriarchalism" as that which "maintained social hierarchy by urging the lower class to submit to those in authority and the higher class to rule benevolently and gently, accommodating its own demands in order to protect the interests of those lower down the social scale" (*Body*, 42). Aristides explains, "Let each side dispense with its envy and greed. I speak of the envy felt by the poor for the rich, and of the greed of the rich against the poor. In sum, imitate the form and fashion of a household ... How do (the rulers) administer their households well? Whenever the rulers do not think that they can do anything, but voluntarily give up some of their authority, and the others accept as authoritative whatever their superiors decide" (24:32–33, translation by Behr). Mitchell identifies compromise in order to bring about unity as a commonplace in *homonoia* speeches (*Paul*, 130–32).

[135] Victor Turner, *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1969) 167.

[136] Ibid., 168.

[137] "The group or category that is permitted to act as if it were structurally superior ... is, in fact, perpetually of a lower status" (ibid., 176).

[138] Ibid., 177.

honorable members are still less honorable according to the world's standards (1 Cor. 12:23). As he describes in the beginning of 1 Corinthians, Christ crucified is still foolishness and a stumbling block to Greeks and Jews (1 Cor. 1:23). What has changed is that the Corinthians, who have the mind of Christ (2:16), can perceive reality and status in a way that is the opposite of the world's way. Christ is the wisdom and power of God (1:24), and the less honorable receive greater honor.

Since Paul is talking about reversal in terms of viewing existence in the new age, the term "status reversal" is not quite adequate to bring out the eschatological significance of what Paul believes has happened in Christ. The new age involves both a different perception of and participation in the eschatological reality. The Corinthians live both in the world, which consists of Jew and Greek, and as members of the body of Christ, in which there is neither Jew nor Greek. Although Paul says that the Corinthians may have been low status from the perspective of the world (1:26),[139] he says that they will enjoy high status as those who participate in the eschatological reality and thus shame the wise and the strong (1:27–28). Paul even mentions that they will judge angels (6:3).

The same principle of reversal then applies in the body of Christ, for example, where the weak and less honorable are more necessary and receive greater honor (12:22–24a).[140] Paul himself is an example of this reversal, since he is an apostle who suffers indignity through his hardships and has low status in the perception of the world (4:9–13), but maintains the highest status as an apostle in the body of Christ (12:28, 30).[141]

On the one hand, Paul uses the language of appearances to enunciate this difference between the two different standards. The reversal is in the perception of who can be considered higher or lower in status. Those members that "seem" (δοκοῦντα) weaker are actually indispensable, and those "that we think (δοκοῦμεν) less honorable"

[139] The actual status of the Corinthians is a matter of dispute. There was a minority of high-status members, such as Crispus, a synagogue ruler (Acts 18:8). According to Meeks, the social structure of the Pauline communities was probably mixed, representing a fair cross-section of society, with few members, if any, from either the extreme top or bottom levels of society (*Urban Christians*, 51–73. See also Theissen in *Pauline Christianity*, 69–119).

[140] The "reversals" may be similar to Stoic paradoxes. For example, "philosophers alone, even if they be most hideous, are handsome, if they are very poor, they are still rich, if they are in slavery, they are still kings" (Cicero, *Mur*. 61).

[141] D. Martin, *Body*, 102–103.

are given greater honor.[142] The less presentable members are to be treated with greater respect than the more presentable ones.

On the other hand, these appearances correspond to reality. While the standards of the world remain the same, there is a new way of evaluating status on the eschatological stage. For those who still live in the world, eschatological status may differ radically from initial worldly appearances.[143]

This means that a person must be able to discern the way in which God has arranged the world, including the body of Christ, since there is a different way of comprehending reality.[144] In 1 Cor. 2:6–16 Paul explicitly says that only those who have God's Spirit can discern his wisdom. Those who are unable to discern spiritual things cannot understand that Christ crucified is the power and wisdom of God (1:24).[145] The issue is not only status reversal, but the ability to understand God's reality which produces this reversal.

As demonstrated earlier, the Stoics spoke of the need to discern the correct order of the universe. Reason allowed a person to discern the order of the universe and live according to nature, that is, virtuously. Furthermore, Seneca spoke of the need to understand the basic principles which related to the whole of life, and these doctrines were rooted in the nature of the universe.[146]

Similarly, Paul speaks of the need to discern the nature of existence. But in 1 Cor. 12:22–26 Paul says that the nature of the universe

[142] Paul uses δοκέω in a similar manner to distinguish between what is "apparent" and "real" in Gal. 2:6.

[143] As D. Martin explains, "the normal connection between status and honor should be questioned; and we must recognize that those who, on the surface, occupy positions of lower status are actually more essential than those of higher status and therefore should be accorded more honor. This is not, then, a compensatory move on Paul's part, by means of which those of lower status are to be compensated for their low position by a benefaction of honor. Rather, his rhetoric pushes for an actual reversal of the normal, 'this-worldly' attribution of honor and status" (*Body*, 95–96).

[144] Or as Duane Litfin explains, Paul presents two "perspectives." "There is God's perspective and over against this there is another perspective comprising all the rest, the perspective τοῦ κόσμου" (*St. Paul's Theology of Proclamation* [SNTSMS 79; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994] 175–76, 213–20. See also T. W. Manson, *On Jesus and Paul* [London: SCM Press, 1963] 38; R. S. Barbour, "Wisdom and the Cross in 1 Corinthians 1 and 2," in *Theologia Crucis – Signum Crucis: Festschrift für Erich Dinkler*, ed. C. Andresen and G. Klein [Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1979] 58–59, 64; Charles Homer Giblin, *In Hope of God's Glory: Pauline Theological Perspectives* [New York: Herder and Herder, 1970] 128).

[145] "Wisdom here is the divinely revealed understanding of God's deep purpose for his elect, a purpose ... hitherto hidden, and involving – and perhaps we can say > culminating in < the crucifixion of the Lord of glory" (Barbour, "Wisdom," 67).

[146] Seneca *Ep.* 95.56–58.

should not be understood according to traditional conventions. There is a profound difference between the world's evaluation of status and God's hierarchy. What may appear less worthy of honor is more worthy. Paul is calling for a comprehensive revolution in the Corinthians' way of thinking about status. The reversal of status in the human body applies to the Corinthian body, as well as to Christ and the significance of the cross. Those who have the mind of Christ (2:16) are able to discern the things of God, including the reversal of normal status conventions.

Although this will be explained in more detail in the next chapter, at this point I note that the reversal is more than a "status reversal" because it entails a simultaneous existence in two spheres with two different ways of perceiving status. The reversal affects the way the Corinthians view their relationship to the world and also to each other. In this way, it is more than a way of maintaining order in the assembly and containing the enthusiasm of the tongues-speakers. Rather, the concept of reversal is a fundamental and paradoxical principle which goes to the heart of the gospel and the nature of eschatological existence, including the body of Christ. This is yet another way in which 1 Cor. 12 defines the believers. The believers are the body of Christ, which exhibits this radical reversal by virtue of their participation in the eschatological reality.

Furthermore, Paul states that the reason why God has composed the body in this way is so that there will not be division in the body, and rather "the members may have the same care for one another," a care characterized by co-suffering and co-rejoicing (12:24b–26). Oneness for Paul has this multi-dimensional quality: rather than independence there is interdependence, and even more, an intimate unity leading to mutual care and a sharing of suffering and rejoicing. All of this is possible because God has reversed the traditional concepts of honor and weakness.

For Paul, the state of co-rejoicing and co-suffering is a result of bodily unity. This connection is very much like that in the Stoic unified body since one of the important characteristics of unified bodies is the "sympathy" which they exhibit. As mentioned earlier, the πνεῦμα creates such a cohesiveness that what happens to one part of the body will affect the rest.[147] These types of connections are a distinctive feature of unified bodies and are not present in non-unified

[147] The concept of co-rejoicing and co-suffering was commonly used in antiquity to illustrate close bonds. For example, Aristotle says that a friend is one "who shares our

bodies.[148] In 12:24b-26 Paul explicitly connects the relationships of mutual care and co-rejoicing and co-suffering with being a body.

Philo illustrates a similar connection in Israel in which Moses commands the people to have "the same griefs and joys (τὰ αὐτὰ λυπουμένους τε καὶ χαίροντας), so that they may seem to be the separate parts of a single living being which is compacted and unified by their fellowship in it."[149] For Philo, this unity which includes sharing griefs and joys is comparable to the unity of a living being.

Mitchell notes that the connection between co-rejoicing and co-suffering was standard in political discourse.[150] For example, Plutarch states, "The law-giver in this way rightly accustomed the citizens, as members of one body (ἕνος μέρη σώματος), to feel and sympathize with one another's wrong."[151] Indeed, there are many connections between Paul's language in 1 Cor. 12 and political *homonoia* speeches, as Mitchell details.[152] Corinth's position as a restored Roman colony heightens the possibility that Paul is speaking in an imperial context. Horsley asserts that proclaiming Jesus as Lord was part of Paul's anti-imperial gospel by which he presented Jesus as the "true Lord" or emperor as opposed to Caesar. Paul used κύριος and other terms from imperial ideology to present "an alternative gospel of an alternative emperor as well as building an alternative assembly in the city of Corinth."[153] Thus, Paul's reminder to the Corinthians in 12:3 that they are the ones who proclaim Jesus as Lord and then his statements that they are his body could be in direct contrast with the proclamation of Caesar as Lord, whom, as we see in Seneca's passage on Nero, could also be the ruler of a body.

joy in good fortune (τὸν συνηδόμενον τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς) and our sorrow in affliction (συναλγοῦντα τοῖς λυπηροῖς), for our own sake and not for any other reason" (*Rhet*. 2.4.3). Dio Chrysostom states, "For is that man not most blessed who has many bodies with which to be happy when he experiences a pleasure, many souls with which to rejoice (χαίρειν) when he is fortunate?" (*3 Regn*. 3.108–109). But what makes Paul's statement most like those of the Stoics is the connection between co-rejoicing and co-suffering and πνεῦμα.

[148] Sextus Empiricus, *Math*. 9.80. [149] Philo, *Virt*. 103. [150] Mitchell, *Paul*, 162.

[151] Plutarch, *Sol*. 18.5. As Mitchell has shown, the ideas of co-rejoicing and co-suffering, and conversely, rejoicing in an enemy's misfortune, were common *topoi* for political unity (Aristides, *Concerning Concord* 23.29; Isocrates, *Paneg*. 168; Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. rom*. 11.22.6–7. Mitchell, *Paul*, 162–63).

[152] *Paul*, 157–164.

[153] Richard A. Horsley, "Rhetoric and Empire – 1 Corinthians," in *Paul and Politics*, ed. Richard A. Horsley (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity, 2000) 92. Or, as N. T. Wright states, the proclamation is a "pagan challenge" ("Paul's Gospel and Caesar's Empire," in *Paul and Politics*, ed. Richard A. Horsley [Harrisburg, PA: Trinity, 2000] 168).

To summarize, in 12:14–26 Paul illustrates two important aspects of the body, corresponding to the two aspects of bodily unity in 12:12. First, the one body comprises a diversity of members, so that each belongs. Not only does this give a sense of identity to each one, but it also means that the existence of the body itself depends upon having a diversity of members. Second, the many members form one body. This leads to relationships of interdependence, mutual care, and co-rejoicing and co-suffering. Furthermore, the many members reflect the "reversal" of eschatological status seen in the beginning of the epistle. Overall, Paul does not present specific behavioral prescriptions here but rather describes what the body, and therefore the body of Christ, is and should be.

The spiritually gifted Corinthians as the body of Christ (section A′: 12:27–30)

After describing the body in section B (12:12–26), Paul explicitly identifies the Corinthians as Christ's body: "Now you are the body of Christ and individually members of it" (12:27). Seneca similarly talks about people as the members of God: "all this universe which encompasses us is one, and it is God; we are associates of God; we are his members (*membra*)."[154]

The transition from 12:12–26 to 12:27–30 marks a change from the universal body of Christ to the Corinthian congregation. They are to understand themselves, and therefore, the spiritual manifestations, in the context of the same type of bodily unity seen in the universal body of Christ.

[154] *Ep.* 92.30. The language is strikingly similar to that in 1 Cor. 6:15, "Do you not know that your bodies are members (μέλη) of Christ?" Conzelmann states that μέλη signifies a "real connection" and is not a figure (*1 Corinthians*, 211). Witherington argues that the connection is spiritual as opposed to the physical connection with a prostitute (*Corinth*, 169). But what Paul is actually doing is describing two types of bodily connection. That which occurs with the prostitute is bodily through the fleshly union (6:16), while the Christian's union with Christ is bodily by virtue of being one Spirit (6:17). Furthermore, Paul also speaks of a spiritual body in 15:44, where the idea of a spiritual body (σῶμα πνευματικόν) is critical for the resurrection. Finally, even though Paul does not call the Corinthians the body of Christ, the idea is implicit here. As Fee explains, "V. 15 asserts … that the bodies of believers are 'members' of the 'body' of the Lord and therefore cannot be joined to a prostitute, to become 'members' of her body. Vv. 16–17 further explain v. 15, asserting on the basis of Gen. 2:24 that in sexual intercourse two bodies become one, which is how a man becomes a 'member' of her body. This in turn is contrasted to the union with Christ's 'body,' now expressed in terms of the Spirit … Both are 'bodily' relationships that imply a form of 'union'" (*Corinthians*, 257).

The emphatic position of the ὑμεῖς in 12:27 is striking considering the relative lack of personal address in the chapter. For example, Paul addresses the Corinthians directly in 12:13 when explaining the formation of the body of Christ, but in section A he more impersonally discusses "distributions," and in 12:7 says the manifestations of the Spirit are given "to each." The primary statements in which Paul addresses the Corinthians directly deal with the nature of their new existence as the body of Christ. In regard to the universal body of Christ he says, "We were all baptized into one body" and "we were all made to drink of one Spirit" (12:13). For the specific Corinthian congregation he says, "You are the body of Christ." Paul has shifted the focus from the manifestations to the people with the manifestations. Thus, his final list in 12:28–30 includes people as well as the distributions (e.g. "apostles," etc.).

That Paul has shifted the focus of the passage from the Corinthians' concern over gifts and how they relate to the individual to his own concerns for the community of spiritually gifted people is seen in how Paul's initial appeal to τὸ συμφέρον, the "advantageous," is now defined in regard to the ἐκκλησία. The gifts are to be seen in the larger context of each person's placement in the body. With this perspective in place, Paul now moves on to delve deeper into the relationships among the members by discussing the "more excellent way" of love and then how love is worked out in the body in regard to prophecy and speaking in tongues.

Conclusion

The significance of the body of Christ lies not only in a comparison with a human body, but in the implications of bodily unity. Bodily oneness is the correct context for thinking about spiritual gifts. The Corinthians, as members of a new humanity, are a unified body, which entails certain ethical obligations.

In ch. 12 Paul is laying out ethical principles rather than precepts. After he has established that Christ/the church is a body and what the nature of bodily existence is, he gives his first direct command to "Strive for the greater gifts" (12:31a). He returns to this theme in 14:1 where, after the section on love (ch. 13), he says, "Pursue love and strive for the spiritual gifts, especially that you may prophesy."

Numerous scholars have commented that the instructions in 12:31a and 14:1 are at odds with the discussion of the body in the rest of ch. 12, where Paul seems to advocate an acceptance of one's

place in the body. Furthermore, it does not seem to make sense for Paul to urge the Corinthians to pursue "greater" gifts when their desire for status is the problem he is addressing in the first place.[155] However, since Paul has revealed a way of evaluating status that is in direct opposition to the standards in the "world," one must also ask what Paul means by "great." Is the greater gift that which is considered so in terms of the world, or in terms of their new eschatological existence? If the latter, then Paul's statements can be seen as part of his strategy. He tells the Corinthians to pursue what is "greater," but will redefine what is "great" according to the paradoxical reality of the body of Christ. We will see that Paul does precisely this in his evaluation of the relative value of tongues and prophecy in ch. 14.

Paul's strategy resembles Seneca's method of principles and precepts, in particular the application of bodily unity as the foundation for social ethics. As mentioned above, the Stoics held that one who grasps life's basic principles will still need help in practical conduct. This is the function of precepts because the person still needs to learn how to apply them to specific situations.

1 Cor. 12–14 reveals a similar strategy. In ch. 12 Paul lays down a basic principle (bodily unity and diversity for the new humanity), and in ch. 14 he gives specific precepts (regarding order in the assembly). As a result, the Corinthians not only learn who they are and what they are to do, but are given more training in how to bridge the gap from a basic principle to specific precepts, physics to ethics, and beliefs to behavior.

[155] This apparent problem has led many to conclude that ζηλοῦτε should be taken as an indicative rather than an imperative (e.g. Gerhard Iber, "Zum Verständnis von I Cor. 12:31," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 54 [1963] 43–52; A. Bittlinger, *Gifts and Graces: A Commentary on 1 Cor. 12–14*, trans. H. Klassen [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968] 73–75; R. Martin, *Spirit*, 35, 57, 75; O. Wischmeyer, *Der höchste Weg. Das 13. Kapitel des 1. Korintherbriefes* [Gutersloh: Gutersloher Verlagshaus, 1981] 52). Paul is thus making a sarcastic comment that the Corinthians "are seeking the better gifts," so he will show them "a still more excellent way" (12:31b). Carson effectively summarizes the problems of understanding ζηλοῦτε as an indicative, the most important of which is that the parallel phrase in 14:1, which resumes the thought of 12:31, is clearly imperatival (*Spirit*, 53–58). However, even if ζηλοῦτε should be taken as an indicative, Paul is still telling the Corinthians to seek the greater gift of prophecy in ch. 14 (e.g. 14:1; 14:5; 14:39). David L. Baker proposes that Paul is quoting a Corinthian slogan in the passages where he follows ζηλόω with a reference to either spiritual gifts in general or prophecy (12:31; 14:1, 12, 39) ("The Interpretation of 1 Cor. 12–14," *EvQ* 46 [1974]: 224–34; see also Max-Alain Chevallier, *Esprit de Dieu, parole d'hommes* [Neuchatel: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1966] 159–63. For a recent discussion of these two options, see Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 600–602).

6

THE ROLE OF THE νοῦς Χριστοῦ (1 COR. 1–4)

We have seen thus far that just as the Stoics saw humanity as a body unified by πνεῦμα, so too does Paul in 1 Cor. 12 describe the new humanity in Christ as a body in the Spirit. Overall, the chapter provides a description of the unity and diversity of the Corinthians as the body of Christ, and this description provides the basis from which Paul can give more specific instructions.

In the following chapters I will explore how Paul further develops the implications of bodily unity. First, while the inherent unity of being a body was a common trait of all humanity for the Stoics, there was still the potential for deeper relationships. "Love" was the means of forming these more intense relationships. In 1 Cor. 13 Paul similarly describes a "more excellent way" of love. Second, the Stoics' bodily unity was the foundational principle for ethical precepts. In 1 Cor. 14 Paul presents his specific commands to the Corinthians in regard to prophecy and speaking in tongues. In the whole picture of 1 Cor. 12–14, then, Paul sets the foundation of the Corinthians' corporate identity as a body, shows them the higher way of love which can intensify the already-existing unity they have in Christ, and concludes by commanding them to apply this unity and love in their use of the spiritual gifts of prophecy and tongues for the edification of the community rather than the self.[1] In doing so, Paul presents a complete picture for the Corinthians' moral growth, teaching them both principles and precepts so that, as Seneca describes in *Ep.* 95, their precepts for social ethics may be founded upon the principle of bodily unity.

[1] Numerous scholars have noted that the overall structure of the chapters is ABA′. Ch. 12 forms the general explanation of spiritual gifts, which sets the stage for ch. 14 as the specific reference to the gifts. Ch. 13, then, forms a digression which allows Paul to speak of the correct attitude in the midst of his argument. This is similar to what will be described below. See the discussion on the ABA′ pattern in Paul in chapter 5 above.

Before I progress to 1 Cor. 13–14, however, it will be helpful to establish one preliminary, that is, the importance of the νοῦς in the believers' new existence. For the Stoics, the νοῦς separated humanity from non-reasoning animals and gave people the ability to comprehend the universal order. Love and ethical precepts in general were based upon this order, which meant that νοῦς was critical in social ethics.

