

**Paul's Metaphorical Temple Language in 1–2 Corinthians:
The influence of Hellenistic Philosophy on the Corinthians'
understanding of Paul's argument**

Philip N. Richardson

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction and Literature Review

1.1 The Scope of the Project

1.2 History of Research

1.2.1 Author-focused approaches: The dependence of Paul on his milieu

1.2.1.1 Hans Wenschkewitz (1932)

1.2.1.2 Bertil Gärtner (1965)

1.2.1.3 Georg Klinzing (1971)

1.2.1.4 Robert J. Daly (1978)

1.2.2 Author-focused approaches: Paul's appropriation of Jewish thought

1.2.2.1 R. J. McKelvey (1969)

1.2.2.2 Michael Newton (1985)

1.2.2.3 Nijay Gupta (2010)

1.2.3 Audience-focused approaches: Paul's engagement with the religious and cultural milieu of Corinth

1.2.3.1 Elizabeth Schüssler Fiorenza (1976)

1.2.3.2 John R Lanci (1997)

1.2.3.3 J. Ayodeji Adewuya (2003, 2007)

1.2.3.4 Albert L. A. Hogeterp (2006)

1.2.3.5 Martin Vahrenhorst (2008)

1.2.3.6 Timothy Wardle (2010)

1.2.3.7 Yulin Liu (2013)

1.3 Temple Imagery in Inter-Testamental Judaism

1.3.1 Metaphorical Temple Language in the Dead Sea Scrolls

1.3.2 Metaphorical Temple Language in the Pseudepigrapha and the Apocrypha

1.4 The Purpose of the Study

1.5 Methodology and Plan of the Work

Chapter 2: Metaphorical Temple Language in Hellenistic Philosophy

2.1 Introduction

2.1.1 Philosophy

2.2 Introduction to Diogenes Laertius

2.2.1 Theophrastus, according to Diogenes Laertius

2.3 Stoicism

2.3.1 Introduction to Stoicism

2.3.2 Zeno according to Diogenes Laertius

2.3.3 Cicero's evidence

2.3.3.1 Sacrifice language

2.3.3.2 The Nature of Divinity

2.3.3.3 Living out the Philosophy

2.3.4 Arius Didymus

2.3.5 Seneca

2.3.5.1 Sacrifice language

2.3.5.2 Priest language

2.3.5.3 Temple Language

2.3.5.4 The Nature of Divinity

2.3.5.5 The Nature of Humanity

2.3.5.6 Living out the Philosophy

2.3.6 Dio Chrysostom

2.3.6.1 Sacrifice language

2.3.6.2 Priest Language

2.3.6.3 Temple Language

2.3.6.4 The Nature of Divinity

2.3.6.5 The Nature of Humanity

2.3.6.6 Living out the Philosophy

2.3.7 Epictetus

2.3.7.1 Sacrifice language

2.3.7.2 Priest language

2.3.7.3 Temple Language

2.3.7.4 The Nature of Divinity

2.3.7.5 The Nature of Humanity

2.3.7.6 Living out the Philosophy

2.3.8 *Marcus Aurelius*

- 2.3.8.1 *Priest Language*
- 2.3.8.2 *Temple Language*
- 2.3.8.3 *The Nature of Divinity*
- 2.3.8.4 *The Nature of Humanity*
- 2.3.8.5 *Living out the Philosophy*

2.3.9 *Hierocles*

- 2.3.9.1 *Temple and Priest Language*
- 2.3.9.2 *The Nature of Divinity*
- 2.3.9.3 *The Nature of Humanity*

2.3.10 *Summary of our Findings from Stoicism*

- 2.3.10.1 *Summary of Sacrifice Language*
- 2.3.10.2 *Summary of Priest Language*
- 2.3.10.3 *Summary of Temple Language and the Nature of Divinity*
- 2.3.10.4 *Summary of the Nature of Humanity*
- 2.3.10.5 *Summary of Living out the Philosophy*

2.4 Middle Platonism

2.4.1 *Plutarch*

- 2.4.1.1 *Sacrifice language*
- 2.4.1.2 *Temple Language*
- 2.4.1.3 *The Nature of Divinity*
- 2.4.1.4 *The Nature of Humanity*
- 2.4.1.5 *Living out the Philosophy*

2.4.2 *Alcinous*

- 2.4.2.1 *Temple Language*
- 2.4.2.2 *The Nature of Divinity*
- 2.4.2.3 *The Nature of Humanity*
- 2.4.2.4 *Living out the Philosophy*

2.4.3 *Maximus of Tyre*

- 2.4.3.1 *Sacrifice language*
- 2.4.3.2 *Temple Language*
- 2.4.3.3 *The Nature of Divinity*
- 2.4.3.4 *The Nature of Humanity*
- 2.4.3.5 *Living out the Philosophy*

2.4.4 *Summary of our Findings from Middle Platonism*

2.4.4.1 *Summary of Sacrifice Language*

2.4.4.2 *Summary of Temple Language*

2.4.4.3 *Summary of the Nature of Divinity*

2.4.4.4 *Summary of the Nature of Humanity*

2.4.4.5 *Summary of Living out the Philosophy*

2.5 Skepticism

2.5.1 *Cicero*

2.5.1.1 *Sacrifice Language*

2.5.1.2 *Temple Language*

2.5.1.3 *The Nature of Divinity*

2.5.1.4 *The Nature of Humanity*

2.5.1.5 *Living out the Philosophy*

2.6 Neopythagoreanism

2.6.1 *Apollonius of Tyana, according to Philostratus*

2.6.1.1 *Sacrifice Language*

2.6.1.2 *The Nature of Divinity*

2.6.1.3 *The Nature of Humanity*

2.6.1.4 *Living out the Philosophy*

2.7 Epicureanism

2.7.1 *Lucretius, De Rerum Natura*

2.8 Miscellaneous

2.9 Conclusions

2.9.1 *Temple Language*

2.9.2 *The Nature of the Divinity*

2.9.3 *The Nature of Humanity*

2.9.4 *Living out the Philosophy*

Chapter 3: Metaphorical Temple Language in Philo of Alexandria

3.1 Introduction

3.2 Sacrifice Language

3.2.1 Literal Sacrifices must be offered with reverence and respect for the rite

3.2.2 Literal Sacrifices can only be offered with a pious life and spirit

*3.2.2.1 Consequently the literal sacrifices are of no worth
if offered by an impious person*

*3.2.2.2 A person should take care to offer literal sacrifices
with a rational and noble mind*

3.2.3 The True Sacrifice is Spiritual and does not have to be a Literal Sacrifice

3.2.3.1 The offering of the soul and mind

3.2.3.2 The offering of purity and virtue

3.2.3.3 The Sacrifice of Praise

3.2.3.4 Summary of Sacrifice Language

3.3 Priest Language

3.3.1 Priest represents divine direction in the soul

3.3.2 Priest as Reason

3.3.3 Priest as Judge of Conscience

3.3.4 Priest as Purity of the soul

3.3.5 Priest represents different actors

3.3.6 Garments of the Priest

3.3.6.1 Garments are a symbol of the soul that is pure inside and out

3.3.6.2 Garments are associated with Reason

3.3.6.3 Garments represent the virtues

3.3.6.3 Garments represent the virtues

3.3.6.4 Garments represent the world

3.3.7 Summary of Priest Language

3.4 Temple Language

3.4.1 The soul is the dwelling place of God

3.4.2 The mind is the dwelling place of God

3.4.3 People in their embodiment described as temples

3.4.4 The Universe as Temple

3.4.4.1 The World is a temple

3.4.4.2 Heaven is a temple

3.4.4.3 God fills all things

3.4.5 The Dwelling of Wisdom

3.4.6 Tabernacle Language

3.4.7 Summary of Temple Language

3.5 Conclusions

Chapter Four: Metaphorical Temple Language in 1 Corinthians

4.1 Introduction

4.1.1 Paul's Introduction to 1 Corinthians

4.2 1 Corinthians 3:16

4.2.1 1 Corinthians 3:16–17: Literary Context

4.2.2 1 Corinthians 3:16–17: Main Features

4.2.3 Comparing 1 Cor 3:16–17 with Hellenistic Philosophy

4.2.3.1. Philosophy

4.2.3.2 Paul

4.3 1 Corinthians 6:19

4.3.1 1 Corinthians 6:19: Literary Context

4.3.2 1 Corinthians 6:19: The Context of 1 Corinthians 6:12–20

4.3.3 1 Corinthians 6:19: Main Features

4.3.4 Comparing 1 Corinthians 6:19 with Hellenistic Philosophy

4.3.4.1 Philosophy

4.3.4.2 Paul

4.4 Corresponding Emphases in 1 Corinthians

4.4.1 Holiness in the Body

4.4.2 Idolatry

4.4.3 Body language

4.5 Comparing the Theologies of 1 Corinthians with Hellenistic Philosophy

4.5.1 Paul's Understanding of God in 1 Corinthians

4.5.2 Paul's Understanding of Humanity in 1 Corinthians

4.5.3 Living as the Temple in 1 Corinthians

4.6 The contrast between Paul's understanding and the Philosophers' understanding

4.6.1 Divinity

4.6.2 Humanity

4.6.3 Living Out the Philosophy

4.7 Conclusions

Chapter Five: Metaphorical Temple Language in 2 Corinthians

5.1 Introduction

5.1.1 The Contested Place of 2 Corinthians 6:14–7:1

5.2 2 Corinthians 6:14–7:1

5.2.1 2 Corinthians 6:14–7:1: Main Features

5.2.2 Comparing 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 with Hellenistic Philosophy

5.2.2.1 Philosophy

5.2.2.2 Paul

5.3. Corresponding Emphases in the Corinthian correspondence

5.3.1 Idolatry

5.3.2 Separation for the sake of purity

5.3.3 The theme of Indwelling in 2 Corinthians

5.4 Comparing the Theologies of 2 Corinthians with Hellenistic Philosophy

5.4.1 Paul's Understanding of God in 2 Corinthians

5.4.2 Paul's Understanding of Humanity in 2 Corinthians

5.4.3 Living as the Temple in 2 Corinthians

5.5 Conclusions

Chapter 6: Conclusions

6.1 Summary

6.2 Avenues for further study

Bibliography

Chapter 1: Introduction and Literature Review

1.1 The Scope of the Project

In three places in the Corinthian correspondence the apostle Paul uses metaphorical temple language to define the identity of his readers. In 1 Cor 3:16 and 6:19 they are described as a temple in which God's Spirit dwells and in 2 Cor 6:16 Paul includes *himself* with his readers as "the temple of the living God".¹ While Paul uses cultic language metaphorically in a number of his letters,² only when writing to the Corinthians does Paul use metaphorical temple language repeatedly to shape the identity of his audience.³ For Paul, a former Pharisee (Phil 3:5; cf. Acts 23:6; 26:5), the image of the temple had primary reference to the temple in Jerusalem: the place where God had promised to dwell, where worshippers longed to meet with God and where his glory had dwelt (1 Kgs 9:3; 2 Chr 5:14; 7:1; Ps 26:8; 43:3) and one day might dwell again (Ezek 43–48).

However, his audience came from very different backgrounds. There are clear indicators that the majority of the readers were Gentiles (1 Cor 6:9–11; 8:7; 12:2). As residents of a very cosmopolitan and pluralistic city, Corinth, they would have been exposed to a variety of religious, cultural and philosophical influences, such as Roman temples to various gods and the feasts held there on various social and religious occasions, the presence of the Imperial cult, the bi-annual Isthmian games, the customs of Roman law, and the behavior of sophists and their

¹ Though some manuscripts are closer in content to 1 Cor 3:16–17, substituting the personal pronoun "ὁμεῖς" for "ἡμεῖς". This issue will be addressed in Chapter Four when the passage is explored in detail.

² E.g. "living sacrifices" in Rom 12:1; the "priestly service of the gospel . . . the offering of the Gentiles" in Rom 15:16; "to be poured out as a drink offering upon the sacrificial offering of your faith" in Phil 2:17 and "a fragrant offering, a sacrifice acceptable and pleasing to God" in Phil 4:18. See Nijay K. Gupta, *Worship That Makes Sense to Paul: A New Approach to the Theology and Ethics of Paul's Cultic Metaphors* (BZNTW 175; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2010), for a survey of all the possible cultic metaphors in the Pauline corpus. Gupta assigns each potential cultic metaphor one of three categories: "certain", "almost certain" or "probable".

³ Among the disputed Paulines, though, the image also appears in Eph 2:19–22.

followers, among others.⁴ While Paul clearly had no hesitation in using OT traditions and expecting his audience to understand his allusions (e.g. 1 Cor 5:7–8 and 10:1–13), how would such temple language have spoken to them in the context of Corinth itself?

Of all Paul's letters, only 1 Corinthians contains a lengthy discussion of the temptations posed by idol food, especially the prospect of eating in or around local temples (8:1–11:1, especially 8:10; 10:14). This fact, at the very least, suggests that Paul's metaphorical temple language would have pointedly contrasted with the reality of Corinth with its many temples.⁵ How would this language have compared with the Corinthians' understanding of temples prior to their conversion? What would have been the chief influences on the thinking of the Corinthians when they read Paul's metaphorical temple language?⁶ The evidence of 1 Cor 8:1–11:1 draws our attention to the religious influences in Corinth and the many opportunities to consume idol food in temple settings. This is clearly an important background for understanding the social and cultural context of the audience and relates to 1 Cor 3:16; 6:19 and 2 Cor 6:16. However, 1 Cor 8:1–11:1 does not use metaphorical temple language and because this background to Paul's

⁴ See e.g. Anthony C. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 1–12; Bruce W. Winter, *After Paul Left Corinth: The Influence of Secular Ethics and Social Change* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), 7–25; and more generally, various essays in Steven J. Friesen, Daniel N. Schowalter, and James C. Walters, *Corinth in Context: Comparative Studies on Religion and Society* (NovTSup 134; Leiden: Brill, 2010).

⁵ See the many essays that deal with this subject in Idem, *Corinth*; Daniel N. Schowalter and Steven J. Friesen, *Urban Religion in Roman Corinth: Interdisciplinary Approaches* (HTS 53; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Divinity School, 2005), and Winter, *Corinth*, 269–86, and more recently in e.g. John R. Lanci, *A New Temple for Corinth: Rhetorical and Archaeological Approaches to Pauline Imagery* (Studies in Biblical Literature 1; New York: Peter Lang, 1997), 89–113; Gregory Stevenson, *Power and Place: Temple and Identity in the Book of Revelation* (BZNTW 107; Berlin: De Gruyter, 2001), 37–114; and Yulin Liu, *Temple Purity in 1-2 Corinthians* (WUNT 2/ 343; Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 2013), 70–105.

⁶ Cf. Stevenson, who addresses the question of how temple imagery in Revelation would have communicated to a mixed cultural audience in Asia Minor (*Power*, 3) and considers Paul's use of temple language in 1–2 Corinthians to provide an analogy to his study of Revelation (*Power*, 19).

discussion has been covered so extensively in numerous articles and published monographs, particularly in the last twenty years, it will not be the focus of my discussion.⁷

It has long been recognized that in order to interpret Paul's letters to the Corinthians, scholars need to understand the behaviors and ideas to which Paul is reacting. These have been conveyed to Paul before the writing of First Corinthians by the Corinthians themselves (e.g. 1 Cor 7:1) and in reports which Paul has received from others (e.g. 1 Cor 1:11; 5:1). As Gordon Fee writes, "As former pagans they brought to the Christian faith a Hellenistic worldview and attitude toward ethical behavior."⁸ However, this worldview was not communicated exclusively or perhaps even primarily through religious practices. Temples were public buildings that were set aside for individuals to offer sacrifices, not places for congregations to worship corporately, as in modern churches. Cult practices, though clearly communicating a certain worldview implicitly, did not express doctrine in a formal way.⁹ Rather, philosophy provided the kind of theological guidance for faith and practice that Paul sought to impart to the Corinthians. Everett Ferguson writes, "The various schools provided the worldview and practical guidance for life that religion does for many today. A person did not normally go to the priest of the local cult for

⁷ Published monographs include Wendell L. Willis, *Idol Meat in Corinth: The Pauline Argument in 1 Corinthians 8 and 10* (SBLDS 68; Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1985); Peter D. Gooch, *Dangerous Food: 1 Corinthians 8–10 in Its Context* (Waterloo, Ont.: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1993); Paul Douglas Gardner, *The Gifts of God and the Authentication of a Christian: An Exegetical Study of 1 Corinthians 8–11:1* (Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1994); Khiok-Khng Yeo, *Rhetorical Interaction in 1 Corinthians 8 and 10: A Formal Analysis with Preliminary Suggestions for a Chinese, Cross-Cultural Hermeneutic* (BibInt 9; Leiden: Brill, 1995); Derek Newton, *Diety and Diet: The Dilemma of Sacrificial Food at Corinth* (JSNTSup 169; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998); A. T. Cheung, *Idol Food in Corinth: Jewish Background and Pauline Legacy* (JSNTSup 176; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999); Joop F. Smit, "About the Idol Offerings". *Rhetoric, Social Context and Theology of Paul's Discourse in First Corinthians 8:1–11:1* (CBET 27; Leuven: Peeters, 2000); John Fotopoulos, *Food Offered to Idols in Roman Corinth: A Social-Rhetorical Reconsideration of 1 Corinthians 8:1–11:1* (WUNT 2/ 151; Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 2003); Richard Liong-Seng Phua, *Idolatry and Authority. A Study of 1 Corinthians 8:1–11:1 in the Light of the Jewish Diaspora* (JSNTSup 299; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2005), and Michael Li-Tak Shen, *Canaan to Corinth* (Studies in Biblical Literature 83; New York: Peter Lang, 2010).

⁸ Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 23.

⁹ See James B. Rives, *Religion in the Roman Empire* (Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2007).

an interpretation of the nature of reality or for moral advice. One turned more often than not to a philosopher for an answer to these questions . . . Some even saw philosophy as bringing a kind of conversion and cleansing of the soul.”¹⁰

Some, however, have questioned the relevance of Hellenistic philosophy as an appropriate background to the Corinthian church, such as Dale B. Martin who writes, “ancient philosophers — who represent a tiny fraction of the population — cannot be used to reconstruct views of the broader population.”¹¹ As one leading scholar of Hellenistic philosophy puts it in his introduction to the field, “In the period covered by this book philosophy became thoroughly institutionalized and practically synonymous with higher education.”¹² Although few members of the Corinthian church might have had higher education, those who did were more influential members socially and may have exerted disproportionate influence on the church (for instance as owners of the homes in which churches met and/or as patrons of the church). However, the issue is not necessarily whether the Corinthians were especially well-educated, or were philosophers, whether they were capable of reading philosophical works or whether there is evidence of them doing so. Rather, the influence of Hellenistic philosophy was pervasive in the first century; its ideas trickled down to influence the thought-world of those who may never have read the original works.¹³ In this respect, Joseph Fitzmyer, a leading scholar in the study of 1 Corinthians, writes,

¹⁰ Everett Ferguson, *Backgrounds of Early Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 320–21 and see also Robert L. Wilken, “Toward a Social Interpretation of Early Christian Apologetics,” *CH* 39.4 (1970): 437–58 at 444.

¹¹ Dale B. Martin, *The Corinthian Body* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 6; cited with approval by Alistair Scott May, *The Body for the Lord: Sex and Identity in 1 Corinthians 5-7* (JSNTSup 278; London: T&T Clark, 2004), 159.

¹² Idem, *Hellenistic Philosophy: Stoics, Epicureans, Sceptics*, 13.

¹³ As A.A. Long, *Hellenistic Philosophy: Stoics, Epicureans, Sceptics* (London: Duckworth, 1974), 12, notes “Epicureans and Stoics were prepared to popularize their teaching. In his *Letter to Herodotus* . . . Epicurus opens by remarking that he has prepared an epitome of his philosophy for those unable to study his technical writings.”

Paul's first letter to the Corinthians seems at times to be coping with secular thinking among the members of the Christian community there, thinking that is at times akin to Epicurean teaching, Stoic tenets, and the rhetoric of the Sophists. That elements of such popular Greek philosophy and secular education were affecting the Christians of Corinth, along with the Roman culture that predominated, is to be expected, because of the heritage of Greek culture and philosophy that would have been there.¹⁴

Some older studies have, perhaps, tainted this field of research by placing great emphasis on the influences of, say, Stoicism in shaping Paul's *own* theology.¹⁵ However, distancing ourselves from this approach (as I do), should not lead us to neglect the ways in which Paul may have deliberately addressed an audience influenced by these world views. N. T. Wright makes a telling point here, "if Paul did not *derive* the central themes and categories of his proclamation from the themes and categories of pagan thought, that doesn't mean he refused to make any use of such things. Indeed, he revels in the fact that he can pick up all kinds of things from his surrounding culture and make them serve his purposes – much as philosophers of his day could quote rival schools in order to upstage or refute them."¹⁶ Some NT scholars have explored the relationship between Hellenistic philosophy and Paul's writings in general.¹⁷ Others have examined the relationship between Hellenistic philosophy (Stoicism in particular) and First

¹⁴ Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 32; New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), 30–31.

¹⁵ The study of Wenschkewitz, explored below, being a prime example.

¹⁶ N. T. Wright, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2013), 201.

¹⁷ Notably Abraham J. Malherbe, *Paul and the Popular Philosophers* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989); Abraham L. Malherbe, "Hellenistic Moralists and the New Testament," *ANRW* 26.1: 267–333; Troels Engberg-Pedersen, *Paul and the Stoics* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2000); and more generally in J. Paul Sampley, ed., *Paul in the Greco-Roman World: A Handbook*. (Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 2003). See now the history of research presented in Nathan J. Barnes, *Reading 1 Corinthians with Philosophically Educated Women* (Eugene, Ore.: Pickwick Publications, 2014), 4–28.

Corinthians in relation to various topics.¹⁸ Others have set the scene for such a comparison in relation to my topic. Everett Ferguson performed an invaluable service with his 1980 article on “Spiritual Sacrifice in Early Christianity and Its Environment”, but since it is so wide ranging, it is necessarily brief and deals only with metaphorical sacrifice language, not with the language of temples.¹⁹ In any case, Ferguson surveys the use of this language in closed categories (such as “Greek and Roman Poets and Philosophers”, “Judaism”, “New Testament” etc.); it is not within his purview to attempt a comparison between the NT and other backgrounds. With these questions in mind, I shall provide an overview of key works from the past century that have addressed Paul’s use of temple language. In particular, I shall explore what light these works have shed on the relationship between Paul’s language and Hellenistic Philosophy.

1.2 History of Research

My review of works on Paul’s metaphorical temple language is necessarily limited by constraints of space. With this in mind, my discussion will focus on a sample of what I consider the most significant contributions, which will be supplemented by brief references to other related studies, where appropriate. I shall provide a summary and critique of each work, but my review of each author will be skewed towards their coverage of the possible backgrounds to the metaphorical temple language, since that is the particular interest of my own study.²⁰ I have

¹⁸ Such as Will Deming, *Paul on Marriage and Celibacy: The Hellenistic Background of 1 Corinthians 7* (2d ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004; Michelle V. Lee, *Paul, the Stoics, and the Body of Christ* (SNTSMS 137; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006); Albert V. Garcilazo, *The Corinthian Dissenters and the Stoics* (Studies in Biblical Literature 106; New York: Peter Lang, 2007).

¹⁹ Everett Ferguson, “Spiritual Sacrifice in Early Christianity and Its Environment,” *ANRW* 23:2: 1151–81; see especially 1152–56.

²⁰ Most of the works I will consider have already been reviewed from a variety of angles in e.g. Lanci, *Temple*, 7–14; Albert L.A. Hogeterp, *Paul and God’s Temple: A Historical Interpretation of Cultic Imagery in the Corinthian Correspondence* (Biblical Tools and Studies 2; Leuven: Peeters, 2006), 2–22; Martin Vahrenhorst, *Kultische Sprache in den Paulusbriefen* (WUNT 230; Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 2008), 10–16; Timothy Wardle,

divided these key studies into three categories that will help us to see more clearly each author's understanding of the relationship between Paul, his audience, and the backgrounds to the imagery. Firstly, I shall explore the works that focus on the author and emphasize his dependence on a particular milieu. I shall note that this was a trend in earlier studies, many of whose conclusions have since been rejected by contemporary scholarship. Secondly, I shall discuss a number of works that argue that Paul was not dependent on a specific milieu, but rather drew on common tenets of Judaism. Because this is a relatively uncontroversial position, it is unsurprising that both older and more recent works have taken this stance. Finally, I shall note a newer trend. In my third category, I observe that the majority of more recent interpreters have turned their attention not so much to the influences on Paul himself, but to the way he uses temple imagery to address the religious and cultural milieu of his audience.

1.2.1 Author-focused approaches: The dependence of Paul on his milieu

1.2.1.1 Hans Wenschkewitz (1932)

The earliest significant modern studies on Paul's temple language concentrated solely on Paul's own background and influences. The first of these was the seminal work of Hans Wenschkewitz²¹ which, although now over eighty years old, still forms the starting point for modern discussions of this topic, since it proved so influential in the decades that followed.²² To

The Jerusalem Temple and Early Christian Identity (WUNT 2/ 291; Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 2010), 5–8; Gupta, *Worship*, 9–26; Liu, *Purity*, 3–9.

²¹ Hans Wenschkewitz, *Die Spiritualisierung der Kultusbegriffe: Tempel, Priester und Opfer im Neuen Testament* (Angelos Beihefte 4; Leipzig: Eduard Pfeiffer, 1932).

²² Discussed by, among others, R. J. McKelvey, *The New Temple: The Church in the New Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969), 42–43; E. Schüssler Fiorenza, "Cultic Language in Qumran and in the New Testament," *CBQ* 38 (1976): 159–77 at 159–61; Michael Newton, *The Concept of Purity at Qumran and in the Letters of Paul* (SNTSMS 53; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 8; Lanci, *Temple*, 9–11; Hogeterp, *Temple*, 2–8; Wardle, *Temple*, 5; Gupta, *Worship*, 9–11; Liu, *Purity*, 3.

his credit, Wenschkewitz devoted more space to the relationship between Paul and Hellenistic philosophy than perhaps any other discussion up to the present day,²³ but he sought it in the wrong place. Wenschkewitz's thesis is devoted to his concept of *Spiritualisierung* (spiritualization). He contends that the objects of the cult were increasingly spiritualized in an evolutionary process whose origins lie in the OT itself but culminate in the writings of Paul. According to Wenschkewitz, from the Maccabean period onwards, the law began to supplant the temple as the most prominent focus of Judaism, even before the destruction of the temple in 70 C.E.²⁴ Wenschkewitz distinguished between a *naive spiritualization* represented by the OT and subsequent Jewish writings of the Diaspora, and a *reflective spiritualization* exemplified in the doctrine of the individual as the temple of God, which can be found in Stoic teaching and the writings of Philo. It was the genius of Paul to fuse these two distinct notions and combine them in his doctrine of the community as temple.²⁵ However, the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls in 1947, subsequent to Wenschkewitz's study, demonstrated that other communities originating in Palestinian Judaism could use metaphorical temple language, particularly in relation to their communities. This finding obviated the need for an explanation outside of Judaism (such as Stoic thought), a fact that R. J. McKelvey was one of the first to note.²⁶ To be fair to Wenschkewitz, he

²³ Wenschkewitz, *Spiritualisierung*, 49–67 deals with Stoic philosophy and 67–87 with Philo of Alexandria, and discusses some key references to the notion of the divine dwelling in the soul/mind of the individual. see e.g. Idem, *Spiritualisierung*, 58.

²⁴ Idem, *Spiritualisierung*, 22f.

²⁵ Idem, *Spiritualisierung*, 116: “So ergibt sich also, daß die Spiritualisierung des Tempelbegriffes bei Paulus in stoischen Gedankenkreisen ihren Ursprung hat.” (So is it clear, therefore, that the spiritualization of the temple concept in Paul has its source in the circles of Stoic thought.)

²⁶ McKelvey, *Temple*, 42–43, 56, 104, 122; also Newton, *Purity*, 120; Wardle, *Temple*, 5. M. Fraeyman, “La spiritualisation de l’Idée du Temple dans les Épîtres Pauliniennes,” *ETL* XXIII (1947): 378–412 at 410–11 had already observed the problems with Wenschkewitz's thesis and postulated that Paul derived his conception of the spiritual temple from Judaism, not Hellenism, though Fraeyman was writing before the publication of the scrolls (also acknowledged by McKelvey, *Temple*, 56 note 1). Fraeyman, “Spiritualisation,” 398 also notes the contrasts between Paul and Platonic theories of the soul and body, but Fraeyman only relates a Pauline critique of Stoicism to the record of Paul's speech in Acts 17:23–24 (Idem, “Spiritualisation,” 411).

does note that Paul's doctrine of the temple of God as the community, not just the individual, and as the body, not only the soul, is radically different from Hellenistic philosophy and could not have been derived from it.²⁷ Nevertheless, Wenschkewitz only thinks in terms of Paul appropriating a Greek concept. He does not explore the possibility that Paul may have intended to challenge or subvert the idea.²⁸

1.2.1.2 Bertil Gärtner (1965)

Bertil Gärtner, writing some thirty years after Wenschkewitz and following the publication of the Dead Sea Scrolls, appreciated the fresh light which the scrolls had cast on the background to aspects of NT doctrine which had previously been attributed to its Hellenistic heritage.²⁹ Gärtner's studies led him to take an *approach* that was essentially identical to Wenschkewitz, though his *conclusions* were precisely the opposite. Like Wenschkewitz, Gärtner claimed that Paul was dependent on his milieu and strongly emphasized the parallels between Paul and his sources, on which he was dependent.³⁰ However, for Gärtner, Paul's source was Qumran theology, and Gärtner alludes to Hellenistic Judaism only in order to dismiss it, but makes no reference to the relationship between Paul, his audience and the temple language in

²⁷ Wenschkewitz, *Spiritualisierung*, 111–13; e.g. in his comment at 112: “Weder in der Stoa, noch bei Philo treffen wir diesen Gedanken, denn hier war alles auf den Einzelnen, auf das Individuum eingestellt” (“Neither in the Stoics nor in Philo do we meet this idea, because here everything was tailored to the individual, for the individual.”), and at 165. This point is also recognized in the critiques by Fraeyman, “Spiritualisation,” 411 and Gupta, *Worship*, 10.

²⁸ Cf. the critique of Idem, *Worship*, 25, that Wenschkewitz does not consider Paul's unique contribution. Similarly to Wenschkewitz, Hans-Josef Klauck, “Kultische Symbolsprache Bei Paulus,” in *Freude am Gottesdienst. Aspekte ursprünglicher Liturgie* (ed. J. Schreiner; Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1983), 109 sees the Hellenistic understanding of the dwelling of God in the soul (citing Philo and a Pythagorean maxim) as the “vorbild” (model) for 1 Cor 3:16.

²⁹ Bertil E. Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament: A Comparative Study in the Temple Symbolism of the Qumran Texts and the New Testament* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965), x.

³⁰ Idem, *Temple*, x–xi, 47–49, 49–60, 142.

Hellenistic philosophy.³¹ Instead, Gärtner's study emphasizes parallels between the language of temple and priesthood in Qumran and the NT (occasionally playing down the role of a literal future temple in the Scrolls, which does not correspond with NT teaching),³² hypothesizing that former members of Qumran/the Essenes brought these traditions into the church.³³ Like Wenschkewitz, Gärtner does not consider Paul's own unique contribution, preferring to stress similarities between Qumran and traditions across the NT corpus. Gärtner does not consider the possibility that Paul's communities and the Qumran community may occupy similar positions vis-à-vis Judaism without one necessarily being dependent upon the other for Temple imagery.³⁴

1.2.1.3 Georg Klinzing (1971)

Georg Klinzing's study is much more focused on the Qumran community than the NT,³⁵ and presents a very thorough study of cultic language in a variety of texts from Qumran. Klinzing is critical of Wenschkewitz's concept of *Spiritualisierung* and prefers the term *Umdeutung* ("Reinterpretation") to describe how both Qumran and Paul appropriated cultic language in speaking of their respective communities.³⁶ While Klinzing recognizes that both the Qumran and Christian communities share a belief that they are an eschatological community living in the last days, like Gärtner, Klinzing is certain that the source for Paul's temple language

³¹ Idem, *Temple*, 47.

³² E.g. Idem, *Temple*, 21.

³³ Idem, *Temple*, 139.

³⁴ See also the reviews of McKelvey, *Temple*, 96–97 and Gupta, *Worship*, 14–15.

³⁵ The brevity of the NT section is noted by Idem, *Worship*, 14.

³⁶ Georg Klinzing, *Die Umdeutung des Kultus in der Qumrangemeinde und im Neuen Testament* (SUNT 7; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971), 143–47. See also the critiques of Wenschkewitz's spiritualization thesis in J. C. Coppens, "The Spiritual Temple in the Pauline Letters and Its Background," in *Studia evangelica. Vol VI: Papers presented to the Fourth International Congress on New Testament Studies held at Oxford, 1969* (ed. Elizabeth A. Livingstone; TUGAL 112; Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1973), 59, and Wolfram Strack, *Kultische Terminologie in ekklesiologischen Kontexten in den Briefen des Paulus* (BBB 92; Weinheim: Beltz Athenäum, 1994), 8–9, 375–80, 391, 396.

is Qumran, “Wenn die christliche Gemeinde von sich selbst als dem Tempel spricht, kann kein Zweifel darüber bestehen, daß diese Vorstellung aus der Qumrangemeinde stammt.”³⁷ Klinzing’s methodical analysis has certainly identified points of similarity between the writings of Qumran and Paul. However, his notion of Pauline dependence is only one way of interpreting the reason for the similarities (such as wider trends within Jewish literature and the similarities between the self-understandings of the two communities in relation to Judaism) and Klinzing plays down some key differences between the two sets of writings which make the “dependency” hypothesis harder to accept.³⁸ Klinzing follows Gärtner in briefly referring to the Stoic and Philonic background espoused by Wenschkewitz, but only in order to dismiss it.³⁹ Despite these assertions, in Klinzing’s brief discussion of 1 Cor 6:19, he considers it likely that Paul knew the Hellenistic conception of the soul as temple and chose to appropriate it in order to subvert it with his own Judeo-Christian understanding.⁴⁰ Similarly, Joseph Coppens, though critical of both Gärtner and Klinzing, expresses a thought comparable to that of Klinzing, “is it impossible that the ideas about a spiritual worship which were so widely diffused in the world of Hellenism and of hellenistic Judaism also contributed to foster Paul’s thought?”⁴¹ This promising line of thought is not developed by either scholar and, in the case of Klinzing, stands in stark contrast with his conclusions.

³⁷ Klinzing, *Umdeutung*, 210 (“If the Christian church speaks of itself as the temple, there can be no doubt about the fact that this idea comes from the Qumran community.”) For a more recent work which concurs with this judgment, see David Flusser, “The Dead Sea Sect and Pre-Pauline Christianity,” in *Judaism and the Origins of Christianity* (ed. David Flusser; Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1988), 23–74, especially at 71–73.

³⁸ See in particular the insightful questions and critique of Schüssler Fiorenza, “Language,” 164–65, and the analysis of Coppens, “Temple,” 62–65 in relation to both McKelvey and Gärtner. More recently, the differences between Qumran and Pauline thought are discussed by Strack, *Terminologie*, 272.

³⁹ Klinzing, *Umdeutung*, 183–84.

⁴⁰ Idem, *Umdeutung*, 184.

⁴¹ Coppens, “Temple,” 65.

1.2.1.4 Robert J. Daly (1978)

The work of Robert Daly should also be mentioned briefly in regard to the three scholars discussed above. Daly published two works on the origins of the Christian notion of sacrifice in the same year. On the one hand, Daly takes over the evolutionary model of Wenschkewitz to postulate a gradual spiritualizing of the notion of sacrifice, beginning in the OT and finding its fulfillment in Christian writings.⁴² On the other hand, Daly cites with approval Gärtner's conclusions that the resemblance between the Qumran writings and the NT suggests a common background, "but also to indicate that some elements in the Qumran tradition were taken over by the early Church"⁴³ Yet, returning to the topic of spiritualizing language which he notes in Philo and Intertestamental literature, he concludes, "Thus, where the same type of spiritualization appears in Qumran and the NT or Early Christian tradition, this is not necessarily an indication of dependence or direct connection"⁴⁴ which appears very much at odds with his earlier comments. The four authors with whom I have engaged each focus on what is influencing Paul, whether Hellenistic thought or Qumran. Where the possibility is raised that Paul may be engaging critically with Hellenistic thought in order to address a Gentile audience, this thought is left undeveloped.

1.2.2 Author-focused approaches: Paul's appropriation of Jewish thought

1.2.2.1 R. J. McKelvey (1969)

R. J. McKelvey's work, as its titles indicates, engages with the topic of the new temple across the NT corpus, but gives significant coverage to both Jewish and Greco-Roman

⁴² Robert J. Daly, *The Origins of the Christian Doctrine of Sacrifice* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978), 136–38.

⁴³ Idem, *Christian Sacrifice: The Judaeo-Christian Background Before Origen* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1978), 158, and see also at 257, 260–61.

⁴⁴ Idem, *Sacrifice*, 161.

background to the theme. McKelvey pays careful attention to the exegesis of all the texts he examines, ranging from the OT, to Intertestamental texts, relevant Greek and Latin sources, and NT texts by a variety of authors. McKelvey finds the new temple theme in a variety of diverse backgrounds, yet while conceding Greek influence on Paul, he also attributes to Paul himself a “Hebraicizing and Christianizing” of the idea.⁴⁵ McKelvey’s work is relatively uncontroversial because its analysis and conclusions are careful and balanced. For my purposes, I note that McKelvey gives more consideration to Paul’s engagement with Hellenistic philosophy than most other writers I will discuss. He recognizes the influence of the Hellenistic milieu on certain Jewish writings,⁴⁶ and while acknowledging similarities with Qumran, notes differences and does not posit the dependence of Paul on the scrolls.⁴⁷ He surveys a number of key philosophical texts by authors such as Epictetus and Seneca,⁴⁸ as well as providing a summary of his main findings from Philo,⁴⁹ noting, like Wenschkewitz, the difference between these writings and Paul, with his emphasis on community and body.⁵⁰ McKelvey is to be commended for his engagement with a neglected area and his well reasoned conclusions, which stress the positive basis for Paul’s spiritualization (McKelvey’s term), which differ from the rationale of the Stoics and Philo on the one hand, and Qumran on the other. However, much more could be said, since his main discussion of Hellenistic philosophical writings is only four pages long. In passing, McKelvey refers to Qumran, the Stoics and Philo as Paul’s “mentors”,⁵¹ but does not address the possibility that Paul may be, not so much their student, but rather in dialogue with some of these works, perhaps in order to accentuate the differences between his conception and theirs.

⁴⁵ McKelvey, *Temple*, 104. See also Idem, *Temple*, 42–43, 53, 55–57, 106–07, 179.

⁴⁶ Idem, *Temple*, 44.

⁴⁷ Idem, *Temple*, 47–53, 96–97.

⁴⁸ Idem, *Temple*, 53–54.

⁴⁹ Idem, *Temple*, 38–40, 54–55.

⁵⁰ Idem, *Temple*, 55.

⁵¹ Idem, *Temple*, 122.

1.2.2.2 Michael Newton (1985)

Like the earlier works of Gärtner, Klinzing and Schüssler Fiorenza (discussed below), Michael Newton's study concentrates on the relationship between Paul and Qumran, while focusing on the concept of purity.⁵² Newton's main point is that previous studies by scholars such as Wenschkewitz, Fraeyman and McKelvey were so preoccupied by the question of Paul's "spiritualization" of Jewish thought under the influence of Philo and the Stoics, that they missed the more obvious concern for temple purity that was common to all strands of Judaism and is rooted in the OT itself.⁵³ For Paul, the temple image is not simply a useful metaphor but a concept that borrows from the temple practice of the OT and applies it to the Christian community.⁵⁴ A careful study of purity language at Qumran and its application to the community reveals significant differences between Paul and the scrolls, so that, unlike at Qumran, specific rites are not applied to Paul's churches and their "temple" does not reside in one geographical location.⁵⁵ Paul's temple language is not a "spiritualization" fusing Greek and Jewish thought, but rather an outworking of his concern for temple purity, which is applied differently from the OT in the light of the coming of Christ, his death and resurrection.⁵⁶ Paul and Qumran shared much in common, but their application of purity language differs too, since one is not dependent on the other; instead both draw on common Jewish thinking which is applied differently in light of a different theological understanding.⁵⁷ Because Newton notes that Paul's starting point is different from that of Philo and the Stoics, particularly in his focus on community,⁵⁸ he dismisses

⁵² Newton, *Purity*.

⁵³ Idem, *Purity*, 1, 8.

⁵⁴ Idem, *Purity*, 8, 58–59.

⁵⁵ Idem, *Purity*, 53; Schüssler Fiorenza, "Language," 163–64 also makes similar points.

⁵⁶ Newton, *Purity*, 77–78, 97, 113–14.

⁵⁷ Idem, *Purity*, 115–16.

⁵⁸ Idem, *Purity*, 57. Idem, *Purity*, 57–58 is also influenced by R. Kempthorne, "Incest and the body of Christ, a study of 1 Corinthians 6:12-20," *NTS* 14:4 (1968): 568-74 in arguing that the primary referent of 1 Cor

the evidence of these writings and simply does not consider how Paul's language might have sounded to an audience who was aware of temple language used in Hellenistic philosophy.⁵⁹

1.2.2.3 Nijay Gupta (2010)

Nijay Gupta's recently published dissertation focuses on the use of non-atonement metaphors in the undisputed Pauline epistles.⁶⁰ One chapter is devoted to metaphor theory, in which Gupta elucidates a number of criteria which help him to assess the likelihood of having discovered a cultic metaphor along a continuum from "Certain" to "Probable".⁶¹ Perhaps because Gupta is interested in Paul's rhetorical strategy of using metaphor to reshape the way his audience thinks,⁶² he is particularly focused on Paul as author and less on the backgrounds of Paul's audience. Gupta asks about Paul's reason for innovating by his use of metaphor, the cultic context from which the metaphors originate and how his own role as apostle shapes the way he uses cultic metaphors.⁶³ However, perhaps because of the necessary limits of his study he does not consider how the backgrounds of Paul's Gentile audience might have influenced the way that Paul may have chosen to interact with those backgrounds. There are points in his monograph where Gupta hints at this issue. Gupta, noting the prevalence of cultic metaphors in 1 Corinthians compared to 1 Thessalonians, suggests that, "there were contextual or rhetorical reasons for the

6:19 is corporate, rather than to the individual bodies of the Corinthians. Kempthorne's argument will be reviewed in Chapter Four.

⁵⁹ Lanci, *Temple*, 11–12 also questions Newton's assumption that Paul would draw exclusively from Jewish cultic purity practices when writing to a Gentile audience.

⁶⁰ Gupta, *Worship*,

⁶¹ Idem, *Worship*, 46–51. Although this is not noted by Gupta, the criteria are reminiscent of Richard Hays' methodology to identify "echoes of scripture" in Paul; see Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993).

⁶² Gupta, *Worship*, 2–4.

⁶³ Idem, *Worship*, 35.

extensive employment of cultic metaphors in the Corinthian epistle.”⁶⁴ In his conclusions, Gupta argues that Paul’s focus was on what these cultic metaphors *do* in seeking to form the identity of his converts.⁶⁵ Agreeing with the work of Francis Watson, Gupta stresses the need to consider Paul as a “social agent” and to take into account Paul’s deployment of metaphor in relation to groups, whether they be his converts, their opponents and/or his opponents.⁶⁶ I would affirm all these points, but simply note that Gupta does not explore these contextual reasons in relation to Hellenistic philosophy. Not all of the primary sources cited by Gupta are listed in his index of sources, but a perusal of his index suggests that Gupta interacts with very few Greco-Roman sources, though he does interact extensively with Philo. Gupta’s conclusions certainly focus on the impact of Paul’s metaphors on his target audience, but seldom bring specific Hellenistic literature into the discussion.⁶⁷

1.2.3 Audience-focused approaches:

Paul’s engagement with the religious and cultural milieu of Corinth

Finally, I turn my attention to works which exhibit perhaps a newer and growing trend: to consider the impact of Paul’s temple language on his audience, and therefore to pay much closer attention to the backgrounds of Paul’s audience than the mainly older studies I have so far discussed. This approach was hinted at in some older studies that I will mention in passing, but of the major works I will examine, only one predates the 1990s.

⁶⁴ Idem, *Worship*, 84.

⁶⁵ Idem, *Worship*, 205–209.

⁶⁶ Idem, *Worship*, 218.

⁶⁷ Space will not allow me to discuss the comprehensive overview of the “Biblical Theology” of temple found in Gregory K. Beale, *The Temple and the Church’s Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God* (NSBT 17; Downers Grove, Ill.: IVP, 2004). Suffice it to say that Beale focuses squarely on the Jewish background to this canonical theme and is only concerned with the author’s perspective. Philo is referenced in various places but other Hellenistic authors are not discussed.

1.2.3.1 Elizabeth Schüssler Fiorenza (1976)

Elizabeth Schüssler Fiorenza's short article compared cultic language in Qumran and in the NT, while offering a searching analysis of the writings of Wenschkewitz and Klinzing.⁶⁸ Schüssler Fiorenza wants to move past the language of 'spiritualization', which she sees as too broad to be helpful. Instead, she argues that the term "transference" is more suitable, since it indicates the way that both Jewish as well as Hellenistic cultic concepts were taken up by the respective communities and applied to non-cultic realities.⁶⁹ While some scholars have been dazzled by the similarities between the use of cultic language at Qumran and in Paul, Schüssler Fiorenza asks how to account for the *differences*, such that the community of the *War Scroll* does not describe itself as a temple, and the community as temple at Corinth do not adopt a hierarchical priesthood?⁷⁰ Instead, Schüssler Fiorenza enquires after "the concrete situation and theological motives that in each community led to the transference of cultic language."⁷¹ Her careful study of some obvious differences between the two indicate that whereas Qumran stressed "sectarian separation", Paul was guided by, "the missionary situation of the early Church."⁷² Schüssler Fiorenza makes the tantalizing comment that, "the NT writers evidence affinity not only to the language of Qumran but also to the concepts of religious propaganda in the Greco-Roman world".⁷³ While she notes that later Christian apologists developed this

⁶⁸ Schüssler Fiorenza, "Language," 159-77.

⁶⁹ Idem, "Language," 161.

⁷⁰ Idem, "Language," 163-64. Timothy Wardle, "Who is Sacrificing? Assessing the Early Christian Reticence to Transfer the Idea of the Priesthood to the Community," in *Ritual and Metaphor: Sacrifice in the Bible* (ed. Christian A. Eberhart; SBLRBS 68; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011), 99-114 contends that early Christian documents were reticent to appropriate the language of priesthood for the church or its leaders, even metaphorically. Wardle's argument depends heavily on a late dating for 1 Peter, on which there is no consensus.

⁷¹ Schüssler Fiorenza, "Language," 161.

⁷² Idem, "Language," 171, 177.

⁷³ Idem, "Language," 177.

understanding within their own context to reach those attracted by the philosophical schools of their time,⁷⁴ she gives no indication of what she means by this sentence for Paul's social and historical context.⁷⁵ Her work raises the question of whether Paul's missionary interest may have included a desire to speak in relevant philosophical language. However, since her focus is on the Qumran and Pauline communities and their relationships with their contexts, her point is left undeveloped and unexplored.⁷⁶

1.2.3.2 John R Lanci (1997)

John R. Lanci's published dissertation, in stark contrast to the earlier author-focused works I examined, makes a number of bold claims at the outset, such as, "The goal is to construct a plausible reading of the text, rather than to discover the original intention of its author" and "I will nowhere discuss the original *intention* behind the argument"⁷⁷ This assertion seems at odds with Lanci's decision to employ rhetorical analysis, mentioned in the next paragraph,⁷⁸ which, though a text-centered method concerned with the "intended effect upon the audience",⁷⁹ tacitly assumes *intent* on the part of an author.⁸⁰ In any case, Lanci later defines the role of an interpreter of 1 Cor 3:16–17 as, "to examine the passage closely in terms of its wider

⁷⁴ Idem, "Language," 171, 177.

⁷⁵ Cf. Bruce W. Winter, "Carnal Conduct and Sanctification in 1 Corinthians: *Simul Sanctus Et Peccator?*," in *Holiness and Ecclesiology in the New Testament* (ed. Kent E. Brower and Andy Johnson; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 191 who is suggestive in the way he relates the Corinthians' worldview to philosophical schools such as Epicureanism. I shall explore this topic in Chapters 2, 4 and 5.

⁷⁶ Cf. C. F. D. Moule, "Sanctuary and Sacrifice in the Church of the New Testament," *JTS* 1:1 (1950): 29–41 at 29, 39 who avers that Paul's apologetic interest may have led him to address the objections of both "Jews and pagans" who objected to the absence of temple, priesthood and sacrifice in Christianity. Strack, *Terminologie*, 380, 392 also suggests that Paul may have used cultic categories in order to communicate the gospel to Gentiles.

⁷⁷ Lanci, *Temple*, 3, italics in the original.

⁷⁸ Idem, *Temple*, 3.

⁷⁹ David E. Aune, *The Westminster Dictionary of New Testament and Early Christian Literature and Rhetoric* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2003), 416.

⁸⁰ Cf. a similar critique made by Gupta, *Worship*, 19.

purpose in Paul's rhetorical arguments in 1 Corinthians".⁸¹ It is difficult to discern a clear difference between "intention" (which Lanci claims not to discuss) and "purpose" (which he does) and this tension is left unresolved.

Nevertheless, Lanci confronts the question of what Paul's reference to a temple may have evoked when writing to a largely Gentile audience.⁸² Lanci is critical of most previous studies which assumed that Paul's referent was the Jerusalem temple; this does not explain for Lanci why Paul would use this concept for a predominantly Gentile audience.⁸³ Lanci is certainly right to say that the Jerusalem temple might not be the *sole* referent for Paul's audience,⁸⁴ and so devotes a chapter to Roman Corinth, which includes some examination of the various temples that would have been found there.⁸⁵ However, Lanci's main interest is in Paul's "construction language", noting the frequent use of words with the root οἰκοδομ- in the letter (e.g. 1 Cor 3:9; 8:1, 10; 10:23; 14:3, 4, 5, 12, 17, 26) and Paul's self characterization as an ἀρχιτέκτων (master builder) in 1 Cor 3:10,⁸⁶ as well as Lanci's assumption that the Erastus of Rom 16:23 (probably written from Corinth) is the same aedile as the one referred to in the 'Erastus inscription'.⁸⁷

Lanci's distinctive contribution is to contend that building construction and renovation was a

⁸¹ Lanci, *Temple*, 18. Elsewhere Lanci refers to the passage's "purpose" (123) and Paul's "goal" (134).

⁸² Idem, *Temple*, 3. A topic also pursued more briefly by Christfried Böttrich, "'Ihr Seid Der Tempel Gottes': Tempelmetaphorik Und Gemeinde Bei Paulus," in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel: Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum* (ed. Beate Ego, Armin Lange, and Peter Pilhofer; WUNT 118; Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1999), 411–25.

⁸³ Lanci, *Temple*, 9–10. Although I note that Paul is not shy of using OT allusions and citations when writing to the Corinthians in places such as 1 Cor 1:19; 2:9, 16; 3:19–20; 5:7; 6:16; 9:9, 13; 10:1–10, 26; 14:21; 15:26, 32, 45, 54–55; 2 Cor 3:1–18; 4:13; 6:2; 6:16–18; 8:15; 9:9; 10:17; 11:3 etc., see the observation of David Horrell, review of John R Lanci, *A New Temple for Corinth: Rhetorical and Archaeological Approaches to Pauline Imagery*, *JTS* 50 (1999): 708–11 at 711, as also noted by Gupta, *Worship*, 19.

⁸⁴ Lanci, *Temple*, 9–10.

⁸⁵ Idem, *Temple*, 25–43.

⁸⁶ Idem, *Temple*, 58–60, 77–78.

⁸⁷ Idem, *Temple*, 34. This has been subsequently challenged by Steven J. Friesen, "The Wrong Erastus," in *Corinth in Context: Comparative Studies on Religion and Society* (ed. Steven J. Friesen, Daniel N. Schowalter, and James C. Walters; NovTSup 134; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 231–56 as also noted by Liu, *Purity*, 7.

major part of life in first century Corinth,⁸⁸ and that this explains Paul’s use of construction imagery. Lanci ties this in to Margaret Mitchell’s argument (which he adopts) that 1 Corinthians is a deliberative letter with 1 Cor 1:10 as its thesis statement and that Paul’s overriding intention is to bring about unity by urging his audience to pursue the common good.⁸⁹

Lanci is doubtless correct to detect an emphasis on unity and building up for the common good in 1 Corinthians, and to observe the connection between building imagery in 1 Cor 3:9–10 and the temple imagery in 1 Cor 3:16–17. However, at times Lanci’s thesis threatens to subsume Paul’s stated purpose for using temple imagery under a more general intent related to building imagery. According to Lanci, Paul identifies the Corinthians with a building in 1 Cor 3:9–10 “because of the community-defining role of some temples in Greco-Roman society”.⁹⁰ Yet Paul’s comment on this imagery concerns the indwelling presence of God’s spirit and the sanctity of this temple and is substantiated with the reason “For God’s temple is holy, and you are that temple” (1 Cor 3:17). Again, Lanci avers that “The temple is a secondary image and is not the primary one with which Paul characterizes the community” nor is Paul’s purpose “to define the community as a *new* temple” but rather to combat dissension through construction imagery.⁹¹ Undoubtedly, many different images are used to describe the community in the Corinthian correspondence (such as the body in 1 Cor 12–14), but to view the temple imagery as non-defining seems strange in view of Paul’s repeated use of it when addressing the Corinthians

⁸⁸ Lanci, *Temple*, 33–34, although some of the evidence is rather circumstantial and hypothetical such as Lanci’s contention that “there *must have been* many people living there who were associated with construction activity directly or indirectly” (33), despite the fact that we “cannot easily confirm the presence of these people by means of archaeological records (33–34), and yet Lanci suggests that “*one may safely assume* that laborers . . . lived there” (34), which is reiterated on Idem, *Temple*, 76; my italics.

⁸⁹ Idem, *Temple*, 45–56, following Margaret M. Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1991).

⁹⁰ Lanci, *Temple*, 89.

⁹¹ Idem, *Temple*, 125.

(including 2 Cor 6:14–7:1), and when Lanci concedes that cultic imagery is prevalent throughout First Corinthians.⁹² Overall, Lanci interacts with an impressive range of primary and secondary sources and identifies one possible background for a major theme in 1 Corinthians, but in doing so he tends to overplay the allusions to building imagery and community formation and downplays Paul’s concern for purity and holiness. Paul’s own interest in the Jerusalem temple as his background is also neglected.⁹³

From the perspective of my topic, Lanci’s correct assumption that, “Paul was capable of interacting with the wider culture around him”⁹⁴ should include the question of metaphorical temple imagery used in Hellenistic philosophy, and Lanci notes the use of this language in the philosophers,⁹⁵ but because there are no clear parallels to the use of this image in community contexts, Lanci moves on to discuss the Dead Sea Scrolls. Lanci quite correctly contends that, “when attempting to explain how Paul uses the temple image, we must investigate how people in Corinth understood temples, be they Jewish, Greek, or Roman”⁹⁶ but this investigation could be broadened to consider how they were influenced by metaphorical temple language in philosophical writings.

⁹² Idem, *Temple*, 128.

⁹³ See Horrell, review of Lanci, and Gupta, *Worship*, 16–19 for similar critiques.

⁹⁴ Lanci, *Temple*, 6.

⁹⁵ Idem, *Temple*, 13.

⁹⁶ Idem, *Temple*, 90.

1.2.3.3 J. Ayodeji Adewuya (2003, 2007)

J. Ayodeji Adewuya's published dissertation⁹⁷ and subsequent article⁹⁸ draw attention to the neglected theme of communal holiness in the Corinthian epistles, and helpfully situates 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 within this wider concern of Paul's for his readers. Much of Adewuya's analysis and conclusions are relatively uncontroversial, so my review will centre on what is most relevant for my topic. Adewuya's monograph raises important questions at the outset like, "What are the differences in Paul's thought world and that of his audience? For example, what is the significance of the temple imagery both to the Jews and Gentiles in Corinth?"⁹⁹ He rightly contends, "the question of influences and backgrounds should not always be restricted to the writer. It must include the readers as well"¹⁰⁰ with particular attention paid to "features of the Greco-Roman moral and religious climate in Corinth".¹⁰¹ A section on religious pluralism observes that Corinth, "maintained many ties with Greek religion, philosophy and the arts. Consequently, the faith of the Corinthians was considerably influenced by a Hellenistic world-view and attitude toward moral behavior."¹⁰² I note that Adewuya specifically cites the influence of philosophy but the section in which these words are found addresses matters of social culture (individualism), socio-economic factors and the role of temples in Corinth (where he summarizes Lanci) but says nothing about the philosophical climate.¹⁰³ Adewuya's subsequent article on the general theme of holiness in 2 Corinthians reuses his words cited above, almost word for word,

⁹⁷ J. Ayodeji Adewuya, *Holiness and Community in 2 Cor 6:14-7:1: Paul's View of Communal Holiness in the Corinthian Correspondence* (Studies in Biblical Literature; New York: Peter Lang, 2003).

⁹⁸ Idem, "The People of God in a Pluralistic Society: Holiness in 2 Corinthians," in *Holiness and Ecclesiology in the New Testament* (ed. Kent E. Brower and Andy Johnson; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 201–18.

⁹⁹ Idem, *Holiness*, 6.

¹⁰⁰ Idem, *Holiness*, 77.

¹⁰¹ Idem, *Holiness*, 78.

¹⁰² Idem, *Holiness*, 85.

¹⁰³ See Idem, *Holiness*, 77–87, and see further 110–15 on temples in Corinth.

but, similarly, the following section makes no reference to philosophy but addressees religious pluralism, and in addition refers to the influence of the imperial cult in relation to temples.¹⁰⁴

Adewuya is asking the right questions but though his frequent references to Paul's "Hellenistic milieu"¹⁰⁵ allude to Hellenistic philosophy, this topic is nowhere discussed.

1.2.3.4 Albert L. A. Hogeterp (2006)

Albert L. A. Hogeterp's substantial monograph is a greatly extended version of his Ph.D. dissertation. He focuses on Paul's use of cultic imagery in 1–2 Corinthians in their historical context,¹⁰⁶ and so devotes a number of chapters to setting Paul's imagery in various historical and cultural contexts before dealing with each letter in turn. In light of this concern with historical context, it is interesting to note that Hogeterp cites, with approval, Schüssler Fiorenza's contention that Paul "creates" a rhetorical situation which cannot be equated with the historical situation, and, "With this distinction in mind, Paul's cultic imagery cannot be aligned with a presupposed idea of the historical context".¹⁰⁷ Hogeterp has in view the presupposed historical context presented by Wenschkewitz especially, although arguably Wenschkewitz was simply articulating a hypothesis based on his understanding of the literary and historical evidence, just as Hogeterp is trying to do. Hogeterp's "historical interpretation" addresses the question, "What does Paul's cultic imagery signify in view of Paul's gospel mission to the Diaspora?"¹⁰⁸ which would seem to focus on Paul's engagement with the Hellenistic world; whether he is speaking to

¹⁰⁴ Idem, "People," 202–03.

¹⁰⁵ E.g. Idem, *Holiness*, 6, 78, 86–87.

¹⁰⁶ Hogeterp, *Temple*, 1.

¹⁰⁷ Idem, *Temple*, 16, citing Elizabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *Rhetoric and Ethic: The Politics of Biblical Studies* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999), 138–140.

¹⁰⁸ Hogeterp, *Temple*, 22.

Jews or Gentiles. Hogeterp repeatedly speaks of the importance of relating Paul’s cultic imagery to the original readers’ own context, bearing in mind that his converts included both Jews and Greeks (citing 1 Cor 1:22–24).¹⁰⁹ These contexts are often described using the terms “cultic” and “religious”.¹¹⁰ Hogeterp does hint at a philosophical context when noting objections that may have been raised to Paul’s gospel message, “that these objections may be of a philosophical, reasoned nature appears to be confirmed by the prominence of the theme of wisdom, σοφία, that is worldly wisdom as opposed to God’s wisdom in 1 Cor 1:17–2:13.”¹¹¹ However, aside from a brief reference to Greek philosophies described by Josephus,¹¹² Hogeterp does not explore this question any further. In his exegesis of 1 Cor 6:18–20, Hogeterp notes parallels from pagan contexts such as Valerius Maximus 4.7 *ext. 1* and passages from Philo. However, because of the obvious emphasis on the communal and bodily aspect of the metaphor in Paul, Hogeterp dismisses these parallels as relevant background,¹¹³ rather like Gärtner and Newton before him. After perhaps the most extensive discussion available of Paul’s cultic imagery, Hogeterp’s work lacks a strong thesis¹¹⁴ but concludes that the Temple imagery is used to teach the Corinthians a holy way of life by drawing strict boundaries.¹¹⁵ Hogeterp’s work on Jewish historical background in general and Qumran in particular is thorough, but despite allusions to the philosophical context of the Corinthians, this particular background is neglected.

¹⁰⁹ E.g. Idem, *Temple*, 297, 300, 301.

¹¹⁰ E.g. Idem, *Temple*, 272, 297.

¹¹¹ Idem, *Temple*, 310.

¹¹² Idem, *Temple*, 311, citing Josephus, *Ag. Ap.* 2.168.

¹¹³ Idem, *Temple*, 342–44.

¹¹⁴ cf. Gupta, *Worship*, 21 for a similar conclusion.

¹¹⁵ Hogeterp, *Temple*, 383–85.

1.2.3.5 Martin Vahrenhorst (2008)

Martin Vahrenhorst's published Habilitation thesis takes a broader approach than the works previously discussed, since Vahrenhorst's interest extends beyond cultic imagery to cultic language more generally. He is concerned with the use of cultic issues with predominantly Gentile addressees and so examines Paul's use of certain purity words in relation to Hellenism.¹¹⁶ Vahrenhorst is unconvinced by studies that detect a critique of the temple in Paul's use of cultic language. Rather, Vahrenhorst contends that Paul uses cultic terminology positively to address his audience's context,¹¹⁷ though, like Lanci, Vahrenhorst does not think that Paul has the Jerusalem temple exclusively in mind, since the audience were more familiar with the reality of idol temples in the city in which they lived.¹¹⁸ Although Vahrenhorst calls attention to the Greek conception of clean and unclean in both philosophical as well as religious contexts,¹¹⁹ in practice his study focuses its attention on the use of cultic language on inscriptions on temples and in their vicinity in order to see how the use of the same language would have struck Paul's readers.¹²⁰ He does not engage much with the philosophical context, although both Philo and Seneca are briefly discussed in relation to 1 Cor 3:16–17.¹²¹ Ultimately, because Vahrenhorst limits his detailed study to cultic language in relation to literal practice, the philosophical background is not his focus.

¹¹⁶ Vahrenhorst, *Sprache*, 1.

¹¹⁷ Idem, *Sprache*, 13, agreeing with Strack, *Terminologie*, 8–9.

¹¹⁸ Vahrenhorst, *Sprache*, 13, 15.

¹¹⁹ Idem, *Sprache*, 14.

¹²⁰ Idem, *Sprache*, 16, though Gupta, *Worship*, 24, questions whether conclusions can be drawn from temple inscriptions that use certain words which were already common in Hellenistic Jewish literature, while, on the other hand, Paul does not use certain cultic terms that were common in non-Jewish literature.

¹²¹ Vahrenhorst, *Sprache*, 151–52.

1.2.3.6 Timothy Wardle (2010)

Timothy Wardle's published dissertation differs from those discussed in this section, in that, while Wardle is focused on the milieu of Paul's audience, his concern is with the Jewish background. Wardle's thesis is a bold one, and envisages a provocative and polemical agenda on the part of Paul, "the decision to proclaim the Christian community as a temple was a bold and calculated move that held particular cultural currency in the first century C.E. It was a culturally recognizable way to register dissent. Moreover, the decision to construct an alternative temple *in Jerusalem*, in the shadow of the sanctuary that dominated the skyline of Jerusalem, held potentially explosive socio-religious consequences."¹²² In order to establish his thesis, Wardle looks at "patterns of dissent" in Jewish literature, in particular in the construction of temples as alternatives to the one in Jerusalem, especially by discussing the Samaritan and Leontopolis temples and the Qumran community's understanding of itself as a rival temple.¹²³ Wardle's monograph is very well written and researched and certainly establishes his thesis vis-à-vis the temples discussed and may have some relevance to the evidence of certain texts in the gospels.¹²⁴

However, when applied to Paul's writings, Wardle's thesis becomes problematic. He asserts, "if I am correct that the formation of alternative temples was the result of specific instances of conflict with the Jerusalem establishment, then it stands to reason that the early Christian temple ideology was borne of similar convictions."¹²⁵ However, it does not "stand to reason" on the basis of the evidence from Paul's letters, nor is there evidence of Paul or his community's, "reaction to the chief priests' involvement in the crucifixion of Jesus and their

¹²² Wardle, *Temple*, 3.

¹²³ Idem, *Temple*, 4, and see 30–165.

¹²⁴ For which, see Idem, *Temple*, 166–91.

¹²⁵ Idem, *Temple*, 10.

continued hostility toward the early Christian leadership in Jerusalem.”¹²⁶ Of course though neither Paul nor the early Christian communities built rival temples, Wardle can point to the example of Qumran, whose understanding of the community as a temple could rival that of the Jerusalem temple.¹²⁷ However, since Wardle accepts the evidence of Acts that the early Christians continue to participate in Jerusalem temple worship (e.g. Acts 2:46; 3:1), this would seem to be damaging to his thesis.¹²⁸ Comparisons with Qumran might seem to provide the strongest warrant for Wardle's thesis in relation to the Pauline communities. In fact, though, in Wardle's discussion of 1 Cor 3:16–17 and 2 Cor 6:16–18, he explicitly acknowledges that Paul's transference of temple language did not appear to be rooted in a denigration of the Jerusalem cult, nor to involve a concept of the community providing for atonement of sins, unlike at Qumran.¹²⁹ When the prevalence of references to temple imagery is noted across multiple strands of the NT as well in a variety of contexts for Paul's churches (Wardle deals with Gal 2:9;¹³⁰ 1 Cor 3:16–17; 6:19; 2 Cor 6:16–18; Eph 2:19–22; 1 Pet 2:4–10 and Rev 3:12), it becomes difficult to argue that all of them are united in a polemical witness against the Jerusalem priesthood. This is especially problematic when the authors are addressing Christian

¹²⁶ Idem, *Temple*, 10.

¹²⁷ Idem, *Temple*, 139–62, especially p. 159. The question of whether this notion was uniformly held across the relevant scrolls will be discussed below.

¹²⁸ Idem, *Temple*, 11. While I shall note below disagreement over the evidence for the Essenes' offering of sacrifices in or around the temple, nobody is arguing that they participated in temple worship to the same degree as everyone else.

¹²⁹ Idem, *Temple*, 210–11. Dr Fredrick J. Long, in personal correspondence, has pointed out the possibility of connecting Paul's critique of the rulers who crucified Jesus in 1 Cor 2:6 (which could include the Jewish Temple establishment) with temple replacement imagery in 1 Cor 3:16. However, Wardle does not make that connection and in fact the first passage that he deals with in the letter is 1 Cor 3:9–15.

¹³⁰ Idem, *Temple*, 207–10 argues that “στῦλοι” in Gal 2:9 refers to the role of James, Cephas and John as pillars in the new eschatological temple, consisting of Christians (with e.g. Richard Bauckham, “James and the Jerusalem Church,” in *The Book of Acts in Its Palestinian Setting* (The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting 4; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995) 415–80.). However, the connotation is ambiguous, and Paul's audience might equally have taken it to mean something like “pillars of the community”, the more common figurative sense, in the absence of explicit temple imagery in context, according to Craig S. Keener, “The Pillars and the Right Hand of Fellowship in Galatians 2.9,” *JGRChJ* 7 (2010): 51–58.

communities far from Jerusalem whose membership may be predominantly or at least partly Gentiles (such as the readers at Corinth and the recipients of 1 Peter and Ephesians), who, unlike the Qumran community, had little interest in the Jerusalem priesthood and cult.¹³¹ Wardle concedes that, although Paul's primary referent may be the Jerusalem temple, the metaphor may speak to Gentiles converted to Christianity who had been displaced from their own temples.¹³² Wardle does make brief reference to the relevance of Philo's understanding of the divine indwelling of the mind,¹³³ but otherwise the philosophical context is not considered because of his very strongly focused thesis in relation to the Jerusalem temple.

1.2.3.7 Yulin Liu (2013)

Yulin Liu's recently published Ph.D. dissertation seeks to fill a lacuna, claiming that, "there is no specific work on linking temple and purity in the Corinthian letters".¹³⁴ Liu's objective is to understand Paul's use of temple and purity language in context by relating Paul's message to the context of both Judaism and the Greco-Roman world.¹³⁵ Liu rightly notes that the historical situation of Corinth and the wider Greco-Roman world as well as the implied audience's likely response to Paul's concern for temple purity needs to be taken into account.¹³⁶ What follows is a very thorough study of both of these contexts, but Liu's distinctive contribution lies in his study of three cults whose temples were found in Corinth (Apollo, Isis

¹³¹ A similar point concerning Wardle's handling of the various texts is made by Robert S. Snow, review of Timothy Wardle, *The Jerusalem Temple and Early Christian Identity*, *BBR* 22.2 (2012): 304–05 at 305.

¹³² Wardle, *Temple*, 222, citing Stevenson, *Power*, 179.

¹³³ Wardle, *Temple*, 213.

¹³⁴ Liu, *Purity*, 3, although I note that Michael Newton does address this very issue, while dealing more broadly with the letters of Paul.

¹³⁵ *Idem*, *Purity*, 3, 9.

¹³⁶ *Idem*, *Purity*, 9–10, 116.

and Asklepios)¹³⁷ and in his reading of particular passages through the lens of temple purity (especially 1 Cor 5 and 7). Liu does occasionally engage with Hellenistic philosophical literature. His discussion of Philo’s metaphorical temple language is brief.¹³⁸ His reference to *Somn.* 1.149 specifically relates Philo’s exhortation to his own soul to become the dwelling place of God to Liu’s own discussion of Israel as the temple of God, which does not seem to be the immediate context in Philo,¹³⁹ although evidence from Philo is also treated in a number of other places.¹⁴⁰ Liu does directly relate Philo’s assertion that the body is the “sacred temple for a reasonable soul” (*Opif.* 1.137) to 1 Cor 6:19 but merely describes Paul’s metaphor as a “similar idea” without noting key differences.¹⁴¹ Liu also treats the teaching of Epictetus on the indwelling of god, but his discussion summarizes Luke Timothy Johnson’s work, including the same citation of a text number that is not found in the Loeb Classical Library edition: *Disc.* 1.14.69.¹⁴² To be fair to Liu, his comprehensive treatment of temple purity demonstrates wide reading in a variety of disciplines and for my purposes exhibits a commendable attention to the Greco-Roman world of Paul’s audience, but because the focus is temple purity language, the metaphorical use of temple imagery in philosophical texts is only discussed in passing.

It seems then, that in the many works that have appeared over a number of decades, none have sought to review the use of metaphorical temple language in Hellenistic writers in a

¹³⁷ Idem, *Purity*, 70–105.

¹³⁸ Idem, *Purity*, 117.

¹³⁹ Idem, *Purity*, 117.

¹⁴⁰ For instance Idem, *Purity*, 62–65 devotes more space to the subject of temple purity in Philo, and again in relation to 1 Cor 6:15–20 in Idem, *Purity*, 155, and in relation to the priesthood in Idem, *Purity*, 166–67.

¹⁴¹ Idem, *Purity*, 155. See also the critique of S. Aaron Son, “Temple Purity in 1-2 Corinthians,” *Review of Biblical Literature* 11 (2013): No Pages. Cited 28 August. Online: http://www.bookreviews.org/pdf/9192_10133.pdf. Online: http://www.bookreviews.org/pdf/9192_10133.pdf on this point.

¹⁴² Liu, *Purity*, 118–19, following Luke Timothy Johnson, *Among the Gentiles: Greco-Roman Religion and Christianity* (AYBRL; New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 73. Johnson’s citation of the words of Epictetus clearly come from *Disc.* 1.14.6 (there are only seventeen verses in the Loeb text). Liu, *Purity*, 81 also alludes to the concept of the body as a metaphorical sacred vessel, citing Robert Parker, *Miasma: Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996), 144–45, 213 as evidence.

comprehensive way and to compare the philosophy of these writers with the temple theology of Paul in 1–2 Corinthians.

1.3 Temple Imagery in Inter-Testamental Judaism

Before proceeding with my study of metaphorical temple language in Hellenistic philosophical writings, I shall briefly survey the most significant references to such language in two places; firstly, its use in the Dead Sea Scrolls, which has been widely documented, and secondly, its use in the Pseudepigrapha and Apocrypha, which is less frequent and therefore has attracted less attention.

1.3.1 Metaphorical Temple Language in the Dead Sea Scrolls

The Dead Sea Scrolls exhibit a profound concern for temple purity, and purity language pervades the literature. However, for the sake of brevity, I shall confine my interest to those passages which most obviously speak of priesthood, sacrifice or temple language in a metaphorical sense.¹⁴³ The Rule of the Community contains perhaps the single highest concentration of such language. Firstly, atonement is available in the community, yet not through literal sacrifices but by the spirit of God and through the obedience of the worshiper,

For it is by the spirit of the true counsel of God that are atoned the paths of man, all his iniquities, so that he can look at the light of life. And it is by the holy spirit of the community, in its truth, that he is cleansed of all his iniquities. And by the spirit of uprightness and of humility his sin is atoned. And by the compliance of his soul with all

¹⁴³ Fragments which simply repeat the same words used in other, longer, extant works will not be listed.

the laws of God his flesh is cleansed by being sprinkled with cleansing waters and being made holy with the waters of repentance.¹⁴⁴

1QS V, 5–6 and VIII, 3–4, 10 also speak of atonement for the community through lives lived in holiness.¹⁴⁵ Similarly, 1QS IX, 4–5 speaks of atonement through spiritual sacrifices, pointedly expressed as, “without the flesh of burnt offerings and without the fats of sacrifice”. Instead the sacrifices are right speech/praise and behavior, “the offering of the lips in compliance with the decree will be like the pleasant aroma of justice and the perfectness of behavior will be accepted like a freewill offering”.¹⁴⁶ CD XI, 20–21 changes the wording of Prov 15:8 (The sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination to the LORD, but the prayer of the upright *is his delight*) to give it a distinctly cultic flavor, thus depicting prayer as a spiritual sacrifice, “the sacrifice of the wicked ones is an abomination, but the prayer of the just ones *is like an agreeable offering*”. Similarly 11Q5 XVIII, 9–12 reads, “The person who gives glory to the Most High is accepted like one who brings an offering, like one who offers rams and calves, like one who makes the altar greasy with many holocausts, like the sweet fragrance from the hand of just ones.”¹⁴⁷ 1QS VIII, 1–10 is one of the clearest passages in the scrolls to speak of the community in terms reminiscent of the temple, “the Community council shall be founded on truth, to be an everlasting plantation, a holy

¹⁴⁴ 1QS III, 6–9; cf. also 1QS III, 4, 9–12. All translations are taken from Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition. 2 vols.* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997–1998). Michael A. Knibb, *The Qumran Community* (Cambridge Commentaries on Writings of the Jewish and Christian World 200BC to AD200 2; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 92–93 understands ‘spirit’ in lines 6, 7 and 8 to refer “to the disposition of the individual”, though a variant reading in lines 7b–8a refers to “his spirit of holiness”, which would then picture the spirit as God’s spirit, which he has given to the community. Eyal Regev, “Abominated Temple and a Holy Community: The Formation of the Notions of Purity and Impurity in Qumran,” *DSD* 10.2 (2003): 243–78 explores a possible reason for righteous behavior functioning as a means of atonement at Qumran.

¹⁴⁵ Though I should note that the scrolls also contain examples of God making atonement for sin, e.g. 1QS II, 8; CD II, 5; as cited by Knibb, *The Qumran Community*, 93.

¹⁴⁶ 1QS XI, 4–5; see also 1QS X, 6, 8, 14 for “the offering of lips”, and cf. 4Q265 7 II, 7–10.

¹⁴⁷ A very similar wording is also found in Ps 154:10–11 (11QPs^a 154) and Ps 154:10–11 (5ApocSyrPs 2) of the Pseudepigrapha.

house for Israel and the foundation of the holy of holies for Aaron . . . This the tested rampart, the precious cornerstone . . . the most holy dwelling for Aaron . . . in order to offer a pleasant aroma; and it will be a house of perfection and truth in Israel”¹⁴⁸ and similar language is used in 1 QS IX, 6–7, “the Community shall set apart a holy house for Aaron, in order to form a most holy community, and a house of the Community for Israel” and in 1 QS XI, 8–9, “He unites their assembly to the sons of the heavens in order (to form) the council of the Community and a foundation of the building of holiness to be an everlasting plantation throughout all future ages.”¹⁴⁹ The most striking, and disputed passage,¹⁵⁰ is found in 4QFlor I, 6–7 which is rendered by Martínez and Tigchelaar, as “And he commanded to build for himself a temple of man, to offer him in it, before him, the works of thanksgiving.”