In 1 Cor. 1–4 Paul makes some important statements regarding the significance of the νοῦς Χριστοῦ in distinguishing the believers from Jews and Greeks, in effect separating the new humanity in Christ from unredeemed humanity descended only from Adam. Furthermore, the νοῦς Χριστοῦ allows people to understand the order of God's eschatological universe as seen in the wisdom of Christ crucified, a wisdom which not even the "rulers of this age" understood. In the end, it is the wisdom of the cross that forms the basis for the "love" which Paul describes in 1 Cor. 13, the love which provides the ultimate unifying force for the community and leads to his specific precepts in 1 Cor. 14.[2] For the Corinthians, therefore, the νοῦς Χριστοῦ both distinguishes them from old humanity which does not have the same reasoning capacity and provides them with the potential for living according to the order of God's eschatological universe.

Context: factionalism and Christ crucified as the wisdom of God

Paul sets the discussion about wisdom and the νοῦς Χριστοῦ within the larger context of his appeal to the Corinthians to cease their factionalism. Beginning in 1:10–17, he urges them to be in agreement and not to be divided. In 3:1–23 he relates quarreling to being of the flesh and warns that such strife does not build the community properly. In between these passages (1:18–2:16) he describes Christ crucified as the wisdom of God as opposed to the wisdom of the world. He denies the significance of the world's wisdom and proclaims that there is a wisdom from God that can only be known by those who have God's Spirit and the mind of Christ. The Corinthians are to live according to this wisdom, which is exemplified both in Christ and in himself, and the result will be unity and the building up of the community of God.

[2] I am grateful to my dissertation director, Harold W. Attridge, who first pointed out to me the connection between the νοῦς Χριστοῦ and ἀγάπη in 1 Cor. 13.

Corporate identity through participation in the νοῦς Χριστοῦ

As mentioned in chapter 2, for the Stoics, humanity was united not only through the Spirit, but also through the common possession of νοῦς. The νοῦς distinguished humanity from the animals because it allowed people to comprehend the universal order and thus act appropriately. In 1 Cor. 1–4 Paul says the Corinthians possess a type of νοῦς which allows them to comprehend the new order which God has instituted in Christ and, consequently, separates them from those who do not understand this new order.

1 Cor. 1–4 is the section which scholars generally agree contains the most overt references to the Corinthians' factionalism.[3] For example, Paul urges the Corinthians "that all of you be in agreement (τὸ αὐτὸ λέγητε) and that there be no divisions (σχίσματα) among you, but that you be united (κατηρτισμένοι) in the same mind (ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ νοΐ) and the same purpose (ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ γνώμῃ") (1:10). Mitchell has shown how the statement has precedent in political speeches urging unity.[4] However, the precise phrase ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ νοΐ is not commonly used, unlike the others, which may highlight the significance of having the same "mind" in Paul's argument for the Corinthians' unity.[5]

Paul contrasts the argument for unity with the Corinthians' current disunity, in which the congregation is divided according to different leaders.[6] Paul's reply contains the seeds of key thoughts that he will develop in the rest of the letter. He asks the rhetorical question "Has Christ been divided?" a foreshadowing of his later

[3] But this is not the unanimous scholarly opinion. Fee, for example, contends that the church stands in opposition to Paul (*Corinthians*). See also Johannes Munck, *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1959) 135–67; and Nils Alstrup Dahl, *Studies in Paul* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1977) 40–61, who also argue against the presence of factions.

[4] For example, Josephus' use of the phrase, τὸ αὐτὸ λέγειν in *A. J.* 10.107; 17.35; 18.375, 378; or the presence of τὴν αὐτὴν γνώμην ἔχοντες in the scholion to Thucydides 5.31.6. A similar phrase, ταὐτὰ φρονεῖν, occurs in Aristides (23.31, 42, 43; 24.29) and Dio Chrysostom (*2 Tars*. 34.20). This recalls Paul's use of φρονέω in his appeals for the Philippians' unity in Phil. 2: 2–5 (Mitchell, *Paul*, 68–70).

[5] However, Mitchell does see ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ νοΐ as the equivalent of ὁμόνοια, which would be commonly used (*Paul*, 77).

[6] The precise nature of the divisions or "factions" is debatable. The use of political terms may not necessarily indicate political parties. This is Witherington's critique of Mitchell and of L. L. Welborn, "On the Discord in Corinth: 1 Corinthians 1–4 and Ancient Politics," *JBL* 106 (1987) 85–111 (*Corinth*, 100).

statements regarding the unity of the body of Christ (1:13). He continues by asking "Was Paul crucified for you?" which provides a connection to his argument regarding the significance of the crucifixion for the Corinthians' new existence. He then asks, "Or were you baptized in the name of Paul?" As noted earlier, baptism identified the group with their leader, and Paul picks up the theme of baptism in chs. 10 and 12. He wants the Corinthians to use their baptism to identify with Christ. But Paul also uses this statement to argue that his purpose was not so much to baptize, but to proclaim the gospel, and that this gospel consists not in "eloquent wisdom" (ἐν σοφίᾳ λόγου) but in the power of the cross of Christ. The cross is ultimately the key to Paul's arguments about unity and wisdom.

Paul's argument at this point poses an interpretive difficulty. He seems to deny the importance of wisdom, but goes on to call Christ the "wisdom of God" (1:24) and present a wisdom theology in 2:6–16. This apparent contradiction has caused scholars to question the purpose and origin of 2:6–16.[7] But the function of the passage within the overall argument on 1 Cor. 1–4 helps to explain Paul's stance. 1 Cor. 1:18–21 is not a simple disclaimer to wisdom. As Pearson points out, Paul actually uses wisdom tradition in his "denial" of the importance of wisdom.[8] His discussion of wisdom is in response to the Corinthians' own position. As Conzelmann states, "It is clear that 'wisdom' is a Corinthian topic."[9] Paul may be using the Corinthians' own language to transform their ideas of wisdom,[10] or to counter a charge that he does not offer a wisdom theology, or both.[11] Furthermore, as Brown points out, Paul objects in 2:1 to wisdom as the "mode" of presenting the gospel, whereas the wisdom which he promotes in 2:7 is significant for its content of Christ crucified.[12] Recent studies have shown the importance of the rhetorical background to 1 Corinthians, in which Paul is combatting the

[7] For a summary of proposals, see Gregory E. Sterling, "'Wisdom among the Perfect': Creation Traditions in Alexandrian Judaism and Corinthian Christianity," *NovT* 37 (1995) 367–68.

[8] Pearson, *Pneumatikos-Psychikos*, 27. In particular, these include the connections with Baruch 3:9–4:4.

[9] Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 57.

[10] E.g. Fee, *Corinthians*, 98. Or as Thiselton states, "Paul wishes to redefine and thus to rescue an important term" (*Corinthians*, 230).

[11] E.g. Sterling, "Wisdom," 368.

[12] Alexandra R. Brown, *The Cross & Human Transformation* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995) 113.

expectation that he use impressive oratory to persuade his audience.[13]

Thus it is important to understand the content of Paul's wisdom. Paul does not deny the importance of wisdom itself but rather a certain type of wisdom. He condemns the wisdom of the world (1:20–21), but says that God's wisdom is essential for understanding the things of God. The question, therefore, is not whether Paul advocates gaining wisdom, but what the content of this wisdom is. Furthermore, it is significant that Paul finishes his argument by claiming that those who have the νοῦς Χριστοῦ are able to understand the things of God.

Paul points to Christ crucified as the central aspect of God's wisdom. Christ has become God's wisdom, which is righteousness (δικαιοσύνη), holiness (ἁγιασμός), and redemption (ἀπολύτρωσις) (1:24, 30). God has accomplished this through the cross. But since the cross is foolishness to the Gentiles and a stumbling block to the Jews (1:23), the "world" in its "wisdom" cannot know the things of God: it cannot understand the logic of a crucified savior because such a person would be more shameful than victorious.[14] The wisdom of God is not "of this age, or of the rulers of this age." Rather, it is God's "secret and hidden" wisdom, which "none of the rulers of this age understood" (2:6–8). Thus Paul presents a critical paradox and challenge to the status-oriented Corinthians: the shame of the cross is not a hindrance to the gospel but the place where God's wisdom is revealed. But those who would know the "secret and hidden" things of God must be able to understand the transcendent meaning of Christ crucified.

Paul has earlier said the cross was the difference between "those who are perishing" and those "who are being saved" (1:18). In ch. 15 he gives a more detailed explanation of how the cross "saves" in that "Christ died for our sins" (15:3). Furthermore, God raised

[13] E.g. Litfin, *Proclamation*; Bruce W. Winter, *Paul and Philo among the Sophists* (SNTSMS 96; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997). The mode of presentation and content are also connected. See Sigurd Grindheim, "Wisdom for the Perfect: Paul's Challenge to the Corinthian Church (1 Corinthians 2:6–16)," *JBL* (2002) 689–709.

[14] As Martin Hengel states, "[Jesus] had suffered a particularly cruel and shameful death, what as a rule was reserved for hardened criminals, rebellious slaves and rebels against the Roman state. That this crucified Jew, Jesus Christ, could truly be a divine being sent on earth, God's Son, the Lord of all and the coming judge of the world, must inevitably have been thought by any educated man to be utter 'madness' and presumptuousness" (*Crucifixion* [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977] 83).

him (15:4). The resurrection is critical for the validity of the κήρυγμα (15:12–19). Without it, the Corinthians are still in their sins, and those who have died in Christ have perished (ἀπώλοντο) (15:17–18), just as the ones in the world are perishing (ἀπολλυμένοις) (1:18). But through the resurrection, Christ becomes the first fruits of those who will be made alive in him (ζῳοποιηθήσονται) (15:22). Both Christ and the believers gain imperishable and immortal bodies (15:50–54). Consequently death, God's last enemy, is defeated (15:26, 54–57). Therefore, what seemed to be defeat was actually the beginning of God's ultimate victory over his enemies. But in order to realize this, a person must understand the paradox by which one who was shamed by worldly standards becomes the means of God's victory (15:54–57).

Whereas Christ crucified is a "scandal" to Jews and "foolishness" to Gentiles, the Corinthians should see that he is the "power of God and the wisdom of God" (1:21–24). What appears as foolishness to the world is actually wisdom to those who understand God's ways. Once again, there is a "reversal" which enables one to see a deeper meaning behind earthly events. But this understanding is not available to everyone because God's wisdom is revealed through the Spirit (2:10) and taught by the Spirit (2:13). Thus, Paul says that these things which must be spiritually discerned can be known by those who have the mind of Christ (2:16). This is what enables the spiritual person in 12:3 to proclaim "Jesus is Lord!" (12:3) This is the person who, through the Spirit, knows the significance of the crucified Jesus.

There is an intriguing connection between πνεῦμα and νοῦς in 1 Cor. 2:6–16. I have already discussed above how for the Stoics both πνεῦμα and νοῦς were pervasive in universal humanity. For example, Chrysippus considers πνεῦμα to be the equivalent to God and divine reason.[15] Sterling notes that Philo commonly associates πνεῦμα and νοῦς.[16] For Paul, the things the νοῦς comprehends are the "spiritual things" of God (2:11–13).

[15] Diogenes Laertius, *Vit. phil.* 7.138 (*SVF* 2.634); Aëtius, *Plac.* 1.7.33 (*SVF* 2.1027). Lapidge, "Stoic Cosmology," 170–71. Michael J. White states in regard to various terms including πνεῦμα and νοῦς, "Although there are contextual differences, subtle or not so subtle, among these terms, there is a sense in which one is referring to the same (corporeal) thing or 'stuff' by all of them" ("Stoic Natural Philosophy (Physics and Cosmology)," in *The Cambridge Companion to the Stoics*, ed. Brad Inwood [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003] 136).

[16] Sterling, "Wisdom," 375–76.

The following quotation from Philo is particularly interesting in the way he connects νοῦς, πνεῦμα, and understanding God:

> [The expression "breathed into," (ἐνεφύσεν)] implies of necessity three things, that which inbreathes, that which receives, that which is inbreathed: that which inbreathes is God, that which receives is the mind (νοῦς), that which is inbreathed is the spirit or breath (πνεῦμα). What, then, do we infer from these premises? A union of the three comes about . . . And for what purpose save that we may obtain a conception of Him? For how could the soul have conceived of God, had He not breathed into it and mightily laid hold of it? For the mind (νοῦς) of man would never have ventured to soar so high as to grasp the nature of God, had not God Himself drawn it up to Himself . . . and stamped it with the impress of the powers that are within the scope of its understanding.[17]

According to Philo, the only way one can understand God is through a change in νοῦς, and this change occurs through the work of πνεῦμα. The result of this change is that the person will now be able to comprehend the nature of God. For Paul, the Spirit searches the deep things of God and knows the very thoughts of God (2:10–11), and it is by the Spirit that one can understand spiritual things given by God (2:12–14). Ultimately, these things can be understood by the person who has the mind of Christ.

Thus, one critical role of the Spirit is to enable a person to comprehend the wisdom of God. Sterling notes that 1 Cor. 2:6–16 is the only time in Paul's letters that νοῦς is the equivalent of πνεῦμα.[18] Paul's connection of the νοῦς Χριστοῦ, πνεῦμα, and Corinthian

[17] Philo, *Leg*. 1.36–38. Although Philo was not a Stoic, Christopher Gill notes that "Philo's theses also come close to Stoicism; but even when they do not, he adopts a highly Stoic conceptual vocabulary, so that his texts are widely used as sources for Stoic terminology" ("The School in the Roman Imperial Period," in *The Cambridge Companion to the Stoics*, ed. Brad Inwood [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003] 55). For example, Gregory Sterling makes the point that Philo reflects a Stoic view of friendship ("The Bond of Humanity: Friendship in Philo of Alexandria," in *Greco-Roman Perspectives on Friendship*, ed. John T. Fitzgerald [SBLRBS 34; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997] 203–23), and Audrey N. M. Rich suggests a compromise between Stoicism and Plato's Ideas in Philo's *Opif*. 5.20, "the universe that consisted of ideas would have no other location than the Divine Reason, which was the Author of this ordered frame" ("The Platonic Ideas as the Thought of God," *Mnemosyne* 7 [1954] 123–33). See also Dillon's analysis of Philo as using Alexandrian Platonism, which was "heavily influenced" by Stoicism (*Middle Platonists*, 182).

[18] Sterling, "Wisdom," 372.

knowledge is even more interesting because of the way in which he uses the Isa. 40:13 passage. Following the discussion regarding how the Spirit reveals the thoughts of God, he asks, "For who has known the mind of the Lord so as to instruct him?" The question implies that knowing the mind of the Lord is an impossible task, but Paul follows the question with his response, "But we have the mind of Christ." Thus, what is inconceivable for ordinary people is now made possible in Christ. The passage provides a contrast with the use of Isa. 40:13 in Rom. 11:34. The Romans passage does not present the mind of Christ as the solution to knowing the thoughts of God. Rather, it illustrates the transcendence of God's knowledge as Paul argues for the mystery of salvation for Jew and Gentile.[19]

The Corinthians' possession of the νοῦς Χριστοῦ distinguishes them from the "world" which "did not know God through wisdom" (1 Cor. 1:21). But the distinction goes beyond the ability to comprehend God's mysteries. As reflected in the baptismal formula in 12:13 and Paul's statements on the last Adam in 1 Cor. 15, the Corinthians belong to a new humanity, and their participation in this new humanity is inextricably linked to the possession of the νοῦς Χριστοῦ. The acceptance of the message of the cross and the foolishness of God leads to new life in Christ (1:30–31). Paul separates the Christians from the world, and their new humanity rests upon their identification with the last Adam. All this is possible because they have the νοῦς Χριστοῦ.

At the same time, the Corinthians live a dual existence. They are both "in the world" (1:27–29) and separated from Jews and Greeks through Christ. Paul's statements to the Corinthians to end their factionalism reveal not only a functional concern for the preservation of the community and the dangers that come from disunity. The concern for unity is built upon an ontological understanding that the Corinthians are a people who stand apart from the world by the mind of Christ.

Furthermore, not only do they stand apart, but they are a community, a corporate whole, which forms the foundation for Paul's

[19] In both instances the rhetorical question "Who has known the mind of the Lord?" expects the same response, "No one." The difference is that in Rom. 11:34, the fact that "no one" can understand the thoughts of God supports Paul's prior statements on the inscrutability of God's ways in regard to the gospel. In 1 Cor. 2:16 the response "no one" sets up Paul's contention that "no one" *except* those who have the Spirit can understand God's ways. Thus, Paul emphasizes the importance of correct thinking for spiritual maturity, especially in relation to Christ as the "foolishness of God."

specific instructions for unity. In 1 Cor. 3:5–9 when Paul tells the Corinthians how to assess himself and Apollos, he reminds them that he and Apollos are only workers who plant and water. This assessment is based upon the idea that the Corinthians are "God's field." He also says that the believers are "God's building," after which he warns the Corinthians to be careful how they build because only that which lasts will receive a reward (3:10–15). He then specifically identifies them as God's temple (3:16–17). As the temple, they are corporately the place of God's presence, and they are God's temple through the indwelling Spirit.[20] The phrase "Do you not know that . . ." is both a rebuke to the Corinthians for not having realized the importance of their behavior as it relates to their eschatological existence and an exhortation to consider this existence more seriously.[21] As God's temple, they are holy. Therefore, if the temple is destroyed through improper building, they will also be destroyed. Paul instructs the Corinthians to consider their actions in light of the significance of their new, corporate existence.

Paul then returns to his discussion of wisdom by warning the Corinthians against judging on the basis of the wisdom of the world (3:18–20). He reiterates his original thought that the Corinthians should not be intent on following human leaders but should rather follow Christ. But following Christ is not merely a matter of loyalties, for Paul has argued that to follow Christ is to live according to the mind of Christ, which in this case means ending strife and building up the community.

Thus, Paul is not arguing just for an enlightened understanding of Christ, but for a proper application of this understanding to the Corinthians' situation. Brown highlights the performative intent of Paul's statements in 1:18–2:16 to effect a change in the perception

[20] E.g. Isaiah 6:1–13. David A. Renwick, *Paul, the Temple, and the Presence of God* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991) 25–46; B. Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament* (SNTSMS 1; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965) 1–3; Ronald Clements, *God and Temple* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1965); Samuel Terrien, *The Elusive Presence: The Heart of Biblical Theology* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1978) 161–226. This understanding would have applied not only to Paul's Jewish background but to the pagan experience of the Gentile Corinthians. See also Fee, *Corinthians*, 146–47; O. Michel, "ναός," in *TDNT* IV: 880–890.

[21] As Fee states, Paul is not simply reminding them of what they should have remembered, but using a rhetorical device. Through the phrase, he is urging them to apply what they already know about their existence as the eschatological community. Their current behavior indicates that they have not been doing so (*Corinthians*, 146). Paul uses the phrase ten times in the letter (3:16; 5:6; 6:2, 3, 9, 15, 16, 19; 9:13, 24).

and worldview of the Corinthians.[22] She states that 1 Corinthians is "fundamentally concerned to promote a new way of *being* in the world, namely a way characterized by unity and reconciliation, by eliciting a new way of *knowing*, 'according to the cross.'"[23] Paul's purpose in 1 Cor. 1–2 in particular is to change the Corinthians' "noetic disposition"[24] so that they view their experiences according to the values of the cross instead of the values of the world. To accomplish this, Paul confronts the Corinthians' old ways of "knowing" in 1:18–2:5 with the perspective of the cross. He then builds upon his argument in 2:6–16 to show that this new way of knowing is revealed by the Spirit and understood by the "mind of Christ." The essence of the cross as the self-giving love of God means that those who accept this new way of knowing will likewise pursue "reconciling service" to God and the world.[25]

Brown argues that 1 Cor. 1–2 is significant for the way in which it sets the foundation for Paul's ethics in the rest of the letter. Specifically, Paul calls for a "cognitive transformation"[26] based upon an understanding of the cross, and this transformation involves revelation by the Spirit and leads to community reconciliation. While the Corinthians have the mind of Christ, they have not yet "appropriated" it properly with all of its implications for living in the eschatological age.[27] It is their "insufficient comprehension and experience of the cross" which Paul seeks to correct even before he moves on to specific ethical imperatives.[28]

The discussion on wisdom, therefore, accomplishes several purposes. Because of their "wisdom," the Corinthians are distinct from the "world." For Paul, like the Stoics, the νοῦς plays a critical role in the identification of "humanity." Because the Corinthians have the νοῦς Χριστοῦ, they are part of a new humanity and distinct from those who are still of the "world." Thus, their possession of the νοῦς is an indication of their corporate identity.