Before I move on, I should note two other types of imagery that may be related to the notion of community as temple. Firstly, some scrolls speak of the community as a plantation (e.g. 1QS VIII, 5; XI,8; CD I,7; 1QH XV, 19; XVI, 5, 6, 9, 10)¹⁵¹ which is associated with a garden and its streams, sometimes related to Eden itself (cf. 1QH XIV, 15–17; XVI, 5–7, 9–11).¹⁵² Eden was often pictured as the first sanctuary.¹⁵³ Secondly, the reference to “Lebanon” as

¹⁴⁸ 1QS VIII, 5–9.

¹⁴⁹ The latter passage using field, building and temple imagery, rather like 1 Cor 3, which will be examined in Chapter 4.

¹⁵⁰ See the discussion below.

¹⁵¹ See also Klinzing, *Umdeutung*, 168, the references cited in Newton, *Purity*, n 9, 131–32 and the discussion in George J. Brooke, “Miqdash Adam, Eden and the Qumran Community,” in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel: Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum* (ed. Beate Ego, Armin Lange, and Peter Pilhofer; WUNT 118; Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1999), 285–301, at 291–93.

¹⁵² Hogeterp, *Temple*, 112.

¹⁵³ Beale, *Temple*, 66–79, and throughout the study, expands on this theme in some depth, citing e.g., Jub 18:9: “And he knew that the Garden of Eden is the holy of holies, and the dwelling of the Lord, and Mount Sinai the centre of the desert, and Mount Zion—the centre of the navel of the earth: these three were created as holy places facing each other.” Copies of Jubilees were found at Qumran and their ideology may have influenced the community; see George J. Brooke, “The Ten Temples in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel* (ed. John Day; London: T&T Clark, 2005), 416–34, at 419–21, 425–26. Idem, “Miqdash,” 285–301, at 289 translates 4Q174 I, 6 as a “sanctuary of Adam” which relates to the garden of Eden; followed by Cecilia Wassen,

the council of the community in 1QpHab XII, 3, 4 has been interpreted as signifying the temple.¹⁵⁴ Finally I note that spiritual priesthood language is not found at Qumran, since the community still functions like the Jewish cult, with distinctions made between laypeople and a priestly order.¹⁵⁵

We observed earlier that, following Gärtner, comparisons have been made between Paul's use of metaphorical temple language and the language of Qumran, with Gärtner and others even claiming that Paul is dependent on the theology of the Qumran community. Because this is not the focus of my study, my discussion of this subject will be necessarily brief. However, I cannot move on before observing that the interpretation of certain passages cited by Gärtner from the Dead Sea Scrolls has been disputed in modern Qumran scholarship and the situation is more complex and less clear cut than Gärtner assumed.

Firstly, not every scholar agrees that all of the references cited above use spiritual temple language for the community. The most disputed subject is the reference to the *מקדש אדם* (temple of man/adam) in 4QFlor I, 6–7. Gärtner's asserts that the phrase should be translated “a temple of men”, meaning “consisting of men” and disputes Yadin's interpretation “a Sanctuary among

“Do You Have to be Pure in a Metaphorical Temple? Sanctuary Metaphors and Construction of Sacred Space in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Paul's Letters,” in *Purity, Holiness, and Identity in Judaism and Christianity: Essays in Memory of Susan Haber* (ed. Carl S. Ehrlich, Anders Runesson, and Eileen Schuller; WUNT 305; Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 2013), 55–86, at 65–66.

¹⁵⁴ In G. Vermes, “The Symbolical Interpretation of Lebanon in the Targums,” *JTS* IX (1958): 1–12, cited by Ernest Best, “Spiritual Sacrifice: General Priesthood in the New Testament,” *Int* 14 (1960): 273–99, at 291, and further in Gärtner, *Temple*, 43–44.

¹⁵⁵ For just a sampling of the many passages referring to priests in the community, see e.g. 1QS I, 18–19; II, 1–2, 19–20; V, 2, 9; VI, 3–10, 19–20; VII, 2–3; VIII, 1–4; 1QSa I, 2; II, 2–3 4QpIsa^d 1, 2; 4QShirShabb^a 1 I, 3–8. Other passages speak of those belonging to the “seed of Aaron” e.g. 4Q265 7, II, 3; 4Q419 1, 5. For more on the literal priesthood depicted in the scrolls, see Florentino García Martínez, “Priestly Functions in a Community Without Temple,” in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel: Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum* (ed. Beate Ego, Armin Lange, and Peter Pilhofer; WUNT 118; Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1999), 303–319. Wardle, *Temple*, 143–44 notes the role of priests in the eschatological temple (e.g. (1QM II, 5–6; 2Q24 4 = 11Q18 20).

men”, which, Gärtner claims, would require a preposition (ב).¹⁵⁶ However, Yadin’s case has not been as easily dismissed (followed, for instance by Klinzing)¹⁵⁷ and though Gärtner’s interpretation is still, perhaps, the most popular view, it has not commanded universal assent. M. O. Wise, writing over twenty five years later, lists four basic lines of interpretation: (1) “A sanctuary made by men, standing among men” (2) “A sanctuary made by God standing among men” (3) “A sanctuary made by men consisting of men” (4) “A sanctuary made by God consisting of men”.¹⁵⁸ Wise himself contends that the phrase refers to an eschatological temple, not the community as temple, since CD III, 12–IV, 4 explicitly links the end time temple with the name of Adam.¹⁵⁹ However, as George Brooke rightly points out, Wise privileges the hermeneutical standpoint of both the *Temple Scroll* (11QT) and the *Damascus Document* (CD) in his interpretation of the disputed phrase, rather than letting the phrase stand in its context.¹⁶⁰ As we shall see below, this is a flawed approach, considering that there may be evidence for historical development in the thinking of the community. Brooke’s own approach seems to balance the two perspectives well, arguing that ‘temple of adam’ functions both as a reference to the community but also as the proleptic last-days sanctuary, anticipating a restoration of Eden in an eschatological temple, which will be built by God.¹⁶¹ A growing number of recent studies also adopt this broad outline,¹⁶² though there is some nuancing of this view, such that Francis

¹⁵⁶ Gärtner, *Temple*, 34–35, citing Y. Yadin, “A Midrash on II Sam. vii and Ps. i–ii (4QFlorilegium),” *IEJ* IX (1959): 95–98 at 96.

¹⁵⁷ Klinzing, *Umdeutung*, 83–84.

¹⁵⁸ M. O. Wise, “4QFlorilegium and the Temple of Adam,” *RevQ* 15 (1991): 103–132 at 107–09, citing at least three major scholars for each view.

¹⁵⁹ Idem, “4QFlorilegium,” 123–27, 131–32.

¹⁶⁰ Brooke, “Miqdash,” 285–301, at 287–89.

¹⁶¹ Idem, “Miqdash,” 289–91.

¹⁶² Such as Lawrence H. Schiffman, “Community Without Temple: The Qumran Community’s Withdrawal From the Jerusalem Temple,” in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel: Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum* (ed. Beate Ego, Armin Lange, and Peter Pilhofer; WUNT 118; Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1999), 267–284 at 279–80; Francis Schmidt,

Schmidt considers the sanctuary to consist of the priests and laymen who make up the council (not the whole community),¹⁶³ and Devorah Dimant interprets the phrase to speak of the congregation of priests only.¹⁶⁴ While some, like Brooke, take the reference to mean ‘a temple of Adam’ and others, like Gärtner, take it to mean ‘a temple of man’, each of these studies agree that the temple is a metaphor for some or all of the community. However, dissenting voices still exist. Daniel R. Schwartz follows Yadin’s understanding but translates the phrase as “a man-made temple”, referring to the construction of Solomon’s temple from a vantage point earlier in Israel’s history.¹⁶⁵ Allan J. McNicol also follows Yadin, but his understanding is directly counter to the interpretation of Schwartz, instead seeing it as a reference to the final eschatological temple.¹⁶⁶ Though the most common understanding of “a temple of men/Adam” fits what we find elsewhere in the scrolls, I must acknowledge this is a probable, rather than certain interpretation. Finally, on this topic, the translation of one of the other references cited above has also been disputed by a minority of scholars. The preposition לֹא in 1QS IX, 4–5 often translated as “without the flesh of burnt offerings and without the fats of sacrifice” could be translated “from the flesh of burnt offerings . . .”¹⁶⁷

How the Temple Thinks. Identity and Social Cohesion in Ancient Judaism (The Biblical Seminar 78; trans. J. Edward Crowley; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 141, 163–65; Wardle, “Sacrificing?,” 157–59; Wassen, “Temple,” 55–86, at 65–66.

¹⁶³ Schmidt, *Temple*, 141, 164–65.

¹⁶⁴ Devorah Dimant, “4Q Florilegium and the Idea of the Community as a Temple,” in *Hellenica and Judaica: Hommage à Valentin Nikiprowetzky* (ed. A. Caquot, M. Hadas-Lebel, and J. Riaud; Leuven: Peeters, 1986), 165–89 at 176–89; cf. also Wassen, “Temple,” 69 who concludes her study, “the community is not the temple; but, as we have seen, certain aspects of the nature and function of the Temple are transferred to the community and appropriated.”

¹⁶⁵ Daniel R. Schwartz, “The Three Temples of 4Q Florilegium,” *RevQ* 10 (1979): 83–91.

¹⁶⁶ Allan J. McNicol, “The Eschatological Temple in the Qumran Peshar 4QFlorilegium 1:1-7,” 5.2 (1977): 133–141.

¹⁶⁷ As argued by J. Carmignac, “L’utilité ou l’inutilité des sacrifices sanglants dans la “Règle de la Communauté” de Qumrân,” *RB* 63 (1956): 524–32, followed by Schmidt, *Temple*, 140–41, and discussed by Jonathan Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple: Symbolism and Supersessionism in the Study of Ancient Judaism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 164. J. Baumgarten, “The Essenes and the Temple – a Reappraisal,” in *Studies in Qumran Law* (ed. Joseph M Baumgarten; SJLA 24; Leiden: Brill, 1977), 57–74 at 67,

While Gärtner has a tendency to downplay the role of the future eschatological temple,¹⁶⁸ most recognize that the community as temple is seen as only a provisional response to the perceived illegitimacy of the contemporary priesthood in Jerusalem, with the emphasis on the greater glory of the temple to be revealed.¹⁶⁹ Indeed, Brooke argues that the community sees itself as a temple not simply because it understands the Jerusalem temple to be defiled but because its worship was to function as an anticipation of God's intention to establish a new temple.¹⁷⁰ The restoration of the temple is a particularly strong theme in the *War Scroll* (1QM), which does not describe the community as a temple.¹⁷¹

On the basis of these and other possible ambiguities, at least one scholar has gone further by questioning whether the Qumran community really saw itself as a temple at all. Jonathan Klawans points to the provisional nature of the community's temple-free existence, the priority given to the future eschatological temple, the ambiguity over some of the references noted above but most importantly for his case, Klawans notes that the term for sanctuary (מִקְדָּשׁ) is never used unambiguously for the community (where the more ambiguous term בַּיִת "house" is used), and asks, in relation to the *Damascus Document*, "If the author(s) of CD wanted to say that the community was truly a temple, why not use the word?"¹⁷² Although Klawans argument is well made, he seems to underplay the clear point that the community does have its own priests, can

takes it as a comparative or qualitative judgment, translating the preposition as "more than" meaning 'more important than'. See, however, the counter-arguments of Klinzing, *Umdeutung*, 37–41 and Hermann Lichtenberger, "Atonement and Sacrifice in the Qumran Community," in *Approaches to Ancient Judaism Volume II* (ed. William Scott Green; BJS 9; Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1980), 161–63 among others.

¹⁶⁸ E.g. Gärtner, *Temple*, 21.

¹⁶⁹ E.g. Lichtenberger, "Atonement," 159–71 at 165–67.

¹⁷⁰ Brooke, "Miqdash," 297–98.

¹⁷¹ E.g. Hogeterp, *Temple*, 114; Klawans, *Purity*, 164; Schiffman, "Community," 279–80; Schmidt, *Temple*, 141.

¹⁷² Klawans, *Purity*, 162–166, at 166. Idem, *Purity*, 166–68 makes further points about the presence of angels with the community rather than an explicit reference to the presence of God, and points to the limited powers of atonement possessed by the community.

make atonement (even if some functions seem inferior to the provisions of the Pentateuch), and that other phrases (such as “house”) are also used in the OT when the temple is clearly in view, and in conjunction with words with the **קדש** root, such as 1 Chr 29:16; 2 Chr 36:14; Ps 5:7 (5:8 MT); Isa 56:7; 64:11 (64:10 MT); 66:20 (and as noted earlier, the majority view is that **מקדש** is used in relation to the community in 4QFlor I, 6).

Before concluding my discussion of temple imagery at Qumran, I should note three further issues that concern the history of the community behind the text that could have a bearing on our interpretation of those texts. Firstly, there is the question of whether the *Damascus Document* presents a different perspective on the sectarians’ relationship to the cult than those already considered. Texts like CD XI, 17–20; CD III, 20–4, 2 and XVI, 13–14 provide regulations for the conduct of sacrifices. Do these suggest that some of the community participated in the sacrificial cult for a time, that they are looking back to an earlier age or are these regulations for a later age and a future temple?¹⁷³ Although we know that there was a definite break with the temple it is unclear whether the community continued to participate in worship in its early years before attitudes hardened, or whether the reverse is the case? To complicate matters, some believe that the Damascus Document may have a complicated history, with different levels of redaction.¹⁷⁴ It is clear that references to the community as temple are strongest in 1QS, limited in CD, disputed in 4QFlor and not found in 1QH, 1QM and many other writings.¹⁷⁵ McNicol draws attention to the early dating usually given to 1QS and suggests that the writings dated post-63 C.E. do not portray the community as a temple.¹⁷⁶ Brooke goes so far

¹⁷³ See Klinzing, *Umdeutung*, 75–80; Lichtenberger, “Atonement,” 161.

¹⁷⁴ Wardle, *Temple*, 148–50.

¹⁷⁵ Schüssler Fiorenza, “Language,” 165.

¹⁷⁶ McNicol, “Temple,” 141.

as to posit a three stage evolutionary approach where a more hierarchical organization gradually gave way to a more egalitarian community.¹⁷⁷

Secondly, archaeological studies have discovered animal bones at Qumran, raising the question of whether these provide evidence of animal sacrifice. J. Baumgarten discusses this question but, considering the placement of the bones in jars, concludes that these were more likely edible remains from communal meals that were preserved in that way as a guard against contamination.¹⁷⁸ There is no corresponding archaeological evidence for a cultic site and Jewish sacrificial regulations contained no requirement for the burying of bones.¹⁷⁹

Thirdly, there is the question of how to relate seemingly contradictory reports of the Essenes by Josephus and Philo respectively and what credence to give to Josephus's statement about sacrifice and the Essenes. Whereas Philo writes that Essenes show themselves to be "especially devout in the service of God, not by offering sacrifices of animals, but by resolving to sanctify their minds",¹⁸⁰ Josephus writes, "When they send what they have dedicated to God into the Temple, they do not offer sacrifices, because they profess to have more pure lustrations, therefore they keep themselves from the public precincts of the Temple, but conduct their worship separately." (*Ant.* 18. 1, 5).¹⁸¹ This ambiguous comment is further complicated by conflicting evidence in the Epitome and Latin manuscripts of Josephus that say that the Essenes *do not* perform sacrifices.¹⁸² Klinzing simply evaluated Josephus's evidence as mistaken,¹⁸³ but

¹⁷⁷ Brooke, "Temples," 425–27.

¹⁷⁸ Baumgarten, "Essenes," 59–61.

¹⁷⁹ Schiffman, "Community," 272; cf. George J. Brooke, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005), 429, for references to different archaeological studies. Klawans, *Purity*, 162 follows Schiffman.

¹⁸⁰ Philo, *Prob.* 75.

¹⁸¹ See more generally the evidence of Josephus, *Ant.* 18. 1, 5, 18–22; *J.W.* 2.119–61.

¹⁸² Wardle, *Temple*, 145–47; Baumgarten, "Essenes," 62.

¹⁸³ Klinzing, *Umdeutung*, 48–49.

Baumgarten takes Philo's statement not as an absolute denial of sacrifice but as a devaluing of its importance to the life of the community,¹⁸⁴ and therefore thinks it likely that Josephus's language indicates some limited accommodation to participation in the temple by some of the community's members.¹⁸⁵ Others remain agnostic on the issue.¹⁸⁶

There are clearly parallels between the use of metaphorical temple language in Paul and at Qumran. However, the reason for this is harder to come by than some earlier scholars confidently assumed. Both communities knew of the use of spiritual sacrifice language in the OT and early Judaism, and the situations and self-understandings of their respective communities may have led them to similar conclusions for different reasons. Certainly the lack of consistency across the Dead Sea Scrolls and the question of dating should make us cautious about positing a direct influence on Paul. It is also unlikely that the scrolls would have been known to a predominantly Gentile congregation in Corinth and would have influenced their understanding of Paul's words. That said, sources like Philo and Josephus know of the Essenes and speak of them to their Diaspora audiences. Qumran may be a witness to the development of spiritual cultic language in some segments of early Judaism, a development that is also attested in other ways in the Diaspora Jewish source Philo,¹⁸⁷ to whom I shall turn in Chapter Three. The question of how

¹⁸⁴ Baumgarten, "Essenes," 67, followed by Wardle, *Temple*, 145–47. If this is Philo's meaning, he could have expressed himself a little more clearly. The translation, "not *by* offering sacrifices of animals, but *by* resolving to sanctify their minds" may be a little misleading on this point. The verb translated "to offer" (καταθύω) could be functioning as a "participle of means" (*by means of* offering sacrifices) but the second verb (κατασκευάζω) is an infinitive. Although this could be functioning as an "infinitive of means", the particular construction is not commonly used this way (see Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 597–98).

¹⁸⁵ Baumgarten, "Essenes," 66–67.

¹⁸⁶ See Wardle, *Temple*, 147. This issue is also discussed by Lichtenberger, "Atonement," 160–61; Dimant, "4Q Florilegium," 186–87; Schmidt, *Temple*, 140.

¹⁸⁷ I owe this point to Dr Craig S. Keener.

the Corinthian audience might have understood 2 Cor 6:14–7:1, a passage often mined for parallels with Qumran, will be covered in Chapter Five.

1.3.2 Metaphorical Temple Language in the Pseudepigrapha and the Apocrypha

The Pseudepigrapha contains many references to the heavenly temple or to an eschatological temple that God will build or send down from heaven at the end of the age.¹⁸⁸ However, since my focus is on metaphorical language (and not upon a heavenly or eschatological reality, which would be considered to be real and literal), I shall not examine those references here.¹⁸⁹ Since among the Jewish groups of which we are aware, only the Qumran community spoke of themselves as a temple with priests, the Pseudepigrapha and the Apocrypha's metaphorical temple language mainly deals with sacrifice. These ideas appear in occasional verses rather than being developed as a coherent theme as they are in the Dead Sea Scrolls. I shall briefly examine the most obvious references by grouping them by category.

Firstly, there are several references that emphasize the disposition of the worshiper rather than the sacrifice. While it would be possible to read some of these verses to mean that the sacrifices are negated, it is more likely in each case that the cultic system is maintained, but purity of intention and behavior is understood to give the sacrifices their true value. Judith's

¹⁸⁸ These are found especially in the eschatological books such as *1 En.* 14:1–25; 24–26; 71:5; *4 Ezra* 10:25–28; *2 Bar.* 4:1–7.

¹⁸⁹ This would also include the reference to sacrifices in heaven as “a rational and bloodless oblation” in *T. Levi* 3:5–6. For an exploration of some of these themes, see C. T. R. Hayward, *The Jewish Temple: A Non-Biblical Sourcebook* (London: Routledge, 1996), and C. C. Rowland, “The Second Temple: Focus of Ideological Struggle?,” in *Templum Amicitiae: Essays on the Second Temple presented to Ernst Bammel* (ed. William Horbury; JSNTSup 48; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), 175–98. There is also the strange rejection of animal sacrifice found in *Sib. Or.* 4:27–30, whose referent is disputed. Its target may be idolatry although a negative assessment of the present Jerusalem cult may also be in view; see Andrew Chester, “The Sibyl and the Temple,” in *Templum Amicitiae: Essays on the Second Temple presented to Ernst Bammel* (ed. William Horbury; JSNTSup 48; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), 37–69, at 62–69.

hymn of celebration includes the lines, “For every sacrifice as a fragrant offering is a small thing, and the fat of all whole burnt offerings to you is a very little thing; but whoever fears the Lord is great forever.”¹⁹⁰ In context, it is hard to read Judith’s words (even if originally penned by another author)¹⁹¹ as a rejection or even a minimizing of the value of the cult, given that Judith’s zeal for the law is emphasized throughout the book.¹⁹² Indeed, immediately after the hymn, the narrator couples the exemplary worship of God’s people with their sacrificial offerings and the sacrifices of Judith in particular (Jdt 16:18–19). The point of Jdt 16:16 seems to be that sacrifices need to be accompanied by a true reverence for God,¹⁹³ a reverence displayed in the account that follows the hymn. The Letter of Aristeas contains a similar sentiment. The narrator recounts the wise answers of each of the putative translators of the Septuagint, and in one case, to the question, “What is the highest form of glory?”, the reply is given, “Honoring God. This is not done with gifts or sacrifices, but with purity of heart and of devout disposition.”¹⁹⁴ In context, the point is not so much a disparagement of the cultic system but an apologetic for the law as the highest form of philosophy, a claim not lost on the audience of the dialogue, who respond with admiration (*Let. Aris.* 235).¹⁹⁵ The broader context of the letter bears testimony to the narrator’s reverence for the temple and priesthood (*Let. Aris.* 83–99),¹⁹⁶ so the statement should be read in that light. Second Enoch (‘J’ recension) contains another statement similar to that of Aristeas and

¹⁹⁰ Jdt 16:16. Unless indicated otherwise, all citations from the Apocrypha are taken from the NRSV and all citations from the Pseudepigrapha come from the translations in the *OTP* edited by James H. Charlesworth.

¹⁹¹ See the discussion in Carey A. Moore, *Judith: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 40A; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1985), 252–57; Deborah Levine Gera, *Judith* (Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature; Berlin: De Gruyter, 2014), 464–65.

¹⁹² Morton S. Enslin and Solomon Zeitlin, *The Book of Judith: Greek text with an English Translation, Commentary and Critical Notes* (JAL 7; Leiden: Brill, 1972), 174.

¹⁹³ Moore, *Judith*, 251; Gera, *Judith*, 467–68.

¹⁹⁴ *Let. Aris.* 234.

¹⁹⁵ A theme developed further in 4 Maccabees; see 4 Macc 1:1; 2:22 5:5, 7, 11, 35; 7:7, 9, 21; 8:15.

¹⁹⁶ For which, see Hayward, *Temple*, 26–37.

Judith, “Does the Lord demand bread or lamps or sheep or oxen or any kind of sacrifices at all? That is nothing, but he [God] demands pure hearts, and by means of all those things he tests people’s hearts.”¹⁹⁷ The assertion comes in the context of the reminder that humanity has been made in God’s image (*2 En.* 44:1) and should act in ways honoring to God and to others (*2 En.* 44:1–5) and is similar to the kind of prophetic critique found in places such as Ps 40:6; 51:16 and Mic 6:6–8. Later in the book, the sacrificial system is assumed as the right form of worship (e.g. *2 En.* 61:4–5; 62:1; 66:2).

The second category concerns passages that view something as an appropriate substitute for sacrifices, such as a right heart or right practices, while not necessarily suggesting that sacrifices per se are discarded. One of the most striking of these is Tobit’s refrain that almsgiving is itself a sacrifice (Tob 4:11) which atones from sin (Tob 12:9) and delivers a person from death (Tob 4:10; 12:9). Almsgiving is a particularly important theme for Tobit,¹⁹⁸ and the writer has reinterpreted passages like Prov 10:2; 11:6; 16:7 (LXX) to emphasize this. The Hebrew word **דקדק** (righteousness), though translated as *δικαιοσύνη* in each of these verses, came to include the sense of “almsgiving” (*ἐλεημοσύνη*)¹⁹⁹ which is used here and elsewhere in the book (e.g. Tob 1:3, 16; 2:14; 3:2; 4:7, 8, 16; 13:8; 14:2, 10, 11). The same theme is picked up in Sir 3:30; 35:4 and 40:24. Additionally Ben Sira views obedience to the commandment to honor father and mother as atoning (Sir 3:3), and counts obedience to the commandments generally as a sacrifice (Sir 35:1–2), which is encapsulated in the forsaking of unrighteousness (Sir 35:5). This does not

¹⁹⁷ *2 En.* 45:3.

¹⁹⁸ See Carey A. Moore, *Tobit: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 40A; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1996), 174–77; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Tobit* (Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature; Berlin: De Gruyter, 2003), 171–72; and on the theme of almsgiving generally, Benedikt Otzen, *Tobit and Judith* (Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha; London: Continuum, 2002), 35–37.

¹⁹⁹ Jeremy Corley, “An Intertextual Study of Proverbs and Ben Sira,” in *Intertextual Studies in Ben Sira and Tobit* (ed. Jeremy Corley and Vincent Skemp; CBQMS 38; Washington, D.C.: 2005), 155–82, at 179.

mean, however, that either Tobit or Ben Sira neglect the sacrificial system. Rather, Ben Sira insists that sacrifices are only efficacious if accompanied by a true righteousness (in line with 1 Sam 15:22; Amos 5:21–24 etc.).²⁰⁰ For Ben Sira, the two must go together, “The offering of the righteous enriches the altar.” (Sir 35:8),²⁰¹ and the importance of the cult is frequently emphasized in the work (e.g. Sir 7:29–31; 35:1–12; 38:9–11).²⁰² Similarly, Tobit looks forward to a glorious restored temple with right worship (Tob 14:5–6). The writer of Jubilees also views the desires of the people (probably referring to their prayers) as “pleasing fragrance, which is acceptable before him always” (*Jub.* 2:22), but this comes from a work which takes a very strict view of the importance of devotion to the law, embodied in circumcision (*Jub.* 15:24–29), festivals (*Jub.* 6:37; 23:19) and sacrifice (*Jub.* 32:1–15).²⁰³ The Prayer of Azariah 15–17 also envisages “a contrite heart and a humble spirit” as an acceptable substitute for sacrificial offerings. However, the three men found in Daniel are simply unable to make an offering in their situation (*Pr Azar* 15), a situation mirrored in the lives of most of the readers who live far from the temple.²⁰⁴ Rather, extenuating circumstances are in view while temple worship is practically impossible for many Jews, whether in time of exile or living in the Diaspora. The Psalms of Solomon compares praise and worship to a first-fruit offering, when it reflects “a devout and

²⁰⁰ Patrick W. Skehan and Alexander A. Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: A New Translation with Notes, Introduction and Commentary*. (AB 39; Doubleday, 1987), 417–18.

²⁰¹ Benjamin G. Wright III, *Praise Israel for Wisdom and Instruction: Essays on Ben Sira and Wisdom, the Letter of Aristeas and the Septuagint* (JSJSup 131; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 101.

²⁰² As noted by Idem, “Ben Sira and the *Book of the Watchers* on the Legitimate Priesthood,” in *Intertextual Studies in Ben Sira and Tobit* (ed. Jeremy Corley and Vincent Skemp; CBQMS 38; Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2005), 241–54, at 242. See also the commentary in Hayward, *Temple*, 73–84.

²⁰³ See also Idem, *Temple*, 85–107 and J. T. A. G. M. van Ruiten, “Visions of the Temple in the Book of Jubilees,” in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel: Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum* (ed. Beate Ego, Armin Lange, and Peter Pilhofer; WUNT 118; Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1999), 215–227.

²⁰⁴ Carey A. Moore, *Daniel, Esther and Jeremiah: The Additions* (AB 44; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1977), 59; Pieter W. van der Horst and Judith H. Newman, *Early Jewish Prayers in Greek* (Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008), 210.

righteous heart” (*Pss. Sol.* 15:3), but may go further, in deliberately evoking the sacrifices mandated for unintentional sin in Lev 4:1–2, 27; 5:18 while replacing them with fasting and humbling, “He atones for (sins of) ignorance by fasting and humbling his soul, and the Lord will cleanse every devout person and his house.” (*Pss. Sol.* 15:3).²⁰⁵ Kenneth Atkinson contends that the theological perspective of the Psalms may be similar to that of the Qumran community, in believing the temple to be defiled.²⁰⁶ Finally in this category, the *Liber antiquitatum biblicarum* has a particular concern with Genesis 22, and in what sense Abraham’s offering of Isaac could be considered a sacrifice (*L.A.B.* 18:5; 32:2–4; 40:2). To this end, Pseudo-Philo speaks of Isaac’s blood having been shed (*L.A.B.* 18:5) but later, perhaps recognizing that his body was not sacrificed, includes an utterance worthy of Philo himself (as we shall see in chapter three), “the Lord has made the soul of a man worthy to be a sacrifice.” (*L.A.B.* 32:3). Again, within the wider context of the work, there is a deep appreciation of the Temple and worship.²⁰⁷

Finally, the death of a martyr came to be seen as atoning for the people of Israel, in the same way that an animal offering could serve for the nation (e.g. Lev 16). This is particularly prominent in 4 Maccabees when Elezear prays on behalf of himself and those martyred before him, “let our punishment be a satisfaction on their behalf. Make my blood their purification and take my life as a ransom for theirs” (4 Macc 6:28–29). This prayer is seen as fulfilled by the writer later in the book, “they became, as it were, a ransom for the sin of our nation. Through the

²⁰⁵ Kenneth Atkinson, *An Intertextual Study of the Psalms of Solomon: Pseudepigrapha* (Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity 49; Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen Press, 2001), 61–63.

²⁰⁶ Idem, *I Cried to the Lord: A Study of the Psalms of Solomon’s Historical Background and Social Setting* (JSJSup 84; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 216.

²⁰⁷ Cf. Hayward, *Temple*, 154–167; though possibly some ambiguity in its appreciation of the temple cult of his day, see Manuel Vogel, “Tempel und Tempelkult in Pseudo-Philos *Lieber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*,” in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel: Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum* (ed. Beate Ego, Armin Lange, and Peter Pilhofer; WUNT 118; Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1999), 251–63.

blood of these righteous ones and through the propitiation of their death the divine providence rescued Israel, which had been shamefully treated” (4 Macc 17:21–22).²⁰⁸ It is also possible to see the Prayer of Azariah (Pr Azar 15–17), mentioned above, as referring not simply to the prayer itself as an offering, but to the young men’s willingness to die a sacrificial death out of a desire to atone for the people.²⁰⁹ In summary, writings from the Pseudepigrapha and Apocrypha place a righteous disposition and behaviors above sacrifices, while still expecting that sacrifices should be performed; some works allow for substitutes for sacrifices, such as purity, praise or almsgiving, while not abandoning the belief in the sacrificial system. Some writings consider the death of a martyr to have an atoning efficacy on behalf of the nation.

My findings so far indicate that metaphorical temple language is not pervasive in Intertestamental literature, save for a number of places in the Dead Sea Scrolls, though the Scrolls are unlikely to have been known to the audience in Corinth.²¹⁰

1.4 The Purpose of the Study

There is thus something of a lacuna in the literature, with little comprehensive study of the most relevant sources of metaphorical temple language that could have influenced the Corinthians’ thinking; namely philosophical ideas. My aim is not to claim that Hellenistic philosophy is Paul’s own background as the author, nor to claim that it provides the sole background for the Corinthians’ own thinking on the topic (which might also include their

²⁰⁸ For the theology of atonement by martyrs on behalf of the people in 4 Maccabees, see further David deSilva, *4 Maccabees* (Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha; London: Continuum, 1998), 137–41.

²⁰⁹ This is the position of John J. Collins, *Daniel* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 201. This may also be how Wis 3:6 reflects on the souls of the righteous as a “sacrificial burnt offering”.

²¹⁰ Certainly Paul assumes that they recognize the referent of Βελιάρ (2 Cor 6:15), a word that occurs repeatedly in the Dead Sea Scrolls, but the same word is also used in other Jewish literature, especially in the Pseudepigrapha.

experience of local idol temples as well as Paul's own teaching). Rather I aver that Hellenistic philosophy is *one* important background for the audience, which has frequently been neglected, and which Paul may seek to address.²¹¹ The purpose of this study is to examine the use of metaphorical temple language in the most relevant Hellenistic philosophical writings in order to understand how they are using this imagery, to what purpose and within what worldview and to compare this with what Paul is doing with such language in 1–2 Corinthians. The benefits of this study would be twofold. Firstly, more light could be shed on the way that the kinds of philosophical thought known in cities like Corinth may have influenced the Corinthians to think about metaphorical temple imagery. Secondly, a better understanding of the way that other philosophies used such language would throw into sharp relief the similarities and differences between Paul's use and theirs and the different worldview that Paul was seeking to communicate to an audience whose thinking and behavior often resembled that of pagans (1 Cor 4:8–21; 5:1; 6:1–6 cf. 1 Cor 3:1).

1.5 Methodology and Plan of the Work

An inductive study will be undertaken of relevant Hellenistic authors in order to discover how metaphorical temple language was used in Hellenistic philosophy. The parameters for this study cannot be set by searches of relevant words such as *ναός*, *θυσία*, or *ἱερεύς*. Firstly, these words are primarily used for literal sacrifices and appear very commonly in ancient literature. Secondly, writers can speak of the concept of a temple without using these particular words or other technical temple vocabulary.²¹² Although Palestinian Jewish works will not be ignored

²¹¹ This is not to suggest that the Corinthians had read this or that work of philosophy, but rather that philosophical ideas common to Stoicism and other philosophies could trickle down to influence the ordinary person, as discussed at the beginning of this chapter.

²¹² For instance, the often cited example from Epictetus, *Diatr.* 2.8.11–13 contains none of these words.

altogether, the focus will be on those writing Hellenistic philosophy in Greek or Latin and, in particular, to those closest to the period in which Paul wrote. Obvious examples of this would include (but not be confined to) those already referenced by Ferguson and McKelvey, such as Epictetus, Plutarch, Seneca and Apollonius of Tyana, all of whom use metaphorical temple language.²¹³ These non-Jewish Hellenistic philosophical writers will be examined in Chapter Two. In addition, Chapter Three will survey the corpus of Philo of Alexandria (ca. 20 B.C.E. – 50 C.E.). Although Philo is a Jewish writer, it would be difficult to neglect his writings, given the considerable number of references to sacrifices, priests and temples used metaphorically.²¹⁴ For Philo, the contextualization of Judaism in a Hellenistic environment lies at the heart of his work. Peder Borgen summarizes the views of many scholars when he writes, “Philo continues the approach seen especially in the Letter of Aristeas, in Aristobulus, and the Wisdom of Solomon to interpret the Laws of Moses and Jewish existence by means of Greek ideas and religious traditions.”²¹⁵ Furthermore, Philo drew from the traditions of Stoicism, Middle Platonism and the Pythagoreans,²¹⁶ and as such, is one of our best sources for understanding Hellenistic philosophy, given his very sizeable corpus.

²¹³ While noting that the latter needs to be used with caution, since our source for his writings, Philostratus, probably completed his work in the early third century. Nevertheless, Apollonius lived in the first century and some of Philostratus’s material may reflect the earlier thought of Apollonius himself.

²¹⁴ See for instance, the studies of Valentin Nikiprowetzky, “La spiritualisation des sacrifices et le culte sacrificiel au temple de Jérusalem chez Philon d’Alexandrie,” *Sem* 17 (1967): 97–116; Carl Werman, “God’s House: Temple Or Universe,” in *Philo und das Neue Testament: Wechselseitige Wahrnehmungen, I. Internationale Symposium zum Corpus Judaeo-Hellenisticum, 1.-4. Mai 2003, Eisenach / Jena* (ed. Roland Deines and Karl-Wilhelm Niebuhr; WUNT 2/ 172; Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 2004), 309–22; Andrea Lieber, “Between Motherland and Fatherland: Diaspora, Pilgrimage and the Spiritualization of Sacrifice in Philo of Alexandria,” in *Heavenly Tablets: Interpretation, Identity and Tradition in Ancient Judaism* (ed. Lynn Lidonnici and Andrea Lieber; JSJSup 119; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 193–210 and Jutta Leonhardt, *Jewish Worship in Philo of Alexandria* (TSAJ 84; Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 2001).

²¹⁵ Peder Borgen, *Philo of Alexandria, An Exegete for His Time* (NovTSup 86; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 43.

²¹⁶ Idem, “Philo of Alexandria,” in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus* (ed. Michael E. Stone; CRINT; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 233–82, at 256.

The study will thus be a comparative one. The insights gained from studying metaphorical temple language in the wider literary context of Hellenistic philosophers will be compared to Paul's deliberate use of metaphorical temple language when writing to an audience influenced by Greek and Roman philosophical and ethical thought in the life of Corinth. This comparison will illuminate Paul's setting of this language in the wider framework of 1–2 Corinthians and the purpose for its use in the argument of the letters. Chapter Four will explore such language in 1 Corinthians, and in order to provide a focus for the study, one pericope, 2 Cor 6:14–7:1, will be given special attention in Chapter Five. Whereas 1 Cor 3:16 appears in a discussion concerning ministry within the church, and 1 Cor 6:19 relates to the issue of prostitution and the physical body, 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 is set in a cultic context and explicitly challenges the Corinthians over their pagan associations and worldview. Although many scholars have held the pericope to be a non-Pauline interpolation, a growing number of modern studies as well as the two most recent major critical commentaries have defended its place within the original letter.²¹⁷ Finally, Chapter Six will summarize and evaluate my findings and suggest some paths for future research.

²¹⁷ A sample would include: Margaret E. Thrall, *2 Corinthians 1-7: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians* (ICC; London: T&T Clark, 1994), 25–36; Murray J. Harris, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 15, 21–25; Adewuya, *Holiness*, 25–29; Hogeterp, *Temple*, 365–73; Fredrick J. Long, *Ancient Rhetoric and Paul's Apology: The Compositional Unity of 2 Corinthians* (SNTSMS 131; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 168–72.

Chapter Two: Metaphorical Temple Language in Hellenistic Philosophy

2.1 Introduction

In this chapter I shall explore the use of metaphorical temple imagery in Hellenistic philosophy. Before I begin, a few preliminary remarks are in order. Firstly, I shall not attempt to document the reporting of descriptions or attitudes towards actual temple worship in these or any other sources (in other words, *literal* temple language). My more limited aim is to investigate *metaphorical* temple language, just as Paul speaks of temple imagery metaphorically in 1 Cor 3:16; 6:19 and 2 Cor 6:16.¹ To do otherwise would broaden the scope of enquiry beyond manageable proportions, and evidence for temple worship in relation to 1–2 Corinthians has been adequately surveyed in other studies.² Similarly, the question of the imperial cult (another focus of much attention currently) will not be our interest, though I shall note along the way references to the divinity of particular emperors. Thirdly, as mentioned at the end of the first chapter, the discussion of temple imagery is not always focused on the use of particular words, since, as we shall see, writers frequently express the concept through common vocabulary that is not specific to temple worship, such as οἶκος or words for indwelling (and in any case, I shall be surveying a number of Latin works, whereas Paul is writing in Greek).³ In this regard, the number of references found that specifically use the language of temple (such as ναός, ἱερόν or οἶκος) are

¹ On the question of metaphor itself in relation to cultic imagery, see the methodology laid out in Nijay K. Gupta, *Worship That Makes Sense to Paul: A New Approach to the Theology and Ethics of Paul's Cultic Metaphors* (BZNW 175; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2010), 27–51.

² For instance, more recently in Yulin Liu, *Temple Purity in 1-2 Corinthians* (WUNT 2/ 343; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), Timothy Wardle, *The Jerusalem Temple and Early Christian Identity* (WUNT 2/ 291; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), and in earlier studies, such as Wendell L. Willis, *Idol Meat in Corinth: The Pauline Argument in 1 Corinthians 8 and 10* (SBLDS 68; Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1985), and Peter D. Gooch, *Dangerous Food: 1 Corinthians 8–10 in Its Context* (Waterloo, Ont.: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1993).

³ A sampling of particularly relevant words can be found, for instance, in Louw & Nida, 534–35 citing words relating to sacrifice such as θυσία, σφάγιον, ἱερόθυτος, κορβᾶν, ἀπαρχή, ὀλοκαύτωμα, θυμιάω; θυμίαμα and σπένδω, words relating to temple in Louw & Nida, 66, such as ναός, οἶκος or such as ἱερόν, σκηνή, ἅγιον (Louw & Nida, 83) or words relating to Priest in Louw & Nida, 66 such as ἱερουργέω, ἱερατεύω, ἱερατεία, ἱεράτευμα, ἱερωσύνη, and ἱερεύς.

relatively few. However, Hellenistic writers frequently use the imagery of God, the gods, or a δαίμων dwelling in or filling the universe or the individual. Since a number of them do so within the wider context of describing the world or the individual as a temple in their writings (even though not necessarily in the immediate literary context), and since Paul uses the language of indwelling in the references which are the focus of my study (οἰκέω in 1 Cor 3:16; “ἐν ὑμῖν” in 1 Cor 6:19 and ἐνοικέω in 2 Cor 6:16), I have deemed it legitimate to explore the imagery of the indwelling God/s when explicit temple language is not always in view. Finally, I shall limit our research to the sources more directly relevant to Paul’s period, beginning with the schools that marked the start of the Hellenistic era and continued at least into the first century (such as Stoicism and Epicureanism) and ending with works no later than the early third century C.E. (other than those that report on earlier eras), that show a strong degree of continuity with first century works of the same philosophical tradition.⁴

2.1.1 Philosophy

Firstly, I shall briefly lay out some evidence from the primary sources that demonstrate the central importance that philosophy played in shaping worldview and behavior in the first century.⁵ There could be no greater endeavor than to study and live out philosophy, according to

⁴ For a survey of Hellenistic philosophy, see e.g. *OCD*, 657–58; Everett Ferguson, *Backgrounds of Early Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 319–95; A. A. Long, *Hellenistic Philosophy: Stoics, Epicureans, Sceptics* (London: Duckworth, 1974); R. W. Sharples, *Stoics, Epicureans and Sceptics: An Introduction to Hellenistic Philosophy* (London: Routledge, 1996); Jacques Brunschwig and David Sedley, “Hellenistic Philosophy,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Greek and Roman Philosophy* (ed. David Sedley; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 151–83; Keimpe Algra et al., eds., *The Cambridge History of Hellenistic Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

⁵ For the relationship between philosophy and religion, see Glenn W. Most, “Philosophy and Religion,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Greek and Roman Philosophy* (ed. David Sedley; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 300–22. Michael Trapp, “The Role of Philosophy and Philosophers in the Imperial Period,” in *A Companion to Plutarch* (ed. Mark Beck; Malden, Mass: Wiley-Blackwell, 2014), 43–57 at 44 writes of philosophy in this period, “It is a comprehensive discipline, operating at the deepest level of understanding across the whole

Cicero, since, “philosophy is the richest, the most bounteous, and the most exalted gift of the immortal gods to humanity.”⁶ Seneca has much to say in praise of philosophy. Philosophers teach people both how to live⁷ and how to die and “open to you the path to immortality”. Unlike honors and statues, philosophy can never be destroyed and so the wise individual should choose to be a son of the philosophers.⁸ Plutarch notes that philosophy is avoided by those sick of soul, but it is their only hope of cure.⁹ Philosophy brings revelation and opens up new vistas, leading us to, “but the sight of things most beautiful that have been wrested from darkness and brought into light.”¹⁰ This light is for all.¹¹ By contrast, to remove the Reason that philosophy brings is likened to removing a candle and plunging the room into darkness, or removing the goatherd and scattering the flock.¹² Philosophy “enables us to understand things human and things divine”,¹³ which can be summed up simply as “wisdom”.¹⁴ Philosophy holds out the promise of equality with God,¹⁵ and is the most appropriate study for a king, who, of all people, most resembles a

range of the real, and embracing all the most central human concerns; in our terms, it combines the authority of Science with that of Religion, and other things besides”. For a survey of the relationship between certain philosophers and Corinth over time, see Barnes, *Women*, 126–40.

⁶ Cicero, *Leg.* 1.22.58 (Keyes, LCL).

⁷ Seneca, *Ep.* 90.1.

⁸ Seneca, *Brev. vit.* 15.4 (Basore, LCL).

⁹ Plutarch, *An. corp.* 501A; similarly Cicero, *Tusc.* 3.3.5–6; 3.6.13.

¹⁰ Seneca, *Brev. vit.* 14.1 (Basore, LCL); cf. Plutarch, *Virt. prof.* 81E, who compares the person who gets “inside” philosophy to one who enters a shrine and “has seen a great light”; see also *Is. Os.* 382D, 382F and Cicero, *Tusc.* 1.26.64.

¹¹ Seneca, *Ep.* 44.2.

¹² Maximus of Tyre, *Or.* 1.3.

¹³ Seneca, *Ep.* 31.8 (Gummere, LCL); cf. *Ep.* 90.2–3; Maximus of Tyre, *Or.* 26.1; DL 1.3.63, discussing the views of Plato.

¹⁴ Seneca, *Ep.* 89.1–6 (Gummere, LCL); or a striving for wisdom, according to Alcinous, *The Handbook of Platonism* (Clarendon Later Ancient Philosophers; trans. John Dillon; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), 3, 152.2–5. F. H. Sandbach, *The Stoics* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1975), 11, sums up the ancients’ understanding of philosophy as “love of wisdom.”

¹⁵ Seneca, *Ep.* 48.12; 73.12. The philosopher should therefore, at the very least, be a follower of the gods (Marcus Aurelius, *Med.* 12.27).

god, according to Dio Chrysostom.¹⁶ According to Plutarch, those who look to states governed by such a ruler can see the light of the knowledge of his image, “which the blessed and the wise copy with the help of philosophy.”¹⁷ Musonius Rufus, moreover, asserts that the study of philosophy is commanded by Zeus.¹⁸ Philosophy is equated with the ideal good.¹⁹ Seneca, writing to Lucilius, urges him that whichever philosopher he may follow “we must be philosophers”, as if the particular philosophy chosen is less important than the choice to follow philosophy at all.²⁰ In a similar vein, Seneca speaks with approval of those who learnt directly from the lives of philosophers and cites examples from a variety of schools and eras, such as Socrates, Zeno and Epicurus,²¹ Pythagoras, Democritus, Aristotle and Theophrastus.²² Like their followers, Seneca exhorts his reader to live as they lived.²³ Philosophy has unique authority and demands our complete devotion.²⁴ Indeed, according to Dio Chrysostom, the pursuit of virtue in character is nothing less than being a philosopher.²⁵ The road chosen by a philosopher will cause them to stand apart from the majority in their way of life and even in matters such as their food and clothing.²⁶ Yet it is the road we must take, Marcus Aurelius avers, since philosophy is the only sure guide on our journey through this transient life.²⁷ The philosopher will be superior to

¹⁶ Dio Chrysostom, *2 Regn.* 24, 26. A true philosopher will be like a king, in that they learn to rule well: whether it be to rule themselves or others (*Rec. mag.* 3). Marcus Aurelius, *Med.* 6.12 also notes that philosophy provides rest from the life of the court.

¹⁷ Plutarch, *Princ. iner.* 782A.

¹⁸ Musonius, *frag.* 16.104.30–32.

¹⁹ Musonius, *frag.* 8.64.37–66.1; *frag.* 16.104.36–37.

²⁰ Seneca, *Ep.* 16.5 (Gummere, LCL). However, Dio Chrysostom warns of the dangers of those who wear only the name of philosopher and fail to improve the lives of their pupils or themselves (*Alex.* 8, 18, 20; *De philosopho* 10).

²¹ Seneca, *Ep.* 6.6.

²² Seneca, *Brev. vit.* 14.5; Plutarch, *Alex. fort.* 327E, 328B also mentions Alexander.

²³ E.g. Seneca, *Ep.* 5; 6.5–6; 7; 8.1–2, 5.

²⁴ Seneca, *Ep.* 53.8, 9.

²⁵ Dio Chrysostom, *Exil.* 28; Maximus of Tyre, *Or.* 26.1; 35.6–8; Cicero, *Tusc.* 3.17.36; 5.1.1.

²⁶ Dio Chrysostom, *De philosophia* 7, 8; *De philosopho* 6. Thus many, seeing the cost of philosophy, neglect it until the necessity of philosophy cannot be avoided (Dio Chrysostom, *Compot.* 7).

²⁷ Marcus Aurelius, *Med.* 2.17; similarly Cicero, *Tusc.* 5.2.5.

all in regard to truth and knowledge,²⁸ and philosophy is superior to all other study and brought nourishment and wholeness to men such as Socrates and Plato.²⁹ The philosophers have a noble purpose, since they seek to win “concord and peace and community of interests” for all,³⁰ and equip people to live the good life, guided by justice and law, which is aided by reason.³¹ Philosophy comforts those who are sad and enhances the joy of celebration.³² Yet the role of philosophy also includes tempering the natural desires, which is compared to a horse-trainer who checks the spirit of the colt with bridle and reins.³³

We shall survey the evidence for metaphorical temple imagery from each Hellenistic Philosopher in which it has been found. This evidence will be presented by school, so far it is possible to assign the philosopher in question to an individual school, and in approximate chronological order within that school. Separate treatment will be given to those who do not fit into an obvious category or who are summarizing their understanding of these schools from the vantage point of later centuries. In regard to each writer, Sacrifice, Priest and Temple language will be discussed separately where the respective evidence presents itself. I have also appended three additional categories to the discussion of each writer’s view. In order to understand the writer’s conception of God’s indwelling presence, it is important to ask about the writer’s understanding of divinity. Thus, where sufficient evidence is available, I consider the character of God and Gods in the writings. This then brings us to the question of how the writer understands the nature of those in whom God dwells, so the writer’s doctrine of human nature will briefly be considered. Finally, since Paul’s doctrine of the Temple of the Holy Spirit/Living

²⁸ Dio Chrysostom, *2 Glor.* 1.

²⁹ Maximus of Tyre, *Or.* 22.6; cf. *Or.* 37.2.

³⁰ Plutarch, *Alex. fort.* 330E (LCL, Babbitt).

³¹ Plutarch, *Adv. Col.* 1108C; cf. Cicero, *Tusc.* 5.7.20.

³² Maximus of Tyre, *Or.* 1.2.

³³ Maximus of Tyre, *Or.* 1.8; 20.6 cf. Jas 3:2–3.

God had practical consequences for how the Corinthians should live their lives (1 Cor 3:16–18; 6:12–20; 2 Cor 6:14–7:1), it is important to consider what practical consequences each writer saw their doctrine having for their readers, so that we can compare the application of their doctrine with that of Paul’s in later chapters.

2.2 Introduction to Diogenes Laertius

By something of an historical accident, the loss of so many primary sources for philosophy has left us dependent on the works of Diogenes Laertius, of whom we know little, including the date of his writings (though often dated to the third or fourth centuries C.E. because of his omission of Neoplatonism and philosophers after the second century).³⁴ According to the translator of the Loeb edition, R. D. Hicks, “In any given passage he is as useful and reliable as the source he happens to be quoting at that exact moment”³⁵ but his information is extremely valuable in the absence of so many other extant sources. Diogenes provides a history of the lives and thought of a considerable number of philosophers from the seventh century B.C.E. through to the third century C.E. As there are a number of important references in Diogenes to metaphorical temple language, these will be covered in relation to the individual philosopher to whose writings or conversation he attributes these views. Because I am dealing with much shorter sections than for other writers, a brief summary will be provided for each author rather than using the various categories described above.

³⁴ Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of Eminent Philosophers, Volume I: Books 1–5*. (LCL 184; trans. R. D. Hicks; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1925), xvi–xix. See also *OCD*, 457. On the question of the scarcity of sources in relation to Hellenistic philosophy, see Jaap Mansfeld, “Sources,” in *The Cambridge History of Hellenistic Philosophy* (ed. Keimpe Algra et al.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 3–30.

³⁵ Laertius, *Lives*, xix.

2.2.1 Theophrastus, according to Diogenes Laertius

Theophrastus (c. 370–286 B.C.E.) was a student of Aristotle and later head of the School from 323 B.C.E.³⁶ In bequeathing his property to various friends, he expresses the view that property should not be devoted purely to private use, and so his house and gardens he gives to those desiring to study literature and philosophy, “so that they hold it like a temple (ἱερόν) in joint possession and live, as is right and proper, on terms of familiarity and friendship (“οἰκεῖως καὶ φιλικῶς”).”³⁷ The temple image here speaks of something shared and open to all.

2.3 Stoicism

2.3.1 Introduction to Stoicism

Zeno of Citium (c. 333–261 B.C.E.) was the founder of the Stoic school in Athens.³⁸ Stoicism became best known through the writings of the third head of the school, Chrysippus (c. 280–207 B.C.E.)³⁹ who both restated and developed the positions of his predecessors, distinguishing between logic, physics and ethics, and contending for a strongly materialist, determinist, empiricist and pantheistic view of the world, with a stringent call to live in accordance with nature, seeing virtue as the only good.⁴⁰ Stoics aimed to live by a thoroughly

³⁶ DL 5.2.36 and see *OCD*, 1461.

³⁷ DL 5.2.53 (Hicks, LCL).

³⁸ See *OCD*, 1587–88; Sandbach, *Stoics*, 20–27; Long, *Philosophy*, 109–113; Paul Oskar Kristeller, *Greek Philosophers of the Hellenistic Age* (trans. Gregory Woods; New York: Columbia University Press, 1993), 22–35; Ferguson, *Backgrounds*, 354–55; David Sedley, “The School, From Zeno to Arius Didymus,” in *The Cambridge Companion to the Stoics* (ed. Brad Inwood; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 7–32 at 8–20.

³⁹ See *OCD*, 316; Long, *Philosophy*, 113–14; Sandbach, *Stoics*, 112–15; J. M. Rist, *Stoic Philosophy* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1977), 22–36; Kristeller, *Philosophers*, 60–86; Ferguson, *Backgrounds*, 355; Sedley, “The School,” 7–32 at 15–20; DL 7.179–202.

⁴⁰ For more on Stoicism, see e.g. *OCD*, 1403–04; Long, *Philosophy*, 107–209; Sandbach, *Stoics*; Rist, *Philosophy*; Brad Inwood, *Ethics and Human Action in Early Stoicism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985); Marcia L. Colish, *The Stoic Tradition from Antiquity to the Early Middle Ages: I. Stoicism in Classical Latin*

comprehensive and all-embracing philosophy in which “cosmic Nature embraces all that there is” so that God and Nature are equated, humans are integrated with that Nature and so must learn the nature of reality in order to live in agreement with it.⁴¹ Stoicism was probably the dominant philosophy of the first century C.E.⁴²

2.3.2 Zeno according to Diogenes Laertius

Zeno has much to say about the wise man, some of which has a bearing on our topic. He uses divine indwelling language, claiming of them, “They are also, it is declared, godlike; for they have a something divine within them (Θείους τ’ εἶναι· ἔχειν γὰρ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς οἶονεὶ θεόν).⁴³ There is a reference to priesthood which could be metaphorical, but perhaps has a more literal meaning, “The wise too are the only priests” (μόνους θ’ ἱερέας τοὺς σοφούς).⁴⁴ This could mean that only the wise are truly priests in a spiritual sense. However, given that the context speaks of the wise’s study of sacrifices, temples and purity, it is more likely to relate to literal priesthood; either that only the wise priests should be recognized as priests or that priests are only appointed

Literature (SHCT 34; Leiden: Brill, 1985), 7–60; M.E. Reesor, *The Nature of Man in Early Stoic Philosophy* (London: Duckworth, 1989); A. A. Long, *Stoic Studies* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996); Susanne Bobzien, *Determinism and Freedom in Stoic Philosophy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998); Brad Inwood, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to the Stoics* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003); Ferguson, *Backgrounds*, 354–69; Brunschwig and Sedley, “Philosophy,” 151–83 at 163–75; Gretchen J. Reydams-Schils, *The Roman Stoics: Self, Responsibility, and Affection* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005); Runar M. Thorsteinsson, *Roman Christianity and Roman Stoicism: A Comparative Study of Ancient Morality* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010); N. T. Wright, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2013), 213–18. On living in accordance with nature, see e.g. I. G. Kidd, “Stoic Intermediaries and the End for Man,” in *Problems in Stoicism* (ed. A. A. Long; London: Athlone Press, 1971), 150–72; Sandbach, *Stoics*, 28–68; Reesor, *Man*, 83–102; Sharples, *Stoics*, 100–113; Long, *Studies*, 134–55, 179–223; Brunschwig and Sedley, “Philosophy,” 151–83 at 172–75; Malcolm Schofield, “Stoic Ethics,” in *The Cambridge Companion to the Stoics* (ed. Brad Inwood; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 233–56 at 239–53. On determinism, see, e.g. A. A. Long, “Freedom and Determinism in the Stoic Theory of Human Action,” (ed. A. A. Long; London: Athlone Press, 1971), 173–99 (arguing for a degree of moral choice within a deterministic framework); Sandbach, *Stoics*, 79–82, 101–08; R. J. Hankinson, “Determinism and Indeterminism,” in *The Cambridge History of Hellenistic Philosophy* (ed. Keimpe Algra et al.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 513–41.

⁴¹ Long, *Philosophy*, 108.

⁴² Sandbach, *Stoics*, 16.

⁴³ DL 7.1.119 (Hicks, LCL).

⁴⁴ DL 7.1.119 (Hicks, LCL).

from among the wise. As with the Stoic writers considered below in greater detail, Zeno equates God with, “Reason, Fate, and Zeus”,⁴⁵ and the world is “a living being, endowed with soul and reason, and having aether for its ruling principle”.⁴⁶ According to Chrysippus, the purer part of this aether is “preeminently God”⁴⁷ and Zeno avers that the world or universe can also be equated with God.⁴⁸ God is the Father of all and known by many names, such as Zeus, Athena, Poseidon and Demeter (so these are different names for God, rather than there being many gods).⁴⁹ Since two of the three temple images in 1–2 Corinthians employ πνεῦμα, it is of interest that for Zeno, the πνεῦμα constituted the world soul, holds the cosmos together and, “accounts for the cohesions of each individual entity.”⁵⁰ For the early Stoics, the individual, “is corporeal pneuma, an aggregate of corporeal qualifications, a single individual quality.”⁵¹ As with his followers, Zeno believed that the end of humanity was to live in accordance with nature,⁵² whose

⁴⁵ DL 7.1.135.

⁴⁶ DL 7.1.139 (Hicks, LCL). On the ruling part of the soul in early Stoicism, see Reesor, *Man*, 137–47.

⁴⁷ DL 7.1.139.

⁴⁸ DL 7.1.137. Sandbach, *Stoics*, 79 writes, “Since the world and its events are entirely determined by God, thought of as a plan, he can be identified with Nature, with Fate, and with Providence.” For more on this topic, see Michael J. White, “Stoic Natural Philosophy (Physics and Cosmology),” in *The Cambridge Companion to the Stoics* (ed. Brad Inwood; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 124–52.

⁴⁹ DL 7.1.147. Keimpe Algra, “Stoic Theology,” in *The Cambridge Companion to the Stoics* (ed. Brad Inwood; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 153–78 at 166, argues that Zeno “makes room for a form of polytheism”, adding “This explains why in Stoicism ‘god’ or ‘the gods’ are in many contexts interchangeable.”

⁵⁰ Reesor, *Man*, 4, citing *SVF*, 2.473. See generally, Reesor, *Man*, 3–4, citing *SVF*, 2.552–53, 634. Algra, “Theology,” 153–78 at 167 speaking of *pneuma*, writes, “even their basically pantheistic conception of a *single* god could take different forms, accordingly as the monistic or the dualistic perspective was predominant.” Dorothea Frede, “Stoic Determinism,” in *The Cambridge Companion to the Stoics* (ed. Brad Inwood; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 179–205 at 185 adds, “The Stoics were pantheists in the sense that for them the entire world is permeated by the divine *pneuma* . . . (but) the divine *pneuma* is not present everywhere in the same form and does not give consciousness and reason to all things.”

⁵¹ Reesor, *Man*, 21. Frede, “Determinism,” 179–205 at 193 writes, “our inner *pneuma* is indeed independent of the external circumstances and constitutes our personality.” Stoic ontology only recognized bodies as “genuinely existent beings” (Jacques Brunschwig, “Stoic Metaphysics,” in *The Cambridge Companion to the Stoics* (ed. Brad Inwood; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 206–32 at 210).

⁵² DL 7.1.54, 87.

goal is virtue and to which all other things (such as strength, wealth, pleasure or wealth or poverty) are indifferent.⁵³

2.3.3 Cicero's evidence

Although Cicero was primarily a Skeptic (see below for biographical information), a number of his works provide early evidence for the views of Stoic thinkers. Since he is the earliest writer I am considering (reflecting the views of Stoicism from the first century B.C.E.), Cicero's reporting of Stoic positions will be presented here, his reporting of other positions in the appropriate sections and his own views under the Skeptics section of this chapter.⁵⁴

2.3.3.1 Sacrifice language

In his work, *De Natura Deorum* (On the Nature of the Gods), Cicero articulates the views of Stoicism through the protagonist Balbus. Balbus repudiates myths about the gods, but recognizes grains of truth in some of the myths in shedding light on, "the personality and the nature of the divinities pervading the substance of the several elements" (referring to the earth and the sea, in his example).⁵⁵ Nevertheless, despite his apparent skepticism about these myths, Balbus considers it a duty to worship gods such as Ceres and Neptune "under the names which custom has bestowed upon them." However, Balbus continues, "But the best and also the purest, holiest and most pious (castissimus atque sanctissimus plenissimusque pietatis) way of

⁵³ DL 7.1.88, 89, 93–117; for more on virtue in Stoic thought, see Idem, *Philosophy*, 189–209; Kidd, "Intermediaries," 150–72. On pleasure in Stoic thought, see Rist, *Philosophy*, 37–53. For the early Stoic school, see Reesor, *Man*; Sedley, "The School," 7–32.

⁵⁴ On Cicero in relation to Stoicism, see Colish, *Tradition*, 61–79, 104–58 and J. G. F. Powell, "Introduction: Cicero's Philosophical Works and their Background," in *Cicero the Philosopher: Twelve Papers* (ed. J. G. F. Powell; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), 1–35 at 23–26. For a synopsis of each of Cicero's philosophical works and their sources, see Paul MacKendrick, *The Philosophical Books of Cicero* (New York: St Martin's Press, 1989).

⁵⁵ Cicero, *Nat. d.* 2.28.71 (Rackham, LCL).

worshipping the gods is ever to venerate them with purity, sincerity and innocence both of thought and of speech.”⁵⁶ The true way of worship is internal (thought), expressed in the external: speech, without mentioning sacrifices. Balbus distinguishes between religion and superstition (following others philosophers) and seems to identify superstition with sacrifices, while clearly siding with religion.⁵⁷

2.3.3.2 *The Nature of Divinity*

Cicero cites Chrysippus (the third head of the Stoic school in the third century B.C.E, so one of our earlier sources for Stoicism)⁵⁸ as believing that, “divine power resides in reason, and in the soul and mind of the universe; he calls the world itself a god, and also the all-pervading world-soul, and again the guiding principle of that soul, which operates in the intellect and reason, and the common and all-embracing nature of things”.⁵⁹ As we shall see, these beliefs are echoed in later Stoic works; the idea of the world soul, the divine soul which permeates intellect and reason and the identification of the world with divinity, such that all things are connected.⁶⁰ For Chrysippus, god is an inference from the superiority of humanity to all other created things, and thus to a creative mind which is superior to it.⁶¹ In the Stoic theology that Balbus expounds, Nature governs and sustains the world⁶² and the gods, who exist in community,⁶³ govern all

⁵⁶ *Nat. d.* 2.28.71 (Rackham, LCL).

⁵⁷ *Nat. d.* 2.28.72.

⁵⁸ See *OCD*, 316.

⁵⁹ *Nat. d.* 1.15.39 (Rackham, LCL). Sandbach, *Stoics*, 73 says of Stoic theology in relation to this passage, “The mistake lies in supposing that the word ‘God’ always denotes the same thing . . . Stoics could call the whole world ‘God’ . . . no less than the immanent force that gave it all its character.”

⁶⁰ See also *Nat. d.* 2.11.30; 2.14.37–2.15.39.

⁶¹ *Nat. d.* 2.6.16.

⁶² *Nat. d.* 2.32.78.

⁶³ *Nat. d.* 2.31.78.

things by divine providence,⁶⁴ exercising great care towards all.⁶⁵ We also learn from Cicero that Stoicism understands God to be the one who cares for the safety of all humanity, as indicated by the titles given to him, “Most Good and Most Great, of Saviour, Lord of Guests, Rallier of Battles”.⁶⁶

2.3.3.3 *Living out the Philosophy*

In the third book of *De Finibus Bonorum et Malorum*, Cicero presents the Stoic view that Virtue or Moral Worth is the only thing of value, to which all else is the means. Other things are indifferent, goodness is absolute and allows of no degrees, and the moral life is thus the only happy life.⁶⁷ M. R. Wright details the way that Cicero develops Stoic ethics in *De Finibus* in terms of life stages, with a movement from self-love to a love that potentially reaches out to all of humanity.⁶⁸

2.3.4 *Arius Didymus*

Little is known of the life of Arius Didymus, but he is presumed to be the author of a work providing a short epitome of Stoic Ethics, and to have lived in the latter half of the first century C.E.⁶⁹ Because his writing is so brief, I will summarize the main points of interest without employing our usual categories. Arius concurs with later Stoic writers that only the wise

⁶⁴ *Nat. d.* 2.29.73–2.30.77.

⁶⁵ *Nat. d.* 2.65.164–2.66.166.

⁶⁶ *Fin.* 3.20.66 (Rackham, LCL); see also Michael Frede, “On the Stoic Conception of the Good,” in *Topics in Stoic Philosophy* (ed. Katerina Ierodiakonou; New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 71–94 at 70–74.

⁶⁷ *Fin.* 3.1.2; 3.3.10–11; 3.6.21; 3.7.25–26; 3.8.28; 3.10.34; 3.14.45–48; 3.15.48–50. For more on Cicero’s understanding of this topic see Rist, *Philosophy*, 97–102 and generally, Frede, *Conception*, 71–94.

⁶⁸ M. R. Wright, “Cicero on Self-Love and Love of Humanity in *De Finibus* 3.” in *Cicero the Philosopher: Twelve Papers* (ed. J. G. F. Powell; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), 171–95.

⁶⁹ Arthur J. Pomeroy, ed., *Arius Didymus: Epitome of Stoic Ethics* (SBLTT 44; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1999), 1–3; *OCD*, 164. For a more substantial treatment, see Long, *Studies*, 107–33.

man can be a prophet or a priest.⁷⁰ In addition to the priest's knowledge of ritual and his experience in the service of the gods, he must also "be inside the divine nature".⁷¹ This tantalizing statement is not expanded upon. Certainly Arius contrasts the piety of the worthwhile man with the impiety and impurity of the worthless throughout his work.⁷² Only the worthwhile man can prophesy and perform service for the gods.⁷³

2.3.5 Seneca

Lucius Annaeus Seneca (Seneca the Younger) was born somewhere between 4 B.C.E. and 1 C.E. and died in 65 C.E. He was well known in his day as an orator, and had a significant involvement in public life, acting initially as tutor and later as political adviser and minister to the emperor Nero.⁷⁴ Seneca produced a very large body of work, but in my survey I shall confine myself to the study of those works that deal specifically with philosophy, that includes his letters. Seneca identifies himself as a Stoic in his writings,⁷⁵ and considers the Stoic school to be superior to any other.⁷⁶

⁷⁰ Pomeroy, ed., *Arius*, 5b12, 28–29 (25); 5b12, 4–5 (26).

⁷¹ Pomeroy, ed., *Arius*, 5b12, 10–11 (26).

⁷² Pomeroy, ed., *Arius*, 5b, 5–21 (26); 11k, 4–14, 18–20, 26–29 (84).

⁷³ Pomeroy, ed., *Arius*, 11s, 16–19 (98).

⁷⁴ *OCD*, 92–95; Sandbach, *Stoics*, 149–62. For a recent biography of Seneca, see Paul Veyne, *Seneca: The Life of a Stoic* (trans. David Sullivan; New York: Routledge, 2003); the main section of the book (31–155) relates Seneca's life to his Stoicism.

⁷⁵ E.g. Seneca, *Ben.* 4.2.1; *Nat.* 3.9.1; 3.13.1; 3.22.1; and cf. his references to "our Stoics" (*Nat.* 7.19.1; 7.20.1; 7.21.1); though sometimes disagreeing with them (*Nat.* 7.22.1). Scholars divide the history of Stoicism into Early Stoicism (Zeno–Antipater), Middle Stoicism (Panaetius and Posidonius) and Late Stoicism, and it is the latter on whose writings we almost entirely depend (as represented by Seneca, Epictetus and others); see Long, *Philosophy*, 115 and especially Christopher Gill, "The School in the Roman Imperial Period," in *The Cambridge Companion to the Stoics* (ed. Brad Inwood; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 32–58.

⁷⁶ *Clem.* 2.4.2–3. For further studies, see e.g. Thorsteinsson, *Stoicism*, 22–27; A. A. Long, "Roman Philosophy," in *The Cambridge Companion to Greek and Roman Philosophy* (ed. David Sedley; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 184–210 at 203–06; Wright, *Faithfulness*, 219–22.

2.3.5.1 *Sacrifice language*

Seneca stresses the intent of the worshipper in offering sacrifice; the object itself is considered indifferent, “It is the intention that exalts small gifts, gives lustre to those that are mean, and discredits those that are great and considered of value; the things themselves that men desire have a neutral nature, which is neither good nor evil”.⁷⁷ This intent is concerned with the piety of the worshipper over the quality of the sacrifice itself in material terms, “the honour that is paid to the gods lies, not in the victims for sacrifice, though they be fat and glitter with gold, but in the upright and holy desire of the worshippers (*recta ac pia voluntate venerantium*). Good men, therefore, are pleasing to the gods with an offering of meal and gruel; the bad, on the other hand, do not escape impiety although they dye the altars with streams of blood.”⁷⁸ Seneca internalizes this imagery still further when speaking of worshipping a vision of virtue in a good man’s soul. In this discussion, it would appear that material objects of worship are not involved at all; rather, the sacrifice consists of a pure will, “this worship does not consist in slaughtering fattened bulls, or in hanging up offerings of gold or silver, or in pouring coins into a temple treasury; rather does it consist in a will that is reverent and upright.” (*pia et recta voluntate*)⁷⁹ In Seneca’s ninety fifth epistle, although the imagery of sacrifice is not used, true and sufficient worship is described as imitating the gods (rather than by sacrifice).⁸⁰ This worship is explicated as knowing and believing in the gods.⁸¹

⁷⁷ *Ben.* 1.6.2 (Basore, LCL).

⁷⁸ *Ben.* 1.6.3 (Basore, LCL).

⁷⁹ *Ep.* 115.5 (Gummere, LCL).

⁸⁰ *Ep.* 95.50.

⁸¹ *Ep.* 95.47–48.

2.3.5.2 Priest language

There is scant reference to priestly imagery in Seneca. The clearest is the brief allusion to “Zeno, Pythagoras, Democritus, and all the other high priests of liberal studies”,⁸² which is not directly relevant to our topic.

2.3.5.3 Temple Language

Seneca explicitly uses temple imagery on two occasions. In his work *De Beneficiis*, Seneca distinguishes between the whole of creation, which belongs to the gods, and the things of religion which have been expressly consecrated to the gods. Thus, “the whole world (mundus) is the temple of the gods” but sacrilege is committed expressly, “in the nook to which has been assigned the name of a sanctuary”⁸³ (*fani* from *fanum*), that is, an earthy temple or sanctuary. Similarly, Seneca speaks of “the vast temple of all the gods—the universe (mundus) itself”⁸⁴. However, though the *word* for temple may be used rarely in metaphorical sense, the *concept* of the indwelling God or gods appears frequently (cf. 1 Cor 3:16; 2 Cor 6:16). Firstly, Seneca speaks often of God pervading all things, to the extent that it is difficult to distinguish between God and the universe, “What is god? The mind of the universe. What is god? All that you see, all that you do not see. In short, only if he alone is all things, if he maintains his own work both from within and without, is he given due credit for his magnitude”.⁸⁵ God is also described as

⁸² *Brev. vit.* 14.5 (Basore, LCL). Additionally the phrase, “Let us, I beseech you, be silent in the presence of this proposition, and with impartial minds and ears give heed” (*Const.* 9.4) is described by translator John W. Basore as “priestly” language in Latin (Faveamus, obsecro vos, huic proposito aequisque et animis et auribus adsimus), commenting, “That the wise man can suffer no wrong is presented as a sort of divine utterance which is to be received in solemn silence.” (76 note a).

⁸³ *Ben.* 7.7.3 (Basore, LCL).

⁸⁴ *Ep.* 90.29 (Gummere, LCL). The Latin word used is “templum” in both cases. Although Basore translates the first example “world” and Gummere the second example “universe”, it is in fact the same word: mundus.

⁸⁵ *Nat.* Preface.1.13 (Corcoran, LCL).

mind and reason in its most complete form.⁸⁶ In his *De Vita Beata*, Seneca seems to equate God with the universe, referring to him as “the all-embracing world and the ruler of the universe.”⁸⁷ In fact, terms such as God (*deus*), Nature (*natura*), Reason (*ratio*), Fate (*fatum*), Fortune (*fortuna*), Providence (*providentia*) and the Universe (*mundus*) can be used interchangeably in Seneca’s writings. In one place Seneca asks, “For what else is Nature but God and the Divine Reason that pervades the whole universe and all its parts?”⁸⁸ and in addition, “If likewise you should call him Fate, it would be no falsehood”⁸⁹ This is because of the pantheistic nature of Stoic doctrine, “In whatever direction you turn . . . there is no Nature without God, nor God without Nature, but both are the same thing, they differ only in their function”⁹⁰ and, “So, if you like, speak of Nature, Fate, Fortune, but all these are names of the same God”⁹¹ Earlier in the same work, Seneca speaks of complaints against nature and the gods and contrasts them with the gifts of nature and the gods which merit gratitude. In these lines, ‘nature’ and ‘the gods’ are spoken of in parallel as if they are synonyms.⁹² In the same manner, in *Naturales Quaestiones*, Seneca says of the supreme God, Jupiter, “Any name for him is suitable. You wish to call him Fate? You will not be wrong. It is he on whom all things depend, the cause of causes. You wish

⁸⁶ *Nat.* Preface.1.14. Algra, “Theology,” 153–78 at 167 avers that rather than being a Platonizing intrusion, this belongs to a strand “that had been present in orthodox Stoicism all along.”

⁸⁷ *Vit. beat.* 8.4 (Basore, LCL).

⁸⁸ *Ben.* 4.7.1 (Basore, LCL). Aetius, the first-second century B.C.E. philosopher speaks of the Stoic view of God as “a designing fire”, “a breath pervading the whole world”, see Aetius 1.7.33 (*SVF* 2.1027, part), translation from A. A. Long and D. N. Sedley, *The Hellenistic Philosophers. Volume 1: Translations of the Principal Sources, with Philosophical Commentary* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 46A, 276. Alexander of Aphrodisias, a philosopher from c. 200 C.E. refers to the Stoic view of God, “They say that god is mixed with matter, pervading all of it and so shaping it, structuring it, and making it into the world” (Alexander, *On mixture* 225, 1–2 (*SVF* 2.3.10, part), translation from Idem, *Philosophers Vol 1*, 45H, 273. Similarly, Sextus Empiricus, a third century C.E. writer also discusses the Stoic view of God, “it is probable that this is nothing else than some power which pervades it, even as our soul pervades ourselves” (*Phys.* 1.75 (Bury, LCL).)

⁸⁹ *Ben.* 4.7.2 (Basore, LCL).

⁹⁰ *Ben.* 4.8.2 (Basore, LCL).

⁹¹ *Ben.* 4.8.3 (Basore, LCL). Long, *Philosophy*, 168 speaks of “Uncreated and imperishable Nature, God, *pneuma* or universal *logos* . . .” See also Michael Lapidge, “Stoic Cosmology and Roman Literature, First to Third Centuries A. D.,” *ANRW* 36.3:1379–1429 at 1399–1400 on the *spiritus* that permeates and penetrates all things in e.g. Seneca, *Nat.* 2.6.5; 6.16.1; 3.29.2; *Helv.* 8.3.