But the significance of the νοῦς lies not only in separating the person from non-reasoning beings, but also in the fact that it enables one to understand the order of the universe and so the nature of one's existence within that universe. Therefore, possession of this νοῦς also requires that the Corinthians comprehend life according to a different standard. In order to follow a crucified Savior, they must know how the scandal and foolishness of the cross fits with the mind

[22] Brown, *Cross*. [23] Ibid., 12. [24] Ibid., 146. [25] Ibid.
[26] Ibid., xxi. [27] Ibid., 30. [28] Ibid., 25.

of Christ. Paul and Apollos themselves exemplify the mind of Christ as those who are apostles, "servants of Christ and stewards of God's mysteries" (4:1), and yet "fools for the sake of Christ" and the "rubbish of the world, the dregs of all things" (4:9–13). As Bruce Winter notes, the appeal to imitate the hardships and low status of the apostles stands in stark contrast to the Corinthians' apparent preference for rhetorical sophistication.[29] The Corinthians must also be able to apply the mind of Christ if they are to build the temple of God.

For Paul, those who have the νοῦς can comprehend the things of God,[30] including the paradox of Christ crucified as the wisdom and power of God. With the mind of Christ, the Corinthians can know the things God reveals through the Spirit, and so be spiritual people who declare the Lordship of Jesus (12:3).

However, the problem with the Corinthians is that they have not fully reached their potential, as evidenced by their quarreling. Paul's appeals to them to cease their factionalism are rooted in the need to apply properly the wisdom of the cross. Until they understand and live by the logic of the eschatological universe, they cannot be spiritually mature.

Spiritual maturity through application of the νοῦς Χριστοῦ

For Paul, the community has already been formed by virtue of their acceptance of the κήρυγμα and subsequent possession of the mind of Christ. But at the same time the community is still being built. Paul laid the foundation of Christ, Apollos watered what Paul planted, and God gives the growth (3:6). But even though God is the ultimate source of the community's growth, each person is responsible for how he or she builds. Therefore, Paul warns that one must take care how one builds, because only what remains on the Day of Judgment will be rewarded (3:10–15).

In 2:6–16 Paul states that the unspiritual neither receive the gifts of God nor understand them, because such gifts are spiritually discerned. The spiritual, however, are able to discern these mysteries. Paul argues that only those who have the Spirit can discern the things

[29] Winter, *Philo and Paul*, 200.

[30] Paul's concept of the νοῦς as that which comprehends the things of God (2:11) may reflect a compromise between Stoicism and Plato's Ideas, as seen for example in Philo, *Opif.* 5.20, "the universe that consisted of ideas would have no other location than the Divine Reason, which was the Author of this ordered frame" (Rich, "Ideas," 123–33).

of God, and in conclusion states that this discernment depends upon having the mind of Christ.

But even though the Corinthians possess the mind of Christ, they have not fully realized their potential. The Corinthians' factionalism is primary evidence that they have not yet reached their full maturity. Because of their immaturity, Paul must address them "as people of the flesh, as infants in Christ (ὡς σαρκίνοις, ὡς νηπίοις ἐν Χριστῷ)," and not as spiritual people (ὡς πνευματικοῖς) (3:1).[31]

The reception of the Spirit and the mind of Christ distinguishes the Corinthians from the unspiritual person (ψυκιχός; 2:14), who cannot understand the things of God, including Christ crucified. These are the Jews and Gentiles. But even among those who have the Spirit, there is a distinction between the τέλειοι and the νήπιοι (2:6; 3:1).[32] The two terms were commonly used in Hellenistic philosophy to describe different stages of maturity.[33] The problem is not that the Corinthians do not have the ability to comprehend, but that they have not grown in their understanding. Thus, "the maturity that Paul wants the Corinthians to reach is characterized by nothing else than a realization of the implications of the state they had already reached as Christians."[34]

The Corinthians need training in how to use the mind of Christ to overcome their "jealousy and quarreling" and so build God's community. Like the Stoics, they need to know how their possession of νοῦς and subsequent membership in universal humanity affect their

[31] As Ilsetraut Hadot notes, Seneca states that before one can make progress, one must be able to recognize one's flaws and desire to remove them (*Seneca und die griechisch-römische Tradition der Seelenleitung* [Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte der Philosophie 13; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1969] 162–64). In this Seneca agrees with Epicurus and quotes him in saying, "The knowledge of sin is the beginning of salvation" (*Ep.* 28.9).

[32] Paul also considers the σάρκινοι/σαρικικοί to be νήπιοι (3:1–3). See Sterling, "Wisdom," 367–70.

[33] Thus, for example, Philo states, "But seeing that for babes (νηπίοις) milk (γάλα) is food, but for grown men (τελείος) wheaten bread, there must also be soul-nourishment, such as is milk-like suited to the time of childhood ... and such as is adapted to grown men in the shape of instructions leading their way through wisdom (φρονήσεως) and temperance and all virtue (ἀρετῆς") (*Agr.* 9). Epictetus asks, "Are you not willing, at this late date, like children (τὰ παιδία), to be weaned and to partake of more solid food, and not to cry for mammies and nurses – old wives' lamentations?" (*Diatr.* 2.16.39). For more examples, see G. Delling, "τέλειος," in *TDNT* VIII: 67–79; G. Bertram, "νήπιος," in *TDNT* IV: 912–23; Pearson, *Pneumatikos-Psychikos*, 27–30; P. J. du Plessis, *ΤΕΛΕΙΟΣ, The Idea of Perfection in the New Testament* (Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1959) 36–121.

[34] Grindheim, "Wisdom," 708.

relationships with each other. But not only do they have obligations to each other, they also have their duties to Christ, just as the gods are also a part of the Stoics' unity.[35]

The dual need for both a corporate orientation and loyalty to Christ is seen in the specific way Paul addresses the problem of factions. That Paul does not want the Corinthians to define themselves according to human leaders is obvious (1:12). However, at first glance it is puzzling why he would be displeased with those who proclaim Ἐγὼ Χριστοῦ since allegiance to Christ would seem to be Paul's central concern. But the problem is not so much the declaration of loyalty to Christ, but the way in which they are making it, and how this is contributing to the instability of the community. Paul questions, μεμέρισται ὁ Χριστός (1:19). The problem is that "each" (ἕκαστος; 1:12) is declaring his or her loyalty individually. Paul's concern is not only the misguided loyalty to human leaders, but the fact that they are not ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ νοῒ καὶ ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ γνώμῃ (1:10).

What Paul wants, rather, is that they as a group follow Christ. Paul himself declares ὑμεῖς Χριστοῦ (3:23), using a grammatical construction similar to the "slogans" in 1:12. Instead of individuals declaring their loyalty with Ἐγὼ Ἀπολλῶ or even Ἐγὼ Χριστοῦ, they should as a group declare their loyalty to Christ. Such unity would then be an indication that they are spiritually mature instead of "infants in Christ" (3:1).

For Paul, building the temple of God will entail accepting the values exemplified in the cross, a value system which reverses those found in the world. Whereas the Corinthians seek the status associated with a particular leader or the use of superior rhetoric, Paul calls them to imitate Christ's example as one who willingly suffered worldly shame. This is the example that he and Apollos have set for them. If they were able to see according to the cross, for example, they would know that their leaders are "a spectacle," "fools," "weak," and "like the rubbish of the world, the dregs of all things" (4:9–13). As Grindheim states, "To be spiritual, then, is to have apprehended the word of the cross in such a way that it has transformed the entire existence of the believer into its image – to a cruciform life, a life characterized by self-sacrificing love, and where power is manifest in weakness."[36]

[35] The importance of devotion to Christ is seen elsewhere in the letter, particularly in Paul's warnings against idolatry, e.g. 10:14–22.

[36] Grindheim, "Wisdom," 708–709.

The application of the mind of Christ to the building of God's temple can be found throughout the letter. For example, Paul says that there should be no stratification according to wealth or status in the community during the sacrament (11:17–34), calling upon the Corinthians to forsake the benefits of public displays of status for the sake of unity.[37] In 1 Cor. 8:1–13 he calls the "strong" to give up their legitimate rights to eat food offered to idols for the sake of the "weak." Although they have "knowledge," they are to act in self-sacrificing "love" instead (8:1).

Furthermore, his instructions are based upon their existence as a community. In 1 Cor. 5 Paul calls the believers a "new batch" of dough because of Christ's sacrifice as the Paschal lamb (5:6–7). As a result, the community should expel the immoral believer because "a little yeast leavens the whole batch of dough" (5:6–7). In all these instances, the action which Paul urges the group to take is based upon their identity as a new community in Christ.

Conclusion

Since the Corinthians exist as a new humanity through the possession of "reason," one of the primary goals of their ethics should be the preservation and upbuilding of the community. However, their problem is their inability to appropriate the gospel for proper actions. Their factions are indications that they have not understood the wisdom of the cross and reached the state of maturity that Paul desires. Paul calls them to consider the nature of their corporate existence and to apply the mind of Christ so they may properly build the community according to the wisdom of the cross. In this wisdom there is a reversal of values and perspective, which necessitates a willingness to be "weak" and "foolish" according to the status system of the world, resulting in self-sacrificial attitudes and actions for the sake of others and the whole.

In 1 Cor. 12–14 the proper building of the community also depends upon the proper application of the wisdom of the cross. The present investigation of 1 Cor. 13 and 14 will reveal even more how "love" reflects the self-sacrificing and community-building attitude found in the mind of Christ, which leads to the correct use of prophecy and tongues in the body.

[37] See chapter 5 above.

7

THE APPLICATION OF THE BODY OF CHRIST: LOVE AND PROPHECY (1 COR. 13–14)

The description of the Corinthians as possessing the mind of Christ and being his body speaks of their new existence. In the first chapters of 1 Corinthians, Paul indicates that they are distinct from the world which does not possess the νοῦς Χριστοῦ and cannot comprehend the things of God. In their new corporate existence as God's temple, they should cease their quarreling over leaders. In 1 Cor. 12 Paul calls them Christ's body and likewise calls them to unity.

Just as both instances reflect the Corinthians' existence as members of a new humanity in Christ, so do both speak of the need to "build" the community of God properly. Even though the Corinthians are already united by virtue of their inclusion in new humanity, Paul wants to "build" the community properly in anticipation of the Day of Judgment (3:10–15). In 1 Cor. 12–14 the Corinthians are the body of Christ, united in the Spirit, and Paul wants them to seek gifts that "build" the community (14:3, 4, 5, 12, 17, 26).

The way to do this is love, and Paul says explicitly in 1 Cor. 8:1, "Love builds up." 1 Cor. 13 is his extended description of love, and 1 Cor. 14 is the application of love to the body, with the result that prophecy is valued more than speaking in tongues. In analyzing Paul's description of love and the rationale by which he values prophecy above tongues, we will see that love means building according to the example and therefore the mind of Christ.

1 Cor. 13 integrally connects the entire argument of chs. 12–14. The basic progression of the argument is as follows: (1) the Corinthians are the body of Christ, characterized by unity and diversity (ch. 12); (2) in the body of Christ love is the "more excellent way" to conduct their relationships (ch. 13); (3) with a perspective of love, the Corinthians will seek the gifts that edify the whole rather than the individual, namely prophecy rather than tongues (ch. 14).

Both love and the method of basing specific precepts upon the principle of bodily unity can be understood according to a Stoic

framework. We will see that love finds its basis in the order of the universe and has as its goal the building of the most intense ties within the members of bodily humanity. Similarly, Paul bases "love" upon the order of the universe, although it is the eschatological universe in Christ. Since "love" is based upon this eschatological order, it necessitates proper application of the mind of Christ, with the result that one follows Christ's example for the benefit of the whole.

Love and the new community in Christ (1 Cor. 12:31b–13:13)

Scholars have long wrestled with the purpose of 1 Cor. 12:31b–13:13 within the overall context of chs. 12–14.[1] Its placement appears odd both because its flowing rhetorical style contrasts sharply with Paul's prose in chs. 12 and 14 and because the text would seem to move naturally from 12:31a to 14:1.[2] But the passage serves a critical purpose within the overall chapters because Paul moves from describing the existing relationships among the members of the unified body to a more intense form of unity, with love as the "more excellent way." For the Stoics and other philosophers, love was a key means of increasing the bonds among the members of universal humanity or political units. For the Stoics in particular, love was the highest way of developing relationships in an already unified humanity in the actual course of life. Love served the same function for Paul. In other words, if 1 Cor. 12 describes a general bond that exists among believers by virtue of being a body, ch. 13 describes the most desired way of intensifying that unity and working it out in their daily lives. For the Stoics, "love" related to how they conceived of the world through νοῦς. Paul's understanding of love was also profoundly shaped by his conception of the world through νοῦς, although for him it was the νοῦς Χριστοῦ and the "wisdom" of the cross.

Love as the bond of humanity in Stoicism

Mitchell calls love "the principle of social cohesion by which Paul calls the Corinthians to unity" since Paul clearly states in 8:1, "Love

[1] In general, scholars have moved away from seeing it as a hymn (J. T. Sanders, "First Corinthians 13: Its Interpretation Since the First World War," *Int* 20 [1966] 159–87) and have focused more on its rhetorical qualities (e.g. Wuellner, "Pauline Argumentation," 177–88, who sees it as an example of epideictic rhetoric).

[2] For a current discussion on the genre of the passage, see Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 606–608.

builds up."[3] In antiquity, various forms of love were valued for their ability to contribute to unity. Mitchell has well noted the role of "love" in *homonoia* speeches, where it was commonly presented as an antidote to στάσις.[4] What is particularly interesting about the Stoics, however, is the way in which they connected love with the harmony of the universe.

Ἔρως

That ἔρως was beneficial for the city was a common idea in antiquity. Plato spoke of ἔρως as creating peace and intimacy among people,[5] while Dio Chrysostom spoke about its role in combatting strife.[6] Plutarch, drawing upon Plato, described it as a force for unifying the state because in its idealized form it did not seek pleasure, but the good of the loved one.[7]

Given the common understanding of ἔρως as passionate, sexual relationship, we might not expect to hear the Stoics extolling its benefits. However, Zeno said that ἔρως was a "god who prepared the way for friendship (φιλίας) and concord (ὁμονοίας) and even liberty."[8] George Boys-Stones points out that there were actually two understandings of ἔρως, with one being cosmological in which "Eros was also the Πρωτόγονος . . . the first being, who emerged from Chaos in the beginning and formed the world in order and harmony."[9] While there is no direct evidence that Zeno held this cosmological view, it

[3] Mitchell, *Paul*, 168.

[4] E.g. Aristotle in *Politics*, "For we think that friendship (φιλίαν) is the greatest blessing for the state, since it is the best safeguard against revolution (στασιάζοιεν)" (2.1.16) (Mitchell, *Paul*, 165–71).

[5] Plato, *Symp*. 197C–D. [6] Dio Chrysostom, *Nicaeen*. 39.8.

[7] E.g. "Those who fixed their affections on the same boys . . . persevered in common efforts to make their loved one (τὸν ἐρώμενον) as noble as possible" (*Lyc*. 18.4). However, for Plutarch, this includes both homosexual and heterosexual love. See Alan Wardman, *Plutarch's Lives* (Berkeley: University of California, 1974) 57–63.

[8] Athenaeus, *Deipn*. 13.561. It is possible that Zeno might have been going through his Cynic phase when he wrote the *Republic*, the work from which the statement was taken, although there are strong arguments for seeing this as a Stoic work. See the discussion in George Boys-Stones, "Eros in Government: Zeno and the Virtuous City," *CQ* 48 (1998) 168.

[9] Boys-Stones, "Eros," 170. Other philosophers also distinguished this form of ἔρως. For example, Athenaeus asserts in *Deipn*. 13.561, "Others, also, who preceded Zeno in philosophic speculation knew Eros as a holy being far removed from anything ignoble . . . And the Athenians were so far removed from apprehending Eros as a god presiding over sexual intercourse that right in the Academy, which was quite obviously consecrated to Athena, they enshrined Eros and joined his sacrifices with hers."

does appear in a Stoicized form in the writings of Cornutus: "Some people consider the whole cosmos to be Eros: beautiful, desirable, young and at the same time the oldest thing of all; possessing much fire, and the cause of motion swift as if shot from a bow or propelled by wings."[10] This passage does not present Eros as the god of unreason and eroticism. Instead, since Chrysippus says that motion is the basis for the cosmic organization,[11] Eros is the god who explains the beauty of the order of the universe.[12] Therefore, the cosmological explanation readily applies to notions of harmony, and, as Boys-Stones concludes, "If Eros can bind the cosmos together in harmonious order, then he can do the same for the city."[13]

For the Stoics, just as an individual's harmony with oneself was a function of one's harmony with nature, so too did the city, as a part of nature too, achieve harmony when brought into harmony with nature. If Eros was the god binding the cosmos, then the Stoic's obligation was to live according to the harmonizing influence of Eros.[14] Boys-Stones summarizes:

> For the internal harmony of a city must be dependent quite specifically on harmonious relationships existing between all of its citizens, and to this extent on the love that the citizens have for each other. And this kind of love is precisely the love of the cosmological Eros: it is the love by which the disparate elements of chaos were brought together into the harmonious arrangement of the cosmos.[15]

Thus, it was possible for Zeno to say that ἔρως could be a harmonizing force for the city if it was the kind of love that brought harmony to the universe.

[10] 48.5–9, as cited in Boys-Stones, "Eros," 171.

[11] Plutarch, *Stoic rep.* 1049F–50A. [12] Boys-Stones, "Eros," 171.

[13] Ibid. This may be what Adolf Bonhöffer called a "moral *eros*" (*The Ethics of the Stoic Epictetus*, trans. William O. Stephens [New York: Peter Lang, 1996] 92). He points to texts in Diogenes Laertius, *Vit. phil.* 7.113, where *eros* is defined as "an effort to win affection due to the visible presence of beauty," and Cicero, *Tusc.* 4.72, "The Stoics actually both say that the wise will experience love, and define love itself as the endeavour to form a friendship inspired by the semblance of beauty" (*Stoici vero et sapientem amaturum esse dicunt et amorem ipsum conatum amicitiae faciendae ex pulchritudinis specie definiunt*).

[14] "[Zeno, among others,] reckoned that the happiness of the whole city, like the happiness in the life of a single man, comes from virtue and harmony with itself" (Plutarch, *Lyc.* 31 [*SVF* 1.263], as cited in Boys-Stones, "Eros," 172).

[15] Boys-Stones, "Eros," 172.

Thus, for the Stoics, ἔρως was one form of "love" which bound together the universe and city.[16] However, it was not the only form of "love" which related to the harmony of the universe and brought these benefits to the city. Φιλία also bound together the members of universal humanity.

Φιλία (and amicitia*)*

"Friendship" was a popular *topos* for urging unity. In general it was based upon a system of giving and reciprocating benefits.[17] There were diverse understandings of what constituted friendship, for example, who could be friends, what were the limitations of friendships, whether one could have many or only a few friends, and so on. P. A. Brunt states, "From the constant intimacy and goodwill of virtuous or at least of like-minded men to the courtesy that etiquette normally enjoined on gentlemen, it covers every degree of genuinely or overtly amicable relation."[18]

Adele M. Fiske notes that in general there seem to be two opposed views: one associating *amicitia* with "political bonds," and the other describing the affection between "good men."[19] The latter was characterized by an intense agreement between friends, an agreement in

[16] The following passage from Diogenes Laertius also indicates how the Stoics did not focus upon the passionate aspect of ἔρως. He states that Chrysippus believed that "Love (ἔρως) is an attempt to make friends (φιλοποιίας); on account of beauty being apparent: its object is not sexual intercourse, but friendship (φιλίας) . . . So love has friendship as its object, as in fact Chrysippus says in On Love, and it is not a matter for censure" (*Vit. phil.* 7.130, translation by Malcolm Schofield, *The Stoic Idea of the City* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991] 34). Chrysippus was not the only one to connect *eros* and friendship, e.g. Dio Chrysostom, *Nicaeen.* 39.8, "I pray to Dionysus the progenitor of this city, to Heracles its founder, to Zeus Guardian of Cities, to Athena, to Aphrodite Fosterer of Friendship (Φιλία), to Harmony, and Nemesis, and all the other gods, that from this day forth they may implant in this city a yearning for itself, a passionate love (ἔρωτα), a singleness of purpose, a unity of wish and thought." John M. Rist notes that for Plato, when friendship becomes intense, it is called ἔρως ("Plutarch's *Amatorius*: A Commentary on Plato's Theories of Love?" *CQ* 51 [2001] 560). Plutarch also cites ἔρως as the foundation for φιλία in *Lyc.* 18.4.

[17] E.g. Cicero, *Amic.* 8.26. See Peter Marshall, *Enmity in Corinth: Social Conventions in Paul's Relations with the Corinthians* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1987) 1–34.

[18] "'Amicitia' in the Late Roman Republic," *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 191 (1965) 20.