⁹² *Ben.* 2.29.1–6; cf. also *Marc.* 17.6–7; *Nat.* 5.18.5, 13–15 for a similar phenomenon.

to call him Providence? You will still be right.”⁹³ and further, “ You wish to call him Nature? You will not be mistaken. It is he from whom all things are naturally born, and we have life from his breath. You wish to call him the Universe? You will not be wrong. He himself is all that you see, infused throughout all his parts, sustaining both himself and his own.”⁹⁴

Specifically, Seneca speaks of God or a divine spirit dwelling in a person. In one key epistle, Seneca explicitly contrasts the proximity and intimacy available with God by his indwelling holy spirit with his accessibility in an idol’s temple. By claiming that “We do not need . . . to beg the keeper of a temple to let us approach his idol’s ear, as if in this way our prayers were more likely to be heard”,⁹⁵ Seneca, though not speaking of indwelling using the vocabulary of a temple, indicates that God’s presence in a person is equal or even superior to what might be available in a temple, “God is near you, he is with you, he is within you . . . a holy spirit indwells within us (*sacer intra nos spiritus sedet*) . . . in each good man “A god doth dwell, but what god know we not”” (*Quis deus incertum est, habitat deus*).⁹⁶ In another epistle, Seneca speaks of an upright soul as “a god dwelling as a guest in a human body.”⁹⁷ In a further epistle, Seneca writes of reason in much the same way as he has done of God and the soul, “Reason, however, is nothing else than a portion of the divine spirit (*pars divini spiritus*) set in a human body.”⁹⁸ Elsewhere he writes, “God comes to men; nay, he comes nearer,—he comes into men. No mind that has not God, is good . . . Divine seeds are scattered throughout our mortal bodies” but it is up to the individual to choose whether to receive and tend the seed, for it is possible to

⁹³ *Nat.* 2.45.1–2 (Corcoran, LCL).

⁹⁴ *Nat.* 2.45.2–3 (Corcoran, LCL); and see *Ben.* 6.23.5 for Nature spoken of as creator, and “Fortune” spoken of in the same terms used earlier for “God” in *Prov.* 4.5–12.

⁹⁵ *Ep.* 41.1 (Gummere, LCL).

⁹⁶ *Ep.* 41.2 (Gummere, LCL). The final quotation is taken from Virgil, *Aen.* 8.352.

⁹⁷ *Ep.* 31.2 (Gummere, LCL).

⁹⁸ *Ep.* 66.12 (Gummere, LCL).

kill off the seed, causing tares to grow where there might have been wheat.⁹⁹ While Seneca says that the Stoics appropriated from their ancestors the idea of a Genius in every person,¹⁰⁰ he personally stresses the presence of God in the upright man. Into the perfect soul a part of God is poured out,¹⁰¹ for a wise man's soul ought to be the proper dwelling place for a God¹⁰² and this being so, he asks, "why should you not believe that something of divinity exists in one who is a part of God? All this universe which encompasses us is one, and it is God; we are associates of God; we are his members."¹⁰³ God can come even into the "very midst" of a person's thoughts.¹⁰⁴ Thus it is possible for the mind to commune with the gods,¹⁰⁵ since the mind is "kindred to the gods"¹⁰⁶ and can enjoy "the noblest spectacle of things divine".¹⁰⁷ To take pleasure in the virtues is to take pleasure in the mind of God himself.¹⁰⁸

2.3.5.4 *The Nature of Divinity*

Because of Seneca's pantheism, at times he seems almost agnostic about the character of God, when he refers to, "the great creator of the universe, *whoever he may be* (quisquis formator universi fuit), whether an all-powerful God, or incorporeal Reason contriving vast works, or divine Spirit pervading all things from the smallest to the greatest with uniform energy, or Fate

⁹⁹ *Ep.* 73.16 (Gummere, LCL); cf. Matt 13:24–30. This theme also appears in *Ben.* 4.6.6, where Seneca speaks of the "seeds" of every provision of God: "In us are implanted the seeds of all ages".

¹⁰⁰ *Ep.* 110.2.

¹⁰¹ *Ep.* 120.14.

¹⁰² *Ep.* 92.3.

¹⁰³ *Ep.* 92.30 (Gummere, LCL).

¹⁰⁴ *Ep.* 83.1 (Gummere, LCL); and a similar phenomenon can occur when theophanies are received in nature, cf. 41.2–4.

¹⁰⁵ *Ben.* 6.23.6.

¹⁰⁶ *Helv.* 11.7 (Basore, LCL); cf. also *Ep.* 124. 23.

¹⁰⁷ *Helv.* 20.2 (Basore, LCL). On Stoic psychology, see A. A. Long, "Stoic Psychology," in *The Cambridge History of Hellenistic Philosophy* (ed. Keimpe Algra et al.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 560–84.

¹⁰⁸ *Ben.* 4.8.3.

and an unalterable sequence of causes clinging one to the other . . .”¹⁰⁹ However, Seneca may be conceding various possibilities to avoid alienating his audience, since the exact nature of God is not germane to his argument. Certainly, Seneca emphasizes that the ways of God are mysterious, “they both fill and elude our vision. Either their subtlety is greater than the human eye-sight is able to follow or such a great majesty conceals itself in too holy a seclusion” and consequently, “the greatest part of the universe, god, remains hidden”.¹¹⁰ In other places, however, Seneca alludes to the character of the gods.¹¹¹ In *De Ira*, Seneca describes the gods as “by nature mild and gentle, as incapable of injuring others as of injuring themselves.”¹¹² In *De Clementia*, he speaks of their kindness by which all, both good and evil, without consideration of their relative merits, are brought forth into the light (presumably a reference to their creation, since it includes those who are evil).¹¹³ Later in the same work, Seneca’s guidelines for the model prince assumes that the gods are merciful and forgiving,¹¹⁴ and in the next paragraph describes them as “merciful and just”.¹¹⁵ In the same vein, the gods send providential blessings like sun, rain, wind and nutrients for the soil upon both the grateful and ungrateful, without thought for the gods’ own self-interest.¹¹⁶ Nevertheless, as we shall see below, a special relationship exists between the gods and the upright, for the gods “are ever best to those who are best.”¹¹⁷ Seneca’s sixty fifth epistle cites Plato with approval in affirming God’s goodness¹¹⁸ and adds that while all things are

¹⁰⁹ *Helv.* 8.3 (Basore, LCL).

¹¹⁰ *Nat.* 7.30.4 (Corcoran, LCL).

¹¹¹ For the purposes of our study, our attention will not be focussed on the imperial cult, but Seneca refers to the divinity of Caesar in e.g. *Clem.* 1.1.2–6; 1.5.1, 7; 1.14.2; *Polyb.* 12.3, 5; 13.1, 3; 14.1–2; 15.3–4; *Marc.* 14.1–2; *Tranq.* 14.9; *Brev. vit.* 4.2, 5.

¹¹² *Ira.* 2.27.1 (Basore, LCL).

¹¹³ *Clem.* 1.5.7.

¹¹⁴ *Clem.* 1.7.1.

¹¹⁵ *Clem.* 1.7.2 (Basore, LCL).

¹¹⁶ *Ben.* 4.25.1; 4.26.1–3; 4.28.1, 3; cf. Matt 5:45.

¹¹⁷ *Prov.* 1.5 (Basore, LCL).

¹¹⁸ *Ep.* 65.10. For the integration of Platonism with middle Stoicism, see Sedley, “The School,” 7–32 at 20–

made up of matter and of God, God is more powerful than matter and controls it.¹¹⁹ Yet, despite this being so, the supreme God submits himself to the same Fate which binds people and gods, “although the great creator and ruler of the universe himself wrote the decrees of Fate, yet he follows them.”¹²⁰

2.3.5.5 *The Nature of Humanity*

Unlike the apostle Paul, Seneca does not consider humanity to be inherently sinful by nature but holds rather “that his natural bent is good”,¹²¹ while recognizing, like Paul, “We have all sinned.”¹²² Seneca infers the existence of God since, like Paul, he recognizes that a conception of God has been granted to each individual, “there is implanted in everyone an idea concerning deity.”¹²³ Moreover, the human mind itself has the divine not merely as its source, but also as its essence, since it “has been formed from the self-same elements as these divine beings.”¹²⁴ Like Stoic teaching in general, Seneca has much to say about the soul.¹²⁵ The soul is the “peculiar property” of people, where reason is brought to perfection, and this distinguishes them from other creatures.¹²⁶ The soul is pre-existent,¹²⁷ is preserved by God,¹²⁸ and so there are

¹¹⁹ *Ep.* 65.23. See further, Sandbach, *Stoics*, 73–75.

¹²⁰ *Prov.* 5.9. (Basore, LCL); cf. *Nat.* 3. Preface.12 (Corcoran, LCL), which asserts that, “all things happen in accordance with a decree of god”. For more on the Stoic conception of divinity, see Algra, “Theology,” 153–78. For Stoic understandings of Providence, see Frede, “Determinism,” 179–205.

¹²¹ *Ira.* 2.15.3 (Basore, LCL) cf. Rom 3:9; 5:12–21; 6:6, 17, 20; 8:2; Gal 3:22.

¹²² *Clem.* 1.6.3 (Basore, LCL); cf. Rom 3:23.

¹²³ *Ep.* 117.6 (Gummere, LCL); cf. Rom 1:19–20.

¹²⁴ *Helv.* 6.8 (Basore, LCL).

¹²⁵ See e.g. Long, *Philosophy*, 170–78; cf. Sandbach, *Stoics*, 82–85, on Stoic teaching on the soul.

¹²⁶ *Ep.* 41.8 (Gummere, LCL).

¹²⁷ *Ep.* 44.5 (Gummere, LCL).

¹²⁸ *Ep.* 57.7–9; 58.27–28 (Gummere, LCL).

no limits set upon it, “except those which can be shared even by the gods.”¹²⁹ This same soul comes from above to grant a person a “nearer knowledge of divinity”.¹³⁰

2.3.5.6 *Living out the Philosophy*

In common with other Stoic writers, Seneca urges those who recognize the truth of his doctrine to make it their goal to, “to live according to Nature, and to follow the example of the gods”.¹³¹ Yet, unlike the gods, who, as we have seen, shower their blessings on both the just and the unjust, the Stoic cannot do good to a bad man.¹³² Those who direct their thoughts “on high” are able to commune with the gods,¹³³ and can be delivered from fear of people, God and death, so as to dedicate themselves to virtue.¹³⁴ This is the freedom from (mental disturbance)¹³⁵ which is extolled by so many Stoic writers.¹³⁶ The good person’s response to the gods should be “goodwill” (in gratitude)¹³⁷ and virtue, which brings about friendship with the gods.¹³⁸ The person of virtue is to be an imitator of God.¹³⁹ This virtue is sufficient for happiness regardless of circumstances, and promises “mighty privileges and equal to the divine”, to the end that “you may body forth God” (*deum effingas*).¹⁴⁰ God sends trials and adversities as a way of training the good person in virtue, commenting in a manner strikingly reminiscent of NT teaching, “God

¹²⁹ *Ep.* 102.21 (Gummere, LCL).

¹³⁰ *Ep.* 41.5 (Gummere, LCL).

¹³¹ *Ben.* 4.25.1 (Basore, LCL); cf. *De otio.* 5.8; *Vit. beat.* 3.3; 8.1.

¹³² *Ben.* 5.12.3.

¹³³ *Ben.* 6.23.6; cf. *Col* 3:1–2 .

¹³⁴ *Ben.* 7.1.7; 7.2.4; cf. also *Ep.* 74.17–18 on freedom from fear of death and gods.

¹³⁵ *Ben.* 7.2.3; cf. *Ira.* 3.6.1; and Seneca’s entire treatise, *De tranquillitate animi*.

¹³⁶ See e.g. *Idem*, *Philosophy*, 206–07.

¹³⁷ *Ben.* 7.15.4.

¹³⁸ *Prov.* 1.5; cf. *Ep.* 31.9.

¹³⁹ *Vit. beat.* 15.6; *Ep.* 95.50. Virtue needs a guide or director according to *Nat.* 3.30.8.

¹⁴⁰ *Vit. beat.* 16.1–2; since all that is not directly related to virtue is neither good nor evil in itself, cf. *Prov.* 5.1. On the Stoic notion that “All sins are equal” see the chapter with that title in Rist, *Philosophy*, 81–96.

hardens, reviews, and disciplines those whom he approves, whom he loves.”¹⁴¹ Therefore, the good person is simply to offer themselves willingly, not begrudgingly, to whatever occurs,¹⁴² and in this way to despise pleasure and overcoming all obstacles, ascend to the highest peak.¹⁴³ They do so by means of reason.¹⁴⁴ Yet while fate is unchangeable,¹⁴⁵ in a mysterious way some of fate’s actions can come about in response to prayer and sacrifice.¹⁴⁶ The person who grasps these truths and lives them out is the Stoic “wise man” who bears a striking resemblance to the gods in almost every respect, “the wise man is next-door neighbour to the gods and like a god in all save his mortality.”¹⁴⁷ The soul who holds its ties to earth and the body loosely enjoys a blessed release and a speedy journey to the gods,¹⁴⁸ finally rewarded by a washing away of all impurity and a serene apprehension of the divine, “There eternal peace awaits it when it has passed from earth’s dull motley to the vision of all that is pure and bright.”¹⁴⁹ This heavenly journey to its source can be attained when the soul casts off sin and, “in purity and lightness, has leaped up into celestial realms of thought.”¹⁵⁰ Therefore, to attain that state the righteous person must be aware

¹⁴¹ *Prov.* 4.7 (cf. *Heb.* 12:5–6) and cf. also *Prov.* 1.5–7; 2.1–9; 3.1, 3.

¹⁴² *Prov.* 5.8; cf. *Ep.* 107.12.

¹⁴³ *Const.* 1.1; 2.1

¹⁴⁴ *Ep.* 74.20.

¹⁴⁵ *Nat.* 2.36.1.

¹⁴⁶ *Nat.* 2.37.2; though Seneca notes the futility of prayer to change the length of a person’s life in *Marc.* 21.5–6.

¹⁴⁷ *Const.* 1.1; 7.2; similar sentiments are expressed in *Ep.* 124.14; cf. *Clem.* 1.19.9 who describes the benevolent ruler (the emperor) as “second only to the gods” and *Tranq.* 2.3; *Ep.* 87.19.

¹⁴⁸ *Marc.* 23.1–2; cf. *Polyb.* 9.3, 8; *Helv.* 11.6. See *Ep.* 41.5 for the soul who, though associating with the body, “cleaves to its origin”.

¹⁴⁹ *Marc.* 24.5; cf. *Helv.* 20.2. The alternate visions, presented in *Ep.* 71.16, of the soul dwelling with deity or being mingled with nature after death, either expresses an agnosticism concerning its fate or the latter pertains to the soul of an unrighteous person.

¹⁵⁰ *Ep.* 79.12.

of God's judgment of his works,¹⁵¹ and judge themselves on their own progress in virtue.¹⁵² The wise person, thus, should pray and live openly before God, seeking to hide nothing.¹⁵³

2.3.6 *Dio Chrysostom*

Dio Chrysostom (c. 40/50–110/120 C.E.) enjoyed a varied career as an orator, public intellectual and writer.¹⁵⁴ His reference to the Stoics as “our sect” firmly identifies him as one of their own.¹⁵⁵

2.3.6.1 *Sacrifice language*

Dio Chrysostom has several references to the supremacy of purity over the physical act of sacrifice. As we read through the Discourses, we can see a steadily increasing emphasis on the right spirit of the offerer and a correspondingly decreasing emphasis on literal sacrifices. In his third Discourse on kingship, Dio, speaks of the model king's conception of the gods, who believes that, “the gods also do not delight in the offerings or sacrifices of the unjust, but accept the gifts made by the good alone.”¹⁵⁶ As in Seneca and Epictetus, the one presenting their offering must be righteous in the sight of gods for their offering to be acceptable. However, Dio goes further still to argue that an increase in piety will necessitate a decrease in physical sacrifices, perhaps implying that the reverence of the worshiper will be received as a kind of

¹⁵¹ *Ep.* 41.2

¹⁵² *Ep.* 26.4–7.

¹⁵³ *Ep.* 10.4–5. For more on the ethics of Seneca, see Thorsteinsson, *Stoicism*, 22–39. For Stoic ethics generally, see Brad Inwood and Pierluigi Donini, “Stoic Ethics,” in *The Cambridge History of Hellenistic Philosophy* (ed. Keimpe Algra et al.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 675–738; and Schofield, “Ethics,” 233–56.

¹⁵⁴ *OCD*, 452; C. P. Jones, *The Roman World of Dio Chrysostom* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1978).

¹⁵⁵ Dio Chrysostom, *Borysth.* 29 (Cohon, Lamar Crosby, LCL).

¹⁵⁶ *3 Regn.* 52 (Cohon, LCL).

spiritual sacrifice that will take the place of the sacrifices themselves, “the more god-fearing (from εὐσεβής) and pious (from ὅσιος) you become, the less frankincense and fragrant offerings and garlands there will be among you, and you will offer fewer sacrifices.”¹⁵⁷ A Discourse that is later still, raises the possibility not only of lesser sacrifices being acceptable in the case of a righteous person, but of sacrifices being done away with altogether, “And as for the gods, you know, I presume, that whether a person makes a libation to them or merely offers incense or approaches them, so long as his spirit is right, he has done his full duty; for perhaps God requires no such thing as images or sacrifices at all.”¹⁵⁸ Finally, in his thirty-third Discourse, Dio reiterates the qualities that make men pleasing to the gods, and these do not include offerings, “it is not river or plain or harbour that makes a city prosperous, nor . . . treasures of the gods—objects to which deity pays no heed . . . instead it is sobriety and common sense (σωφροσύνη καὶ νοῦς) that save. These make blessed those who employ them; these make men dear to the gods, not frankincense or myrrh, God knows”.¹⁵⁹

2.3.6.2 Priest Language

There were no spiritual priest references found in Dio, other than an exhortation not to shy away from imitating even “priests of purification” (though the usual word for priest, ἱερεύς, is not used) in the hope of winning souls from wickedness and leading them to virtue.¹⁶⁰

¹⁵⁷ *Exil.* 35 (Cohoon, LCL).

¹⁵⁸ *Rhod.* 15 (Cohoon, Lamar Crosby, LCL).

¹⁵⁹ *I Tars.* 28 (Cohoon, Lamar Crosby, LCL). There is also an imaginary discourse between Alexander the Great and Diogenes, who tells the king to propitiate his δαίμων. Alexander wrongly imagines he must do so through sacrifices and purifications (*4 Regn.* 76.)

¹⁶⁰ *4 Regn.* 89 (Cohoon, LCL). This is Cohoon's translation of τὰ καθάρσια, and is an ironic statement considering, according to Cohoon, (LCL, 209 note 2) “The kathartai were regarded as charlatans, as we see from Hippocrates and Plutarch.”

2.3.6.3 Temple Language

There are no references in Dio that explicitly make use of temple imagery. However, in his Fourth Discourse, Dio alludes to the later Stoic understanding of δαίμων that dwells in the soul of each person.¹⁶¹ In this case, the “genius” or “guardian spirit” will be received when the person has sufficiently matured in their understanding and their relationship with reason, “But come, let us attain a pure harmony . . . and extol the good and wise guardian spirit (δαίμονα) or god—us who the kindly Fates decreed should receive Him when we should have gained a sound education and reason.”¹⁶² Elsewhere, Dio alludes to the belief that this guiding spirit is divine and expresses his opinion that there is no such thing as a bad δαίμων.¹⁶³ Dio also articulates the belief that the universe is the dwelling place of God, or “home of Zeus”, but using the metaphor of household and home, rather than temple.¹⁶⁴

2.3.6.4 The Nature of Divinity

Dio speaks frequently of God as Zeus. He describes him using a variety of titles to indicate his nature such as “Father”, “King”, “Protector”, “God of Refuge” and “God of Hospitality”, “these and his countless other titles signifying goodness and the fount of goodness.”¹⁶⁵ He is supremely just and good,¹⁶⁶ peaceful, gentle,¹⁶⁷ beneficent to all and the “common protector and father of men and gods.”¹⁶⁸ Dio asserts God’s governance of the

¹⁶¹ See Rist, *Philosophy*, 261–71 on the development of this theology in later Stoic thought. For a comparison of Stoic and Epicurean theology, see Jaap Mansfeld, “Theology,” in *The Cambridge History of Hellenistic Philosophy* (ed. Keimpe Algra et al.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 452–78 at 452–75.

¹⁶² *4 Regn.* 139 (Cohoon, LCL).

¹⁶³ *Fel. sap.* 10.

¹⁶⁴ *Borysth.* 36.

¹⁶⁵ *1 Regn.* 39 (Cohoon, LCL); cf. also *Dei cogn.* 22, 74, 75; *Borysth.* 32.

¹⁶⁶ *1 Regn.* 16.

¹⁶⁷ *Dei cogn.* 74.

¹⁶⁸ *2 Regn.* 26 (Cohoon, LCL); cf. *Hom.* 12.

world,¹⁶⁹ and his “watchful care” over humanity, revealing the future, disclosing wisdom to them for their benefit and providing for them all that is for their good.¹⁷⁰ There is a happy “partnership of god with god” (speaking of the stars) in the heaven, where the gods exist as friends, free from strife.¹⁷¹ Dio prays to multiple gods¹⁷² though the gods have limitations: it is difficult for them to be in many places at once,¹⁷³ and the law has such power that even the gods rely on its help.¹⁷⁴ In fact, it is known as “king of men and gods”.¹⁷⁵

2.3.6.5 *The Nature of Humanity*

Dio describes both the dark and light side of humanity. Humanity is capable of devoting itself to wanton pleasure¹⁷⁶, a love of glory¹⁷⁷ and captive to “difficult and savage emotions”.¹⁷⁸ Those who are depraved flee from the voice of reason¹⁷⁹ that alone could guide them on the right path. The source of evil comes from within, “for it is through man’s folly and love of luxury and ambition, that life comes to be vexatious and full of deceit, wickedness, pain, and countless other ills.”¹⁸⁰ Yet there has been placed within humanity an innate recognition of God¹⁸¹ and a desire to worship and honor him.¹⁸² There exists a kinship between God and humanity and the

¹⁶⁹ *1 Regn.* 42, 56; *3 Regn.* 50.

¹⁷⁰ *Alex.* 12–14; cf. *Nicom.* 18.

¹⁷¹ *Borysth.* 22, 23; cf. *Nicom.* 11.

¹⁷² *Nicaeen* 8; though in another Discourse dealing with Greek myth, the gods spoken of there are described as a “democratic rabble” (*Invid.* 25).

¹⁷³ *2 Regn.* 107.

¹⁷⁴ *De lege* 5.

¹⁷⁵ *De lege* 2.

¹⁷⁶ *4 Regn.* 102.

¹⁷⁷ *4 Regn.* 118; 126.

¹⁷⁸ *4 Regn.* 126 (Cohon, LCL).

¹⁷⁹ *Alex.* 17.

¹⁸⁰ *Alex.* 15 (Cohon, Lamar Crosby, LCL); cf. Matt 15:19; Mk 7:20–23; Rom 1:21, 29–31; Tit 3:3; Jas 3:16.

¹⁸¹ *Dei cogn.* 27.

¹⁸² *Dei cogn.* 60; cf. Rom 1:19–21.

progenitors of humanity have lived in close relationship to God.¹⁸³ Since that intimate fellowship was broken, good people are still loved by the gods¹⁸⁴ but wicked and wanton people hold no pleasure for him.¹⁸⁵

2.3.6.6 *Living out the Philosophy*

Those who seek to be the kind of people who are loved by the gods can be called “sons of Zeus”. Their identity as those of his seed can be discerned by their self-controlled lives.¹⁸⁶ They should seek to imitate the power and goodness of God.¹⁸⁷ The philosopher needs “no ruler other than reason and God”.¹⁸⁸ Reason is “the only sure and indissoluble foundation for fellowship and justice.”¹⁸⁹ The King should model himself and his rule on Zeus,¹⁹⁰ and his prayers should be appropriate (not asking selfishly or for that which is wicked).¹⁹¹ The gods do not leave people alone in their quest but send signs and omens to teach them how to live.¹⁹² Consequently, those who heed and obey are wise, and such a wise person is the only one who can be truly free and happy.¹⁹³

¹⁸³ *Dei cogn.* 28.

¹⁸⁴ *1 Regn.* 16; *3 Regn.* 51, 53; *1 Tars.* 28; *Rhod.* 58; *Virt. (Or. 69)* 4 and in particular, the king tries to make the gods his friends (*3 Regn.* 115).

¹⁸⁵ *1 Regn.* 16; *1 Tars.* 23; *Virt. (Or. 69)* 4.

¹⁸⁶ *4 Regn.* 23.

¹⁸⁷ *3 Regn.* 82.

¹⁸⁸ *Rec. mag.* 3; cf. also *Rec. mag.* 6, 7, 12, 14.

¹⁸⁹ *Borysth.* 31.

¹⁹⁰ *Hom.* 11–12.

¹⁹¹ *2 Regn.* 62–63.

¹⁹² *Nicom.* 18.

¹⁹³ *1 Serv. lib.* 17; *Gen.* 1; *Fel. sap.*

2.3.7 Epictetus

Epictetus (c. 55 – 135/50–120 C.E.) was a former slave who became a pupil of the Stoic philosopher Musonius Rufus. He established his own school in Nicopolis, and although no writings of his own composition survive, his pupil Arrian published his lecture notes as his *Discourses*, which are summarized in a shorter manual or *Enchiridion*. These writings propounded Stoicism and are said to have greatly influenced the emperor Marcus Aurelius.¹⁹⁴

2.3.7.1 Sacrifice language

There are no obvious examples of metaphorical sacrifice imagery in Epictetus, but twice he speaks of the necessity of the offerer approaching sacrifices with the right intent, “with his mind predisposed to the idea that he will be approaching holy rites”¹⁹⁵ and again, “to give of the firstfruits after the manner of our fathers, and to do all this with purity, and not in a slovenly or careless fashion”.¹⁹⁶ For Epictetus, right sacrifice has to involve more than correct performance. A pure motivation and a reverent disposition must govern the action of the worshiper.

2.3.7.2 Priest language

There is a brief reference to the Cynic philosopher as a ὑπηρέτης of Zeus,¹⁹⁷ a word that can be used as an assistant to a priest.¹⁹⁸ This seems the closest I could find to a spiritual priest reference in Epictetus.

¹⁹⁴ See e.g. *OCD*, 512–13; Sandbach, *Stoics*, 164–70; Ferguson, *Backgrounds*, 366–69; Thorsteinsson, *Stoicism*, 55–58; Wright, *Faithfulness*, 223–27 and especially A. A. Long, *Epictetus: A Stoic and Socratic Guide to Life* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002); see 7–17 for his setting, 27–96 for more on his philosophy, framework and method and 97–104 on his Stoicism.

¹⁹⁵ Epictetus, *Diatr.* 3.21.14 (Oldfather, LCL).

¹⁹⁶ *Ench.* 31.5 (Oldfather, LCL); emphases we find in a later and much different kind of writer such as Marcus Cornelius Fronto, in his *Epist. Graecae*. 8.3, 7.

¹⁹⁷ Epictetus, *Diatr.* 3.22.82.

2.3.7.3 Temple Language

Epictetus has much to say about the indwelling presence of God. He stresses the unique status of humanity within the created order. All other created things, such as animals or vegetation are born to serve humanity; they are not “portions of Divinity” (μέρη τοῦ θεῶν).¹⁹⁹ This contrasts with the way a person should see themselves, so Epictetus urges his audience, “But you are a being of primary importance; you are a fragment of God [ἀπόσπασμα]; you have within you a part of Him.”²⁰⁰ Epictetus emphasizes this here, “God himself is present within you”²⁰¹ and elsewhere, “you are not alone; nay, God is within, and your own genius (δαίμων) is within.”²⁰² This a point of which his audience obviously needs reminding, “Have you not God there, where you are?”²⁰³, since Epictetus seems to assume that God is present within all, speaking as an example of “this fellow” who is ignorant of his presence within him.²⁰⁴ So great is this ignorance for some, that Epictetus uses quite stark and striking imagery to drive home the point, “Whenever you mix in society, whenever you take physical exercise, whenever you converse, do you not know that you are nourishing God, exercising God? You are bearing God about with you, you poor wretch, and know it not?”²⁰⁵ Indeed, they are privileged to be bearing the one who governs the universe within them.²⁰⁶ I shall return to the practical consequences of this doctrine in a later section, but for now we must note that Epictetus goes further to draw out the implications of the deep unity that exists between God and humanity for his Stoic pantheistic

¹⁹⁸ “ὑπερέτης,” BDAG, 1035.

¹⁹⁹ *Diatr.* 2.8.11 (Oldfather, LCL).

²⁰⁰ *Diatr.* 2.8.11 (Oldfather, LCL).

²⁰¹ *Diatr.* 2.8.14 (Oldfather, LCL).

²⁰² *Diatr.* 1.14.14 (Oldfather, LCL); and cf. *Diatr.* 1.14.12 on the place of a “particular genius” in each person. Long, *Epictetus*, 165 comments “Here Epictetus speaks as if the *daimôn* were an alter ego or at least a superego.” This *daimôn*, Long, *Epictetus*, 166–67 speaks of as close to “the ideally rational or normative self” (166).

²⁰³ *Diatr.* 2.8.17 (Oldfather, LCL).

²⁰⁴ *Diatr.* 2.8.15–16.

²⁰⁵ *Diatr.* 2.8.12 (Oldfather, LCL).

²⁰⁶ *Diatr.* 2.16.33.

understanding of this union, “if our souls are so bound up with God and joined together with Him, as being parts and portions of His being, does not God perceive their every motion as being a motion of that which is His own and of one body with Himself?”²⁰⁷ and so, “you possess a faculty which is equal to that of Zeus”.²⁰⁸ Although in one place Epictetus describes the cosmos as if it is identified with God,²⁰⁹ while not uncharacteristic of Stoicism, it is uncharacteristic of Epictetus,²¹⁰ and so it is possible to speak of the distinctive qualities of God and the gods.

2.3.7.4 The Nature of Divinity

Epictetus speaks frequently of Zeus²¹¹ as the supreme God, and he pictures a serene deity who, “communes with himself, and is at peace with himself”.²¹² The true nature of god is found in him and he can be described using abstractions such as, “intelligence, knowledge, right reason”.²¹³ He governs the universe,²¹⁴ provides for all its needs,²¹⁵ and is faithful, beneficent, high-minded and free to act as he chooses.²¹⁶ Even the motives and thoughts of a person cannot be hidden from him,²¹⁷ who looks down from above upon all that takes place and requires that

²⁰⁷ *Diatr.* 1.14.6 (Oldfather, LCL). Alexander of Aphrodisias, a philosopher from c. 200 C.E. says, of Stoic belief, that “the world is a unity which includes all existing things in itself and is governed by a living, rational, intelligent nature” and thus, “They say that the very fate, nature and rationale in accordance with which the all is governed is god.” (Alexander, *On fate* 191,30–192,28 (*SVF* 2.945)); translation from Long and Sedley, *Philosophers Vol 1*, 55N, 337–38.

²⁰⁸ *Diatr.* 1.14.12 (Oldfather, LCL), and like other Stoics, ascribes the same attributes to both God and Nature.

²⁰⁹ *Frag.* 3.

²¹⁰ See 443 note 1, on *Frag.* 3 (LCL), though see also *Diatr.* 1.14.10 and the comment on it in Lapidge, “*Cosmology*,” *ANRW* 36.3.1414–1415.

²¹¹ E.g. *Diatr.* 1.1.10, 24; 1.12.25; 1.19.9, 12; 1.22.15–16; 1.25.3, 5; 2.17.22, 25; 2.23.42; 3.7.36; 3.11.5–6; 3.22.56–59; 3.24.16, 19; 4.1.131; 4.4.34. Long, *Epictetus*, 143 notes that Epictetus speaks more frequently of Zeus than any other proper name other than Socrates.

²¹² *Diatr.* 3.13.7 (Oldfather, LCL).

²¹³ *Diatr.* 2.8.2 (Oldfather, LCL). Although *Frag.* 8 suggests that divine beings can change, this may be a reference to the “heroes” or to other divinities, such as the stars.

²¹⁴ *Diatr.* 2.14.25–26; 2.16.33.

²¹⁵ *Diatr.* 2.14.11; 3.13.7; 3.26.28.

²¹⁶ *Diatr.* 2.14.13.

²¹⁷ *Diatr.* 2.14.11.

his creatures should live to please him rather than people.²¹⁸ This same one guides their thoughts and gives them promptings and directions.²¹⁹ When speaking in general of the gods, Epictetus describes them as “pure (καθαρός) and undefiled (ἀκήρατος)”.²²⁰

2.3.7.5 *The Nature of Humanity*

God is described as the father of men as well as gods,²²¹ thus humanity are his children and there is a close kinship between humanity and gods.²²² One dominating theme of Epictetus’ writings is that the gods have given to us our reasoning faculty,²²³ which is a part of God’s own being²²⁴ and with it the power to make “correct use of external impressions”.²²⁵ We cannot necessarily change situations in which we find ourselves but we have been given the power of

²¹⁸ *Diatr.* 1.30.1; cf. Rom 2:29; Col 3:22–23; Gal 1:10; 1 Thess 2:4; Eph 6:5–6.

²¹⁹ *Diatr.* 1.25.5–6, 13. See Long, *Epictetus*, 144–47 for more on the nature of God. Long considers how the Stoics held together both a pantheistic and yet theistic or “personalist” conception of God, and contends that Epictetus tends to emphasize theism over pantheism (147–48).

²²⁰ *Diatr.* 4.11.3 (Oldfather, LCL). In passing, we should also note that Epictetus refers to the practice of worshiping Caesar as a god in *Diatr.* 4.1.60–61, though his argument seem to undercut this particular premise for worshiping him.

²²¹ *Diatr.* 1.3.1; 1.9.7.

²²² *Diatr.* 1.9.1–7, 22–26; cf. Cleanthes, *Hymn to Zeus* (*SVF* 1.537), 1 who says of all mortals “we are your offspring” (translation from Long and Sedley, *Philosophers Vol 1*, 54I, 326).

²²³ *Diatr.* 1.1.4; Aetius, the first-second century B.C.E. philosopher refers to the “reasoning faculty” that is also the “commanding faculty”; the “soul’s highest part”; see Aetius 4.21.1–2 (*SVF* 2.836, part); translation from Idem, *Philosophers Vol 1*, 53H, 315.

²²⁴ *Diatr.* 1.17.27. Long, *Epictetus*, 145–46 identifies God as “cosmic rationality” in the thought of Epictetus

²²⁵ *Diatr.* 1.1.7 (Oldfather, LCL); also 1.20.5–7; 1.27.15–19; 1.28.1–28; 2.1.4; 4.10.2, 14–17, 36; *Frag.* 4, 9; see also Aetius of Antioch, 4.21.1–4, cited by Long and Sedley, *Philosophers Vol 1*, 315; Idem, *The Hellenistic Philosophers. Volume 2: Greek and Latin Texts with Notes and Bibliography* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 314. The use of impressions was a key question for Stoicism, see e.g. F. H. Sandbach, “Phantasia Katalēptikē,” in *Problems in Stoicism* (ed. A. A. Long; London: Athlone Press, 1971), 9–21; Long, *Philosophy*, 123–31, 172–75; Sharples, *Stoics*, 20–23; Reesor, *Man*, 32–82, 103–117; Michael Frede, “Stoic Epistemology,” in *The Cambridge History of Hellenistic Philosophy* (ed. Keimpe Algra et al.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 295–322; Brunschwig and Sedley, “Philosophy,” 151–83 at 166–67; Tad Brennan, “Stoic Moral Psychology,” in *The Cambridge Companion to the Stoics* (ed. Brad Inwood; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 257–94; R. J. Hankinson, “Stoic Epistemology,” in *The Cambridge Companion to the Stoics* (ed. Brad Inwood; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 59–84.

moral choice,²²⁶ so that we desire the things that are good, and cultivate an aversion towards what is evil, counting all other things as indifferent, and this results in virtue.²²⁷ These choices are also made possible because we have an innate concept of what is good and what is evil.²²⁸ Moral choice is in our hands alone and neither another person, nor even Zeus, is able to overcome the moral purpose of a person.²²⁹ This faculty of reason is one which humanity alone possesses of all created things²³⁰ and enables us to have communion with God, “being intertwined with him through the reason.”²³¹ The goal of reason and moral choice is to will each thing to be exactly as it is, not concerning oneself with matters beyond our control,²³² and thus to live in accordance with nature.²³³ The result of this life will be a freedom from disturbance, since it is only a person’s own judgments that have power to disturb them.²³⁴ It is the way to follow God’s path,²³⁵ and in fact to be free from fear as a friend of God.²³⁶ Consequently, in exercising these moral choices Epictetus urges his reader, “you possess the faculty of understanding the divine administration of the world”²³⁷ Yet, the “little soul” of a person is only “carrying around a corpse”²³⁸ that, one day, shall be separated from the spirit.²³⁹

²²⁶A particular focus of the whole of *Diatr.* 4.1 as well as 1.25.1; 2.6.9; 2.10.1; 4.4.47; 4.9.17; *Ench.* 1.1–5. See further on this topic, Bobzien, *Determinism*, 330–57 and Long, *Epictetus*, 27–34.

²²⁷*Diatr.* 1.4.1, 4; 1.29.2–8, 24; 1.30.3–4; 2.1.5; 2.2.3, 7, 14; 2.6.1; 2.22.1–3; 2.23.19; 3.2.1–5; 3.10.18; 3.12.1–12; 3.18.1–5; 3.24.24; 4.8.12; *Ench.* 2.2; 13; 19; 34.

²²⁸*Diatr.* 2.11.2–3.

²²⁹*Diatr.* 1.1.23; 1.29.60; 2.13.10; 3.3.10; 4.5.23, 34; 4.12.7. In contrast to Pauline teaching here, it is assumed that the will of a person is not in bondage and captive to sin (cf. Rom 6:15–23; 7:7–25), “For it is within you that both destruction and deliverance lie” (Epictetus, *Diatr.* 4.9.17). The will of the individual and their ability to make choices is a key theme in Epictetus; see Long, *Epictetus*, 207–30.

²³⁰*Diatr.* 1.6.15.

²³¹*Diatr.* 1.9.4–5 (Oldfather, LCL).

²³²*Diatr.* 1.4.19; 1.11.33, 37; 1.12.16; 1.25.1; 2.5.8; 2.17.22; *Ench.* 8.

²³³*Diatr.* 1.4.18; 1.6.20–21; 1.15.5; 1.26.1–2.

²³⁴*Diatr.* 1.19.7–8; 2.2.3; 2.6.8.

²³⁵*Diatr.* 1.20.15; 1.30.5.

²³⁶*Diatr.* 2.17.29; 4.5.35; 4.7.9; *Frag.* 4.

²³⁷*Diatr.* 2.10.3 (Oldfather, LCL).

²³⁸*Frag.* 26 (Oldfather, LCL).

2.3.7.6 Living out the Philosophy

Epictetus urges responses from those who understand that the divine spirit dwells within them and who become aware of their duties to exercise moral choice and indifference towards external matters. Firstly, they should have right opinions about the gods,²⁴⁰ and then to set their minds to obey them and to submit to what happens.²⁴¹ They should look to God as guide,²⁴² and honor the one within.²⁴³ Since they are bearing God in their bodies, his audience must attend to their inner life (so as not to defile God by impure thoughts) and to their outer life (so as not to defile him with “filthy actions”,²⁴⁴ that may include the reference to intercourse with women).²⁴⁵ The person must live to imitate God,²⁴⁶ and offer themselves completely to him.²⁴⁷ Since, whatever happens is what God wants, submitting to whatever happens (see above) is the same as wanting what God wants.²⁴⁸ In desiring to become pure in the presence of God,²⁴⁹ they wish to be of one mind (ὁμογνώμονέω) with God,²⁵⁰ showing themselves to be those who have set their heart upon changing into a god.²⁵¹ Such a person can live as a friend of God, without

²³⁹ *Diatr.* 2.1.17. See Long, *Epictetus*, 156–62 for the tendency of Epictetus to denigrate the body as an obstacle to kinship with God and even to God’s work itself, in a way that Long sees as going beyond traditional Stoicism.

²⁴⁰ *Ench.* 31.1. See Long, *Epictetus*, 180–89 on how much of his moral philosophy stems from right understanding of God/s.

²⁴¹ *Diatr.* 1.14.16–18; 3.24.95–102; 4.12.12; *Ench.* 31.1.

²⁴² *Diatr.* 2.7.11. So, for example, since Epictetus has within him the true diviner who can reveal to him the true nature of good and evil, divination is rendered unnecessary (*Diatr.* 2.7.3).

²⁴³ *Diatr.* 2.8.18–22.

²⁴⁴ *Diatr.* 2.8.12–13.

²⁴⁵ *Diatr.* 2.8.12; cf. 1 Cor 6:15–20.

²⁴⁶ *Diatr.* 2.14.13. {Thiselton, 2000, #27996} {Thiselton, 2000, #27996} {Bartchy, 1973, #19254} {Martin, 1990, #74716} {Lightfoot, 1895, #52791} {Schrage, 1995, #58923} {Lang, 1986, #86747} {Collins, 1999, #52919} {Fee, 2014, #26727} {Schnabel, 2006, #3181} {Schrage, 1995, #58923} {Robertson and Plummer, 1914, #51357}

²⁴⁷ *Diatr.* 2.16.42; cf. the command in 4.1.172–73.

²⁴⁸ *Diatr.* 2.17.22; *Ench.* 53.

²⁴⁹ *Diatr.* 2.18.19.

²⁵⁰ *Diatr.* 2.19.26.

²⁵¹ *Diatr.* 2.19.27. Long, *Epictetus*, 146–47 contends that in the thought of Epictetus, assimilation to the divine, “gives persons a potential status that virtually eliminates the qualitative difference between the ideal human and the divine.” (147) See also Long, *Epictetus*, 168–72 on becoming a person of virtue and like God.

fear,²⁵² since God has set them free from the slavery of bondage to others' esteem or rules.²⁵³ In order to live in this state, the hearers of Epictetus should exercise right judgments in regard to sense impressions (as discussed above) and in that way, their soul will be pure.²⁵⁴ Thus there is the need to purify their judgments,²⁵⁵ destroy desire,²⁵⁶ love their fellow,²⁵⁷ and so, seek the common good.²⁵⁸ That is, philosophy should bear real fruit in the lives of its adherents.²⁵⁹ The fruit of the right use of external impressions is, “freedom, serenity, cheerfulness, steadfastness; it is also justice, and law, and self-control, and the sum and substance of virtue”,²⁶⁰ the ability to choose and to live by a certain standard of character and values.²⁶¹ This is to say that the true philosopher must be devoted to the mind, and specifically to the philosophic principles.²⁶² There is the need to count the cost of such a life in a thoughtful and considered manner,²⁶³ remembering that both people and things are only mortal.²⁶⁴ Thus, the philosophic life may involve a difficult road. At times, God sends ordeals and difficulties of various kinds in order to test the person, so that they may become a victor in the moral life, like an Olympic champion.²⁶⁵

²⁵² *Diatr.* 2.17.29; 3.24.60; 4.3.9.

²⁵³ *Diatr.* 4.7.9, 17.

²⁵⁴ *Diatr.* 4.11.3, 5.

²⁵⁵ A command in *Diatr.* 4.1.112.

²⁵⁶ *Diatr.* 4.1.175.

²⁵⁷ Implied by *Diatr.* 4.4.27.

²⁵⁸ *Diatr.* 4.10.12.

²⁵⁹ *Diatr.* 4.8.20, 32, 36.

²⁶⁰ *Frag.* 4 (Oldfather, LCL) (cf. Gal 5:22–23). See also Long, *Epictetus*, 189–206 on external impressions and 244–54 on feelings in the philosophy of Epictetus.

²⁶¹ *Ench.* 33.1ff.

²⁶² *Ench.* 41; 46; 48; 52.

²⁶³ *Diatr.* 3.6; 3.15.1–7, 11–12.

²⁶⁴ *Diatr.* 3.24.84–89. See Long, *Epictetus*, 154–56 for the balance in Epictetus between his awareness of our mortality and transience, while also highlighting the way that individuals are ‘parts’ of God himself by their minds, citing *Diatr.* 1.12.26; 2.5.13; 4.7.6–7 and 2.8.10–11.

²⁶⁵ *Diatr.* 1.24.1; cf. 1 Cor 9:24–27; 2 Tim 2:5; Jas 1:12. For more on the ethics of Epictetus, see Thorsteinsson, *Stoicism*, 58–70.

2.3.8 Marcus Aurelius

Marcus Aurelius (121–180 C.E.) reigned as emperor from 161–180 C.E., having been previously adopted in Hadrian’s family and married to his cousin. Marcus studied with a number of famous teachers, including the orator Fronto, and was greatly drawn to philosophy. He was heavily influenced by Epictetus and is most associated with Stoicism.²⁶⁶

2.3.8.1 Priest Language

Marcus describes a man who lives in total integrity, whose thoughts are guided by reason away from all vice and whose character and actions are transparently good, “all that is in thee is simple and kindly and worthy of a living being that is social and has no thought for pleasures”.²⁶⁷ His description of the, “one who no longer puts off being reckoned now, if never before, among the best, is in some sort a priest and minister of the Gods”,²⁶⁸ could refer to a kind of spiritual priest towards *the divine*, but it is more likely to be a straightforward reference to one who acts as God’s priest towards *others*. Just before this section Marcus contemplates what lies beyond death, whether it be life with the gods or merely a state of non-sensation. In regards to the latter possibility, he makes a passing reference to “that which ministers” to the bodily vessel (presumably the soul),²⁶⁹ using the verb λατρεύω, which is often used in cultic contexts.²⁷⁰ It is possible that this too is a cultic metaphor, and pictures the soul acting as a priest to the body.

²⁶⁶ *OCD*, 210; Sandbach, *Stoics*, 172–77; Ferguson, *Backgrounds*, 367–68; Long, “Roman,” 184–210 at 207–08; Wright, *Faithfulness*, 227–28. For a comprehensive study, see R. B. Rutherford, *The Meditations of Marcus Aurelius: A Study* (OCM; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), especially xv–xviii, 1–89 for background to the work and Pierre Hadot, *The Inner Citadel: The Meditations of Marcus Aurelius* (trans. Michael Chase; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1998), especially 1–34.

²⁶⁷ Marcus Aurelius, *Med.* 3.4.2 (Haines, LCL); cf. his injunctions in *Med.* 7.54.

²⁶⁸ *Med.* 3.4.3 (Haines, LCL).

²⁶⁹ *Med.* 3.3.2 (Haines, LCL).

²⁷⁰ See “λατρεύω,” BDAG, 587.

2.3.8.2 Temple Language

Marcus speaks frequently of an indwelling divine presence. In one place he refers to “the god that is in thee” (ὁ ἐν σοὶ θεός)²⁷¹ and elsewhere speaks of “one God immanent in all things” (θεός εἷς διὰ πάντων),²⁷² a subject to which I shall return below. When Marcus is not speaking of the unity of God with all things, but of a presence dwelling in the life of an individual human being, he does not commonly use the language of θεός. Rather, Marcus typically uses the language of the indwelling δαίμων. Although in one place this is rendered by C. R. Haines as “the very deity enthroned in thee”²⁷³ his translations for Loeb prefers phrases such as “the divine genius” within a person.²⁷⁴ On one occasion Marcus couples the two names, averring that, “it is in my power to do nothing contrary to the God and the ‘genius’ within me (ὅτι ἔξεστί μοι μηδὲν πράσσειν παρὰ τὸν ἐμὸν θεὸν καὶ δαίμονα).²⁷⁵ Since the two nouns, θεός and δαίμων are governed by the same article, neither is impersonal, neither is plural and neither is a proper name, this seems to be an example of the Granville Sharp rule, where the second noun in the construction refers to the same person denoted by the first noun.²⁷⁶ Hence θεός and δαίμων refer to one person and not two, demonstrating that Marcus can speak of (a) God and δαίμων interchangeably. Accordingly, elsewhere Marcus can either refer to “that which in thee is divine” (καὶ τὸ ἐν σοὶ θεῖον),²⁷⁷ using θεῖος, a cognate of θεός, or remind his audience that “thou hast in thyself something better and more god-like” (κρεῖττον τι καὶ δαιμονιώτερον ἔχεις ἐν σαυτῷ)

²⁷¹ Marcus Aurelius, *Med.* 3.5.1 (Haines, LCL).

²⁷² *Med.* 7.9 (Haines, LCL).

²⁷³ *Med.* 3.6.2 (Haines, LCL).

²⁷⁴ *Med.* 2.13, 17; 3.3.2; 3.12, 16; 5.27 (Haines, LCL).

²⁷⁵ *Med.* 5.10.2 (Haines, LCL).

²⁷⁶ For further explanation, see Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 270–72. As Idem, *Grammar*, 272 note 42, explains, θεός can be pluralized, and hence is not a proper name, thus fitting the rule.

²⁷⁷ Marcus Aurelius, *Med.* 12.1.2 (Haines, LCL).

employing a cognate to δαίμων. Terms from both the roots θεο- and δαίμ- are apparently used by Marcus without any great differentiation of meaning. Reason is sometimes paired with the divine presence within,²⁷⁸ or this δαίμων is completely identified with intelligence and reason.²⁷⁹ Marcus reminds his readers that, “each man’s intelligence is God and has emanated from Him” (ὁ ἐκάστου νοῦς θεός καὶ ἐκεῖθεν ἐρρήγηκε).²⁸⁰ As we shall see in our next section, God can be equated with reason and intelligence.²⁸¹

2.3.8.3 *The Nature of Divinity*

Marcus’s conception of God is strongly pantheistic, in common with Stoic doctrine generally.²⁸² In the same paragraph, Marcus speaks of providence being “the works of the Gods”, the “control of Providence”, the co-dependence of “Fortune” and “Nature” and “the Nature of the Whole” which brings about good for every part of Nature.²⁸³ Or again, Marcus avers, “there is both one Universe, made up of all things, and one God immanent in all things, and one Substance, and one Law, one Reason common to all intelligent creatures, and one Truth.”²⁸⁴ It is hard to distinguish between God/s, Fortune, Providence and Nature in Marcus’s worldview

²⁷⁸ E.g. *Med.* 12.1.2.

²⁷⁹ *Med.* 5.27.

²⁸⁰ *Med.* 12.26.

²⁸¹ The references to “That which holds the mastery within us” (Τὸ ἔνδον κυριεῦον) in Marcus Aurelius, *Med.* 4.1 (Haines, LCL), and to “that Hidden Thing within us” (ἐκεῖνο τὸ ἔνδον ἐγκεκρυμμένον) in *Med.* 10.38. may also be allusions to this same god/genius. See further Long, *Epictetus*, 163–67, 177–78.

²⁸² Long, *Philosophy*, 150 avers that “Fundamentally, Stoic theology is pantheist.” Algra, “Theology,” 153–78 at 165 elaborates that the Stoic conception of God or gods is, “as an at first sight perhaps surprising mixture of pantheism, theism and polytheism.”; cf. Hadot, *Citadel*, 147–63, who makes the connection between Marcus and Seneca, *Nat.* 2.45.1 (158), quoted above.

²⁸³ *Med.* 2.3 (Haines, LCL). Marcus also speaks of the “Nature of the Whole” as a Creator who felt compelled to create the universe in *Med.* 7.75 (Haines, LCL) and of the “Begetter and Upholder of all things” in *Med.* 10.1 (Haines, LCL).

²⁸⁴ *Med.* 7.9 (Haines, LCL); cf. Cleanthes, *Hymn to Zeus* (*SVF* 1.537), 54I, 327 who speaks of “the universal law” Long and Sedley, *Philosophers Vol 1*.

because all is one.²⁸⁵ Therefore, he admonishes his readers “to think of the Universe as one living Being, possessed of a single Substance and a single Soul.”²⁸⁶ At the same time, Marcus says that all go back to a single source, that is “sentience”,²⁸⁷ “the all-embracing intelligence”,²⁸⁸ “Universe” (addressed in the vocative singular: ὦ κόσμῃ)²⁸⁹ or controlling Reason.²⁹⁰ So interconnected are all things, that what “contributes to the health of the Universe” contributes to the well being of Zeus himself, since “there is one harmony of all things.”²⁹¹ This is also conceptualized as a “universal Substance” (σμπάσης οὐσίας or Ἡ τῶν ὅλων οὐσία), of which all are a part.²⁹² We also learn from Marcus that the gods lend aid to all,²⁹³ can give freedom from anything (such as lust or fear),²⁹⁴ and bear fruit in due season.²⁹⁵

²⁸⁵ According to the fourth century philosopher, Calcidius, Chrysippus also believed that “everything in accordance with fate is also the product of providence, and likewise everything in accordance with providence is the product of fate”, whereas Cleanthes distinguished between the two; see Calcidius 144 (*SVF* 2.933); translation from Idem, *Philosophers Vol 1*, 54U, 331. Aulus Gellius (c. 125 – after 180 C.E.) also discusses Chrysippus’s view of Providence in a now lost work, *On Providence*, in Gellius, *Noct. att.* 7.1.1–13; 7.2.3–12. On the philosophy of Cleanthes, see Kristeller, *Philosophers*, 35–40.

²⁸⁶ *Med.* 4.40 (Haines, LCL); see 90 note 1. The Christian theologian Origen (184/185 – 253/254 C.E.) later writes of the “god of the Stoics” who “sometimes has the whole substance as his commanding-faculty; this is whenever the conflagration is in being; at other times, when world-order exists, he comes to be in a part of substance.” (from Origen, *Against Celsus* 4.14 (*SVF* 2.1052, part); translation from Long and Sedley, *Philosophers Vol 1*, 46H, 276.)

²⁸⁷ *Med.* 4.40 (Haines, LCL). *Med.* 8.23 pairs the gods with “the Source of all things”.

²⁸⁸ *Med.* 8.54 (Haines, LCL).

²⁸⁹ *Med.* 4.23 (Haines, LCL); see 380 note 3. Marcus speaks of “the Nature of the Universe” as creator and sustainer in both *Med.* 8.26 and 9.1 (Haines, LCL).

²⁹⁰ *Med.* 5.1; 6.36.2 (Haines, LCL). This is of the essence of Stoicism, as attested by the very early *Hymn to Zeus* by Cleanthes (c. 330– c. 230 B.C.E, the second head of the Stoic school; see *OCD*, 329), that speaks of, “the universal reason [κοινὸν λόγον] which runs though all things and intermingles with the lights of heaven both great and small” and claims that all things “share in a single everlasting reason”, Cleanthes, *Hymn to Zeus*, 2–3 (*SVF* 1.537); translation from Long and Sedley, *Philosophers Vol 1*, 54I, 326–27.

²⁹¹ *Med.* 5.8.1–2; cf. 6.37–38 (Haines, LCL). See his discussion of the “Universal Nature” in *Med.* 12.26.

²⁹² *Med.* 5.24; 6.1; 12.30, 32 (Haines, LCL). Sometimes Haines translates this phrase (ὅλη οὐσία) as “Universal Nature”, e.g. *Med.* 7.5.

²⁹³ *Med.* 9.27.

²⁹⁴ *Med.* 9.40.

²⁹⁵ *Med.* 9.10.

2.3.8.4 *The Nature of Humanity*

Marcus repeatedly stresses the connection between the human and the divine (as we saw above), emphasizing that even an evil doer shares a kinship with him, “partaker of . . . intelligence and a morsel of the Divine.” (νοῦ καὶ θείας ἀπομοίρας)²⁹⁶ Humans are both soul and body, or to put it another way “the Causal and the Material.”²⁹⁷ The soul is the ruling part of the person and “the Soul alone deflects and moves herself”, forming her own judgments about all things.²⁹⁸ Just as Marcus speaks of God as “ruling Reason”, he frequently uses the same term (ἡγεμονικός) for the reason within.²⁹⁹ This is a reason which comes from God and is shared in common with the Gods,³⁰⁰ though some are at variance with “the Reason that administers the whole Universe.”³⁰¹ The soul, or reason, is the well-spring from which all attitudes, motivations and designs flow, “for every conviction and impulse and desire and aversion is from within, and nothing climbs in thither.”³⁰² Although Marcus ascribes all that happens to the Universal Nature, this does not absolve wrongdoers of responsibility for their evil.³⁰³ Throughout Marcus’s writings he is keen to reiterate the frailty and dependence of human beings on other forces and their short mortal lives. In his second book he calls his reader to realize, “as an emanation from what Controller of that Universe thou dost subsist.”³⁰⁴ As one who subsists from that controller as part of a greater whole, their destiny is to return to the source from which they came, “Thou shalt vanish into that which begat thee, or rather thou shalt be taken again into its Seminal

²⁹⁶ *Med.* 2.1 (Haines, LCL).

²⁹⁷ *Med.* 5.13 (Haines, LCL).

²⁹⁸ *Med.* 5.19 (Haines, LCL).

²⁹⁹ *Med.* 4.38; 7.16; 8.43, 61; 9.7; 11.20; 12.1 (Haines, LCL). Frede, “Determinism,” 179–205 at 185 explains that in the Stoic view, “Human beings . . . are also ruled by a portion of the pneuma in its purest form, namely reason (*dianoia*).”

³⁰⁰ *Med.* 6.35 (Haines, LCL).

³⁰¹ *Med.* 4.46 (Haines, LCL).

³⁰² *Med.* 5.28 (Haines, LCL); cf. Matt 15:18; Mk 7:21–23. Thus, impulses must be restrained (*Med.* 9.7).

³⁰³ *Med.* 12.26; 9.38.

³⁰⁴ *Med.* 2.4 (Haines, LCL). On the question of Marcus’ “pessimism”, see Hadot, *Citadel*, 163–79.

Reason by a process of change” (τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ τὸν σπερματικὸν).³⁰⁵ In other places, however, Marcus seems uncertain as to whether the end of the soul will be, “extinction or translation”,³⁰⁶ though death can be welcomed as an emergence of the soul from its captivity (as with Platonism).³⁰⁷

2.3.8.5 *Living out the Philosophy*

In light of the deep connection between Nature, the Universe, God/the gods and humans, Marcus reasons that “there is nothing to prevent” him from beginning “at once” in living according to nature.³⁰⁸ This can also be described as living according to reason,³⁰⁹ or being in tune with the Universe,³¹⁰ thinking, “in unison with the all-embracing Intelligence”³¹¹ or even doing “nothing contrary to the God and the ‘genius’ within me.”³¹² The philosopher should seek to live as they are: a fellow citizen of Gods and people in a common “World-City”.³¹³ There is great danger in cutting ones’ soul off from “the soul of all rational things” which also severs their link to the universe and their comprehension of all the things within it, which includes the life of the community.³¹⁴ In order not to be cut off in this way, “That which holds the mastery within

³⁰⁵ *Med.* 4.14 (Haines, LCL); similarly on the eventual dissolution of the soul, *Med.* 4.21.1; 4.23; 7.10, 19; 8.18. For further discussion, see Rutherford, *Meditations*, 206–08.

³⁰⁶ *Med.* 5.33 (Haines, LCL); similarly *Med.* 6.4, 24; 10.7.2.

³⁰⁷ *Med.* 9.3.1; cf. *Med.* 6.28. Some, though, fear death: *Med.* 8.58. Rutherford, *Meditations*, 244–50 notes the preoccupation with death in Marcus, and see also Hadot, *Citadel*, 275–88.

³⁰⁸ *Med.* 9.5 (Haines, LCL); cf. *Med.* 5.3; 7.55.1; 7.56; 7.70; 8.7; 12.1.2. The corollary Marcus draws from this doctrine of providence is that, “Nothing befalls anyone that he is not fitted by nature to bear.” *Med.* 5.18 (Haines, LCL); cf. 1 Cor 10:13. See generally, Hadot, *Citadel*, 183–208.

³⁰⁹ *Med.* 4.1; or people “following narrowly their own ruling reason” *Med.* 4.38 (Haines, LCL); *Med.* 12.1; cf. the opposite behavior in *Med.* 4.46.

³¹⁰ *Med.* 4.23.

³¹¹ *Med.* 8.54 (Haines, LCL).

³¹² *Med.* 5.10 (Haines, LCL).

³¹³ *Med.* 10.1, 15 (Haines, LCL). For more on this topic, see Dirk Obbink, “The Stoic Sage in the Cosmic City,” in *Topics in Stoic Philosophy* (ed. Katerina Ierodiakonou; New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 178–95.

³¹⁴ *Med.* 4.29 (Haines, LCL).

us”³¹⁵ (most likely a reference to the ruling Reason) will adapt itself to whatever happens to it, so long as it is living in accordance with nature.³¹⁶ Accordingly, the wise person should be indifferent to what nature treats as indifferent.³¹⁷ In this life according to the nature of the universe, death is “just a function of nature” and no longer something to be feared.³¹⁸ Similarly, since the soul is preeminent, the body fulfills a lowly function, of little significance, “To the body indeed all things are indifferent, for it cannot concern itself with them.”³¹⁹ The mind, on the other hand, is only indifferent towards those matters which are external to its affairs.³²⁰ Yet at the same time, Marcus urges his audience to resist bodily inclinations uncompromisingly.³²¹

So, practically speaking, how is this life to be lived? At the heart of it all is our attitude to the divine genius, or reason, or intelligence, living within a person. Marcus instructs his reader to serve the δαίμων by keeping it pure,³²² and this kind of service is elaborated as, “to keep it pure from passion and aimlessness and discontent with anything that proceeds from Gods or men.”³²³ In other words, this genius is to be “lord of all pleasures and pains”³²⁴. Marcus repeatedly stresses the need for this genius or god to rule, with injunctions like, “let the god that is in thee be lord of a living creature,”³²⁵ and refers to this “very deity” as “enthroned” in the person by

³¹⁵ *Med.* 4.1 (Haines, LCL).

³¹⁶ *Med.* 2.12; cf. thus a person should keep their ruling Reason sound (*Med.* 8.43).

³¹⁷ *Med.* 9.1.4; cf. *Med.* 4.39; 11.16.

³¹⁸ *Med.* 2.12 (Haines, LCL). So, life should be lived with a conscious awareness of our own mortality (*Med.* 4.48).

³¹⁹ *Med.* 6.32 (Haines, LCL); cf. 1 Cor 6:13. Rutherford, *Meditations*, 243–44 refers to the “revulsion from the physical and condemnation of worldly objects” in Marcus, suggesting a “more transcendent view of deity”.

³²⁰ *Med.* 6.32.

³²¹ *Med.* 7.55.1–2. For more on Marcus’ guiding principles, see Hadot, *Citadel*, 35–53.

³²² *Med.* 2.17. Elizabeth Asmis, “The Stoicism of Marcus Aurelius,” *ANRW* 36.3:2228–52 at 2243 comments, “This notion of the intellect as an inner deity may be traced back to Posidonius . . . Nowhere, however, is the notion as prominent as in Marcus’ writings; it forms the basis of his ethics.” Rutherford, *Meditations*, 237 speaks of the “notorious” difficulties of pinning down the referent to the δαίμων in later Stoic writers and whether they would even distinguish between God, the best part of a person or their guiding spirit.

³²³ *Med.* 2.13 (Haines, LCL).

³²⁴ *Med.* 2.17 (Haines, LCL).

³²⁵ *Med.* 3.5.1 (Haines, LCL).

bringing all desires “into subjection to itself”.³²⁶ Reason is described as having a kingly, legislative function, “in its royal and law-making capacity.”³²⁷ It is to have first place in a person’s life.³²⁸ Accordingly, the one devoted to his own intelligence and good genius will lead a life of virtue.³²⁹ The theme of purity and cleanliness often occurs in relation to the divine indwelling. Marcus urges his audience to keep their “divine genius” in its “virgin state” (actually καθαρός);³³⁰ or conversely not to “sully” (φύρω, “with a sense of mixing so as to spoil or defile”³³¹) the divine genius, which, he reminds them, again using ruling language, “is enthroned” in their bosom.³³² The true follower of reason will always be ready to be corrected; a turnabout that Marcus describes as a ‘conversion’ (from μετάγω).³³³ Marcus’s writings are filled with injunctions designed to lead his readers towards this goal, and below I list the most obvious ones, in two categories.

Firstly, Marcus deals with the inner life as it relates to the genius within and to relations with the gods. He urges his readers to “walk with the Gods!”, by carrying out the will of that genius within, identified with intelligence and reason³³⁴ and by keeping their thoughts on God at all times.³³⁵ This is what it means to “rest in philosophy”,³³⁶ and to return to the harmony within in order to gain control of it.³³⁷ At the same time, the wise person is to be attentive by looking

³²⁶ *Med.* 3.6.2 (Haines, LCL).

³²⁷ *Med.* 4.12 (Haines, LCL); cf. Jas 2:8. Hadot, *Citadel*, 123–25 identifies the δαίμων with “reason” in Marcus.

³²⁸ *Med.* 3.6.1–3; thus one’s ruling reason should be kept “sound” (*Med.* 9.7.).

³²⁹ *Med.* 3.7.

³³⁰ *Med.* 3.12 (Haines, LCL).

³³¹ “φύρω”, *LSJ* 1963.

³³² *Med.* 3.16 (Haines, LCL).

³³³ *Med.* 4.12 (Haines, LCL).

³³⁴ *Med.* 5.27 (Haines, LCL).

³³⁵ *Med.* 6.7, and so leave no room for wrong thoughts, cf. *Med.* 7.54.

³³⁶ *Med.* 6.12 (Haines, LCL).

³³⁷ *Med.* 6.11 (Haines, LCL).

within to seek out the “special quality or worth” of each thing.³³⁸ The “fountain of Good” is to be found within.³³⁹ Such a wise person will welcome what “Universal Nature” has designed for it,³⁴⁰ and live each day at peace with themselves, as if the day were their last.³⁴¹ The person who has been schooled in philosophy and who is humble of heart will say to Nature, “Give what you will and take back what you will”.³⁴² They should disdain wrong sense-impressions (like Epictetus, above).³⁴³ They can do all this because they live by axioms (δόγματα) which guide all their impulses and actions. These axioms concern the nature of good and evil, and look to the goal of what makes a person, “just, temperate, manly, free.”³⁴⁴ Though Marcus repeatedly stresses providence and destiny, he also emphasizes the free judgment and action of the individual.³⁴⁵ The gods can be prayed to since they have power to give freedom from wrong impulses, such as fear or lust.³⁴⁶ Good people can have “the closest commerce with the Divine” and “the most intimate fellowship with it” by pious behavior and acts of worship.³⁴⁷

Secondly, Marcus stresses the social dimension of the philosopher and instructs them in how to live with other people. He urges his readers not to look around at the affairs of others and to compare themselves with other people³⁴⁸ but rather, “run straight for the goal”,³⁴⁹ and thus live

³³⁸ *Med.* 6.3 (Haines, LCL).

³³⁹ *Med.* 7.59.

³⁴⁰ *Med.* 8.7, 25.

³⁴¹ *Med.* 7.69.

³⁴² *Med.* 10.14; cf. Job 1:21. See also *Med.* 12.11.

³⁴³ *Med.* 8.26; or not go beyond initial impressions (*Med.* 8.19).

³⁴⁴ *Med.* 8.1. See further, Hadot, *Citadel*, 101–27.

³⁴⁵ *Med.* 8.16. Frede, “Determinism,” 179–205 at 186 comments that despite the deterministic nature of Stoic philosophy, “individual entities have a certain autonomy. It is the inner makeup of human reason that determines the way in which a person interacted with his or her environment.”

³⁴⁶ *Med.* 9.40. For more on prayer in Marcus, see Rutherford, *Meditations*, 200–205.

³⁴⁷ *Med.* 12.5. *Med.* 1.17.6 also speaks directly of communication with the gods, see Rutherford, *Meditations*, 192–95.

³⁴⁸ *Med.* 4.17; cf. *Med.* 8.56.

³⁴⁹ *Med.* 4.17 (Haines, LCL); cf. Phil 3:13–14; 1 Cor 9:24; Heb 12:1.

the life of the content person.³⁵⁰ However, in case Marcus be misunderstood as dismissing the relations between the wise person and their fellows, Marcus reminds them to test every case to see how it may affect the community and to respect its judgment, “if the community be not hurt by this, neither am I hurt; but if the community be hurt, there is no need to be angry with him that hath done the hurt, but to enquire, In what hath he seen amiss?”³⁵¹ The wise person should seek the common interest.³⁵² In their behavior towards others they should neither do nor speak evil to anyone.³⁵³ There is a strong social element in Marcus’s injunctions. Each person is to see themselves as, “a limb of the organized body of rational things”³⁵⁴ and so should love all people,³⁵⁵ even those who stumble.³⁵⁶ They should deal righteously with their neighbors.³⁵⁷ This concern for each person, whatever their relationship to them, is enabled by encouraging a sense of empathy with everyone, “Enter into every man’s ruling Reason, and give every one else an opportunity to enter into thine”,³⁵⁸ since humankind was created for the sake of each another.³⁵⁹ This perspective on life is even described by Marcus as “salvation” (σωτηρία) which involves an accurate comprehension of reality and “on our doing what is just and speaking what is true with all our soul.”³⁶⁰

³⁵⁰ *Med.* 4.25; cf *Med.* 7.54; 2 Cor 12:10; Phil 4:11; 1 Tim 6:8; Heb 13:5.

³⁵¹ *Med.* 5.22 (Haines, LCL).

³⁵² *Med.* 11.12. See Hadot, *Citadel*, 210–31.

³⁵³ *Med.* 5.31; also *Med.* 8.26. Cf. Tit 3:2; Jas 4:11; 1 Pet 3:10.

³⁵⁴ *Med.* 7.13 (Haines, LCL); cf. 1 Cor 12:12–26.

³⁵⁵ *Med.* 7.31; 11.1.2.

³⁵⁶ *Med.* 7.22; e.g. by forbearing to be angry with those who do not return thanks for their love, and even to care for them (*Med.* 8.8; cf. Lk 6:35), or seeking to convert them to the right path (*Med.* 9.11.).

³⁵⁷ *Med.* 7.54, for instance by not lying to them or committing injustice (*Med.* 9.1.1–2.).

³⁵⁸ *Med.* 8.61.

³⁵⁹ *Med.* 8.59; cf. *Med.* 9.1.1; 11.18.1.

³⁶⁰ *Med.* 12.29 (Haines, LCL).

2.3.9 Hierocles

Hierocles was a Stoic writer from the second century C.E., sometime around the reign of Hadrian (117–38 C.E.). He left behind some of his *Elements of Ethics*, as well as other fragments and excerpts from his writings.³⁶¹

2.3.9.1 Temple and Priest Language

There is one fleeting metaphorical temple reference in Hierocles. In his treatise *On Marriage*, Hierocles considers his parents worthy to be honored as gods, since the filial relationship between child and parent is even closer than that between people and gods.³⁶² Indeed they can be compared to “domestic gods” and this naturally leads Hierocles to consider how we should serve these gods, “we must consider ourselves as kinds of ministers and priests in our home as in a temple (νομιστέον ἑαυτοὺς καθάπερ ἐν ἱερῷ τῇ οἰκίᾳ ζακόρους τινὰς καὶ ἱερέας), elected and consecrated by nature itself and entrusted with the tendance of our parents.” This is expressed through care for their bodies, but more especially, for their souls.³⁶³

2.3.9.2 The Nature of Divinity

According to Hierocles, the gods are fixed in their judgements, since “changelessness and firmness” typify their virtues. They do chastise and sometimes natural disasters such as famines, droughts and floods are caused by them.³⁶⁴ Hierocles, however, wants to stress that the gods are

³⁶¹ *OCD*, 682–83; Sandbach, *Stoics*, 170–72.

³⁶² Ilaria Ramelli, *Hierocles the Stoic: Elements of Ethics, Fragments, and Excerpts* (SBLWGRW 28; trans. David Konstan; Society of Biblical Literature, 2009), 82–83.

³⁶³ *Idem*, *Hierocles*, 82–87. This whole section corresponds to *SVF*, 4.79.53 (3:95,30–99, 9 Meineke; cf. Anth. 4.25.53 = 4:640,4–644,15 Wachsmuth and Hense).

³⁶⁴ *Idem*, *Hierocles*, 64–65, from the treatise *How Should One Behave toward the Gods?* This section corresponds to *SVF*, 1.3.53–54 (1:63,6–27–1:64, 1–14 Wachsmuth and Hense).

responsible for good because they themselves are good, since they are filled with all the virtues.³⁶⁵ Zeus can be described as the first god and parent.³⁶⁶

2.3.9.3 *The Nature of Humanity*

A human being is a mix of body and soul, which are intermingled, with the soul itself understood as corporeal.³⁶⁷ Evil in the world comes about as a result of vice, not because of God's judgments, and people choose evil freely. Matter is a second cause of evils, after vice.³⁶⁸

2.3.10 *Summary of our Findings from Stoicism*

2.3.10.1 *Summary of Sacrifice Language*

As I have surveyed temple language in Stoicism, a number of themes have stood out. Some, like Seneca, Dio Chryostom and Epictetus have, in places, continued to stress the need for physical sacrifices but have also emphasized the vital role of the motivation and inner purity of the worshiper. Seneca speaks in other places of the holy desire and the upright will of the offerer, almost in place of the victim. For Seneca, knowing, believing and imitating the gods itself is worship. Dio Chrysostom's work appears to show a development, as the emphasis on purity increases, so the focus on literal sacrifices appears to decrease. In fact, for Dio, the more pious the worshiper, the fewer sacrifices are needed. Indeed, a later discourse makes sobriety and common sense a sacrifice in its own right. Cicero's evidence also emphasizes purity of thought and speech instead of a literal sacrifice.

³⁶⁵ Idem, *Hierocles*, 66–69. This section corresponds to *SVF*, 2.9.7 (2:181,8–182, 30 Wachsmuth and Hense).

³⁶⁶ Idem, *Hierocles*, p. 68–69. This section corresponds to *SVF*, 3.39.34 (3:730,17–731,15 Wachsmuth and Hense).

³⁶⁷ From the treatise *Elements of Ethics* in Idem, *Hierocles*, 11, III.60; IV.5–20.

³⁶⁸ Idem, *Hierocles*, 66–69, from the treatise *How Should One Behave toward the Gods?* This section corresponds to Stobaeus, *Anthology* 2.9.7 (2:181,8–182, 30 Wachsmuth and Hense).

2.3.10.2 Summary of Priest Language

There were fewer obvious use of metaphorical priest language. Zeno and Arius Didymus claim that only the wise and godlike are priests. Marcus Aurelius says that a true priest is a man of integrity, guided by reason, who avoids pleasure. Hierocles compares the offspring of parents as priests to them.

2.3.10.3 Summary of Temple Language and the Nature of Divinity

Since many of the writers fuse their understanding of divine indwelling with their observations of the character of divinity, I shall combine these two sections in this summary. Seneca explicitly speaks of the world as being the temple of the gods. Within that context, God is spoken of as infused through the whole universe. Indeed, God is described by him as the mind of the universe, and sometimes equated with Nature, Reason, Fate and Fortune. Reason elsewhere is described as a portion of the divine spirit. In this, Seneca is following Zeno, who speaks of the world as a living soul and also appears to identify God with Reason and Fate (later followed by Marcus Aurelius). Cicero confirms this evidence, describing the world as God and speaking of the all-pervading soul as Reason. Marcus Aurelius also speaks of God as immanent in all things and the source of reason and intelligence. Epictetus, on the other hand, seems to envisage a more distinct role for God than other Stoics, speaking of him as separate from the universe. Seneca also avers that God or the Holy Spirit dwells in individuals; sometimes specified as in each good person and assumes that communication with the gods is possible. Dio Chrysostom also speaks of the divine in each person, here meaning each person's δαίμων (sometimes translated as "genius" or "guardian spirit"), but adds that they are received when a person matures. Epictetus

similarly puts the emphasis squarely on the individual's relationship to God; having much to say about the God within (even within someone who is ignorant, unlike the view of Dio Chrysostom) who is carried around wherever they go. Marcus Aurelius speaks of the person's δαίμων, god and the "god-like" and "divine" inside a person fairly interchangeably. Hierocles, alone of these writers, uses the temple imagery for the home and compares parents to "domestic gods". Seneca describes the character of the gods as beneficent; gentle, merciful, forgiving and providing for all, especially the good. Dio Chrysostom uses similar imagery and portrays a harmonious partnership between the gods. However, for Dio the gods are not entirely self-sufficient, since they rely on the law. Epictetus uses abstractions to describe God, such as intelligence, knowledge and right reason. The gods are pure and undefiled and govern the universe. Marcus Aurelius also sees the gods as benevolent beings who lend to all and bring freedom from fear and evil. Hierocles portrays the gods as good and changeless, and likens Zeus to a parent, though one who can punish his children.

2.3.10.4 Summary of the Nature of Humanity

Seneca's view of humanity balances an understanding of the natural goodness of humanity with their tendency to sin. The human mind is formed from the divine essence and so alone of all creatures, humans have a conception of divinity. The soul is pre-existent and preserved by God, who grants to it knowledge of divinity. Dio Chrysostom stresses the evil within each individual but also the ability to recognize, worship and have kinship with the gods. Epictetus sees humanity as God's children. They can understand the divine ways and live as friends of God. They have reasoning powers and the ability to desire the good and make right moral choices. They can live according to nature if they choose, and will all things to be as they

are. Humans can follow God's path and be free from fear and inward disturbance about their own judgments. According to Marcus Aurelius, human beings partake of the divine intelligence; they are a morsel of the divine. The soul, or Reason, rules the body and is the source of impulses and aversions. People are frail and Marcus seems ambivalent about the soul's destiny (once speaking of its extinction but another time envisaging its translation to a different sphere).