[19] Adele M. Fiske, "Hieronymus Ciceronianus," *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 96 (1965) 120. Both φιλία and *amicitia* are considered to be "friendship" (e.g., see Marshall, *Corinth*). However, David Konstan proposes that while *amicitia* assumes some of the "wider connotations" of φιλία, *amor* corresponds more to φιλία "in the sweeping sense," and does this "just as *amare* is the Latin equivalent to the Greek verb *philein*" (*Friendship in the Classical*

"words, counsels, opinions, and feelings" so complete that they were said to have the same mindset and to be so alike as to have almost one soul.[20] Such closeness would be difficult to maintain with more than a few friends,[21] since the demands of intimacy precluded a person's ability to have many friends.[22]

However, there was another type of friendship which was more universal, and was often associated with a unified state. In this type of friendship, the bonds among the citizens were often stated in the same terms as intimate personal friendship. For example, the ideal unity in political friendship could also be described as sharing "one soul" and being in complete agreement, as seen in Dio Chrysostom:

> When a city has concord, as many citizens as there are, so many are the eyes with which to see that city's interest, so many the ears with which to hear, so many the tongues to give advice, so many the minds concerned in its behalf; why, it is just as if some god had made a single soul (μίαν ψυχήν) for so great and populous a city.[23]
>
> Indeed what spectacle is more enchanting than a city with singleness of purpose, and what sound is more awe-inspiring than its harmonious voice? What city is wiser in council than that which takes council together? What city acts more smoothly than that which acts together? What city is less liable to failure than that which favours the same policies?

World [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997] 122). But as will be noted below, *amor* can also be seen more as a term of affection as well as the concrete manifestation of *amicitia*.

[20] Plutarch, *Amic. mult.* 96E–F. Aristotle states, "Friends have one soul (μία ψυχή) between them" (*Eth. Nic.* 9.8.2; also 5.20). Cicero says that "friendship is nothing else than an accord in all things, human and divine, conjoined with mutual goodwill and affection" (*Amic.* 6.20) and "the most complete agreement in policy, in pursuits, and in opinions" (*Amic.* 4.15). A real friend is even considered to be "another self" (*Amic.* 21.80).

[21] Cicero, *Amic.* 5.20.

[22] Since friendship involved "a thorough-going likeness in characters, feelings, language, pursuits, and dispositions," it would be impossible for a person to have many friends without having a changing and shifting character whereas friendship demanded a "fixed and steadfast" character (Plutarch, *Amic. mult.* 96F–97D). Because of these requirements, Plutarch says that one should choose one's friends carefully, selecting only those "worthy of friendship" (*Amic. mult.* 94E; also 96D). Seneca likewise says he would not have an "unworthy" person as his friend (*Ben.* 2.18.5) and that only the wise can be friends (*Ben.* 7.12.2). In addition, intimate friendships depend upon "continual association and mutual acts of kindness" (Plutarch, *Amic. mult.* 95B), and the possession of a multitude of relationships would be a hindrance since it would be impossible to satisfy the needs of many friends, and services to one friend could engender jealousy on the part of other friends (*Amic. mult.* 95C–96A).

[23] Dio Chrysostom, *Nicaeen.* 39.5.

> To whom are blessings sweeter than to those who are of one heart and mind (ὁμονοούτων)?[24]

Aristotle concluded that friendship was "the bond of the state."[25] He even believed that lawgivers considered friendship more important than justice in maintaining concord.[26] Aristotle associated concord with friendship (φιλία) between citizens and spoke about its practical nature since it focused upon "the interests and concerns of life."[27] Others, such as Aristides also spoke of the importance of friendship in maintaining concord.[28]

Like Aristotle, Seneca called friendship "the chief bond of human society (*maxime humanam societatem alligat*)."[29] However, for the Stoics, it was intricately tied to their ideas of the universal order and the application of the rational faculty.

Gregory Sterling has discussed how the Middle Stoa viewed humanity as held together through a bond of friendship,[30] in which φιλία, implanted by nature, is the basis for the parent–child relationship,[31] ultimately extending to other relationships until it includes all of humanity.[32] J. C. Fraisse concludes that *philia* is the final stage of

[24] Dio Chrysostom, *Nicaeen*. 39.3–4.

[25] τὰς πόλεις συνέχειν ἡ φιλία (Aristotle, *Eth. nic*. 8.1.4).

[26] Aristotle, *Eth. nic*. 8.1.4. [27] Aristotle, *Eth. nic*. 9.6.1–3.

[28] I.e. "Thus friendship and concord with one another is naturally the cause of great good for the nation, the leading cities, and each individual city in common, and on the contrary faction the cause of the most extreme evils" (Aristides, 23.53); "[Concord] is the true adornment of cities, this is their greatest protection, this is their greatest glory. This is the part of those who look upwards, not at excavations and rocks, of those who have truly seen nature, not the nature of stone and wood, but that under whose sway the Universe is led, of those who have taken their share of that part of the divine government which falls to us. Indeed, one will together with the power of friendship administer all the heavens and Universe, which itself has received the greatest glory and title of all" (Aristides, 23.76–77). "It is fitting that those whose city was founded by gods should maintain peace and concord (ὁμόνοια) and friendship (φιλία) toward one another" (Dio Chrysostom, *Nicaeen*. 39.2).

[29] Seneca, *Ben*. 1.4.2.

[30] Sterling, "Bond of Humanity," 220. He cites the analysis of H. C. Baldry, *The Unity of Mankind in Greek Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963) 173–203.

[31] Cicero, *Amic*. 27, "Friendship springs rather from nature than from need ... What this feeling is ... is much more evident in man; first, from the affection existing between children and parents."

[32] "Parental affection is the source from which we trace the origin of the association of the human race in communities." "It is clear that we derive from nature herself the impulse to love (*amemus*) those to whom we have given birth" (Cicero, *Fin*. 3.19.62–63). "There is nothing more glorious nor of wider range than the solidarity of mankind, that species of alliance and partnership of interests and that actual affection which exists between man and man, which, *coming into existence immediately upon our birth*, owing to the fact that children are loved by their parents and the family as a whole, is

oikeiosis.[33] Blundell similarly argues that there is considerable overlap between the two.[34] The idea of "belonging" to one another through shared humanity and common participation in the rational faculty forms the basis for friendships among people.

Thus, to understand friendship for the Stoics is to understand how it was based upon their conception of humanity. Seneca states, "Nature bids me do good to all mankind – whether slaves or freemen, freeborn or freed-men ... Wherever there is a human being there is the opportunity for a kindness (*beneficī*)."[35] For Seneca, the obligation to benefit another depends simply upon a person's being a part of humanity. As Epictetus states, "All things are full of friends (φίλων), first gods, and then also men, who by nature have been made of one household with one another."[36] Friendship stems from the natural connectedness of bodily humanity.

For the Stoic, true friendship springs from nature and not from need. Marcia Colish distinguishes between the "traditional utilitarian" and the "idealistic Stoic view of friendship."[37] The cause, says Cicero, is "love" (*amor*). This type of friendship is superior to one that arises from a calculation of how much benefit one may receive.[38]

bound together by the ties of marriage and parenthood, gradually spreads its influence beyond the home, first by blood relationships, then by connections through marriage, later by friendships, afterwards by the bonds of neighbourhood, then to fellow-citizens and political allies and friends, and lastly by embracing the whole of the human race" (Cicero, *Fin*. 5.23.65). "For most friendships (φιλίαι) are in reality shadows and imitations and images of that first friendship which Nature implanted in children toward parents and in brothers towards brothers; and as for the man who does not reverence or honour this friendship, can he give any pledge of goodwill to strangers?" (Plutarch, *Frat. amor*. 479C–D).

[33] J. C. Fraisse, *"Philia": La notion d'amitié dans la philosophie antique. Essai sur un problème perdu et retrouvé* (Paris: Librairie J. Vrin, 1974) 338–55.

[34] Blundell, "Stoic οἰκείωσις," 223. [35] Seneca, *Vit. beat*. 24.3.

[36] Epictetus, *Diatr*. 3.24.11.

[37] Colish, *Stoicism*, 134. Konstan argues that friendship in general, and not just for the Stoics, was not limited to such objective relationships based on reciprocal obligations, although that has been a prevalent view. Rather, it can be understood primarily as a "personal relationship predicated on affection and generosity rather than on obligatory reciprocity" (*Friendship*, 5).

[38] *Amic*. 8.26–27. Benjamin Fiore, SJ, "The Theory and Practice of Friendship in Cicero," in *Greco-Roman Perspectives on Friendship*, ed. John T. Fitzgerald [Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997] 59–76; and K. Bringmann, *Untersuchungen zum späten Cicero* [Hypomnemata 29; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971] 223–25, observe that Cicero's conception of friendship was more eclectic than distinctively Stoic. But Fiore also notes that Cicero reflects a Stoic view in seeing the source of friendship in the natural sociability of people, to be sought for itself and not for self-interest ("Cicero," p. 61, n. 5). Gill notes that Cicero is the "richest source in the pre-Imperial period" for Stoic practical ethics ("School," 41).

Its profit comes from "the love itself."[39] Thus Cicero says, "The sentiments of love and of kindly affection spring from nature, when intimation has been given of its moral worth."[40] Cicero notes the close connection between *amor* and *amicitia* when he says, "Both words are derived from a word meaning "to love (*amando*),"[41] and "For it is love (*amor*) from which the word "friendship" (*amicitia*) is derived."[42]

Seneca discusses the relationship between *amor* and human nature in answering the question of whether anger is in accordance with nature:

> What is more loving (*amantius*) to others than man? Man is born for mutual help; anger for mutual destruction. The one desires union, the other disunion; the one to help, the other

[39] *Amic*. 9.31. Catherine Osborne equates *eros* and *amor* (*Eros Unveiled: Plato and the God of Love* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1994] 70, 73).

[40] Cicero, *Amic*. 9.32. The Stoics, of course, were not the only ones to have a more idealistic form of friendship. Aristotle describes three types: friendship based upon utility (διὰ τὸ χρήσιμον), friendship based upon pleasure (δι' ἡδονήν), and friendship "between the good (τῶν ἀγαθῶν) and those who resemble each other in virtue (κατ' ἀρετήν)." The last is the highest form because it is the only one in which a person loves the friend for the friend's sake and not for what is useful or pleasurable (Aristotle, *Eth. nic*. 8.3.1–8.4.5). Furthermore, this type of friendship is "perfect" (τελεία) and "permanent" (μόνιμος) (Aristotle, *Eth. nic*. 8.3.6–7). The friendship of the good is inherently more enduring than friendship based upon utility and pleasure, since the latter type is easily ended once usefulness or pleasure has ended. He says, "Hence in a friendship based on utility or on pleasure men love their friend for their own good or their own pleasure, and not as being the person loved, but as useful or agreeable. And therefore these friendships are based on an accident, since the friend is not loved for being what he is, but as affording some benefit or pleasure as the case may be. Consequently friendships of this kind are easily broken off, in the event of the parties themselves changing, for if no longer pleasurable or useful to each other, they cease to love each other. And utility is not a permanent quality; it differs at different times. Hence when the motive of the friendship has passed away, the friendship itself is dissolved, having existed merely as a means to that end" (*Eth. nic*. 8.3.2–3). Thus friendship based upon virtue would potentially be the most beneficial to any society. As Osborne remarks, "it is the focus of real co-operation between individuals in society, and represents a lasting and effective cohesive force" (Osborne, *Eros Unveiled*, 146). In Aristotle's terms, only the good can produce a truly cohesive society. John T. Fitzgerald has argued that in Philippians, Paul is calling the congregation to a higher form of friendship, from utility to virtue ("Philippians in the Light of Some Ancient Discussions of Friendship," in *Friendship, Flattery, and Frankness of Speech: Studies on Friendship in the New Testament World*, ed. John T. Fitzgerald [Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1996] 141–60).

[41] *Amic*. 27.100.

[42] *Amic*. 8.26. Also "There is something attractive in the very sound of the word 'love (*amoris*),' from which the Latin term for friendship (*amicitiae*) is derived" (*Nat. d*. 1.44.122).

> to harm ... Who, therefore, has less knowledge of the ways of Nature than the man who would ascribe to her best and more finished work this cruel and deadly vice? Anger, as I have said, is bent on punishment, and that such a desire should find a harbour in man's most peaceful breast accords least of all with his nature. For human life is founded on kindness (*beneficiis*) and concord (*concordia*), and is bound into an alliance for common help, not by terror, but by mutual love (*mutuo amore*).[43]

Since people are born for "mutual help," love is more fitting to human nature because it desires union and promotes mutual help. Human life is based upon kindness and concord, and to this end love binds people together. Anger creates the opposite: destruction, disunion, terror. Thus, love results from being created as parts of the already unified whole and furthers the unity of the whole. Lucan describes the importance of love in Stoic thought when he says, "Be present now, thou that embracest all things in an eternal bond, Harmony (*Concordia*), the preserver of the world and the blended universe! Be present, though hallowed Love (*amor*) that unitest the world!"[44]

In the following passage, already mentioned earlier, Seneca speaks of *amor* in relationship to the actions taken by the members of the body:

> As all the members of the body are in harmony one with another because it is the advantage of the whole that the individual members be unharmed, so mankind should spare the individual man, because all are born for a life of fellowship, and society can be kept unharmed only by the mutual protection and love (*amore*) of its parts.[45]

Since all are born for a life of fellowship, this entails "mutual protection and love" among the parts. In this particular case it means not injuring a fellow citizen of the greater commonwealth. Seneca contrasts this corporate love with "excessive self-love (*amor nostri nimius*)"[46] which leads to anger when one is wronged. For the sake of the already unified humanity, the members must exhibit actions of love toward one another.

[43] Seneca, *Ira* 1.5.2–3. [44] Lucan, *Bciv*. 4.190. [45] Seneca, *Ira* 2.31.6–8.
[46] Seneca, *Ira* 2.31.3.

Thus, we see in our central passage that Seneca explicitly connects bodily humanity and love:

> I can lay down for mankind a rule, in short compass, for our duties in human relationships: ... We are the parts of one great body. Nature produced us related to one another, since she created us from the same source and to the same end. She engendered in us mutual affection (*amorem*), and made us prone to friendships (*sociabiles fecit*) ... Through her orders, let our hands be ready for all that needs to be helped.[47]

Because of humanity's corporeal unity, all have the same "end," and Nature has "engendered" *amor*, which results in the concrete manifestation of mutual help. Even though humanity is united by reason and spirit, this does not seem to lead automatically to the Stoics' ideal society. Although all are parts of the unified body, each must still learn how to act properly, and this is the way of love, which comes from Nature.

The importance of "love" is further seen in the following passage from Marcus Aurelius, discussed previously:

> The principle which obtains where limbs and body (τὰ μέλη τοῦ σώματος) unite to form one organism, holds good also for rational things with their separate individualities ... But the perception of this shall come more home to thee, if thou sayest to thyself, I am a *limb* (μέλος) of the organized body of rational things. But if (using the letter R) thou sayest thou art but a *part* (μέρος), not yet does thou love (φιλεῖς) mankind from the heart, nor yet does well-doing delight thee for its own sake.[48]

For Marcus it is not enough simply to be attached to the body. He asserts that one must be able to love (φιλέω) humanity and that this ability makes the difference between being a "limb" and a "part." Only the one who loves humanity is a "limb." Love, therefore, affects the type of connection one has with the body.

The result of acting in love is summarized by Philo, whom Sterling concludes reflects a Stoic view of friendship:[49]

[47] Seneca, *Ep.* 95.52. [48] Marcus Aurelius, *Med.* 7.13.
[49] Sterling, "Bond of Humanity," 203–23.

> (Moses) commands all members of the nation to love (ἀγαπᾶν) the incomers, not only as friends (φίλους) and kinsfolk but as themselves both in body and soul . . . so that they may seem to be the separate parts of a single living being (ὡς ἐν διαιρετοῖς μέρεσιν ἓν εἶναι ζῷον δοκεῖν) which is compacted and unified by their fellowship in it.[50]

Philo states that love (as the verb, ἀγαπάω) will produce an organic cohesion such that the nation will seem to be as one living being.

It should be noted that it is difficult to determine the relationship between ἀγαπάω and φιλέω (or ἀγάπη and φιλία). However, Robert Joly argues that the two terms are virtually synonymous.[51] For example, Dio Chrysostom states,

> For it is somehow natural for the courageous to love (φιλεῖν) the courageous, while cowards eye them with misgiving and hate them as enemies, but welcome the base and like them (ἀγαπῶσιν). And so to the one class truth and frankness are the most agreeable things in the world, to the other, flattery and deceit.[52]

In addition, when Aristotle says, "To be loved (τὸ φιλεῖσθαι) is to be cherished (ἀγαπᾶσθαι) for one's own sake,"[53] he is not distinguishing between the two senses of the terms, but "il veut simplement remarquer que le vrai sense de 'etre aimé,' c'est 'etre aimé pour soi-même.'"[54] We may perhaps see this in 1 Corinthians when,

[50] Philo, *Virt*. 103.

[51] Robert Joly, *Le vocabulaire chrétien de l'amour, est-il original?* (Brussels: Universitaires de Bruxelles, 1968) 39.

[52] Dio Chrysostom, *4 Regn*. 4.15. Similarly, *1 Regn*. 1.19, "And further, cattle love (φιλοῦσι) their keepers best and are most submissive to them; the same is true of horses and their drivers; hunters are protected and loved (ἀγαπῶνται) by their dogs, and in the same way other subject creatures love (ἀγαπᾷ); *3 Regn*. 3.110–11, "Now, while in any other matter, such as leisure, ease, and relaxation, our good king does not wish to have unvarying advantage over private citizens and indeed, would often be satisfied with less, in the one matter of friendship (φιλίᾳ) he does want to have the larger portion; and he doubtless thinks it in no wise peculiar or strange – nay, he actually exults because young people love him (ἀγαπώμενος) more than they do their parents, and older men (ἀγαπώσι) more than than they do their children, because his associates love him (ἀγαπώσι) more than they do their peers, and those who know him only by hearsay love him (ἀγαπῶνται) more than they do their nearest neighbours. Extremely fond of kith and kin though he may be, yet, in a way, he considers friendship (φιλίαν) of greater good than kinship"; *3 Regn*. 3.103, "When a man has hosts of excellent friends (φίλοι) . . . when he has many who love him (ἀγαπῶντες), still more who admire him . . . is he not perfectly happy? For such a man has multitudes to share his joy."

[53] Aristotle, *Rhet*. 1.11.17. [54] Joly, *Le vocabulaire*, 39.

after extolling ἀγάπη as the "more excellent way," Paul warns in 1 Cor. 16:22, "Let anyone be accursed who has no love (οὐ φιλεῖ) for the Lord." At any rate, we see there is a degree of flexibility in the use of the terms.

Thus, the Stoics often described friendship, or even more specifically, a type of love which leads to true friendship, in relationship to their understanding of the natural, bodily unity of humanity. Although being unified as a body was the starting point, a greater goal was for the members to be bonded together in love. The application of the rational faculty was critical for people to be able to understand this.

Furthermore, it was possible to adapt the basic framework. Colish discusses the way in which Cicero modifies the Stoic conception of friendship in *De Amicitia*, in particular, the idea that only wise men could truly be friends. In response to the Stoics' conception of virtue, Cicero changes the standard so that friends do not need to be perfect sages. To this end, he "substitutes a more realistic conception of human nature" so that the ideal can be "reconceived and equated instead with ... a type of virtue that is less extreme and that bears a more specific set of political loyalties than Stoicism requires."[55]

That one could adapt a common concept of love to fit one's own philosophy is also seen in the following passage from 4 Maccabees. Hans-Josef Klauck examines how the concept of "brotherly love (φιλαδελφία)" in popular morality could be adapted according to a Jewish definition of what was righteous and virtuous.[56]

> You cannot be ignorant of the charm of brotherhood (ἀδελφότητος φίλτρα) which the divine and all-wise providence (πρόνοια) has allotted through fathers to their

[55] So, for example, Laelius discusses situations that would be inconceivable in a traditional Stoic framework, such as whether one should do wrong for a friend (Colish, *Stoicism*, 134–35). See Cicero, *Amic*. 5.18–6.21.

[56] There is debate over the dating of 4 Maccabees. H. Anderson dates the work between 63 BCE and 70 CE, which could possibly make the author a contemporary of Paul. Although the author's connections with Stoicism are unclear, he does at times adopt Stoic language and views, such as a reference to "providence" at the beginning of the passage (H. Anderson, trans., *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, vol. II, ed. James H. Charlesworth [New York: Doubleday, 1985] 537–38; Moses Hadas, ed. and trans., *The Third and Fourth Book of Maccabees* [New York: Harper & Brothers, 1953] 115–18).

> offspring, implanting it, in fact, in their mother's womb ... They are brought to birth through the same span and draw milk from the same fountains, and through being embraced at the same breast, fraternal souls (φιλάδελφοι ψυχαί) are nourished, and they grow from strength to strength through a common nurture and daily companionship as well as in the training imposed by our discipline in the Law. The ties of brotherly love (συμπαθοῦς τῆς φιλαδελφίας), it is clear, are firmly set and never more firmly than among the seven brothers; for having been trained in the same Law and having disciplined themselves in the same virtues (ἀρετάς), and having been reared together in the life of righteousness, they love one (ἠγάπων) another all the more. Their common zeal for beauty and goodness strengthened their goodwill (εὔνοιαν) and fellow feeling (ὁμόνοιαν) for one another, and in conjunction with their piety made their brotherly love (φιλαδελφίαν) more ardent.[57]

The author moves from the already strong ties of brotherly love (φιλαδελφίαν) to an even stronger bond which occurs through the brothers' similar training in the law and their common lives of righteousness. Their already strong "ties of brotherly love" (συμπαθοῦς τῆς φιλαδελφίας) are strengthened because of their common zeal.

This deepening of ties relates to virtue, and especially as it relates to social ethics. For the brothers in 4 Maccabees, their natural φιλαδελφία is also strengthened through their commitment to virtue (ἀρετή) and righteousness. But it is specifically the brothers' understanding of the Law that allows them to create the strongest bonds of ἀγάπη, εὔνοια, ὁμόνοια, and φιλαδελφία.

In this way, 4 Maccabees argues for the superiority of the Jewish law. The law provides an ethic based upon "a completely different foundation"[58] and elevates this foundation above any other. "It is proved not only that Judaism obviously knows the value of brotherly love, accepted by all in that cultural world, but also that brotherly love in Judaism, through its connection to the law, is qualitatively more valuable and a more powerful image than is understood and

[57] 4 Macc. 13:19–26, trans. H. Anderson, *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 558.

[58] Hans-Josef Klauck, "Brotherly Love in Plutarch and in 4 Maccabees," *Greeks, Romans, and Christians*, ed. David L. Balch, Everett Ferguson, and Wayne A. Meeks (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990) 154.

practiced elsewhere." It is precisely the training in the Law that allows for this superior form of brotherly love.[59]

The author of 4 Maccabees demonstrates that Judaism is comprehensible within a Hellenistic philosophical framework. But at the same time, he indicates that the Jewish law redefines virtue and righteousness. The revealed Law of Israel's God provides a superior means of attaining a cohesive and virtuous society.

What becomes important for the present study, then, is to examine the ways in which Paul modifies the understanding of love. For Paul, "love" is equated with what is in the mind of Christ and provides the primary means of unity which should operate within the new humanity. Like the Stoics, Paul appears to be urging the Corinthians to use "love" to build upon their already existing ties of bodily unity. However, as Cicero and the author of 4 Maccabees adapted concepts according to their own perceptions of reality, so does Paul. Specifically, love is understood not through the Stoic νοῦς, but the νοῦς Χριστοῦ and is exemplified in the crucified Christ. This type of love is a "more excellent way" to "build up" the body of Christ.

Love in 1 Corinthians 13

To understand love means one must understand the nature of the universe, and the eschatological universe is best understood through the mind and example of Christ. I will now examine how, for Paul, following Christ's example will ultimately lead to the building up of the Corinthian community.

Showing a more excellent way

J. Hellegouarc'h states that *amor* is "la manifestation concrète de l'état d'*amicitia*." He notes that while *amor* designates a particularly strong personal sentiment, it is a term of action as well as an affective

[59] Ibid., 154. In addition, the type of love exhibited by the brothers is desirable for the whole community. As Klauck explains, "The harmony (v. 25) produced by brotherly love is simultaneously the ideal state of the whole Jewish people (3:21). At this level brotherly love can be projected beyond the narration about the seven physical brothers. All children of Israel should practice it toward one another not as an unattached moral ideal but on the basis and within the framework of the Torah" (ibid., 155). In 3:20–21 the author describes those who "took repressive measures against the communal harmony (τὴν κοινὴν ὁμόνοιαν) and so ruined the peace that the people had been enjoying through their observance of the Law (εὐνομίαν)."

one.[60] This corresponds with Holladay's observation that in the New Testament δείκνυμι is generally used for "that which is graphically concrete or, if not, should be."[61] Thus, ὁδὸν δείκνυμι in 1 Cor. 12:31 reflects Paul's desire to illustrate love through example. As we will see, this is Paul's example, which is ultimately the example of Christ.

Furthermore, Paul introduces the discussion of love with the phrase, καὶ ἔτι καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ὁδόν, which is probably best understood with καθ' ὑπερβολήν having an attributive function modifying ὁδόν, and thus rendered "Yes, an even greater way still,"[62] "an extraordinary way,"[63] or the traditional "more excellent way."[64]

Similarly, Cicero praises friendship, or *amicitia*, as being "more excellent" than anything else except virtue. He says, "I exhort you both so to esteem virtue (without which friendship [*amicitia*] cannot exist), that, excepting virtue, you will think of nothing more excellent (*praestabilius*) than friendship."[65]

But perhaps even more significantly, he talks about a superior source for friendship, which is love. As mentioned above, *amor* was considered to be the source for true friendship. He says that

> While it is true that advantages (*utilitates*) are frequently obtained . . . it seems to me that friendship (*amicitia*) springs rather from nature than from need, and from an inclination of the soul joined with a feeling of love (*sensu amandi*) rather than from calculation of how much profit (*utilitatis*) the friendship is likely to afford.[66]

He finds a type of friendship that is more noble than one based upon personal advantage. This is one that seeks friendship for its own sake and for the benefit of the friend rather than utility.

Elsewhere Cicero speaks of "love and of kindly affection" (*diligendi et benevolentiae*) as sources of friendship springing from nature. Because these are more in line with Nature, and Nature is "unchangeable," they produce real friendships (*verae amicitiae*).

[60] J. Hellegouarc'h, *Le vocabulaire latin des relations et des parties politiques sous la République* (Paris: Société d'Edition les Belles Lettres, 1963) 146–47.

[61] E.g. Matt. 4:8; 8:4. Only once is it a synonym for διδάσκειν (Matt. 16:21) (Carl. R. Holladay, "1 Corinthians 13: Paul as Apostolic Paradigm," in *Greeks, Romans, and Christians*, ed. David L. Balch, Everett Ferguson, and Wayne A. Meeks [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990] 87).

[62] Thiselton, *Corinthians*, 1026. [63] R. F. Collins, *Corinthians*, 474–75.

[64] See the discussion of various proposals in Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 603–604.

[65] Cicero, *Amic*. 27.104. [66] Cicero, *Amic*. 8.26–27. Also *Fin*. 3.21.70.

Love produces a union between those who exhibit similar qualities of virtue, and this union is "more dignified and more consonant with truth."[67]

Therefore, while advantages may result from friendship, they should not be the motive for the highest form of friendship. Cicero says, "But love (*amare*) is nothing other than the great esteem and affection felt for him who inspires that sentiment, and it is not sought because of material need or for the sake of material gain."[68] He does not deny that "mutual interchange" is inevitably a part of friendship. But rather than friendship springing forth from "weakness and want," *amor* is "another cause, older (*antiquior*), more beautiful (*pulchrior*), and emanating more directly from Nature herself."[69] Cicero's description of *amor* as "beautiful" and "older" recalls Cornutus' description of the cosmological, unifying Eros.[70] For both, "love" stems from the natural order of the world and provides unity.

Thus, when it comes to forming bonds between people, love is the highest way for both the Stoics and Paul. Being unified as a body and by the rational nature was a beginning point, but not the end. Ultimately, the goal was to love, and to do this entailed an understanding of the universal nature. For Paul, the nature of the eschatological universe is seen in the example of Christ as the wisdom of God.

The content of love

In ch. 13 Paul establishes the superiority of love, but his main point is not a direct contrast with the spiritual manifestations so that the way of love is superior to the way of the gifts. Rather, exercising the gifts in love (or simply love itself) is a "more excellent way" than alternative ways of using the distributions and will help to achieve the goal of building the community. As Garland states, "Only when they are exercised with love do they become useful in building up the church."[71]

In 1 Cor. 13:1–3 Paul describes the uselessness of tongues, prophecy, faith, and giving without the motive of love.[72] According to

[67] Cicero, *Amic*. 9.32. [68] Cicero, *Amic*. 27.100. [69] Cicero, *Amic*. 8.26.
[70] 48.5–9, as cited in Boys-Stones, "Eros," 171. [71] Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 609.
[72] E.g. "Paul now cites examples of extreme self-denial and again discounts anything that is not motivated by love" (ibid., 614).

Seneca, the importance of the benefit is the way in which it is given. "And so what counts is, not what is done or what is given, but the spirit (*mente*) of the action, because a benefit (*beneficium*) consists, not in what is done or given, but in the intention (*animo*) of the giver or doer."[73]

A good intention can make a small gift great, and a bad intention can lessen the value of a large gift. It is not the size of the benefit, but the character of the giver which matters.[74] The gift should be given not for personal gain but for the benefit of the recipient. Seneca defines a benefit as "the act of a well-wisher who bestows joy and derives joy from the bestowal of it, and is inclined to do what he does from the prompting of his own will."[75] It consists not in things, but in the desire to benefit.[76] Likewise, what matters for Paul is not the manifestation a person has, but whether or not it is exercised in love.

But, for Paul, love has a specific content related to the nature of the eschatological universe. Like the Stoics, Paul sees a universal humanity as a bodily unity in which social obligations are understood through νοῦς. The one who has the reasoning capacity can understand nature and, thus, love. For Paul, love must be understood in relationship to an eschatological universe defined by the wisdom of God seen in the cross. "The cross of Christ as the manifestation of God's love for the world ... is the central defining reality for Paul's understanding of ἀγάπη."[77]

The Stoics understood the importance of having the correct goal based upon understanding the universe. Seneca notes that "all depends upon the end toward which these are directed by the Ruling Principle that gives to things their form."[78] The reasons for one's actions stem from participation in the universal mind. The thing done or given is "neutral."[79] One must therefore look toward the universal mind to understand what constitutes a true "benefit."

Paul's presentation of love is a call for the Corinthians to act as Christ did, and, in so doing, they will bring about the unity that Paul desires. His presentation of love reflects the application of the eschatological values of the cross to the community. Many of the qualities of love in 1 Cor. 13:4–7 are similar to those found in Seneca's description of friendship. According to Paul, love is patient and

[73] Seneca, *Ben.* 1.6.1. Also 1.5.2. [74] Seneca, *Ben.* 1.9.2.
[75] Seneca, *Ben.* 1.6.1. [76] Seneca, *Ben.* 1.7.1.
[77] Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 605–606. [78] Seneca, *Ben.* 1.6.2–3.
[79] Seneca, *Ben.* 1.6.3.

kind, not boastful or arrogant. Likewise Seneca says that in friendship gifts should be given willingly,[80] without hesitation,[81] and with kindness (*humanitas*).[82] He says that above all one should avoid arrogance (*superbia*) in giving a benefit.[83] He insists, "Empty boasting must be banished."[84] But perhaps most significantly, as Antoinette Wire describes, love is "taking loss on behalf of others."[85] This willingness to suffer loss is particularly relevant in light of how Paul portrays love.

Carl R. Holladay has shown how the content of love in 1 Cor. 13 corresponds with the rest of 1 Corinthians and Paul's own apostolic example.[86] For instance, when Paul refers to the "tongues of men and of angels" or talks about knowing "all mysteries," these are all gifts or abilities that he possesses or has the potential to possess (2:1–10; 4:1; 14:6, 18; 15:51). When he says that love does not seek its own, this contrasts with the Corinthians' self-seeking behavior, but it also reflects Paul's example of not seeking his own advantage (10:33).[87] Paul's point, of course, is that he does love, so the Corinthians should follow his example.

Paul's presentation of himself as an example to be imitated is not unique to ch. 13. In 4:16 he states, "I appeal to you, then, be imitators of me." He presents Apollos and himself as models of how to live according to the wisdom of the cross presented in chs. 1–3. Though despised in the eyes of the world because of their weakness and suffering, they are esteemed by God's standards. In this way, they are examples of the kind of life and thought required of those who are in Christ, who also was despised by the world (4:6–13). Rather than seeking individual glory and status, they are willing to be "fools for Christ's sake" (4:10). This selflessness, seen in their willingness to sacrifice personal status, incomprehensible by the world's standards, promotes the building up of the temple of God. But it is first of all

[80] Seneca, *Ben.* 1.4.3; 2.1.1. [81] Seneca, *Ben.* 2.1.1–4.
[82] Seneca, *Ben.* 2.11.4. [83] Seneca, *Ben.* 2.11.6; 2.18.1; 2.13.1–3.
[84] Seneca, *Ben.* 2.11.6.
[85] Antoinette Wire, *The Corinthian Women Prophets* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990) 139.
[86] Holladay, "1 Corinthians 13," 80–98. For a recent study on Paul's use of personal example in general, see Brian Dodd, *Paul's Paradigmatic 'I': Personal Example as Literary Strategy* (JSNTSup 177; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994) 187–95.
[87] Samuel Vollenweider observes that Paul connects the concept of freedom with the body of Christ as the Stoics linked freedom with the order of the universe (*Freiheit als neue Schöpfung* [Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989] 229–30.

based on the example of Christ crucified, the wisdom of God, which the Corinthians understand by the mind of Christ.

In 11:1 Paul explicitly states, "Be imitators of me, as I am of Christ." This second passage likewise refers to an example of individual humility for the sake of the larger good. 11:1 is preceded by Paul's statement of his desire not to seek his own gain, but the gain of the many so that they may be saved (10:31–33). Paul calls for the Corinthians to relinquish "their so-called rights to act on their so-called knowledge."[88] This consideration of the other before one's own benefit reflects the concern of the entire section of chs. 8–10 in regard to liberty and eating idol meat. Paul instructs the "strong" to curtail the freedom they have because of their knowledge so that they may avoid harming their brothers and sisters in the church. Thus, his introductory statement in 8:1 that "love builds up" seems to find its specific application in the willingness to seek gain for others over personal gain. Although their knowledge would allow them to eat the meat, love should compel the "strong" to abstain in order to benefit the "weak." Love seeks gain for the other rather than self-benefit. If the Corinthians imitate Paul as he imitates Christ, they will know how to love.

1 Corinthians is not the only epistle where Paul discusses the relationship between proper thinking, "love," and the example of Christ. In Phil. 1:27–2:11, he explicitly connects the three. In this passage Paul also appeals to self-sacrifice and consideration of others for the sake of unity, and he bases this understanding on the crucifixion and the willingness to forgo claims to personal status. Because of the extensive way in which Paul discusses the example of Christ, it will be helpful to examine the passage here.

Paul urges the Philippians to live in a manner worthy of the gospel (1:27), and this "manner" is revealed through their unity. They are to be "standing firm in one spirit (ἐνὶ πνεύματι), striving side by side with one mind (μιᾷ ψυχῇ) for the faith of the gospel" (1:27). They are to "be of the same mind, having the same love, being in full accord and of one mind" (τὸ αὐτὸ προνῆτε, τὴν αὐτὴν ἀγάπην ἔχοντες, σύμψυχοι, τὸ ἓν φρονοῦντες; 2:2).

But this unity cannot happen while each is looking out for his or her own interests. Thus Paul urges them, "Do nothing from selfish ambition or conceit, but in humility regard others as better than

[88] Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 502.

yourselves." Each should "look not to your own interests, but to the interests of others" (2:3–4). Unity is achieved when people are more other-regarding than self-regarding. Paul then presents the Philippians with a model of this unifying way of thinking through Christ's example (τοῦτο φρονεῖτε ἐν ὑμῖν ὃ καὶ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ; 2:5).

Gerald Hawthorne observes that the best way to maintain the grammatical parallelism between ἐν ὑμῖν and ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ is to translate Phil. 2:5 as "This way of thinking must be adopted by you, which also was the way of thinking adopted by Christ Jesus."[89] Thus the Philippians are to adopt Christ's way of thinking if they are to achieve the oneness that Paul seeks. L. Michael notes that in Philippians the phrase τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν and its variations refer to "social relations" so that Paul is not merely speaking of an outlook or state of mind, but an attitude that the Philippians should adopt toward each other.[90]

Whether or not the phrase itself refers to social ethics, the function of the hymn lies in the way in which Paul applies the example of Christ for the purposes of unity.[91] Even though the hymn has an essential soteriological content and may have had a different original context and function, its purpose within Philippians is to present Christ as "the supreme example of the humble, self-sacrificing, self-denying, self-giving service that Paul has just been urging the Philippians to practice in their relations one toward another."[92] Since Paul's goal is unity, he teaches them to follow the example of Christ in their social relations.

This other-regarding manner of thinking is also exemplified through Christ's willingness to forgo higher status for the sake of the Philippians. Paul states that Christ did not regard equality with

[89] Gerald Hawthorne, *Philippians* (WBC; Waco, TX: Word, 1983) 81.

[90] L. Michael White, "Morality between Two Worlds: A Paradigm of Friendship in Philippians," in *Greeks, Romans, and Christians*, ed. D. L. Balch, E. Ferguson, and W. A. Meeks (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990) 210. Thus the phrase should be instead, "Adopt toward one another in your mutual relations, the same attitude which was found in Christ Jesus." He cites the work of C. F. D. Moule, "Further Reflexions on Philippians 2.5–11," in *Apostolic History and the Gospel: Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F. F. Bruce*, ed. W. W. Gasque and R. P. Martin (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1970) 265.

[91] As L. W. Hurtado explains in regard to the passage, "Whatever the origin of imagery, terms, or concepts, the crucial step in exegesis is seeing how such matters are treated in the context of a given NT document and of early Christianity" ("Jesus as Lordly Example in Philippians 2:5–11," in *From Jesus to Paul*, ed. Peter Richardson and John C. Hurd [Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1984] 119).

[92] Hawthorne, *Philippians*, 79.

God as ἁρπαγμόν (Phil. 2:6). Although interpretation of this term is still disputed,[93] a plausible conclusion by Roy W. Hoover[94] is that ἁρπαγμός means "something to use for his own advantage."[95] The term implies that Christ already possessed equality with God, but chose not to exploit it for his own gain.[96]

Joseph H. Hellerman has argued that the background behind the hymn is the Roman *cursus honorum*, or "the formalized sequence of public offices that marked out the prescribed social pilgrimage for aspiring senatorial aristocrats in Rome." The traditional goal would be to ascend to higher office, or similarly ascend in status, as the *cursus* ideology could be replicated in various non-elite settings. Jesus, however, reverses the sequence and descends in honor in a *cursus pudorum*, or "succession or race of ignominies," following a trajectory from "equality with God" to "the form of a slave" (the most dishonorable public *status*) to "death on a cross" (the most dishonorable public *humiliation*). Christ, although possessing all of the advantages of deity, does not use these advantages for his own gain, and conversely chooses the opposite course – obedience leading to willing humiliation for the sake of others.[97]

The rhetorical function of the passage is not to highlight the nature of Christ's being, although that is definitely an aspect of the passage. Instead the passage focuses upon Christ's pattern of thinking as the one who looked to the interests of others (2:4) by giving up his divine rights to status to become one who suffered the utmost dishonor. Just as Paul says in 1 Cor. 13:4 that love "does not insist on its own way," Christ becomes the prime example of selflessness, and he does this in his renunciation of his privileges for the sake of others. Thus, Paul tells the Philippians that it is only in giving up one's individual needs or rights to status that they can "be of the same mind, having

[93] For discussions of the history of interpretation, see Peter T. O'Brien, *The Epistle to the Philippians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991) 211–16; and N.T. Wright, "ἁρπαγμός and the Meaning of Philippians 2:5–11," *JTS* 37 (1986) 321–52. See also the discussion in Joseph H. Hellerman, *Reconstructing Honor in Roman Philippi: Carmen Christi as Cursus Pudorum* (SNTSMS 132; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

[94] Roy W. Hoover, "The Harpagmos Enigma: A Philological Solution," *HTR* 64 (1971) 95–119.

[95] Ibid., 118.

[96] This is opposed to Christ's literal "seizing" of that which he did not previously possess (Ralph P. Martin, *Carmen Christi. Philippians 2:5–11 in Recent Interpretation and in the Setting of Early Christian Worship* [SNTSMS 4; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967] 143–53).