2.3.10.5 Summary of Living out the Philosophy

The Stoics, such as Zeno, Seneca, Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius commonly call their audience to live in accordance with nature, that is to will everything to be as God, Nature, Reason, Fate or the gods have allowed it. Both Seneca and Epictetus elaborate on this as a call to follow the example of the gods by living a life of virtue and thus become like them. Seneca calls his readers to commune with the gods in order to enjoy freedom from disturbance. The one who follows God may find themselves trained by him through various trials, according to both Seneca and Epictetus. Seneca says that their soul should cling loosely to the things of the body which speeds their return to God. The emphasis of Epictetus is on having right opinions about the gods and our own judgments. They should honor the one within and live in purity both within and without. This will include destroying selfish desires, loving their fellows and seeking good. Marcus also stresses this theme and calls his reader to keep their inner genius pure, allowing the deity within to rule. This rule encompasses both the relationship to the gods by avoiding wrong sense-impressions concerning them, and in relationship to others, by running straight for the goal without being distracted by the opinions of others. At the same time, Marcus urges his readers to seek the common interest and to empathize with the experience of others.

2.4 Middle Platonism

The term “Middle Platonism” is usually given to the Platonism of the era roughly between Antiochus of Ascalon (d. c. 68 B.C.E.) and Plotinus (b. 205 CE), whose writings herald the start of Neoplatonism. This development of Platonism was eclectic and drew freely on the thinking of other schools, such as the Stoics, the Peripatetics and the Neopythagoreans. Most Middle Platonist works have been lost, with the notable exception of the large literary corpus of Plutarch and Philo.³⁶⁹

2.4.1 Plutarch

Plutarch of Chaeronea (c. 45–120 CE) moved in influential circles as a lecturer, philosopher and biographer and was also a priest at Delphi for the last thirty years of his life. He left behind him a voluminous collection of writings. Despite the reputation and extent of his *Parallel Lives*, these works will not be considered in this section, since they are more biographical than philosophical and, instead, I shall concentrate on his philosophical works that reveal Plutarch as indebted to Middle Platonism.³⁷⁰

2.4.1.1 Sacrifice language

Plutarch’s *Isis and Osiris* (his retelling of the Egyptian myth), offers advice for his readers in order that they may avoid superstition on the one hand, and atheism on the other, in

³⁶⁹ *OCD*, 1158; Ferguson, *Backgrounds*, 387–89. See especially John M. Dillon, *The Middle Platonists: 80 B.C. to A.D. 220* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1977), Preface xiv, 1, 115. Philo will be covered separately in the following chapter.

³⁷⁰ See *OCD*, 1165; Ferguson, *Backgrounds*, 389–90; Mark Beck, ed., *A Companion to Plutarch* (Malden, Mass.: Wiley-Blackwell, 2014) 13–42. For Plutarch’s life, see D. A. Russell, *Plutarch: Classical Life and Letters* (London: Duckworth, 1973) and Robert Lamberton, *Plutarch* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001) and, briefly, Dillon, *Platonists*, 185–86; Frederick E. Brenk, “An Imperial Heritage: The Religious Spirit of Plutarch of Chaironeia,” *ANRW* 36.1:248–349 at 250–56, and for more on Plutarch’s Platonism, John Dillon, “Plutarch and Platonism,” in *A Companion to Plutarch* (ed. Mark Beck; Malden, Mass.: Wiley-Blackwell, 2014), 61–72.

their interpretation of the stories about these divinities. They must believe that, “no sacrifice that you can offer, no deed that you may do will be more likely to find favor with the gods than your belief in their true nature.”³⁷¹ In this instance, a true understanding and trust in the gods is of greater value than sacrifice, making it a kind of spiritual sacrifice. That said, this clause is conjoined to a preceding one which adds an important condition here, “if you always perform and observe the established rites of worship”,³⁷² so Plutarch is not dismissing the necessity of literal sacrifices. Earlier in the same work, there are two references that are perhaps a little more ambiguous, but may also point to metaphorical sacrifice language. The first concerns “a longing for the divine” that focuses itself on the effort to arrive at the truth about their nature. This effort will involve study and investigation of “sacred subjects”, and “it is a work more hallowed than any form of holy living or temple service.” (ἀγνείας τε πάσης καὶ νεωκορίας ἔργον ὀσιώτερον).³⁷³ Since the word translated by Frank Cole Babbitt “temple service” (νεωκόρος) is associated more with one who is responsible for the maintenance and security of the temple (whether an individual, a city, or a deity)³⁷⁴ than it is for the service of offering sacrifices in the temple, Plutarch cannot be said to be directly comparing such a work with sacrifice. At the very least, however, he does identify study and seeking after divine truth as the holiest (ὄσιος) form of work. In the same book, Plutarch seeks to explain the etymology of the shrine of Isis, the Iseion, by the Greek word οἶδα (to know) to stress that a true worshiper can only understand the divine realities of that which they worship by a pure and holy disposition, “we shall comprehend reality if in a reasonable and devout frame of mind we pass within the portals of her shrines.”³⁷⁵ Like

³⁷¹ Plutarch, *Is. Os.* 355D 11 (Babbitt, LCL).

³⁷² *Is. Os.* 355D 11 (Babbitt, LCL).

³⁷³ *Is. Os.* 351E 2 (Babbitt, LCL).

³⁷⁴ See “νεωκόρος,” BDAG, 670.

³⁷⁵ Plutarch, *Is. Os.* 2, 352A (Babbitt, LCL).

the earlier reference in *Isis and Osiris*, the emphasis lies on motivation, attitude and comprehension rather than the physical act of sacrifice. That said, Plutarch elsewhere speaks in a disparaging manner of those who reject belief in divine providence and the divinity of the planets, who are appropriately worshiped through sacrifice as well as prayer.³⁷⁶ Again, Plutarch does not seem to be repudiating physical sacrifices.

There are two further references that may bear indirectly on the subject of spiritual sacrifices. Firstly, in Plutarch's discourse *On Brotherly Love*, he comments on duty to parents in view of the greatest honor that Nature and the Law have assigned to parents after the gods, and avers that, "there is nothing which men do that is more acceptable to gods than with goodwill and zeal to repay to those who bore them and brought them up the favours "long ago lent to them when they were young." ³⁷⁷ This return of favor is more acceptable (κεχαρισμένον from χαρίζομαι) to the gods than anything else which could be offered, and that, presumably, by implication, would include the offering of sacrifices. Finally, in a discourse against the Epicureans, Plutarch insists that sacrifices and feast days are meaningless and do nothing for a person if the god's presence is not felt, "if the god is not present at the sacrifice as master of rites (so to speak) what is left bears no mark of sanctity or holy day and leaves the spirit untouched by the divine influence."³⁷⁸ For this to happen, people must bring these thoughts close to God and honor and reverence him.³⁷⁹ It can even be necessary for the sacrifice itself to, "both in body and in soul, be pure, unblemished, and unmarred."³⁸⁰

³⁷⁶ *Adv. Col.* 1123A.

³⁷⁷ *Frat. amor.* 479F (Helmbold, LCL).

³⁷⁸ *Suav. viv.* 1102A (Einarson, De Lacy, LCL).

³⁷⁹ *Suav. viv.* 1102B.

³⁸⁰ *Def. orac.* 437B.

2.4.1.2 Temple Language

Plutarch's *On Tranquillity of Mind* is in agreement with Seneca (see Seneca, *Ben.* 7.7.3; *Ep.* 90.29 earlier) in affirming that, "the universe is a most holy temple and most worthy of a god".³⁸¹ Human beings enter the world as a spectator of its images, not the kind of images crafted by hand and placed in a temple, but, "of those sensible representations of knowable things that the divine mind . . . has revealed."³⁸² Similarly, in his *Platonic Questions*, also acknowledging his debt to Plato, Plutarch states that the universe "has in it a large portion of vitality and divinity, which god sowed from himself in the matter and mixed with it",³⁸³ and speaking of the soul of the universe he adds, "The soul, however, when it has partaken of intelligence and reason and concord, is not merely a work but also a part of god and has come to be not by his agency but both from him as source and out of his substance."³⁸⁴ The universe, then, is infused with god, deriving its life from him and even identified with divinity.³⁸⁵ In the next question, Plato deals with the same subject, speaking of the god who stretched the soul through everything in the universe and thus preserved its corporeal state from dissolution (unlike the body of human beings which is "subject to mortality").³⁸⁶ Plutarch also compares an individual to a temple in *How a Man May Become Aware of His Progress in Virtue*. He speaks of the man making progress in the path of virtue, for whom no sin is too small to overlook, and no vice is condoned. Unlike the sloppy laborer who uses whatever materials come to hand to finish a wall, his life has a "golden foundation".³⁸⁷ His life is compared to "some holy temple or

³⁸¹ *Tranq. an.* 477C (Helmbold, LCL).

³⁸² *Tranq. an.* 477C (Helmbold, LCL), alluding to Plato's *Timaeus*, 92C and *Epinomis*, 984A.

³⁸³ *Quaest. plat.* 2, 1001B (Cherniss, LCL).

³⁸⁴ *Quaest. plat.* 2, 1001C (Cherniss, LCL).

³⁸⁵ See also *Quaest. plat.* 8.

³⁸⁶ *Quaest. plat.* 2, 1002C (Cherniss, LCL). There is also a passing reference in *Amat.* 762E to "a god within", citing the words of Telemachus from Homer, *Od.* 19.40.

³⁸⁷ *Virt. prof.* 86A (Babbitt, LCL) (citing Pindar, *Frag.* 206.1.).

regal palace” where each action is fitted into the place prepared for it “using reason to guide them.”³⁸⁸

2.4.1.3 *The Nature of Divinity*

God orders all things,³⁸⁹ and “through noiseless ways advancing, guides by Justice all affairs of mortal men.”³⁹⁰ God is the creator (although the soul of the universe was not brought into being by him, but is self-moved, being regulated and ordered by him).³⁹¹ God is the source of the radiant vision of philosophy, “that beauty which is for men unutterable and indescribable”,³⁹² since he is great and majestic.³⁹³ God is timeless,³⁹⁴ he binds together the substance of the world and keeps it from dissolution,³⁹⁵ and sustains the universe.³⁹⁶ God’s qualities are described in passing as including “justice, benevolence and kindness.”³⁹⁷ and “goodness, magnanimity, kindness, and solicitude.”³⁹⁸ He is the father of all that is honorable, and so it is his nature to bless and to help. He is ready to help because he is always standing near.³⁹⁹ Plutarch’s treatise, *On the Delays of the Divine Vengeance*, as its name suggests, assumes the premise that God does repay the wrongdoer, but considers the reasons why divine punishment is sometimes delayed. God is the great physician, knowing when it would be

³⁸⁸ *Virt. prof.* 86A (Babbitt, LCL). The reference to “the god in his holy temple” in *Def. orac.* 437A. concerns a sacrifice performed in a god’s temple in order to discern his will.

³⁸⁹ *Is. Os.* 382B; Dillon, *Platonists*, 199.

³⁹⁰ *Is. Os.* 381B (Babbitt, LCL), citing Euripides, *Tro.* 887–888 (see Plutarch, *Is. Os.* 172 note a).

³⁹¹ *An. procr.* 1013ABC, 1014BC, E, 1015E, 1016C, 1027A; cf. *Quaest. conv.* 720C.

³⁹² *Is. Os.* 383A (Babbitt, LCL).

³⁹³ *Praec. ger. rei publ.* 822B.

³⁹⁴ *E Delph.* 393A (Babbitt, LCL).

³⁹⁵ *E Delph.* 393F.

³⁹⁶ *Exil.* 601B; *Adv. Col.* 1124F.

³⁹⁷ *Def. orac.* 423D (Babbitt, LCL).

³⁹⁸ *Superst.* 167F (Babbitt, LCL).

³⁹⁹ *Suav. viv.* 1102D.

beneficial to delay punishment;⁴⁰⁰ sometimes because he wants people to learn not to be vengeful in applying punishment themselves,⁴⁰¹ and at other times because he knows which souls will respond with repentance, given a period of grace.⁴⁰² In other cases, he will punish preemptively, rooting out the evil in someone predisposed to it before they commit wrong.⁴⁰³

There is one Reason and one Providence which watches over all peoples, though the gods may be known by different names in different places, according to local custom.⁴⁰⁴ The gods are their own masters, not subject to anyone's control,⁴⁰⁵ and indestructible.⁴⁰⁶ They are good governors,⁴⁰⁷ and are described as acting with, "moderation, adequacy, excess in nothing, and complete self-sufficiency."⁴⁰⁸ In accordance with their own nature, the gods derive, "their only or their chief enjoyment" from "the good deeds and noble actions" of those who engage in public affairs.⁴⁰⁹ Indeed, they are the most important friends of people.⁴¹⁰ Plutarch has Heracleon in *On the Obsolescence of Oracles* advance the opinion that Providence acts like "a benign and helpful mother, who does everything for us and watches over us."⁴¹¹ This provision includes things like sight, hearing and medicinal agents.⁴¹² Like Seneca and Marcus Aurelius, Plutarch can speak of Nature using the same language that he uses to speak about God. But Plutarch distinguishes himself from the Stoics in respect to Nature. Unlike them, he does not understand there to be one

⁴⁰⁰ *Sera* 549F.

⁴⁰¹ *Sera* 550 E–551 C.

⁴⁰² *Sera* 551D.

⁴⁰³ *Sera* 562D. For more on Plutarch's conception of God, see Brenk, "Heritage," *ANRW* 36.1:248–349 at 262–75.

⁴⁰⁴ *Is. Os.* 377F.

⁴⁰⁵ *Def. orac.* 426C.

⁴⁰⁶ *Comm. not.* 1074EF–1075D, against the Stoics' claim that, though Zeus was eternal and indestructible, other gods were eventually consumed (since the planets were considered to be gods).

⁴⁰⁷ *Adv. Col.* 1124F.

⁴⁰⁸ *Def. orac.* 413F (Babbitt, LCL).

⁴⁰⁹ *An seni* 786B (Fowler, LCL).

⁴¹⁰ *Conj. praec.* 140D.

⁴¹¹ *Def. orac.* 413C (Babbitt, LCL); see also the treatment of this topic in *Stoic. rep.*

⁴¹² *Def. orac.* 436D.

good, governing force, such as Reason, which doles out both good and evil as part of its good purposes. Rather, Nature has, “commingled” within itself two opposing principles, one of which guides us in a straight line to the right path, but the other down a different path, “Nature must have in herself the source and origin of evil, just as she contains the source and origin of good.”⁴¹³ Nature takes the initiative in many matters, even acting above God. Nature, together with the Law, is described as assigning honor to gods.⁴¹⁴ Nature is repeatedly described as the source of life and limbs,⁴¹⁵ called “the most holy and great of sacred things”⁴¹⁶ and is the one who implants emotions in her creatures⁴¹⁷ and introduces people “to a conception of justice and law and to the worship of the gods.”⁴¹⁸ (rather than the initiative lying with God).

2.4.1.4 *The Nature of Humanity*

Plutarch puts into the mouth of one of his characters the view that, “men are divine and dear to God”⁴¹⁹ Their very birth and their “becoming”, “are a gift of God to make him known.”⁴²⁰ In particular, the king is in the “image” (εἰκών) of God, and forms himself in the “likeness” (ὁμοίωμα) of God by his virtue,⁴²¹ “and thus creates a statue most delightful of all to behold and most worthy of divinity”, provided the ruler upholds righteous decisions “in God’s likeness” (θεουδής⁴²²).⁴²³ Some the Gods wish to make divine, whereas others, having been set

⁴¹³ *Is. Os.* 369D (Babbitt, LCL); see also Dillon, *Platonists*, 202–04.

⁴¹⁴ *Frat. amor.* 479F.

⁴¹⁵ E.g. *Frat. amor.* 478DEF; 479CD; 480B.

⁴¹⁶ *Frat. amor.* 479D (Helmbold, LCL).

⁴¹⁷ *Am. prol.* 494F.

⁴¹⁸ *Am. prol.* 495C (Helmbold, LCL).

⁴¹⁹ *Gen. Socr.* 593A (De Lacy, Einarson, LCL).

⁴²⁰ *Lat. viv.* 1129F (De Lacy, LCL).

⁴²¹ *Princ. iner.* 780E (Fowler, LCL); cf. also *Princ. iner.* 781A.

⁴²² The definition of θεουδής is “fear of God” according to “θεουδής,” LSJ, 792, but adds that it can be taken as θεοειδής, meaning “godlike” in works later than Homer; cf. “θεοειδής,” LSJ, 790.

⁴²³ *Princ. iner.* 780F (Fowler, LCL).

free from the body, become daemons that watch over people.⁴²⁴ They are like retired athletes, who cheer on those who are still running the race of life, and encourage them to reach their goal.⁴²⁵ Vice and depravity come from the soul itself and become its sickness.⁴²⁶ Elsewhere, Plutarch, citing Homer, avers that the body is the dwelling of both good and evil.⁴²⁷ In line with Plato's own thought, souls are wanderers, exiled from their true home, who are imprisoned within their bodies,⁴²⁸ viewed as, "the encasement of their souls".⁴²⁹ For this reason, persons should have as little association with the body as is possible in their earthy life.⁴³⁰ The body is the instrument of the soul, but the soul is granted a far loftier role; it is the instrument of God.⁴³¹ After death, the soul will be set free from the body, and travels to the realm of things invisible and pure where God truly rules as their king.⁴³² The soul is imperishable and thus will never die.⁴³³ The honor or punishment due to the soul for its life on earth is awarded to it after death,⁴³⁴ but in one passage in *On the Delays of the Divine Vengeance*, Plutarch envisages these rewards and punishments being meted out to the living descendants of the soul.⁴³⁵

⁴²⁴ *Gen. Socr.* 593D. Dillon, *Platonists*, 46–47 notes the development of the theory of daemons in Plutarch and subsequent Middle Platonic thinkers.

⁴²⁵ *Gen. Socr.* 593DEF; cf. 1 Cor 9:24–27; 1 Tim 6:12; 2 Tim 2:5; 2 Tim 4:7; Heb 12:1–3; Jude 3. On this notion of daemons and guardian spirits in Plutarch, see Dillon, *Platonists*, 217–21, and Brenk, "Heritage," *ANRW* 36.1:248–349 at 275–94.

⁴²⁶ *An. corp.* 500C; cf. Dillon, *Platonists*, 208.

⁴²⁷ *Virt. prof.* 122E, citing Homer, *Od.* 4.392.

⁴²⁸ *Exil.* 607D.

⁴²⁹ *Is. Os.* 353A (Babbitt, LCL).

⁴³⁰ [*Cons. Apoll.*] 108CD; a common view in Middle Platonism, see Dillon, *Platonists*, 47.

⁴³¹ *Sept. sap. conv.* 163E. For more on the soul in Plutarch, see Dillon, *Platonists*, 194, 202–08, 211–13.

⁴³² *Is. Os.* 383A; cf. *Suav. viv.* 1105D.

⁴³³ *Cons. ux.* 611EF, 612A.

⁴³⁴ *Sera* 560F; cf. *Suav. viv.* 1105C.

⁴³⁵ *Sera* 561A.

2.4.1.5 Living out the Philosophy

Because Plutarch's *Moralia* is such a large corpus (nearly eighty works) and since ethics is such a major concern of those works, it is not possible in a brief survey of this nature to provide a comprehensive analysis of the ways in which Plutarch's understanding of God's relationship to humanity should affect how people live. Instead, I shall provide a very brief representative sample of his advice by drawing on some of the works cited in earlier sections. Wise people should ask for good things from the gods and in particular that they may gain a knowledge of the gods themselves, that is, a revelation of true reality.⁴³⁶ The true worshiper cannot simply rely on the knowledge of religious rites communicated to them; they must use reason to understand the truth.⁴³⁷ This reasoning must come from Philosophy.⁴³⁸ This is the most divine possession available to humanity, especially the capacity to reason concerning the gods, and nothing has greater power to bring true happiness.⁴³⁹ Those who are wise should honor the inanimate and incorporeal objects which point towards the Divine, recognizing them as instruments of God for that purpose.⁴⁴⁰ In particular, Reason directs the passions towards the right course.⁴⁴¹ Reason provides guidance in matters as diverse as, for example, caring for wives,⁴⁴² knowing how to speak succinctly and show restraint in speech,⁴⁴³ how to handle wealth,⁴⁴⁴ avoiding envy and hate,⁴⁴⁵ and rage,⁴⁴⁶ and how to praise oneself for the right

⁴³⁶ *Is. Os.* 351D.

⁴³⁷ *Is. Os.* 352C.

⁴³⁸ *Is. Os.* 378A.

⁴³⁹ *Is. Os.* 378CD c.f. *Cupid. divit.* 527F.

⁴⁴⁰ *Is. Os.* 382AB.

⁴⁴¹ See generally, *Virt. mor.*

⁴⁴² *Frat. amor.* 491DE.

⁴⁴³ E.g. *Garr.* 510DE.

⁴⁴⁴ E.g. *Cupid. divit.* 526AB.

⁴⁴⁵ *Inv. od.* generally.

⁴⁴⁶ *Sera* 550E–551C.

reasons,⁴⁴⁷ among many other topics. In each of these areas of life, and many more, the person of virtue should copy and aspire to, “the beauty and the goodness that are his.”⁴⁴⁸ Above all, the soul should be ready to yield itself to the service of God, “for Him to direct it and turn it in whatsoever course He may desire.”⁴⁴⁹ This emphasis corresponds to a wider pattern in Middle Platonism. Such philosophers tended to see the *telos* of existence as knowing and imitating God, rather than the Stoic goal of living in accordance with nature.⁴⁵⁰

2.4.2 Alcinous

Alcinous is one of two second century Middle Platonic philosophers with whom I shall deal briefly. Although they are both later than Paul (and even the second century dating of Alcinous is the best reasonable conjecture, rather than an established date),⁴⁵¹ their ideas are congruent with earlier writers influenced by Middle Platonism, such as Plutarch and Philo.⁴⁵² In the absence of other extant Middle Platonic works earlier than or contemporaneous with Paul, I shall draw on Alcinous and Maximus of Tyre to support our observations from Plutarch (and, in the next chapter, from Philo).

⁴⁴⁷ *De laude* generally.

⁴⁴⁸ *Sera* 550E (De Lacy, Einarson, LCL).

⁴⁴⁹ *Sept. sap. conv.* 163E (Babbitt, LCL).

⁴⁵⁰ See Dillon, *Platonists*, 43–44, 192–93, 229.

⁴⁵¹ See *OCD*, 53; Alcinous, *Handbook*, Preface, and ix–xl.

⁴⁵² John Dillon’s commentary in Idem, *Handbook*, 51–211, draws out the way Alcinous’ work is directly dependent upon and often cites (or alludes to) the work of Plato. The sections with which I will engage evince a particular dependence on Plato’s *Timaeus*.

2.4.2.1 Temple Language

The main allusion to God's indwelling presence, is the statement that, "by his own will he has filled all things with himself", in reference to a "rousing up" of the soul of the world which gives it its intellect.⁴⁵³

2.4.2.2 The Nature of Divinity

Alcinous surmises that whatever is prior to actualized intellect, as actualized intellect is superior to potential intellect, and potential intellect is to the soul, must be God, the "unmoved mover" of Aristotle.⁴⁵⁴ Since nothing finer than God's thoughts can be conceived, God must be eternally thinking about his own thoughts,⁴⁵⁵ and his own thoughts are eternal and unchanging.⁴⁵⁶ This God is also perfect in every way; in beauty, truth and goodness and the Father of all things.⁴⁵⁷ God has no parts, and so, is incorporeal.⁴⁵⁸ The world always existed but God endowed it with soul and intellect and brought order to the world soul, that has also existed eternally.⁴⁵⁹ On the other hand, God created the other divinities (including daemons).⁴⁶⁰ Of all species, Alcinous considers humanity to be "most akin to the gods" and so God himself created people, and sent down the appropriate number of souls to earth (equal to the stars) and expounded his revelation of the order of things to them (as opposed to animals, fish and birds, whose creation is attributed to lesser gods).⁴⁶¹

⁴⁵³ Idem, *Handbook*, 165.10.3.1–2 (18). The numbers in parentheses denote the page numbers in Dillon's translation.

⁴⁵⁴ Idem, *Handbook*, 164.10.2.18–26 (17) and see Dillon's commentary on 103.

⁴⁵⁵ Idem, *Handbook*, 164.10.3.27–29 (17–18).

⁴⁵⁶ Idem, *Handbook*, 163.9.30–35 (16).

⁴⁵⁷ Idem, *Handbook*, 164.10.31–41 (18).

⁴⁵⁸ Idem, *Handbook*, 165.34–166.14 (19).

⁴⁵⁹ Idem, *Handbook*, 169.14.3–170.4 (23–24).

⁴⁶⁰ Idem, *Handbook*, 171.15.1.15–2.23 (25).

⁴⁶¹ Idem, *Handbook*, 171.1.38–172.2.12 (26), drawing on Plato, *Tim.* 41.BCD.

2.4.2.3 *The Nature of Humanity*

The soul who engages in contemplation of the divine and its thoughts achieves a state of wisdom which is described, by negation as, “no other than likeness to the divine”.⁴⁶² The soul’s nature is to rule and it is, “imperishable and indestructible.”⁴⁶³

2.4.2.4 *Living out the Philosophy*

Despite being described as “ineffable”, it is possible for the seeker after him to grasp him by the intellect. Alcinous outlines a number of paths to do so, by meditating on his attributes, by analogy, by contemplating his beauty by a series of steps; from beauty in bodies, to souls, to laws and on to a final “intuition of the Good”, that becomes like a light shining on the soul as it ascends on its path towards God.⁴⁶⁴ Likeness of God, declares Alcinous, following Plato, consists at least in being just, and preferably in being, “intelligent, and just, and pious.”⁴⁶⁵ This likeness to God is attained by those who have a “suitable nature” and who, further, train that nature by the right habits and disciplines of philosophy, reason and education. This must be coupled by a distancing of oneself from worldly concerns, and a correspondent intimacy with “intelligible reality”.⁴⁶⁶ Perhaps surprisingly for a Jewish or Christian reader, however, is that the god whose likeness Alcinous says souls should imitate is not the supreme God, but the “god in the heavens” described in chapter 10.⁴⁶⁷ The goal of the souls is to return to their “kindred star”

⁴⁶² Idem, *Handbook*, 153.2.5–8 (4); cf. 177.25.34 (33); 181.28.1.19–20 (37), citing Plato.

⁴⁶³ Idem, *Handbook*, 177.25.33–35 (33).

⁴⁶⁴ Idem, *Handbook*, 165.10.4–6 (18–19).

⁴⁶⁵ Idem, *Handbook*, 181.28.22–30 (37), and see the references from Plato cited there and the commentary on (170).

⁴⁶⁶ Idem, *Handbook*, 182.4.3–8 (38).

⁴⁶⁷ Idem, *Handbook*, 181.28.3.44–46 (38).

and the key to achieving this goal is to achieve dominance over the sensations that would seek to attach themselves to them from the body.⁴⁶⁸

2.4.3 Maximus of Tyre

Little is known of Maximus of Tyre, other than his second century C.E. date. We have 41 extant Lectures or *Philosophical Orations*, that seems to have been delivered during the reign of Commodus in Rome. His work clearly draws on Middle Platonic thought.⁴⁶⁹

2.4.3.1 Sacrifice language

Although Maximus does not directly use the language of sacrifice, he does speak of the kind of worship that the gods require. In his oration on the images of the Gods, he emphasizes that the gods do not need images, statues or dedications; rather, this is more for the benefit of humanity in its own weakness. Yet, “People whose memories are strong, and who can reach straight out for the heavens with their souls and encounter the divine, may perhaps have no need of images”.⁴⁷⁰ Those who are advanced in their understanding of their worship, “honour them, but by word of mouth alone, believing that the gods have no need of images and dedications”,⁴⁷¹ that would include sacrifices. Direct encounter with the divine and the prayers and praises of the lips are what is needed, rather than literal sacrifices.

⁴⁶⁸ Idem, *Handbook*, 172.16.2.10–19 (26), drawing on Plato, *Tim.* 42AB.

⁴⁶⁹ See *OCD*, 915 and the introduction to M. B. Trapp, *Maximus of Tyre: The Philosophical Orations* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997).

⁴⁷⁰ Maximus of Tyre, *Or.* 2.2. All translations are taken from Idem, *Maximus*,

⁴⁷¹ *Or.* 2.1.

2.4.3.2 Temple Language

There are two obvious instances of ‘indwelling’ language in Maximus. The first of these reads, “God has breathed expectation of the Good into the human race like a spark of life”⁴⁷² but the second says that Nature “has breathed into him [man] an invisible spark to ensure his survival, a spark which men call intelligence, thanks to which his continued survival is assured.”⁴⁷³ Though Maximus uses the language of ‘spark’ in both instances, one statement refers to an expectation of “the Good” (used by Maximus for the ideal of virtue, as we shall see below) and the other to intelligence.⁴⁷⁴ However, what is of interest is that in the first sentence the subject is God, and in the second it is Nature. I shall also observe below the way that different functions are attributed to God and to Nature in Maximus’s philosophy.

2.4.3.3 The Nature of Divinity

God is described in a number of places as Father and Creator.⁴⁷⁵ He is immortal and free from emotion.⁴⁷⁶ He is wiser than man,⁴⁷⁷ and the source of all beauty, himself beautiful.⁴⁷⁸ God is not divided between soul and body, as humans are, but rather, he is incorporeal, “of a single nature, pure intelligence and knowledge and reason.”⁴⁷⁹ God is understood as “the most perfect form of intellect . . . which thinks all things for ever at the same time,”⁴⁸⁰ prompting the translator, Michael B. Trapp, to compare Maximus to the writer I have just surveyed, Alcinous,

⁴⁷² *Or.* 29.6.

⁴⁷³ *Or.* 31.4.

⁴⁷⁴ A further reference to a spark, this time to philosophy, that knows and communicates to humanity the way to pray, can be found in *Or.* 5.8.

⁴⁷⁵ *Or.* 2.10; 11.5; 11.9, 12; 41.2.

⁴⁷⁶ *Or.* 9.2.

⁴⁷⁷ *Or.* 6.1.

⁴⁷⁸ *Or.* 11.11.

⁴⁷⁹ *Or.* 27.8.

⁴⁸⁰ *Or.* 11.8; cf. 11.9.

“where one sees the same slide from God as supreme Intelligible to God as supreme Intelligence.”⁴⁸¹ In one revealing Oration that addresses the topic of prayer, Maximus distinguishes between the jurisdiction of different powers, “Of all the things which men pray to obtain, some are under the control of Providence, some are enforced by Destiny, some are at the mercy of fickle Fortune, and some are regulated by Science. Providence is God’s work, Destiny the work of Necessity, Science the work of man, and Fortune the work of blind Chance.”⁴⁸² Therefore, the object and goal of prayer must be related to the particular power that might determine the answer and in some cases, prayer is unnecessary since ineffectual, “nothing that falls under the heading of Providence is to be requested or prayed for.”⁴⁸³ Although the examples I have examined from Stoic writers sometimes suggest fine distinctions between, for instance, Nature and God, many of them blur the boundaries considerably. Maximus, by contrast, demarcates quite separate roles for Nature, Providence, Necessity and Chance in a way that seems foreign to Stoicism.⁴⁸⁴ Fate is impersonal, acting in a regular, impartial manner.⁴⁸⁵ God is also described as King,⁴⁸⁶ he administers the heavens,⁴⁸⁷ and governs skillfully with “beauty and artistry and knowledge”, a knowledge which consists in virtue.⁴⁸⁸ His government and direction of the universe is compared to a master musician and conductor, a mechanic who understands perfectly the machines he operates (compared to the human power of reasoning), a helmsman

⁴⁸¹ Trapp, *Maximus*, 102–03; comparing this passage with Alcinous, *Handbook*, 164.10 (18), that was cited in the discussion on the “Nature of Divinity” in Alcinous.

⁴⁸² Maximus of Tyre, *Or.* 5.4.

⁴⁸³ *Or.* 5.4.

⁴⁸⁴ Alexander of Aphrodisias, a philosopher from c. 200 C.E., referring to the Stoic view of freedom, writes, “everything they do is done of necessity” (Alexander, *On fate* 181,13–182,20 (SVF 2.979)); translation from Long and Sedley, *Philosophers Vol 1*, 62G, 389–90. For more on fate and necessity in Stoicism, see Rist, *Philosophy*, 112–32 and especially Bobzien, *Determinism*.

⁴⁸⁵ *Or.* 13.4.

⁴⁸⁶ *Or.* 11.5.

⁴⁸⁷ *Or.* 8.8.

⁴⁸⁸ *Or.* 27.8.

who watches the sea, and a doctor whose knowledge of disease and patients leads to the right diagnosis.⁴⁸⁹ Despite what I have noted about the separate dispensations of God, Fate, Providence and Chance, at the same time, Maximus claims that in governing, he is assisted by “Chance and Opportunity” but that they are merely “secondary influences”; God is the “all-controlling agent in human affairs.”⁴⁹⁰ Having made the claim that God is all-controlling, Maximus is quick to point out that evil does not come from the hand of God, nor through Fate.⁴⁹¹ In this, as Trapp points out, Maximus distances evil from Fate and Providence in a way quite different to Stoic writers, who speak more of only seeming evils that turn out for the best.⁴⁹² Sometimes these evils arise from God’s work but they are ancillary, not caused or intended by God, like the anvil and heat from the furnace that are “necessary consequences” of the work done by the master craftsman (this image again), rather than the direct product of his work.⁴⁹³

Gods also exist and lend their aid to humanity.⁴⁹⁴ Although the Universe is the shared home of both gods and people, the gods do not dwell in the earth but in heaven.⁴⁹⁵ Below the gods are the daemons, who are superior to men, since they relate more closely to God than people do. Daemons share in kinship with both, and form a kind of bridge between God and humanity.⁴⁹⁶ These daemons share in God’s immortality but are susceptible to emotions in a way that God is not.⁴⁹⁷ They are disembodied souls who became daemons and act as watchers or guardian angels; acting on behalf of the good and punishing the wicked.⁴⁹⁸

⁴⁸⁹ *Or.* 13.3–4; cf. also *Or.* 41.4 for the craftsman analogy.

⁴⁹⁰ *Or.* 13.7, citing Plato, *Leg.* 709bc.

⁴⁹¹ *Or.* 13.8.

⁴⁹² Trapp, *Maximus*, 123 note 33.

⁴⁹³ Maximus of Tyre, *Or.* 41.4; cf. 41.5.

⁴⁹⁴ *Or.* 2.1.

⁴⁹⁵ *Or.* 13.6.

⁴⁹⁶ *Or.* 8.8.

⁴⁹⁷ *Or.* 9.2.

⁴⁹⁸ *Or.* 9.6–7; 13.6.

2.4.3.4 *The Nature of Humanity*

Maximus assumes that the soul is very close to God and like him in nature.⁴⁹⁹ The soul is a compound of both the mortal and the immortal, that has different functions in relation to its components, including perception, intellect and prudence, and “in virtue of its immortal component it unites with the divine, in that it is capable of thought, reasoning, learning, and knowledge”⁵⁰⁰ There is a “sparse”, yet real, element of good in human nature that can reap a harvest in the lives of great pupils if they fan into flame the “living, breathing spark that alone knows how to pray” by availing themselves of philosophy.⁵⁰¹ Since the soul comes from “the same stock as Beauty itself”, it is able to recollect the true Beauty that is “immortal and ineffable.”⁵⁰² There are rewards and punishments for people, awarded to them by God (vice to those of a wicked nature and virtue to those of a good nature).⁵⁰³ This assumes that virtue and vice come from within the souls of people,⁵⁰⁴ and, despite Maximus’s idea of providence and fate, vice can be freely chosen in such a way that God is blameless for the fault.⁵⁰⁵ Despite this, elsewhere, Maximus contends that Virtue is distributed by God, and yet God’s assistance is needed in the fight between Virtue and Vice, to enable individuals to be victorious in the struggle.⁵⁰⁶ The soul rules over the body,⁵⁰⁷ holding it together as if a ship in the stormy sea of life.⁵⁰⁸ On earth, the soul is like a captive to the body and life is like dreaming while it is still

⁴⁹⁹ *Or.* 2.3, and thus, unlike the animals, in that humans can know God by virtue of reason (see *Or.* 41.5).

⁵⁰⁰ *Or.* 6.4; cf. also *Or.* 9.6; 33.7.

⁵⁰¹ *Or.* 5.8.

⁵⁰² *Or.* 21.7–8.

⁵⁰³ *Or.* 8.7.

⁵⁰⁴ Assumed by *Or.* 34.3.

⁵⁰⁵ *Or.* 41.5.

⁵⁰⁶ *Or.* 38.6.

⁵⁰⁷ *Or.* 7.2; 9.6.

⁵⁰⁸ *Or.* 9.6; 40.5.

entrapped in the flesh.⁵⁰⁹ The soul and body are intertwined and, “the one is implicated in the discomforts and pleasures of the other.”⁵¹⁰ However, the soul has innate knowledge (“self-taught”) that can be awakened by Reason, and Reason then allows the soul to at least dimly perceive reality.⁵¹¹ Reason is described as acting like a midwife to the pregnant soul,⁵¹² but in this analogy the soul is the procreator; it has its own powers of discovery, “which are self-generated, natural and innate.”⁵¹³ However, the soul longs to be free from the body and feels no regret to shed its skin, like a prisoner set free from confinement or a man who swims free to shore.⁵¹⁴ At this point reality is at last visible to the soul who joins the gods, “as a member of the divine host led and commanded by Zeus.”⁵¹⁵ The virtuous soul becomes a “daimon”, who watches over its former peers for whom it feels pity.⁵¹⁶

2.4.3.5 *Living out the Philosophy*

In order for the soul to ascend to God it must focus its attention on him. The intellect will see and hear the things of the Divine, “by bringing to bear an upright, vigorous soul, by fixing its gaze firmly on that pure light . . . and entrusting its guidance to true Reason and vigorous Love,”⁵¹⁷ and eventually by stripping off the clothing of the body.⁵¹⁸ On this earth, the good person should live a life of virtuous action,⁵¹⁹ doing no wrong.⁵²⁰ For this, moral education is

⁵⁰⁹ *Or.* 10.3–5.

⁵¹⁰ *Or.* 28.2.

⁵¹¹ *Or.* 10.3, 9.