[97] From the introduction of Hellerman, *Reconstructing Honor*.

the same love, being in full accord and of one mind" and so be the community of God that Paul envisions. Likewise in 1 Corinthians, Paul wants the community to apply the mind of Christ in being willing to forgo status for a unity based upon serving each other.

Furthermore, it may be possible to gain a deeper understanding of the significance of Christ's example through a comparison with friendship language. Recent studies have shown the extensive use of friendship language in Philippians.[98] L. Michael White argues that Philippians portrays Christ as a friend.[99] At the same time, however, Paul's portrayal of Christ as a friend seems to play upon yet another "reversal" of values seen in the cross. Thus, in contrast to Christ's giving up the privileges of his status, giving up one's status for a friend or another was not a part of the Greco-Roman tradition of friendship.[100] In general, friendship took place among equals.[101] A gift would only be given if one could assume that the receiver had the means to repay.[102]

This is not the only way in which Christ's action went against expectations. For Cicero, friendship should only happen between people of equal virtue.[103] Consequently, in seeking friends one should "seek another like yourself."[104] In order to make sure one finds a proper friend, "you should love (*diligere*) your friend after you have appraised him; you should not appraise him after you have

[98] E.g. Fitzgerald, "Philippians," 141–60; Stanley K. Stowers, "Friends and Enemies in the Politics of Heaven: Reading Theology in Philippians," in *Pauline Theology*, ed. J. M. Bassler (vol. I; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991) 105–21.

[99] L. M. White, "Philippians," 201–15.

[100] White observes that when a similar situation happens in Lucian's *Toxaris*, when Demetius exchanges roles with the slave Antiphilus, this is seen as "an all-surpassing act of selfless love – that is, the supreme virtue of friendship." He proposes that Paul portrays Christ according to this supreme example of friendship ("Philippians," 213). This example, however, is difficult to assess. Richard I. Pervo notes that Lucian's account is probably a parody, rather than a serious treatment of friendship ("With Lucian: Who Needs Friends? Friendship in the *Toxaris*," in *Greco-Roman Perspectives on Friendship*, ed. John T. Fitzgerald [SBLRBS 34; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997] 163–80).

[101] As Marshall points out, friendship was based upon the giving and receiving of gifts, resulting in an agonistic attitude by which the recipient was obligated to outdo the giver. Aristotle describes how both the liberal and the just person will need wealth in order to be friends (*Eth. nic.* 10.8.4). Through the system of gift exchange, a person's status was enhanced and affirmed (Marshall, *Corinth*, 1–34).

[102] Marshall, *Corinth*, 8.

[103] Hence, Cicero's comment that "friendship cannot exist except among good men" (*Amic.* 5.18; 18.65). Aristotle believed that it was desirable to sever a friendship when there was no longer equality in virtue (*Eth. nic.* 8.7.3).

[104] Cicero, *Amic.* 22.82.

begun to love (*dilexeris*) him."[105] In other words, one should make a careful evaluation of a person's suitability before pursuing the friendship.[106] But in regard to the believers, Paul states in Rom. 5:8, "But God proves his love (ἀγάπην) for us in that while we still were sinners Christ died for us."

Furthermore, Seneca says that one must not give more than one is able. He does say that one can give to the point of one's own ruin, but only if "by so doing I shall purchase the safety of a great man or a great cause."[107] Aristotle does note that it may be necessary for a person to die for the sake of a friend or country,[108] and Epictetus also says that one may have a duty to die for a friend.[109] Paul may be reflecting this tradition when he says in Rom. 5:7, "Indeed, rarely will anyone die for a righteous person – though perhaps for a good person someone might actually dare to die." But as just noted, Christ died for "sinners," not those who could be considered "great." Paul relates Christ's death as given for those who by conventional standards would be undesirable as friends.[110]

Love exemplified by Christ stood in opposition to conventional standards of friendship in numerous ways.[111] It meant the abandonment of exclusive self-interest. It also implied pursuing the relationship without regard to a person's qualifications or ability to return a favor. Rather, it selflessly pursued the good of the other. Therefore, in contrast to traditional qualifications of friendship, Paul does not set limits on love in 1 Cor. 13. Instead, it "bears all things, believes all things, hopes all things, endures all things" (1 Cor. 13:7).

For Paul, thinking like Christ leads to this pattern of humility. Love binds the community together, but it must be understood

[105] Cicero, *Amic*. 22.85.

[106] Plutarch notes that one should select "worthy" friends (*Amic. mult*. 94E).

[107] Seneca, *Ben*. 2.15.1. [108] Aristotle, *Eth. nic*. 9.8.9.

[109] Epictetus, *Diatr*. 2.7.3.

[110] Paul's statements on God's love for sinners contrast with Plutarch's remarks that one should be friends only with those "who are qualified to keep up the same participation, that is to say, those who are able, in a like manner, to love and participate (φιλεῖν καί κοινενεῖν)" (*Amic. mult*. 96D).

[111] In regard to the potential problem of seeing the motif of friendship in Paul's letter despite the lack of explicit use of the terms φιλία or φίλος, Stowers remarks, "Often one finds friendship discussed without these words. Philippians is clearly a letter of friendship even without these direct terms. After all, how many business letters use the word 'business' or explicitly state, 'this is a business letter'? On the other hand, the virtual absence of these words from the whole Pauline corpus is a bit more surprising and may indicate that Paul was deliberately trying to avoid certain associations, as, e.g., with Epicureanism" ("Friends and Enemies," 119, n. 45).

according to a "reversal" of the world's standards. Paul uses the hymn in Philippians as an example of how the believers are to be selfless and humble for the sake of the community.[112] This attitude is a direct result of their new existence in Christ. As Stanley Stowers points out, the Philippians are citizens of a heavenly commonwealth, and selflessness is the expected way of life for those who belong to this new commonwealth (1:27; 3:20).[113] In 1 Corinthians the mind of Christ is likewise used for building up the community. It leads to a mindset of love in which the person considers the good of the other and the whole rather than one's own gain, including status.

Therefore, having the mind of Christ and being able to love means much more than exchanging favors. Paul calls the believers to pursue the highest motive for their community relationships. Having the mind of Christ means one should love as it is defined according to the nature of the universe. For Paul, the order of the universe has been redefined through Christ's sacrifice. Because of Christ the normal positions of status are reversed, and the standard limitations of friendship no longer apply. But the irony is that lowering one's status in the eyes of the world ultimately means exaltation in God's universe and the complete giving of oneself for the sake of others constitutes gain in the eschatological kingdom.

"Love" according to Christ's example is complete selflessness for the sake of others, a selflessness that manifests itself especially in a willingness to suffer worldly shame and loss of status. In Rom. 8:31–39 Paul describes God's giving up his son and Christ's sacrifice

[112] See Hurtado, "Jesus," 113–26; and Gordon D. Fee, *Paul's Letter to the Philippians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995) 197–229, for more on Christ as an example in 2:5–11.

[113] Stowers, "Friends and Enemies," 112–17. He builds upon Andrew Lincoln's observation on 3:20, "It is not, as has often been thought, that heaven as such is the homeland of Christians to which they, as perpetual foreigners on earth, must strive to return, but rather that since their Lord is in heaven, their life is to be governed by the heavenly commonwealth" (*Paradise Now and Not Yet* [SNTSMS 43; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981] 193). As is well known, the Stoics considered both humans and gods to be members of a universal city. Cicero explains, "For the world is as it were the common dwelling-place of gods and men, or the city (*urbs*) that belongs to both; for they alone have the use of reason and live by justice and by law" (*Nat. d.* 2.62.154). As Malcolm Schofield explains, the significance of the doctrine of the cosmic city was that it "attempts to retain community and citizenship while removing all contingency – such as physical proximity or mutual acquaintance – from the notion of citizenship. What citizenship now consists in is nothing but obedience by a plurality of persons to the injunctions of right reason" (*Stoic Idea*, 103). For Paul membership in the eschatological community transcended physical placement.

as τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ Χριστοῦ (8:35) and τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ θεοῦ (8:39).[114] In both Philippians and 1 Corinthians, Paul urges the believers to practice this type of love within the Christian community. Love is the proper way to build up the community on the foundation of Christ (1 Cor. 3). It includes a voluntary giving up of earthly status and privileges to pursue what is the greatest good according to God's wisdom. It gives to others without consideration of worthiness and does this for the sake of Christ's community.

This is the love that "never ends" (1 Cor. 13:8). Cicero says that friendships that spring from "love and kindly affection" are "eternal (*sempiternae*)."[115] Paul's love, based on the eschatological universe, is likewise eternal.

Thus, ἀγάπη is "the content of Christian wisdom" in 1 Cor. 2:6–16 and provides the "ultimate 'norm' " of social life in 1 Cor. 13.[116] In 1 Cor. 14 Paul explains how this model of unifying love as self-sacrifice and reversal of status should operate in the spiritually gifted community.

Paul's precepts for the use of spiritual gifts in the community (1 Cor. 12:31b, 14:1–40)

We have just seen how "love" for the Stoics was related to universal humanity. "Friendship" was connected with οἰκείωσις and *amor*, and grew from nature and not from need. Therefore, to build the highest relationships, one had to recognize and apply properly one's relation to the universal humanity.

For Paul, "love" also springs from understanding the rational universe. However, in the eschatological universe, this entails understanding according to the "mind of Christ," and this in turn means accepting the reversal of values in which one willingly surrenders status in worldly terms for the sake of others.

Paul's concern in 1 Cor. 14 is "building" the community. He says to pursue prophecy because it builds up the church (14:3, 4, 5, 12, 17) and that all things in the church should be done for building up

[114] He also describes Christ as τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντος ἡμᾶς (8:37).

[115] Cicero, *Amic.* 9.32. Aristotle also speaks of the enduring quality of friendship, since it is based upon virtue, which is itself "a permanent quality (μόνιμον)" (*Eth. nic.* 8.3.6).

[116] Troels Engberg-Pedersen, "The Gospel and Social Practice According to 1 Corinthians," *NTS* 33 (1987) 567–68.

(14:26).[117] He has previously connected "love" and "building up" explicitly in 1 Cor. 8:1, where "love" manifests itself in the "strong" willingly giving up their privileges to care for the faith of weaker believers. In 1 Cor. 3:10–15 Paul connects the "mind of Christ" and "building up" when he talks about "building" the corporate temple of God (3:10–15), and urges the Corinthians to look to himself and Apollos as examples of ones who live according to the eschatological reversal of values.

Although the Corinthians are already the body of Christ, they are to work on edifying others and building up the whole, the goal of love. If the Corinthians understand the significance of their existence as a bodily unity and follow the way of love, they will know how to use their gifts.

The Stoics reasoned that one needed both principles and precepts to determine one's actions. A person still progressing in virtue needed to be given specific precepts in order to learn how to bridge the gap between general principles and specific acts in a particular situation. 1 Cor. 14 provides the precepts for Paul's principle of bodily unity in ch. 12. In this way, 1 Cor. 12 provides the "indicative" for Paul's "imperative" in 1 Cor. 14.[118]

1 Cor. 12 contains significant statements about the Corinthians' identity as the body of Christ (e.g. 12:12–13, 27) along with the extended description of the nature of the body. In contrast, all of the imperatives in 1 Cor. 12–14 occur in 14:1–40 (and 12:31a). The verses contain twenty-two imperatives,[119] as opposed to none in 12:1–30 and 12:31b–13:13.[120] This makes it even more likely that ch. 14 contains Paul's precepts as opposed to the principles of ch. 12.[121]

[117] Mitchell has shown how the building metaphor was often used in political contexts to urge unity (*Paul*, 99–111, 126).

[118] See the discussion in chapter 1 on the indicative and imperative in Paul.

[119] Ζηλοῦτε (12:31), διώκετε, ζηλοῦτε (14:1), ζητεῖτε (14:12), προσευχέσθω (14:13), γίνεσθε, νηπιάζετε, γίνεσθε (14:20), γινέσθω (14:26), διερμηνευέτω (14:27), σιγάτω, λαλείτω (14:28), λαλείτωσαν, διακρινέτωσαν (14:29), σιγάτω (14:30), σιγάτωσαν, ὑποτασσέσθωσαν (14:34), ἐπερωτάτωσαν (14:35), ἐπιγινωσκέτω (14:37), ζηλοῦτε, κωλύετε (14:39), γινέσθω (14:40).

[120] Thus when Paul says, for example, "The eye cannot say to the hand, 'I have no need of you (12:21),' " this is not a command, but an example of the type of unity present in the body.

[121] As noted earlier, principles as well as precepts could be in the form of imperatives. The overwhelmingly disproportionate number of imperatives in ch. 14 as opposed to ch. 12 indicates that the former should be understood as containing the precepts and the latter the principle.

Paul's imperatives are of sufficient variety that they do not seem to support a single deliberative argument for the benefits of concord. For example, Paul says, "Strive for the greater gifts" (12:31); "Therefore, one who speaks in a tongue should pray for the power to interpret" (14:13); "Do not be children in your thinking; rather, be infants in evil, but in thinking be adults" (14:20); "so my friends, be eager to prophesy, and do not forbid speaking in tongues" (14:39). Rather, Paul's statements appear to describe a certain *type* of concord that Paul desires to see in Corinth and how the Corinthians should achieve it. As the new bodily humanity in Christ, the Corinthians are to work for building up the whole, rather than seeking only individual benefit. As Philipp Vielhauer notes in his study of οἰκοδομή/οἰκοδομεῖν, the community is to be the object and the result of the "building up."[122] 1 Cor. 14 is the specific explanation of how to use spiritual gifts to "build up" the body in love.

To this end, Paul's evaluation of prophecy as greater than speaking in tongues goes against the Corinthians' evaluation of the gifts, since they seem to have favored the latter.[123] For Paul, prophecy is greater than tongues because, unless they are interpreted, they edify the individual only, not the church (14:1–19). The concern for the good of the church also means that prophets should speak in an orderly fashion (14:27–33). The guiding principle in the use of gifts is, "Let all things be done for building up" (14:26).

The Corinthians need instruction on what eschatological existence entails for those in Christ. In ch. 14, Paul lets them know that membership in the body and the application of love according to the νοῦς Χριστοῦ means that they must come to a radically different understanding of the relative significance of the spiritual manifestations.

Dale Martin has shown that speaking in tongues, rather than prophecy, was generally regarded as the higher-status gift in the ancient world, most probably because it was thought to be a type of heavenly or otherworldly speech. Prophecy took the form of

[122] Philipp Vielhauer, *Oikodome: Das Bild vom Bau in der christlichen Literatur vom Neuen Testament bis Clemens Alexandrinus* (Karlsruhe-Durlach: Tron, 1940) 90–92. Mitchell has also noted the connections between οἰκοδομ– language and combatting factionalism (*Paul*, 99–111).

[123] This is the common understanding of the situation in Corinth; e.g. Fee, "The correctives (in ch. 14) are all aimed at the abuse of tongues in the assembly, which seems to be both singular in its emphasis and disorderly in its expression" (*Corinthians*, 571).

normal human speech, so it was less desirable, since that did not confer as high a status upon the person.[124]

However, in 14:1 Paul urges the Corinthians to seek prophecy (12:31a; 14:1). In the rest of ch. 14 he affirms the greater desirability of prophecy rather than tongues because of its potential to benefit the community. Paul's instructions run counter to the Corinthians' expectations since he uses benefit to the whole, and not individual status, as the key factor in valuing the gift.

Paul values prophecy because it builds up the body through comprehensible encouragement and exhortation. In 1 Cor. 12 he describes how the Corinthians' new life in Christ leads to their being a part of the body of Christ. However, love may require self-sacrifice as they seek the gift that will benefit the whole, even at the expense of individual status.

The Corinthians should be able to make this sacrifice because, if they have the mind of Christ, they should be willing to seek a lower status in the world's valuation for the good of the body. Love means that one can abandon the rights and privileges of status to seek the good of the other and the whole. However, their "sacrifice" is ultimately for their own gain since, as argued earlier, bodily unity means that corporate and individual advantage coincide. Helping the body as a whole means helping oneself. Furthermore, the Corinthians can know that while such a sacrifice may be foolishness in the world's system, it is ultimately wisdom according to God's standard.

If they understand and do this, that is, pursue prophecy rather than tongues, then they have matured in their reasoning because they know that taking care of the whole is to be their focus. They are no longer "infants" if they are willing to consider the other before themselves by giving up individual rights and privileges, as did Christ. This ability to

[124] D. Martin, *Body*, 88–92; "Tongues of Angels," 547–89. The issue also revolves around the hierarchy of the *pneuma* and the *nous*, especially in regard to which agent controls the person. Martin argues that the *pneuma* was viewed as being superior to the *nous*. This is a Platonic hierarchy which also appears in Philo. Therefore, when Paul says in 1 Cor. 14 that the *nous* and the *pneuma* should work together in producing manifestations that will build up the community, this implies a reversal of status. "Paul's insistence on an equal partnership of the higher- and lower-status entities would have been heard as a reversal of their statuses. To say that the *pneuma* should give up its claim to rule unchallenged when it comes upon the scene – that it should join the *nous* in a mutually cooperative agreement – is to imply a lowering of the status of the *pneuma* to the level of or below the *nous*" (*Body*, 96–102). However, Paul's connection between *pneuma* and *nous* would seem to mitigate the tension between the two.

understand the implications of their new existence as it applies to the use of spiritual gifts becomes another way in which they can demonstrate that they are true πνευματικοί. In 1 Cor. 1–4 being mature and thus πνευματικοί means building up the church by overcoming divisions related to leaders. In 1 Cor. 12–14 it is overcoming individual status concerns in order to build up the body in love.

This interpretation of ch. 14 may also shed light on the troublesome question of why Paul would tell the Corinthians to seek the "greater gifts," specifically prophecy (12:31a and 14:1), when he has worked so hard to encourage the Corinthians' humility in ch. 12. As mentioned in chapter 5, the difficulty of resolving this conflict has led some interpreters to favor interpreting 12:31a as an indicative describing the Corinthians' current condition rather than an imperative urging them to strive for the gifts. But in light of the "reversal" which Paul has described, an imperative fits well with the flow of Paul's argument. 12:31a is most probably an ironic statement, since Paul entices the Corinthians to seek the "greater" gifts, only to reveal that in Christ the one who would be "greater" must actually become "lesser" in terms of the world's valuation. Thus, they should pursue prophecy rather than tongues. In light of the new eschatological way of reversal, one should by all means seek that which is "greater," which is ultimately that which benefits the whole at the cost of individual status. Paul's challenge to the Corinthians to seek the "greater gifts" is a challenge to follow the way of love, which is self-sacrifice for the sake of others.

Summary and conclusion

Because the Corinthians have the "mind of Christ," they are set apart from the world, and more importantly, they should understand the need for unity as a new humanity. In 1 Cor. 12–14 Paul brings out more of the implications of their new existence. Not only do they share the same mind, but in the Spirit they are the body of Christ. As one body they are all to contribute to the good of the whole and exist in "sympathetic" relationships with one another (12:1–30). But even more, they are to pursue "love" as the means of building up the body (12:31b–13:13). Love provides the means for creating even stronger ties among the members of this bodily humanity. In relationship to spiritual gifts, this takes shape in practical instructions concerning the usefulness of prophecy, rather than tongues, and the orderly manifestation of gifts.

The form of Paul's presentation resembles Seneca's description of paraenesis as both "principles" and "precepts." The principle explains the nature of the Corinthians' existence and the precepts are drawn from the implications of this existence. In 1 Cor. 12–14 Paul instructs the Corinthians on the important topic of "how to deal with men" by first laying down a "rule" that all "are the parts of one great body," from which he can talk about the importance of love as it has been "engendered" in the body.[125] The result is specific obligations to Christ's community and new humanity in regard to prophecy and tongues.

[125] Seneca, *Ep*. 95.51–52.

8

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In dealing with the situation at Corinth, Paul was faced not only with the immediate problems in the congregation, such as the abuse of tongues, but with the greater problem of how to bring a young, formerly pagan people to maturity in Christ. For Paul, the issue was not simply how to change their present behavior, but how to bring the congregation to a deeper understanding of how to live out the implications of their new life in Christ. Thus, for the interpreter the issue relates not only to the content of Paul's instructions, but also to how he viewed his instructions as intimately linked to their new existence.

In 1 Cor. 12 Paul is most probably dealing with the misuse of spiritual gifts, particularly tongues. He tailors his answer toward the specific situation – he downplays the importance of glossolalia and builds up his own authority. But at the same time he sets the specific situation within the context of the Corinthians' eschatological existence as the body of Christ. The Corinthians' unity in Christ is the basis for dealing with their specific problem regarding spiritual gifts.

In this way, Paul deals with the problem on two different levels. On one level, he addresses the specific problem of the abuse of spiritual gifts. Thus, he gives instructions regarding tongues and prophecy in ch. 14. Chs. 12 and 13 also contain specific references to the Corinthian situation, and Paul uses all of these chapters to give the believers, particularly the glossolalists, a correct evaluation of the gifts.

But ch. 12 also serves a more foundational purpose. In this chapter Paul establishes the identity of the Corinthians as the body of Christ. For the Stoics, humanity was a body, unified by spirit and arranged by "God." For Paul as well, the Corinthians are part of a bodily humanity, which is a new humanity through Christ, unified in the Spirit and arranged by God. Thus, while he compares Christ/the church *with* a body, he also identifies them *as* a body.

At this point the intersection of Stoic physics and ethics becomes helpful. The bodily existence of humanity was the foundation for Stoic ethics, creating sympathetic relationships among the members and emphasizing the necessity of behavior aimed at preserving the whole. In regard to social ethics, this was the main principle for specific precepts. In a similar way for Paul, the bodily unity of new humanity in Christ forms the basis for relationships in the Christian community. It leads to ethical precepts in regard to spiritual gifts, such as the need for orderly worship and the priority of gifts which edify the entire congregation (1 Cor. 14). In addition, all actions are to be done in love, which creates the strongest bonds for the spiritual community (1 Cor. 13). As with the Stoics, love finds its basis in the nature of the universe, and so is comprehended by reason. For Paul, this takes the form of the νοῦς Χριστοῦ and is seen in the example of Christ crucified.

Leigh Clasby Viner argues that exemplars, as especially seen in the Stoic sage, are used in conjunction with principles in Stoic ethics. In particular, "Such exemplars help to bridge the gap between the universal nature of moral principles and inevitable particularity of individual moral choices and actions."[1] Viner's observations fit well with the connections drawn in the present work. Paul establishes the principle of bodily unity, but also presents Christ as an exemplar. What Paul most desires from the Corinthians is love, which means understanding eschatological wisdom as seen in Christ.

In establishing the Corinthians' existence as a bodily humanity in which the members are to follow the example of Christ, Paul attempts to move the Corinthians from an individual and status-oriented mindset to a corporate-based way of thinking where one is willing to sacrifice one's own gain for the sake of the whole. In the introduction I discussed Engberg-Pedersen's model of Stoic and Pauline ethics in which one moves from the individual, or I-level, to the group, or S-level, after having been "struck" by something from outside oneself at the X-level. He concludes that there was "a single, basic thought structure that is formulated in both Stoic ethics and in Paul."[2] In this work I have similarly sketched a movement from individual to group identity. However, whereas Engberg-Pedersen identifies reason as the factor in the Stoics' X-level in comparison with Christ in Paul's X-level, I have more specifically

[1] "Moral Paradigms and the Stoic Sage" (Ph.D. diss., Duquesne University, 2002) 3.
[2] Engberg-Pedersen, *Paul*, 301.

identified the "mind of Christ" as the factor behind the movement. Thus, I propose that reason is also the key to the movement for Paul, but with reason corresponding to the νοῦς Χριστοῦ. Thus, a primary difference between Paul and the Stoics is in the content of "reason."

The relationship between Paul and Stoicism is hardly a new question, and this work has not sought to answer the question but merely to show that there was influence. In particular, seeing the correspondence between Paul and the Stoics can enrich our understanding of Paul's concept of the body of Christ in 1 Cor. 12 and, subsequently, its relationship to ethics in 1 Cor. 13–14.

We have seen how others such as Plutarch, in his discussion on different types of marital union, could appropriate the Stoic concepts of unity for their own purposes. Furthermore, the overall popularity of Stoicism in the Roman Empire probably meant that general Stoic ideas could be understood by those who did not have formal philosophical training. G. M. Ross describes Seneca's role as a "popularizer," whose goal was "to propound and defend the Stoic way of life in a way that would appeal to the layman."[3] If such ideas were a part of the culture in Corinth, then it makes sense that Paul would communicate in a way that would be readily apprehended by his audience. Given the popularity of Stoicism, then, we need not be surprised to see it reflected in Paul's letters.[4]

Thus, I have tried to show that Paul is influenced by Stoicism in the way in which he conceives of the Corinthians as a unified body through their membership in the universal new humanity. But we should look not only to the content, but also to the method. Paul desires to instruct the Corinthian community so that they may truly grasp their corporate identity in Christ. What he seeks is not just a change in their external behavior, but a deep change in their way of thinking about themselves and each other. Paul believes that they need to comprehend their connections as members of unified humanity in order to behave rightly as a community. If they can grasp these things, they can become a community that loves and therefore exemplifies life as followers of the crucified Christ.

[3] "Seneca's Philosophical Influence," 117.

[4] This becomes especially relevant if Paul is presenting Christ as an "alternative emperor" and the Corinthians as an "alternative community" (Horsley, "Rhetoric and Empire," 92). See chapter 5 above.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary sources

Aelius Aristides: The Complete Works. Vol. II: *Orations XVII–LIII*. Edited by Charles A. P. Behr. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1981.

Ancient Epistolary Theorists. Edited by Abraham J. Malherbe. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988.

Aristotle. Translated by Hugh Tredennick *et al*. 23 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926–91.

Athenaeus. *Deipnosophists*. Translated by Charles Burton Gulick. 7 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1927–41.

The Authorised Daily Prayer Book. Translated by S. Singer. New York: Bloch Publishing Co., 1962.

Cicero. Translated by C. W. Keyes *et al*. 29 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1913–99.

Demosthenes. Translated by J. H. Vince *et al*. 7 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926–49.

Dio Chrysostom. Translated by H. Lamar Crosby *et al*. 5 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1932–51.

Diogenes Laertius. *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*. Translated by R. H. Hicks. 2 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1950–54.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus. *Roman Antiquities*. Translated by Ernest Cary. 7 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1943–56.

Epictetus. Translated by W. A. Oldfather. 2 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995–96.

The Hellenistic Philosophers. A. A. Long and D. N. Sedley. 2 vols. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Isocrates. Translated by George Norlin and Larue van Hook. 3 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1954–56.

Josephus. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray *et al*. 10 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926–65.

Later Greek Religion. Edited by Edwyn Bevan. London: J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd., 1926.

Livy. *History of Rome*. Translated by B. O. Foster *et al*. 14 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1919–59.

Lucan. *The Civil War*. Translated by J. D. Duff. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1951.
Lucian. Translated by A. M. Harmon and M. D. MacLeod. 8 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1913–67.
4 Maccabees. In *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Translated by H. Anderson, edited by James H. Charlesworth. Vol. II. New York: Doubleday, 1985: 531–64.
Manilius. *Astronomica*. Translated by G. P. Goold. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1977.
Marcus Aurelius. Translated by C. R. Haines. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
Pausanius. *Description of Greece*. Translated by W. H. S. Jones and H. A. Ormerod. 5 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1918–35.
Philo. Translated by F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker. 12 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1929–62.
Plato. Translated by H. N. Fowler *et al*. 12 vols. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1914–39.
Plutarch. *The Parallel Lives*. Translated by Bernadotte Perrin. 11 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1914–26.
Moralia. Translated by Frank Cole Babbitt *et al*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1927–69.
Physics of the Stoics. Edited and translated by S. Sambursky. Westport: Greenwood Press, 1959.
Pseudo-Libanius. "Epistolary Styles." In *Ancient Epistolary Theorists*, edited by Abraham J. Malherbe. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988: 66–81.
Quintilian. *The Institutio Oratoria*. Translated by H. E. Butler. 4 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1953.
Seneca. Translated by Richard M. Gummere *et al*. 10 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1917–72.
Sextus Empiricus. Translated by R. G. Bury. 4 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1933–49.
Ioannis Stobaei: Anthologium. Curtis Wachsmuth and Otto Hense. 5 vols. Berlin: Weidmann, 1894–1912.
Strabo. *Geography*. Translated by Horace Leonard Jones. 8 vols. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1917–32.
Thucydides. *History of the Peloponnesian War*. Translated by Charles Foster Smith. 4 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1919–23.
Xenophon. Translated by Carleton L. Brownson *et al*. 7 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1914–23.

Secondary Works

Aletti, J.-N. "La *dispositio* rhétorique dans les épitres pauliniennes. Proposition de méthode." *NTS* 38 (1992): 385–401.
Algra, Keimpe. "Stoic Theology." In *The Cambridge Companion to the Stoics*, edited by Brad Inwood. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003: 153–78.

Anderson H. *4 Maccabees*. In *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, edited by James H. Charlesworth. Vol. II. New York: Doubleday, 1985: 531–64.
Anderson, R. Dean Jr. *Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Paul*. Kampen: Kok Pharos Publishing House, 1996.
Atkins, E. M. "'Domina et Regina Virtutum': Justice and Societas in De Officiis." *Phronesis* 35 (1990): 258–89.
Baasland, E. "Die περί-Formel und die Argumentation(ssituation) des Paulus." *ST* 42 (1988): 69–87.
Baker, David L. "The Interpretation of 1 Cor. 12–14." *EvQ* 46 (1974): 224–34.
Baldry, H. C. *The Unity of Mankind in Greek Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963.
Barbour, Robin S. "Wisdom and the Cross in 1 Corinthians 1 and 2." In *Theologia Crucis – Signum Crucis: Festschrift für Erich Dinkler*, edited by Carl Andresen and Günter Klein. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1979: 57–71.
Barlow, Claude W. *Epistolae Senecae ad Paulum et Pauli ad Senecam <quae vocantur>*. Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome 10. Horn, Austria: Ferdinand Berger, 1938.
Barrett, C. K. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1968. (Repr., Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1996.)
Barton, S. C. "Paul's Sense of Place: An Anthropological Approach to Community Formation in Corinth." *NTS* 32 (1986): 225–46.
Bassler, Jouette M. "1 Cor. 12:3 – Curse and Confession in Context." *JBL* 101 (1982): 415–21.
Beasley Murray, G. R. *Baptism in the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981.
Berger, Peter L. and Thomas Luckmann. *The Social Construction of Reality*. New York: Anchor Books/Doubleday, 1966.
Bertram, G. "νήπιος, νηπιάζω." In *TDNT* IV: 912–23.
Best, Ernest. *One Body in Christ*. London: SPCK, 1955.
Betz, Hans Dieter. *Galatians*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979.
Bittlinger, A. *Gifts and Graces: A Commentary on 1 Cor. 12–14*. Translated by H. Klassen. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968.
Blundell, Mary Whitlock. "Parental Nature and Stoic οἰκείωσις." *Ancient Philosophy* 10 (1990): 221–48.
Bodson, Arthur. *La morale sociale des derniers Stoïciens, Sénèque, Epictète et Marc Aurèle*. Paris: Société d'Edition Les Belles Lettres, 1967.
Bonhöffer, Adolf. *The Ethics of the Stoic Epictetus*. Translated by William O. Stephens. New York: Peter Lang, 1996.
Bornkamm, Günther. *Paul*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1971.
Boys-Stones, George. "Eros in Government: Zeno and the Virtuous City." *CQ* 48 (1998): 168–74.
Braaten, C. E. *Eschatology and Ethics*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1974.
Bringmann, K. *Untersuchungen zum späten Cicero*. Hypomnemata 29. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971.
Brown, Alexandra R. *The Cross & Human Transformation*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995.
Bruce, F. F. *1 and 2 Corinthians*. London: Oliphants, 1971.
1 & 2 Thessalonians. WBC 45. Waco, TX: Word, 1982.

Brunschwig, Jacques. "The Stoic Theory of the Supreme Genus and Platonic Ontology." In *Papers in Hellenistic Philosophy*, translated by Janet Lloyd. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994: 92–157.

Brunt, P. A. "'Amicitia' in the Late Roman Republic." *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 191 (1965): 1–20.

"Stoicism and the Principate." *Papers of the British School at Rome* 43 (1975): 7–35.

Bultmann, Rudolf. *Theology of the New Testament*. 2 vols. Translated by Kendrick Grobel. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1954–55.

"The Problem of Ethics in Paul." In *Understanding Paul's Ethics*, edited by Brian S. Rosner; translated by Christoph W. Stenschke. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995: 195–216.

Bünker, M. *Briefformular und rhetorische Disposition im 1 Korintherbrief*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984.

Burgess, Theodore. *Epideictic Literature*. Studies in Classical Philology 3. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1902.

Campbell, J. Y. "Κοινωνία and Its Cognates in the New Testament." *JBL* 51 (1932): 352–80.

Cancik, Hildegaard. *Untersuchungen zu Senecas Epistulae morales*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1967.

Carson, D. A. *Showing the Spirit: A Theological Exposition of 1 Corinthians 12–14*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1987.

Cerfaux, L. *The Church in the Theology of St. Paul*. New York: Herder and Herder, 1959.

Chevallier, Max-Alain. *Esprit de Dieu, parole d'hommes*. Neuchatel: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1966.

Clements, Ronald. *God and Temple*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1965.

Colish, Marcia L. *The Stoic Tradition from Antiquity to the Early Middle Ages*. Vol. II: *Stoicism in Christian Latin Thought through the Sixth Century*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1990.

"Stoicism and the New Testament: An Essay in Historiography." *ANRW* 26.1 (1992): 334–79.

Collins, John J. "Chiasmus, the 'ABA' Pattern and the Text of Paul." In *Studiorum Paulinorum Congressus Internationalis Catholicus* 2 (1963): 575–83.

Collins, Raymond F. *First Corinthians*. Sacra Pagina 7. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1999.

Conger, George Perrigo. *Theories of Macrocosms and Microcosms in the History of Philosophy*. New York: Russell & Russell, 1967.

Conzelmann, Hans. *1 Corinthians*. Translated by J. W. Leitch. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975.

Cousar, Charles. "The Theological Task of 1 Corinthians: A Conversation with Gordon D. Fee and Victor Paul Furnish." In *Pauline Theology*, edited by Jouette M. Bassler. Vol. II. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993: 90–102.

Cranfield, C. E. B. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. 2 vols. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1975.

Cuming, G. J. "ΕΠΟΤΙΣΘΗΜΕΝ (1 Corinthians 12,13)." *NTS* 27 (1981): 203–205.

Dahl, Nils Alstrup. *Studies in Paul*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1977.
Daines, Brian. "Paul's Use of the Analogy of the Body of Christ." *EvQ* 50 (1978): 71–78.
Davies, W. D. *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980.
de Broglie, G. "Le texte fondamentale de Saint Paul contre la foi naturelle." *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 39 (1951): 253–66.
Deidun, T. J. *New Covenant Morality*. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1981.
Delling, G. "τέλειος." In *TDNT* VII: 67–79.
Derrett, J. D. M. "Cursing Jesus (1 Cor. XII.3): The Jews as Religious 'Persecutors.' " *NTS* 21 (1975): 544–54.
deSilva, David. "Paul and the Stoa: A Comparison." *JETS* 38 (1995): 549–64.
Dillon, John. *The Middle Platonists*. Ithaca: Cornell, 1977.
Dodd, C. H. *Gospel and Law*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963.
Dodd, Brian. *Paul's Paradigmatic "I": Personal Example as Literary Strategy*. JSNTSup 177. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.
Douglas, Mary. *Natural Symbols: Exploration in Cosmology*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1982.
du Plessis, P. J. *ΤΕΛΕΙΟΣ*, The Idea of Perfection in the New Testament. Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1959.
Dunn, James D. G. *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*. London: SCM Press, 1970.
"'The Body of Christ' in Paul." In *Worship, Theology and Ministry in the Early Church*, edited by Michael J. Wilkins and Terence Paige. JSNTSup Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992: 146–62.
Dyck, Andrew R. *A Commentary on Cicero, De Officiis*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996.
Ellingworth, Paul and Howard Hatton. *A Translator's Handbook on Paul's First Letter to the Corinthians*. London: United Bible Societies, 1985.
Elliot, John. *A Home for the Homeless*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981.
Engberg-Pedersen, Troels. "Discovering the Good: *oikeiōsis* and *kathēkonta* in Stoic Ethics." In *The Norms of Nature*, edited by Malcolm Schofield and Gisela Striker. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986: 145–83.
"The Gospel and Social Practice According to 1 Corinthians." *NTS* 33 (1987): 557–84.
The Stoic Theory of Oikeiosis. Denmark: Aarhus University Press, 1990.
Paul and the Stoics. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 2000.
Eriksson, Anders. *Traditions as Rhetorical Proof*. Coniectanea Biblica New Testament Series 27. Stockholm: Almquist & Wiksell International, 1998.
Fee, Gordon D. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. NICNT Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987.
Paul's Letter to the Philippians. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
Fiore, Benjamin, SJ. *The Function of Personal Example in the Socratic and Pastoral Epistles*. AnBib 105. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1986.
"The Theory and Practice of Friendship in Cicero." In *Greco-Roman Perspectives on Friendship*, edited by John T. Fitzgerald. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997: 59–76.

Fiske, Adele M. "Hieronymus Ciceronianus." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 96 (1965): 119–38.

Fitzgerald, John T. "Philippians in the Light of Some Ancient Discussions on Friendship." In *Friendship, Flattery and Frankness of Speech: Studies on Friendship in the New Testament World*, edited by John T. Fitzgerald. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1996: 141–60.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A., SJ. *Romans*. AB 33. New York: Doubleday, 1993.

Fraisse, J. C. *"Philia": La notion d'amitié dans la philosophie antique. Essai sur un problème perdu et retrouvé*. Paris: Librairie J. Vrin, 1974.

Furnish, Victor Paul. *Theology and Ethics in Paul*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1968.

II Corinthians. AB 32A. New York: Doubleday, 1984.

Gale, Herbert W. *The Use of Analogy in the Letters of Paul*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1964.

Garland, David E. *1 Corinthians*. Baker Exegetical Commentary. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2003.

Gärtner, B. *The Temple and the Community Qumran and the New Testament*. SNTSMS 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965.

Georgi, Dieter. *Theocracy in Paul's Praxis and Theology*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.

Giblin, Charles Homer. *In Hope of God's Glory: Pauline Theological Perspectives*. New York: Herder and Herder, 1970.

Gill, Christopher. "Personhood and Personality: The Four *Personae* Theory in Cicero, *De Officiis* I." *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 6 (1988): 169–99.

"The School in the Roman Imperial Period." In *The Cambridge Companion to the Stoics*, edited by Brad Inwood. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003: 33–58.

Glad, Clarence. *Paul and Philodemus: Adaptability in Epicurean and Early Christian Psychagogy*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1995.

Goppelt, L. *Theology of the New Testament*. 2 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981–82.

Grant, Robert M. "Hellenistic Elements in 1 Corinthians." In *Early Christian Origins*, edited by Allen Wikgren. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1961: 60–66.

Gressman, H. "Ν ΚΟΙΝΩΝΙΑ ΤΩΝ ΔΑΙΜΟΝΙΩΝ." *ZNW* 29 (1921): 224–30.

Grindheim, Sigurd: "Wisdom for the Perfect: Paul's Challenge to the Corinthian Church (1 Corinthians 2:6–16)." *JBL* (2002): 689–709.

Gundry, Robert H. *SOMA in Biblical Theology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.

Guthrie, George. *The Structure of Hebrews: A Text-Linguistic Analysis*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994.

Hadas, Moses, ed. and trans. *The Third and Fourth Book of Maccabees*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1953.

Hadot, Ilsestraut. *Seneca und die griechisch-römische Tradition der Seelenleitung*. Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte der Philosophie 13. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1969.

Hahm, David E. *The Origins of Stoic Cosmology*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press, 1977.
Hainz, Josef. *Ekklesia*. Regensburg: Pustet, 1972.
Halliwell, Stephen. "Popular Morality, Philosophical Ethics, and the *Rhetoric*." In *Aristotle's Rhetoric*, edited by David J. Furley and Alexander Nehamas. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994: 211–30.
"The Challenge of Rhetoric to Political and Ethical Theory in Aristotle." In *Essays of Aristotle's Rhetoric*, edited by Amélie Oksenberg Rorty. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996: 175–90.
Hauck, F. "κοινός, κτλ." In *TDNT* III: 789–809.
Hawthorne, Gerald. *Philippians*. WBC. Waco, TX: Word, 1983.
Hellegouarc'h, J. *Le vocabulaire latin des relations et des parties politiques sous la République*. Paris: Société d'Edition les Belles Lettres, 1963.
Hellerman, Joseph H. *Reconstructing Honor in Roman Philippi: Carmen Christi as Cursus Pudorum*. SNTSMS 132. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
Hengel, Martin. *Crucifixion*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977.
Hill, Andrew. "The Temple of Asclepius: An Alternative Source for Paul's Body Theology?" *JBL* 99 (1980): 437–39.
Hill, Forbes. "The Amorality of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*." *GRBS* 22 (1981): 133–47.
Holladay, Carl R. "1 Corinthians 13: Paul as Apostolic Paradigm." In *Greeks, Romans, and Christians*, edited by David L. Balch, Everett Ferguson, Wayne A. Meeks. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990: 80–98.
Hoover, Roy W. "The Harpagmos Enigma: A Philological Solution." *HTR* 64 (1971): 95–119.
Horsley, Richard A. "1 Corinthians: A Case Study of Paul's Assembly as an Alternative Society." In *Paul and Empire: Religion and Power in Roman Imperial Society*, edited by Richard A. Horsley. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity, 1997: 242–52.
Paul and Politics: Ekklesia, Israel, Imperium, Interpretation. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity, 2000.
"Rhetoric and Empire – 1 Corinthians." In *Paul and Politics: Ekklesia, Israel, Imperium, Interpretation*, edited by Richard A. Horsley. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity, 2000: 72–102.
Hurd, John C. *The Origin of 1 Corinthians*. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1983.
Hurtado, L. W. "Jesus as Lordly Example in Philippians 2:5–11." In *From Jesus to Paul*, edited by Peter Richardson and John C. Hurd. Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1984: 113–26.
Iber, Gerhard. "Zum Verständnis von I Cor. 12:31." *ZNW* 54 (1963): 43–52.
Inwood, Brad. "Comments on Professor Görgemanns' Paper: The Two Forms of *Oikeiōsis* in Arius and the Stoa." In *On Stoic and Peripatetic Ethics: The Work of Arius Didymus*, edited by W. W. Fortenbaugh. New Brunswick: Transaction Books, 1983: 190–201.
"Hierocles: Theory and Argument in the Second Century AD." *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 2 (1984): 151–83.
"Seneca and Psychological Dualism." In *Passions & Perceptions: Studies in Hellenistic Philosophy of Mind*, edited by Jacques Brunschwig and

Martha C. Nussbaum. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993: 150–83.

"Rules and Reasoning in Stoic Ethics." In *Topics in Stoic Philosophy*, edited by Katerina Ierodiakonou. Oxford: Clarendon, 1999: 95–127.

Irwin, T. H. "Stoic and Aristotelian Conceptions of Happiness." In *The Norms of Nature*, edited by Malcolm Schofield and Gisela Striker. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986: 205–44.

Jewett, Robert. *Paul's Anthropological Terms: A Study of Their Use in Conflict Settings*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1971.

Johnston, G. *The Doctrine of the Church in the New Testament*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1943.

Joly, Robert. *Le vocabulaire chrétien de l'amour, est-il original?* Brussels: Universitaires de Bruxelles, 1968.

Judge, E. A. "Paul as Radical Critic of Society." *Interchange* 16 (1974): 191–203.

Käsemann, Ernst. *Leib und Leib Christi*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1933.

Perspectives in Paul. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971.

Essays on New Testament Themes. Translated by W. J. Montague. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982.

Kennedy, George A. *The Art of Persuasion in Greece*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963.

Classical Rhetoric and Its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1980.

New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984.

Kidd, I. G. "Moral Actions and Rules in Stoic Ethics." In *The Stoics*, edited by John M. Rist. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978: 247–58.

Kim, Seyoon. *The Origin of Paul's Gospel*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1984.

Klauck, Hans-Josef. "Brotherly Love in Plutarch and in 4 Maccabees." In *Greeks, Romans, and Christians*, edited by David L. Balch, Everett Ferguson, and Wayne A. Meeks. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990: 144–56.

Knox, W. L. "Parallels to the N. T. Use of σῶμα." *JTS* 39 (1938): 243–46.

Paul and the Church of the Gentiles. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961.

Konstan, David. *Friendship in the Classical World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Kramer, Werner. *Christ, Lord, Son of God*. Naperville: Alec R. Allenson, 1966.

Kümmel, W. G. *Theology of the New Testament*. London: SCM Press, 1980.

Lapidge, Michael. "Stoic Cosmology." In *The Stoics*, edited by John M. Rist. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978: 161–85.

"Lucan's Imagery of Cosmic Dissolution." *Hermes* 107 (1979): 344–70.

Lincoln, Andrew. *Paradise Now and Not Yet*. SNTSMS 43. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Litfin, Duane. *St. Paul's Theology of Proclamation*. SNTSMS 79. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Long, A. A.. "The Stoic Concept of Evil." *Philosophical Quarterly* 18 (1968): 329–43.

Soul and Body in Stoicism. Berkeley: Center for Hermeneutical Studies, 1980.
"Soul and Body in Stoicism." *Phronesis* 27 (1982): 34–57.
"Stoic Eudaimonism." In *Proceedings of the Boston Area Colloquium in Ancient Philosophy*, edited by John J. Cleary. Vol. IV. Lanham: University Press of America, 1988: 77–101.
Longenecker, R. N. *Paul: Apostle of Liberty*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1977.
Mack, B. *Rhetoric and the NT*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.
Malherbe, Abraham J. "Antisthenes and Odysseus, and Paul at War." *HTR* 76 (1983): 143–73.
"Exhortation in First Thessalonians." *NovT* 25 (1983): 238–56.
Paul and the Thessalonians. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1987.
Paul and the Popular Philosophers. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989.
"Hellenistic Moralists and the New Testament." *ANRW* 26.1 (1992) 267–33.
Mansfeld, J. "Providence and the Destruction of the Universe in Early Stoic Thought." In *Studies in Hellenistic Religions*, edited by M. J. Vermaseren. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1979: 129–88.
Manson, T. W. "A Parallel to a N.T. Use of σῶμα." *JTS* 37 (1936): 385.
On Jesus and Paul. London: SCM Press, 1963.
Marrou, H. *A History of Education in Antiquity*. Translated by George Lamb. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1956.
Marshall, Peter. *Enmity in Corinth: Social Conventions in Paul's Relations with the Corinthians*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1987.
Martin, Dale. "Tongues of Angels and Other Status Indicators." *JAAR* 59 (1991): 547–89.
The Corinthian Body. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.
Martin, Ralph P. *Carmen Christi. Philippians 2:5–11 in Recent Interpretation and in the Setting of Early Christian Worship*. SNTSMS 4. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967.
The Spirit and the Congregation: Studies in 1 Corinthians 12–15. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984.
2 Corinthians. WBC 40. Waco, TX: Word, 1986.
Meeks, Wayne A. "The Image of the Androgyne: Some Uses of a Symbol in Earliest Christianity." *HR* 13 (1974): 165–208.
The First Urban Christians. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983.
"'Since Then You Would Need to Go Out of the World': Group Boundaries in Pauline Christianity." In *Critical History and Biblical Faith*, edited by Thomas J. Ryan. Villanova, PA: College Theology Society, 1985: 4–29.
The Moral World of the First Christians. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986.
Meyer, Paul W. "The Holy Spirit in the Pauline Letters." *Int* 33 (1979): 3–18.
Michel, O. "ναός." In *TDNT* IV: 880–90.
Mitchell, Margaret M. "Concerning ΠΕΡΙ ΔΕ in 1 Corinthians." *NovT* 31 (1989): 229–56.
Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1991.

Mitsis, Philip. "Seneca on Reason, Rules, and Moral Development." In *Passions & Perceptions: Studies in Hellenistic Philosophy of Mind*, edited by Jacques Brunschwig and Martha C. Nussbaum. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993: 285–312.
Morris, Leon M. *1 Corinthians*. Leicester: InterVarsity, 1985.
Motto, Anna Lydia. *Seneca: Moral Epistles*. Chico: Scholars Press, 1985.
Moule, C. F. D. "Further Reflexions on Philippians 2:5–11." In *Apostolic History and the Gospel. Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F. F. Bruce*, edited by W. W. Gasque and R. P. Martin. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1970: 264–76.
Mullins, Terence Y. "Disclosure: A Literary Form in the New Testament." *NovT* 7 (1964): 44–50.
"Formulas in New Testament Epistles." *JBL* 91 (1972): 380–90.
Munck, Johannes. *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind*. Atlanta: John Knox, 1959.
Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome. *St. Paul's Corinth*. Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1983.
Neufeld, Vernon. *The Earliest Christian Confessions*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1963.
Neyrey, Jerome H. *Paul, In Other Words: A Cultural Reading of His Letters*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1990.
Nussbaum, Martha C. *The Therapy of Desire: Theory and Practice in Hellenistic Ethics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994.
Obbink, Dirk. "The Stoic Sage in the Cosmic City." In *Topics in Stoic Philosophy*, edited by Katerina Ierodiakonou. Oxford: Clarendon, 1999: 178–95.
Obbink, Dirk and Paul A. Vander Waerdt. "Diogenes of Babylon: The Stoic Sage in the City of Fools." *GRBS* 32 (1991): 355–96.
O'Brien, Peter T. *Introductory Thanksgivings in the Letters of Paul*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1977.
The Epistle to the Philippians. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991.
Ong, Walter J. *Orality and Literacy*. London: Methuen, 1982.
Osborne, Catherine. *Eros Unveiled: Plato and the God of Love*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1994.
Panikulam, G. *Koinonia in the New Testament, a Dynamic Expression of Christian Life*. AnBib. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1979.
Parsons, Michael. "Being Precedes Act: Indicative and Imperative in Paul's Writing." In *Understanding Paul's Ethics*, edited by Brian S. Rosner. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995: 217–47. (Reprinted from *EvQ* 60 [1988]: 99–127.)
Parunak, H. Van Dyke. "Transitional Techniques in the Bible." *JBL* 102 (1983): 525–48.
Pearson, Birger Albert. *The Pneumatikos-Psychikos Terminology in 1 Corinthians*. SBLDS 12. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1973.
Perdue, Leo. "Paraenesis and the Epistle of James." *ZNW* 72 (1981): 241–56.
"The Social Character of Paraenesis and Paraenetic Literature." *Semeia* 59 (1990): 5–39.
Perelman, Ch. *The Realm of Rhetoric*. Translated by William Kluback. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1982.

Perelman, Ch. and L. Olbrechts-Tyteca. *The New Rhetoric*. Translated by John Wilkinson and Purcell Weaver. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1969.

Perriman, Andrew. "'His Body, Which Is the Church . . .' Coming to Terms with Metaphor." *EvQ* 62 (1990): 123–42.

Pervo, Richard I. "With Lucian: Who Needs Friends? Friendship in the *Toxaris*." In *Greco-Roman Perspectives on Friendship*, edited by John T. Fitzgerald. SBLRBS 34. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997: 163–80.

Pogoloff, Stephen M. *LOGOS AND SOPHIA: The Rhetorical Situation of 1 Corinthians*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.

Pohlenz, Max. *Paulus und die Stoa* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1956).

Porter, Stanley E. "The Theoretical Justification for Application of Rhetorical Categories to Pauline Epistolary Literature." In *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*, edited by Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht. JSNTSup 90. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993: 100–22.

Rawlinson, A. E. J. "Corpus Christi." In *Mysterium Christi*, edited by G. K. A. Bell and Adolf Deissmann. London: Longmans, 1930: 225–44.

Reed, Jeffrey T. "The Epistle." In *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period: 330 B.C.–A.D. 400*, edited by Stanley E. Porter. Leiden: Brill, 1997: 171–93.

Renwick, David A. *Paul, the Temple, and the Presence of God*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991.

Reydams-Schils, Gretchen. *Demiurge and Providence: Stoic and Platonist Readings of Plato's Timaeus*. Turnhout: Brepols Publishers, 1999.

The Roman Stoics: Self, Responsibility, and Affection. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005.

Rich, Audrey N. M. "The Platonic Ideas as the Thoughts of God." *Mnemosyne* 7 (1954): 123–33.

Rist, J. M. "Categories and Their Uses." In *Problems in Stoicism*, edited by A. A. Long. London: Athlone Press, 1971: 38–57.

"Seneca and Stoic Orthodoxy." *ANRW* 36.3 (1989) 1993–2012.

"Plutarch's *Amatorius*: A Commentary on Plato's Theories of Love?" *CQ* 51 (2001): 557–75.

Robertson, A. and A. Plummer. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians*. ICC. T. & T. Clark: Edinburgh, 1994.

Robinson, John A. T. *The Body*. London: SCM Press, 1966.

Rogers, E. R. "ΕΠΟΤΙΣΘΗΜΕΝ Again." *NTS* 29 (1983): 139–42.

Ross, G. M. "Seneca's Philosophical Influence." In *Seneca*, edited by C. D. N. Costa. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1974: 116–65.

Ruef, John. *Paul's First Letter to Corinth*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1977.

Russell, D. A. "Letters to Lucilius." In *Seneca*, edited by C. D. N. Costa. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1974: 70–95.

Sambursky, S., ed. and trans. *Physics of the Stoics*. Westport: Greenwood Press, 1959.

Sanders, J. T. "The Transition from Opening Epistolary Thanksgiving to Body in the Letters of the Pauline Corpus." *JBL* 81 (1962): 348–62.

"First Corinthians 13: Its Interpretation Since the First World War." *Int* 20 (1966): 159–87.
Sandmel, Samuel. "Parallelomania." *JBL* 81 (1962): 1–13.
Schmidt, Traugott. *Der Leib Christi*. Leipzig: A. Deichert, 1919.
Schmithals, Walter. *Gnosticism in Corinth*. Translated by John E. Steely. Nashville: Abingdon, 1971.
Schnackenburg, Rudolf. *Baptism in the Thought of St. Paul*. Translated by G. R. Beasley-Murray. New York: Herder and Herder, 1964.
Schofield, Malcolm. *The Stoic Idea of the City*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
Schüssler Fiorenza, E. "Rhetorical Situation and Historical Reconstruction in 1 Corinthians." *NTS* 33 (1987): 386–403.
Schweitzer, Albert. *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1956.
Schweizer, Edward. "σῶμα, κτλ." In *TDNT* VII: 1024–94.
Scroggs, R. "The Exaltation of the Spirit by Some Early Christians." *JBL* 84 (1965): 359–73.
The Last Adam. London: Basil Blackwell, 1966.
Sedley, David. "The Stoic–Platonist Debate on *kathêkonta*." In *Topics in Stoic Philosophy*, edited by Katerina Ierodiakonou. Oxford: Clarendon, 1999: 128–52.
Sevenster, J. N. *Paul and Seneca*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1961.
Smit. J. "Argument and Genre of 1 Corinthians 12–14." In *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*, edited by Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht. JSNTSup 90. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993: 211–30.
Smith, D. Moody. "Glossolalia and Other Spiritual Gifts in a New Testament Perspective." *Int* 28 (1974): 307–20.
Smith, Jonathan Z. "The Social Description of Early Christianity." *RelSRev* 1 (1975): 19–25.
Snow, David A., and Richard Machalek. "The Convert as a Social Type." In *Sociological Theory*, edited by Randall Collins. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1983: 259–89.
Solmsen, Friedrich. "Nature as Craftsman in Greek Thought." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 24 (1963): 473–96.
Sterling, Gregory E. "'Wisdom among the Perfect': Creation Traditions in Alexandrian Judaism and Corinthian Christianity." *NovT* 37 (1995): 355–84.
"The Bond of Humanity: Friendship in Philo of Alexandria." In *Greco-Roman Perspectives on Friendship*, edited by John T. Fitzgerald. SBLRBS 34. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997: 203–23.
"Hellenistic Philosophy and the New Testament." In *Handbook to Exegesis of the New Testament*, edited by Stanley E. Porter. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1997: 313–58.
Stowers, Stanley. *Letter Writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986.
"Friends and Enemies in the Politics of Heaven: Reading Theology in Philippians." In *Pauline Theology*, edited by Jouette M. Bassler. Vol. I. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991: 105–21.

Striker, Gisela. "The Role of *Oikeiosis* in Stoic Ethics." *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 1 (1983): 145–68.

Stuhlmacher, P. "The Hermeneutical Significance of 1 Cor 2:6–16." In *Tradition and Interpretation in the New Testament: Essays in Honor of E. Earle Ellis for His 60th Birthday*, edited by Gerald F. Hawthorne and Otto Betz. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987: 328–47.

Talbert, Charles. "Paul's Understanding of the Holy Spirit: The Evidence of 1 Corinthians 12–14." In *Perspectives on the New Testament*, edited by Charles H. Talbert. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1985: 95–108.

Reading Corinthians. New York: Crossroad, 1987.

Taylor, Nicholas H. "The Social Nature of Conversion in the Early Christian World." In *Modelling Early Christianity*, edited by Philip F. Esler. London: Routledge, 1995: 128–36.

Terrien, Samuel. *The Elusive Presence: The Heart of Biblical Theology*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1978.

Theissen, Gerd. *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity: Essays on Corinth*. Edited and translated by John H. Schütz. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982.

Thiselton, Anthony C. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.

Thrall, Margaret. *I and II Corinthians*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965.

Todd, Robert B. *Alexander of Aphrodisias on Stoic Physics*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976.

Turner, Victor. *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1969.

Unnik, W. C. van. "Jesus: Anathema or Kyrios (1 Cor. 12:3)." In *Christ and Spirit in the New Testament*, edited by Barnabus Lindars and Stephen S. Smalley. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973: 113–26.

Verbeke, G. *L'évolution de la doctrine de pneuma*. Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1945.

Vielhauer, Philipp. *Oikodome: Das Bild vom Bau in der christlichen Literatur vom Neuen Testament bis Clemens Alexandrinus*. Karlsruhe-Durlach: Tron, 1940.

Viner, Leigh Clasby. "Moral Paradigms and the Stoic Sage." Ph.D. diss., Duquesne University, 2002.

Vollenweider, Samuel. *Freiheit als neue Schöpfung*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989.

Walter, Matthias. *Gemeinde als Leib Christi*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001.

Wardman, Alan. *Plutarch's Lives*. Berkeley: University of California, 1974.

Watson, Duane. "Paul's Rhetorical Strategy in 1 Corinthians 15." In *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*, edited by Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht. JSNTSup 90. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993: 231–49.

Welborn, L. L. "On the Discord in Corinth: 1 Corinthians 1–4 and Ancient Politics." *JBL* 106 (1987): 85–111.

White, John. "Introductory Formulae in the Body of the Pauline Letter." *JBL* 90 (1971): 91–97.

White, L. Michael. "Morality between Two Worlds: A Paradigm of Friendship in Philippians." In *Greeks, Romans, and Christians*, edited by D. L. Balch, E. Ferguson, and W. A. Meeks. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990: 201–15.

White, Michael J. "Stoic Natural Philosophy (Physics and Cosmology)." In *The Cambridge Companion to the Stoics*, edited by Brad Inwood. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003: 124–52.

White, Nicholas P. "The Basis of Stoic Ethics." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 83 (1979): 143–78.

Wikenhauser, Alfred. *Die Kirche als der mystische Leib Christi nach dem Apostel Paulus*. Münster: Aschendorff, 1937.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Ulrich von. *Der Glaube der Hellenen*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1955.

Willis, Wendell Lee. *Idol Meat at Corinth*. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1985.

Winter, Bruce. *Philo and Paul among the Sophists*. SNTSMS 96. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Wire, Antoinette. *The Corinthian Women Prophets*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.

Wischmeyer, O. *Der höchste Weg. Das 13. Kapitel des 1. Korintherbriefes*. Gutersloh: Gutersloher Verlagshaus, 1981.

Witherington, Ben III. *Conflict and Community in Corinth*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.

Wolff, Christian. *Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther*. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1996.

Wright, N. T. "ἁρπαγμός and the Meaning of Philippians 2:5–11." *JTS* 37 (1986): 321–52.

"Paul's Gospel and Caesar's Empire." In *Paul and Politics: Ekklesia, Israel, Imperium, Interpretation*, edited by Richard A. Horsley. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity, 2000: 160–83.

Wuellner, W. "Greek Rhetoric and Pauline Argumentation." In *Early Christian Literature and the Classical Intellectual Tradition: In honorem Robert Grant*, edited by W. F. Schoedel and R. L. Wilken. Paris: Editions Beauchesne, 1979: 177–88.

"Paul as Pastor. The Function of Rhetorical Questions in First Corinthians." In *L'apôtre Paul: personnalité, style, et conception du ministère*, edited by A. Vanhoye. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1986: 49–77.

Yorke, Gosnell L. O. R. *The Church as the Body of Christ in the Pauline Corpus*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1991.

Zerwick, M. *Biblical Greek*. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1963.

INDEX OF PASSAGES CITED

Biblical references

Apocrypha

Greek and Latin texts

INDEX OF MODERN AUTHORS

INDEX OF SUBJECTS