⁵¹² *Or.* 10.4.

⁵¹³ *Or.* 10.5.

⁵¹⁴ *Or.* 7.5; 9.6; cf. 10.9.

⁵¹⁵ *Or.* 10.9.

⁵¹⁶ *Or.* 9.6.

⁵¹⁷ *Or.* 11.10.

⁵¹⁸ *Or.* 11.11.

⁵¹⁹ *Or.* 15.6, 10.

⁵²⁰ *Or.* 12.

needed,⁵²¹ and people should imitate God (for instance, his “preservative and affectionate and paternal qualities”),⁵²² and seize hold of “the Good”, the highest and greatest of all virtue, which can neither be increased nor decreased.⁵²³ At the same time, the soul must resist vice, restraining its impulses by preserving its recollections of God, like a charioteer who restrains the impulses of the horses driving the chariot.⁵²⁴

2.4.4 Summary of our Findings from Middle Platonism

2.4.4.1 Summary of Sacrifice Language

Plutarch emphasizes a pure motivation in worship, but also speaks of other things that could count as a sacrifice, such as trusting in and understanding the gods and study and seeking after divine truth. Additionally, the return of favor to parents is compared to a sacrifice in the temple. Maximus of Tyre allows for worshiping God with prayer and contemplation as if this could function as a substitute for a physical sacrifice.

2.4.4.2 Summary of Temple Language

Plutarch speaks of the universe as a holy temple (as Seneca did also), which has been sowed with divinity and is identified with God. A person can also be a temple, guided by reason in the path of virtue, where each action is fitted in its rightful place, just as with each part of the temple. Alcinous agrees that God fills all things with himself, and Maximus says that God and Nature have breathed into people the expectation of good and the spark of intelligence.

⁵²¹ *Or.* 27.9.

⁵²² *Or.* 35.2; cf. 26.9.

⁵²³ *Or.* 39.1, 3; 40.3, 4.

⁵²⁴ *Or.* 41.5.

2.4.4.3 Summary of the Nature of Divinity

Plutarch speaks of God as the creator and sustainer of the universe and the source of philosophy. He is beneficent, timeless and incorporeal. There is one Reason and Providence, and God sends or delays punishment at the appropriate time. The gods are known by different names in different places and act as good governors. Unlike the Stoics, Plutarch sees Nature as the source of both good and evil. It can take the initiative and act almost independently of God. Alcinous sees God more as pure intellect, a kind of Aristotelean unmoved mover. God is occupied with thinking about his own perfect thoughts. He endowed the pre-existing world with intellect or soul and brought order to the world soul. He communicates with people and created both divinities and daemons. Maximus speaks of God as father, creator, immortal incorporeal (like Alcinous) and source of all beauty and goodness. Like Alcinous, God is conceived as perfect intelligence. Yet not everything is under his control, and Maximus envisages separate roles for Nature and Providence. Elsewhere he speaks of God governing with the assistance of Chance and Opportunity. Evil is not the direct result of God's work and is distinct from Fate and Providence. The gods help people but they reside in the heavens, not the earth.

2.4.4.4 Summary of the Nature of Humanity

Plutarch understands humanity as divine, and very dear to God. The king in particular is an image of God and can become like God. Some are made divine by God, others are set free from the body and become daemons after death. Both good and evil resides in the soul. After death the soul is set free and travels to the divine realm. Honor and punishment are meted out after death, but to living descendants. Alcinous, like Plutarch, sees humanity as most akin to the gods. The soul who contemplates the divine can become like it and is imperishable. Maximus

agrees with both writers that the soul is like God, and since it is a compound of both the mortal and immortal, it can unite with the divine. Humans can recollect the beauty of the divine and fan into flame the divine spark within them. Virtue and vice come from within and are appropriately rewarded or punished. God can aid these virtues. The soul rules the body and can be awakened by reason and set free.

2.4.4.5 Summary of Living out the Philosophy

Plutarch urges his audience to use reason to seek the revelation of God. A person should honor what points to the divine, and follow Reason's guidance with the passions and live a temperate life by imitating God's beauty and goodness and let themselves be directed by God's design. Alcinous claims that one can grasp God by the intellect and become like him in his virtues, although, unlike the other writers, he concedes that it is not the supreme God whom we can imitate but only the "god in the heavens". This process comes about through discipline, moral education and by distancing oneself from the body and worldly concerns. Maximus calls his readers to be guided by Reason and thus fix their gaze on the divine. They should live a life of virtue and imitate God through moral education; seizing the good and resisting Vice.

2.5 Skepticism

The "Academy" was the name given to the school founded by Plato in the fourth century B.C.E. The "New Academy" was associated more with Skepticism than Platonism,⁵²⁵ and under heads such as Carneades (214/3–129/8 B.C.E.),⁵²⁶ and Philon of Larissa (159/8–84/3 B.C.E.), argued for the impossibility of certain knowledge and therefore the suspension of judgment on

⁵²⁵ *OCD*, 2.

⁵²⁶ *OCD*, 282; Kristeller, *Philosophers*, 87–99.

all matters, though Philon, following Carneades, argued for a theory of “plausible impressions” that would allow Sceptics to follow the view they deemed most convincing. Cicero was a devoted follower of Philon.⁵²⁷

2.5.1 Cicero

Here I shall be considering Cicero’s own views, as distinct from his summaries of other schools covered elsewhere in this chapter. Marcus Tullius Cicero (106–43 B.C.E.), came from a wealthy and well-connected family, and rose through the ranks to become consul. He studied both philosophy and rhetoric and wrote widely in both fields, through varying political fortunes.⁵²⁸ In this survey I shall limit my investigations to his philosophical works.

2.5.1.1 Sacrifice Language

At the start of the second book of *De Legibus*, Cicero uses the metaphor of adoption to speak of the relationship between Rome and its citizens. Although, in common with other Italians, they might be expected to give allegiance to the fatherland in which they were born, Cicero uses a sacrificial image to urge total consecration to Rome, “For her it is our duty to die, to her to give ourselves entirely, to place on her altar, and, as it were, to dedicate to her service,

⁵²⁷ *OCD*, 1133; Idem, *Philosophers*, 99–103.

⁵²⁸ *OCD*, 1514–19; Ferguson, *Backgrounds*, 380–82. For overviews of Cicero’s philosophical thought, see e.g. Long, “Roman,” 184–210 at 198–200; MacKendrick, *Cicero*, 1–28; Powell, “Introduction,” 1–35 and Malcolm Schofield, “Writing Philosophy,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Cicero* (ed. Catherine Steel; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 73–87. For biographies of Cicero, see W. K. Lacey, *Cicero and the End of the Roman Republic* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1978); Kathryn Tempest, *Cicero: Politics and Persuasion in Ancient Rome* (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2011), and Anthony Corbeil, “Cicero and the Intellectual Milieu of the Late Republic,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Cicero* (ed. Catherine Steel; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 9–24 and for a biographical portrait that allows Cicero to speak for himself, see D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Cicero. Classical Life and Letters* (New York: Scribner, 1971).

all that we possess.” (pro qua mori et cui nos totos dedere et in qua nostra omnia ponere et quasi consecrare debemus).⁵²⁹

Later, in Cicero’s laws on religion, he requires that the worshiper approach the gods in purity, “bringing piety”.⁵³⁰ Although the requirement of purity is the normal standard for worship of the gods, Cicero then clarifies his instructions with the expansion, “that is, purity of mind, for everything is included in that” and, while still requiring bodily purity in worship, he avers, “we ought to be much more careful about the mind.”⁵³¹ Further, the rule that piety should be brought “means that uprightness is pleasing to God” as well as open access to his presence for all.⁵³² While the requirements of literal sacrifice are not waived,⁵³³ Cicero is clear that mental and spiritual purity are even more important.

2.5.1.2 Temple Language

Philosophy teaches us to know ourselves, according to Cicero. The one who knows himself, will recognize something essential to his being, “he has a divine element within him, and will think of his own inner nature as a kind of consecrated image of God.”⁵³⁴ He cites, seemingly with approval, the view of Socrates that a divine influence (δαίμόνιον) constrains him and ought to be obeyed.⁵³⁵ In his work *De divinatione*, Cicero understands that the universe, “is wholly filled with the Eternal Intelligence and the Divine Mind” which influences the human

⁵²⁹ Cicero, *Leg.* 2.2.5 (Keyes, LCL).

⁵³⁰ *Leg.* 2.8.19 (Keyes, LCL).

⁵³¹ *Leg.* 2.10.24 (Keyes, LCL).

⁵³² *Leg.* 2.10.25 (Keyes, LCL).

⁵³³ And see *Leg.* 1.15.43 (Keyes, LCL), where he upholds “rites and pious observances in honour of the gods”, and that “the sacred rites and ceremonies” should be retained in order to preserve “the institutions of our forefathers” according to *Div.* 2.72.148 (Falconer, LCL).

⁵³⁴ *Leg.* 1.22.59 (Keyes, LCL).

⁵³⁵ *Div.* 1.54.122; cf. 1.53.120.

soul who is brought into contact with it, usually in sleep.⁵³⁶ This same idea that the Gods fill the universe is expounded using temple terminology in the second book of *De Legibus*, where Cicero substantiates his argument that shrines to the gods should not be shut up in homes or temples, “seeing that this whole universe is their temple and home” (quorumque hic mundus omnis templum esset et domus),⁵³⁷ in agreement with Seneca and Plutarch. Cicero then connects the dedication of Roman temples to the deification of intellect, piety, virtue and good faith, and says of these qualities, “the purpose being that those who possess them (and all good men do) should believe that the gods themselves are established within their own souls.”⁵³⁸ Cicero cites, with approval, the words of Thales of Miletus (the pre-Socratic seventh-sixth century B.C.E. philosopher), “that men ought to believe that everything they see is filled with the gods.”⁵³⁹ In particular, though all have immortal souls, the souls of those who are brave and good can be described as “divine”.⁵⁴⁰ The final book (Book 6) of *De republica* narrates the mystical dream of Scipio (*Somnium Scipionis*), a Roman general from an earlier era. As such, it is difficult to be sure whether the beliefs expressed by Scipio are identical to those of Cicero and some of his ideas may be influenced by Stoicism. Since Cicero does not provide a riposte to the views expressed, they are narrated here rather than in the section on Stoic writings. In the dream, Scipio is visited by his father Paulus, who, in passing, alludes to his conviction that everything which

⁵³⁶ *Div.* 1.49.110 (Falconer, LCL); cf. also *Div.* 1.52.118.

⁵³⁷ *Leg.* 2.10.26 (Keyes, LCL). We should also note in passing that Cicero makes mention of Xerxes burning the temples at Athens, for “he thought it sacrilege to keep the gods whose home is the whole universe shut up within walls.” (*Resp.* 3.9.14 (Keyes, LCL).) The universe is described as their home (domus) rather than temple, but in the immediate literary context the contrast with the Athenian temples *could* suggest that the universe is a superior temple to the Athenian temples.

⁵³⁸ *Leg.* 2.11.28 (Keyes, LCL).

⁵³⁹ *Leg.* 2.11.26 (Keyes, LCL), which is taken from Aristotle, *De an.* 1. 411 A, according to 403 note 3.

⁵⁴⁰ *Leg.* 2.11.27 (Keyes, LCL).

Scipio sees is God's temple.⁵⁴¹ Later in the dream, Africanus claims that Scipio is a god, "if a god is that which lives, feels, remembers, and foresees, and which rules, governs, and moves the body over which it is set, just as the supreme God above us rules this universe", comparing the "immortal spirit" ruling his body to the eternal God ruling the universe.⁵⁴² This again is suggestive of the concept of the divine ruling the body (the idea of a genius or *daemon*) which we saw in Stoic literature.

Further, in *Tusculanae disputationes*, Cicero contends for the importance of the view that there are divine elements in souls.⁵⁴³ Whatever else he knows about the soul, "it is divine" and resembles the soul of God.⁵⁴⁴ In a passing comment, Cicero alludes to "the God who is master within us" (*dominans ille in nobis deus*).⁵⁴⁵

2.5.1.3 *The Nature of Divinity*

God is a divine mind and a god "of transcendent power."⁵⁴⁶ He knows "to their innermost depths" all that people think and do.⁵⁴⁷ God is the one who begets human beings and yet, "Nature, alone and unaided, goes a step farther" by strengthening the reason of people,⁵⁴⁸ and sustaining the universe.⁵⁴⁹ Law also is pictured as a god-like figure, since it is, "something eternal which rules the whole universe by its wisdom in command and prohibition." It is nothing

⁵⁴¹ *Resp.* 6.15.15. The one caveat to this finding is that the translator Clinton W. Keyes, remarks that "Templum originally meant a region of the sky marked off for purposes of divination." (Keyes, LCL, 267 note 1). If this is relevant to the saying, it makes the reference a less certain one for our purposes. That said, we have seen elsewhere that the universe is frequently considered to be the temple of the gods.

⁵⁴² *Resp.* 6.24.26 (Keyes, LCL).

⁵⁴³ *Tusc.* 1.24.56.

⁵⁴⁴ *Tusc.* 1.25.62 (King, LCL); so also *Tusc.* 1.26.65; 1.27.66–67; *Parad.* 1.14.

⁵⁴⁵ *Tusc.* 1.30.74 (King, LCL).

⁵⁴⁶ *Leg.* 1.7.23 (Keyes, LCL).

⁵⁴⁷ *Div.* 1.11.17 (Falconer, LCL).

⁵⁴⁸ *Leg.* 1.7.26–27.

⁵⁴⁹ *lib. inc. fr.* 2.

less than, “the primal and ultimate mind of God”,⁵⁵⁰ equated with reason and contemporary with God, who would not be able to function without it, “it is coeval with that God who guards and rules heaven and earth. For the divine mind cannot exist without reason”.⁵⁵¹ Yet, elsewhere God is described as the “author”, “promulgator” and “enforcing judge” of this Law.⁵⁵² The gods rule over all things but they are benevolent, while also taking account of the good and evil characters of people.⁵⁵³ Either the gods or mother nature appoint the day of death.⁵⁵⁴ There is at least one recorded instance of a man (Romulus, the founder of Rome) being added to the number of the gods.⁵⁵⁵

2.5.1.4 *The Nature of Humanity*

According to Cicero, humanity has a highly exalted status. The human soul has the divine soul as its source.⁵⁵⁶ Human beings are the only creatures who share with God in reason and thought and so can attain to wisdom.⁵⁵⁷ This is particularly so of those who practice divination and “seem to approach very near to the divine spirit of the gods”.⁵⁵⁸ This right reason is expressed in Law and so it follows that humans share Law in common with the gods.⁵⁵⁹ Gods and human beings share the universe as one commonwealth.⁵⁶⁰ The soul was generated by God and thus share a kind of “blood relationship”. Following this, only humans of all creatures have a

⁵⁵⁰ *Leg.* 2.4.8 (Keyes, LCL).

⁵⁵¹ *Leg.* 2.4.8–10 (Keyes, LCL).

⁵⁵² *Resp.* 2.22.23.

⁵⁵³ *Leg.* 2.7.15–16. Their existence is believed in by “natural instinct” and their nature “by the exercise of reason” according to *Tusc.* 1.16.36 (King, LCL).

⁵⁵⁴ *Tusc.* 1.49.118; cf. *Div.* 1.51.117.

⁵⁵⁵ *Resp.* 2.10.17.

⁵⁵⁶ *Div.* 1.32.70; 1.49.110; cf. *Amic.* 4.13.

⁵⁵⁷ *Leg.* 1.7.22–23.

⁵⁵⁸ *Div.* 1.18.34 (Falconer, LCL).

⁵⁵⁹ *Leg.* 1.7.23; cf. *Leg.* 1.6.18–19, where the Law is seen as the highest reason, implanted in Nature, an intelligent power that preceded any written law.

⁵⁶⁰ *Leg.* 1.7.23; *Resp.* 1.13.20.

knowledge of God.⁵⁶¹ Humans share in his likeness and can exhibit Virtue, which is Nature at its pinnacle,⁵⁶² or reason “completely developed.”⁵⁶³ The life of the mind that is free from the body can be like that of a god (*divina vita est*),⁵⁶⁴ since it is immortal and can see all that there is in nature.⁵⁶⁵ Cicero records the teaching of the ancients that after death, life continues in a new mode “which often served as a guide to heaven for illustrious men and women”, some of whom became as gods.⁵⁶⁶ Cicero also alludes to the view that humans’ ultimate destination is to be gods or to be in company with the gods.⁵⁶⁷

2.5.1.5 *Living out the Philosophy*

According to *De Legibus*, the person who realizes that they have within themselves this divine spark will examine themselves, grasp the means given to them to attain wisdom, perceive the path to be a good and happy man and, “so he will always act and think in a way worthy of so great a gift of the gods.”⁵⁶⁸ Their mind will always and only meditate on divine and eternal subjects.⁵⁶⁹ According to the god at Delphi, this will cause it to, “feel its union with the divine mind” and its desire for gaining immortality will be kindled.⁵⁷⁰ Such a person will abandon their bondage to their body and its desires, know virtue, leave behind fear of suffering and death and know itself. This will include recognizing all who are joined to them by Nature, and take up, “the worship of the gods and pure religion”. Their mental and spiritual vision will concern itself with

⁵⁶¹ *Leg.* 1.7.24.

⁵⁶² *Leg.* 1.7.25.

⁵⁶³ *Leg.* 1.16.45 (Keyes, LCL); cf. *Div.* 1.30.65.

⁵⁶⁴ *lib. inc. fr.* 2; cf. *Div.* 1.57.129.

⁵⁶⁵ *Div.* 1.51.115; 1.57.131.

⁵⁶⁶ *Tusc.* 1.12.27–1.13.29 (King, LCL).

⁵⁶⁷ *Tusc.* 1.32.76.

⁵⁶⁸ *Leg.* 1.22.59 (Keyes, LCL).

⁵⁶⁹ *Resp.* 1.17.28.

⁵⁷⁰ *Tusc.* 5.25.70 (King, LCL).

choosing the good and rejecting the bad, and recognizing the place of each being in the universe, whether it be divine and eternal or mortal and transient. They shall come to see their place as a “citizen of the whole universe” and give themselves to the, “ruler and governor of the universe.”⁵⁷¹ Virtue is attained by knowing the “principles of right living” but bad habits can breed a corruption which stamps out the sparks of fire kindled within people by Nature.⁵⁷²

2.6 Neopythagoreanism

Pythagoras (sixth century B.C.E., c. 582–500 B.C.E.) founded a school of philosophy that became known as Pythagoreanism. This philosophy contained both scientific and religious aspects. The religious tradition emphasized the superiority of the soul over the body, especially in relation to its teaching on the immortality and transmigration of the soul (or metempsychosis), that led to vegetarianism and the forbidding of animal sacrifice (since a soul may take up residence in an animal).⁵⁷³ During the Hellenistic era, there was a renewed interest in Pythagoreanism, now known as Neopythagoreanism.⁵⁷⁴ Much of the writings of the most important Neopythagorean writers (such as as Nigidius Figulus, Nicomachus of Gerasa, Moderatus of Gades or Numenius of Apamea) have either not survived, survived in very fragmentary form or do not contain anything of significance for our enquiry. However, via the work of Philostratus, a late second or early third century writer,⁵⁷⁵ we have been left significant traditions concerning both the life and letters of Apollonius of Tyana, to whom I now turn.

⁵⁷¹ *Leg.* 1.23.60–62 (Keyes, LCL).

⁵⁷² *Leg.* 1.11.32–1.12.33.

⁵⁷³ *OCD*, 1245–46. See also Seneca, *Ep.* 108. 19–22; Philostratus, *Vit. Apoll.* 3.19.1.

⁵⁷⁴ *OCD*, 1008; Ferguson, *Backgrounds*, 382–84.

⁵⁷⁵ *OCD*, 1137.

2.6.1 Apollonius of Tyana, according to Philostratus

According to his biographer, Philostratus, Apollonius was born in Tyana, in Cappadocia around the beginning of the first century C.E. and died during the reign of Nerva. Philostratus portrays him as an itinerant ascetic wandering holy man and Neoplatonic philosopher.⁵⁷⁶

2.6.1.1 Sacrifice Language

As we have seen, Pythagoras, like those who followed after him, disdained animal sacrifices, instructing, “not to let victims be brought for sacrifice to the gods, and to worship only at the altar unstained with blood.”⁵⁷⁷ Philostratus elaborates on the sacrifices which Pythagoras offered in their place; “he never defiled altars with blood (μη̄ γὰρ αἰμάττειν τοὺς βωμούς); instead honey cakes, frankincense, and hymns were this Master’s offerings to the gods (καὶ τὸ ἐφρυνῆσαι, φοιτᾶν ταῦτα τοῖς θεοῖς παρὰ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς τούτου).⁵⁷⁸ Here it is clear that Pythagoras offered inanimate physical sacrifices (such as honey cakes and frankincense) but that hymns were also considered a kind of sacrifice. When Apollonius defends the philosophical path he chose, he points to the greatness and “ineffable wisdom” of Pythagoras because, “he approached altars in purity, he kept his stomach undefiled by the flesh of living things.”⁵⁷⁹ These “humble sacrifices” give greater pleasure to the gods, “than those who spill the blood of bulls for them.”⁵⁸⁰ In the same vein, Philostratus emphasizes the continuity between Pythagoras and the first century Apollonius, when he reports that during the latter’s visit to the tomb of the Achaeans, he made many funeral speeches, “and many heroic sacrifices of a bloodless and pure

⁵⁷⁶ *OCD*, 124; *Idem, Backgrounds*, 384–86.

⁵⁷⁷ *DL* 8.1.22.

⁵⁷⁸ Philostratus, *Vit. Apoll.* 1.1.1 (Jones, LCL, 2005).

⁵⁷⁹ *Vit. Apoll.* 6.11.3 (Jones, LCL, 2005).

⁵⁸⁰ *Vit. Apoll.* 6.11.6 (Jones, LCL, 2005).

kind” (πολλὰ δὲ τῶν ἀναίμων τε καὶ καθαρῶν καθαγίσας).⁵⁸¹ It is not specified, however, whether these are physical sacrifices or spiritual sacrifices (such as hymns). What truly pleases the gods is not sacrifices, but the acquisition of wisdom and good works towards the deserving.⁵⁸² Eusebius, a Roman historian and Christian apologist of the third and fourth centuries also cites a purported fragment of Apollonius, that states that God rejects physical sacrifice in favor of pure speech and a noble mind.⁵⁸³ In an earlier passage Apollonius claims to know how the deity chooses to receive worship, as well as the identity of virtue, justice and chastity. These things can only be discerned by the soul, “If it is pure and unblemished when it apprehends them, in my opinion it soars much higher than the Caucasus here.”⁵⁸⁴ Additionally, one such who prophesies “become divine” (θεῖοί) under its influence, “with no pollution besmirching his soul, and no scars of sin traced on his mind.”⁵⁸⁵

2.6.1.2 *The Nature of Divinity*

God is the creator of the universe; everything comes from him.⁵⁸⁶ The “eternal god” (θεὸς αἰδῖος) is also the “first substance” who acts and is acted upon and is at one with all.⁵⁸⁷ The gods reveal themselves to people, especially those who pursue philosophy, and in contexts like the temple of Asclepius.⁵⁸⁸ As we have seen, the deity cares for people and loves to receive

⁵⁸¹ *Vit. Apoll.* 4.11.1 (Jones, LCL, 2005); cf. also his aversion to animal sacrifices recorded in *Vit. Apoll.* 1.10.1–2; 1.24.3; 1.31.1–1.32.2.1; 1.38.1; 8.7.30; *Ep.* 27.

⁵⁸² *Ep.* 26.

⁵⁸³ Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 4.13.

⁵⁸⁴ Philostratus, *Vit. Apoll.* 2.5.3 (Jones, LCL, 2005).

⁵⁸⁵ *Vit. Apoll.* 3.42.1–2 (Jones, LCL, 2005).

⁵⁸⁶ *Vit. Apoll.* 8.7.22.

⁵⁸⁷ *Ep.* 58.3. Sextus Empiricus, the third century C.E. philosopher documents the view of Pythagoras and others that “there is one spirit which pervades, like a soul, the whole Universe” (Sextus Empiricus, *Phys.* 1.128 (Bury, LCL).)

⁵⁸⁸ *Vit. Apoll.* 1.1.1–3, 7; 2.5.3.

worship. They reward the sincere and those who are free from sin with every blessing.⁵⁸⁹ This worship does not need to consist of sacrifices.⁵⁹⁰ They provide for all but give preference, firstly to “virtuous students of wisdom” and next to “innocent people”.⁵⁹¹ Neither God nor people can “absolve” (or purify; ἀπονίπτω) a murderer.⁵⁹² Human should not “pry into the intentions of the gods”.⁵⁹³

2.6.1.3 *The Nature of Humanity*

As we have already observed, Apollonius, in common with Pythagoras, understood souls to transmigrate; moving from one body to another.⁵⁹⁴ Human beings have a kind of kinship with the gods that they do not share with any other creature.⁵⁹⁵ Their soul is immortal.⁵⁹⁶ There is no such thing as a true death, but only a passing from one thing to another, as when the whole dissolves into its parts or vice versa.⁵⁹⁷ At death a person is both described as becoming a god (ὅταν θεὸς ἐξ ἀνθρώπου γένηται) and going to God.⁵⁹⁸ A later second century C.E. writer, Atticus Gellius, claimed that Pythagoreans located evil impulses within people, who harm themselves “by their own purpose and determination”.⁵⁹⁹

⁵⁸⁹ *Vit. Apoll.* 1.1.11.

⁵⁹⁰ *Ep.* 26.

⁵⁹¹ *Vit. Apoll.* 2.39.3.

⁵⁹² *Vit. Apoll.* 8.7.23 (Jones, LCL, 2005).

⁵⁹³ *Vit. Apoll.* 8.23.1 (Conybeare, LCL, 1912), which seems more accurate than Jones’ more recent 2005 translation, which renders θεῶν βουλάς as “decisions of heaven” rather than those of God.

⁵⁹⁴ *Vit. Apoll.* 3.19.1.

⁵⁹⁵ *Vit. Apoll.* 8.7.20.

⁵⁹⁶ *Vit. Apoll.* 8.31.3.

⁵⁹⁷ *Ep.* 58.1–2.

⁵⁹⁸ *Ep.* 58.4.

⁵⁹⁹ Aulus Gellius, *Noct. att.* 7.2.12–13 (Rolfe, LCL).

2.6.1.4 Living out the Philosophy

Pythagoras himself is of course the model for Apollonius's teaching and practice, and he was familiar with the gods, who revealed their identities to him.⁶⁰⁰ Apollonius was said to exhibit a wisdom that was even more inspired than that of Pythagoras, "by which he came close to being thought possessed and inspired." (ὕφ' ὧν ἔψαυσε τοῦ δαιμόνιός τε καὶ θεῖος νομισθῆναι).⁶⁰¹ Apollonius was led by his guardian spirit or δαίμων.⁶⁰² The consequence of choosing this path is to be self-controlled, just and envious of no one and to cause tyrants to fear them rather than the other way around. Revelation is given to such a one so that they will be able to recognize gods and distinguish them from "insubstantial ghosts".⁶⁰³ Those who follow the gods should be led by wisdom and their guardian spirit (δαίμων).⁶⁰⁴ Those who love prophecy can "become divine under its influence" and even "act for the salvation of mankind" (θεῖοί τε ὑπ' αὐτῆς γίνονται καὶ πρὸς σωτηρίαν ἀνθρώπων πράττουσι). Such a one must be utterly pure of soul and free from sin.⁶⁰⁵ Those who take hold of the virtues that come from God "are close to the gods and holy." Further, "men who are good have some part in God" (καὶ φημὶ τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς τῶν ἀνθρώπων θεοῦ τι ἔχειν).⁶⁰⁶ A man who truly resembles God can divert others from the passions and in fact the description of such a man seems to be set in apposition to a reference to God, as if this man is a god (ἀλλὰ δεῖ ἀνδρὸς ὃς ἐπιμελήσεται τοῦ περὶ αὐτὰς κόσμου, θεὸς ὑπὸ σοφίας ἦκων).⁶⁰⁷ A true Pythagorean will have true greatness of mind, soul and of manner, piety and knowledge and

⁶⁰⁰ *Vit. Apoll.* 1.1.1–2.

⁶⁰¹ *Vit. Apoll.* 1.2.3 (Jones, LCL). This is quite a different translation from the original Loeb one by F. C. Conybeare in 1912 which speaks of, "the habits and temper of wisdom by means of which he succeeded in being considered a supernatural and divine being."

⁶⁰² *Vit. Apoll.* 1.18.1; cf. also *Vit. Apoll.* 2.39.3.

⁶⁰³ *Vit. Apoll.* 6.11.3 (Jones, LCL).

⁶⁰⁴ *Vit. Apoll.* 1.18.1.

⁶⁰⁵ *Vit. Apoll.* 3.42.1–2.

⁶⁰⁶ *Vit. Apoll.* 8.7.21–22.

⁶⁰⁷ *Vit. Apoll.* 8.7.23.

friendship with both gods and other spirits. They will be frugal, restrained, self-sufficient and at ease in their perceptions.⁶⁰⁸

2.7 Epicureanism

Epicureanism, though a major philosophy of the first century, will prove to be the least relevant for our enquiries, which is why it has been treated last. For this reason, and due to constraints of space, I shall offer only a brief summary of the features of Epicureanism that directly relate to our topic, followed by one possible spiritual sacrifice reference from an Epicurean writer. This summary should demonstrate that relationship to the gods did not play an important role in the life of an Epicurean, and so we would not expect to find an abundance of spiritual temple language. Epicurus of Samos (341–270 B.C.E.) founded a school in Athens in 307/6 B.C.E., known as “the Garden”, where he lived with his followers, both men and women, slaves and free, and avoided public life.⁶⁰⁹ According to Epicurus, although nature has imprinted upon the minds of all a conception of the gods, many hold to wrong understandings of their nature.⁶¹⁰ God is an “imperishable and blessed creature”.⁶¹¹ The gods live a peaceful and blissful existence, “far removed and separated from our affairs”, they do not need humans for anything and Lucretius, an Epicurean, says of divinity, “it is neither propitiated with services nor touched by wrath.”⁶¹² Rather, the world was not designed for the sake of humanity, and Nature orders its

⁶⁰⁸ *Ep.* 52.

⁶⁰⁹ *OCD*, 513–14; Ferguson, *Backgrounds*, 370–79; DL 10.1–11 speaks of the life and teaching of Epicurus; *Lucr.* 1.62–79; 3.1–15; 5.6–12; 6.1–30 sing the praises of Epicurus, whose discoveries about the gods liberated those weighed down by wrong thoughts about them. Seneca, *Const.* 16.1 (Basore, LCL) speaks of Epicurus, “who most of all indulged the flesh”.

⁶¹⁰ Cicero, *Nat. d.* 1.15.42–17.44.

⁶¹¹ Epicurus, *Letter to Menoeceus* 123–24, cited in Long and Sedley, *Philosophers Vol 1*, 140.

⁶¹² *Lucr.*, 1.44–49 (Smith, LCL); cf. 2.1094–95; 3.18–24; 5.73–90, 146–49; 6.54–67; DL 10.123, 139; Cicero, *Nat. d.* 1.17.45; 1.19.51; cf. Epictetus, *Diatr.* 1.12.1–3. See also Sharples, *Stoics*, 56–58.

path without recourse to the gods.⁶¹³ Epicurus places great emphasis on sensations and the “perceptions of mental presentations” as the standard by which ideas can be judged.⁶¹⁴ Only two states of feeling exist; pleasure or pain.⁶¹⁵ In order to maximize pleasure (that is the absence of pain) and minimize pain, the wise person should, by the right use of reason, attend to wrong feelings and sense perceptions. These wrong perceptions interfere with the kind of blissed existence lived by the gods that is the model for the Epicurean.⁶¹⁶ Since death is merely the absence of sensation, not the gateway to immortality, it holds no fear for the Epicurean.⁶¹⁷ It is possible for those who follow this teaching to live like a god among men.⁶¹⁸ The wise person is always happy and should live a life unconcerned and uninvolved with anything that might disturb that life, such as responsibility for a wife and family or involvement in politics.⁶¹⁹

2.7.1 Lucretius, *De Rerum Natura*

The work of Lucretius (first century B.C.E.) on the nature of things (*De Rerum Natura*) expounds Epicurean philosophy and contains one possible spiritual sacrifice reference.⁶²⁰ He opines that because of humanity’s false conception of the gods, they practice a false piety that includes turning towards stones, approaching every altar, and falling prostrate before the shrines

⁶¹³ Lucr., 2.1–1104; 5.198–99; DL 10.77–78; Cicero, *Nat. d.* 1.20.53.

⁶¹⁴ DL 10.31–33; Seneca, *Nat.* 1.3.10.

⁶¹⁵ DL 10.34.

⁶¹⁶ DL 10.82, 117, 127–31; Cicero, *Nat. d.* 1.20.53. In fact, according to Cicero, “complete absence of pain Epicurus considers to be the limit and highest point of pleasure” (Cicero, *Fin.* 1.11.38 (Rackham, LCL)).

⁶¹⁷ Epicurus, *Letter to Menoeceus* 124–27, cited in Long and Sedley, *Philosophers Vol 1*, 144; cf. Lucr., 3.580–930; DL 10.123–25, 133; see also Norman Wentworth DeWitt, *Epicurus and His Philosophy* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1954); Sharples, *Stoics*, 93–99 and now James Warren, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Epicureanism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

⁶¹⁸ Epicurus, *Letter to Menoeceus* 135, cited in Long and Sedley, *Philosophers Vol 1*, 144; cf. Lucr., 3.322.

⁶¹⁹ DL 10.118–22 Cicero, *Nat. d.* 1.20.53; 3.16.26; Seneca, *De otio.* 3.2. For further on Epicureanism, see e.g. Brunschwig and Sedley, “Philosophy,” 151–83 at 155–162.

⁶²⁰ Little is known of the life of Lucretius; see *OCD*, 863–65.

of the gods with covered heads.⁶²¹ Instead of coming, “to sprinkle altars with the blood of beasts in showers and to link vow to vow” (*nec aras sanguine multo spargere quadrupedum, nec votis nectere vota*) the truly pious person should rather, “be able to survey all things with tranquil mind” (*sed mage placata posse omnia mente tueri*).⁶²² Unless the worshiper recognizes that no sacrifice is required and that the gods have no interest in meting out wrath to their followers, “you will not be able to approach their shrines with placid heart, you will not have the strength to receive with tranquil peace of spirit the images which are carried to men’s minds from their holy bodies, declaring what the divine shapes are.”⁶²³ In this case, Lucretius does not intend the call for a tranquil mind and placid heart to be a spiritual sacrifice, since the gods do not require any kind of sacrifice at all.⁶²⁴

Further, most rejected the teaching of the Epicureans and it was attacked and ridiculed by many of the leading philosophers of their day. Through the character of Cotta, Cicero voices ridicule of Epicurus’s belief in gods as virtuous but not active, and holy while disdainful interest in anyone’s affairs but their own.⁶²⁵ Epicureans themselves are attacked for their self-indulgence and slavery to pleasure.⁶²⁶ Their philosophy is both expounded, then critiqued, at length by Cicero.⁶²⁷ Epictetus accuses them of severing the bond between people by their self-centered focus on pleasure and for ignoring sense-perceptions when they should be listening to them.⁶²⁸

Dio Chrysostom accuses the Epicureans of keeping the gods from being recognized, banishing

⁶²¹ Lucr., 5.1194–1200.

⁶²² Lucr., 5.1200–1203 (Smith, LCL).

⁶²³ Lucr., 6.75–78 (Smith, LCL).

⁶²⁴ See also *Anonymous Epicurean treatise on theology* (Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 215) 1.4–24, cited in Long and Sedley, *Philosophers Vol 1*, 144.

⁶²⁵ Cicero, *Leg.* 1.12.39.

⁶²⁶ Cicero, *Nat. d.* 1.20.53. The reference in Marcus Aurelius, *Med.* 9.1.3 to the impiety of those who seek after pleasure and eschew pain may also be a scarcely veiled reference to the Epicureans.

⁶²⁷ See Cicero, *Fin.* 1.5.13–1.21.72 (exposition); *Fin.* 2.1.1–35.119 (critique); cf. also Cicero, *Tusc.* 5.26.73–74 for further brief critique.

⁶²⁸ Epictetus, *Diatr.* 2.20.6–20.

gods from the universe, leaving the universe with no purpose or direction, and in essence making ‘pleasure’ the only goddess.⁶²⁹ Seneca ridicules Epicurus’s teaching for making the gods both harmless and powerless,⁶³⁰ and for linking virtue inseparably with pleasure.⁶³¹ Plutarch scorns Epicurus for calling Providence a myth,⁶³² and for praising his own impassiveness and inactivity.⁶³³ Since their aim is to be rid of anxiety rather than to fear God, they remove both good and evil from their gods and leave themselves no hope of divine favor, no confidence in prosperity, and no refuge in God in adversity.⁶³⁴ Epicureans, like animals, have no conception of divine justice or reverence for virtue and so only live for pleasure.⁶³⁵ Yet, in their hypocrisy they still sacrifice to the Gods who need no sacrifice.⁶³⁶ This sort of ignorance about the gods leads to atheism, in Plutarch’s view.⁶³⁷ Maximus of Tyre simply ridicules Epicurean doctrines as odd, idle, careless, and ignorant of the gods.⁶³⁸ In conclusion then, Epicureanism does not offer a fruitful field of comparison with Paul’s imagery when considering spiritual temple language.

2.8 Miscellaneous

Finally, there are two brief references to metaphorical temples but without the kind of philosophical underpinning found in the other writers explored above. Valerius Maximus, a first century C.E. writer of a handbook of *Memorable Deeds and Sayings*,⁶³⁹ compares friendships to

⁶²⁹ Dio Chrysostom, *Dei cogn.* 36–37.

⁶³⁰ Seneca, *Ben.* 4.19.1; *Ep.* 90.35; *Apol.* 8.

⁶³¹ Seneca, *Vit. beat.* 7.1; 10.3; *Ep.* 90.35; though he concedes that Epicurus’s teaching on pleasure is more austere than his critics admit in *Vit. beat.* 13.1.

⁶³² Plutarch, *Def. orac.* 420B; *Stoic. rep.* 1043B.

⁶³³ *Praec. ger. rei publ.* 824B.

⁶³⁴ *Suav. viv.* 1100F–1101C.

⁶³⁵ *Adv. Col.* 1125A.

⁶³⁶ *Stoic. rep.* 1034B.

⁶³⁷ *Superst.* 164EF.

⁶³⁸ Maximus of Tyre, *Or.* 4.8; 4.9.

⁶³⁹ *OCD*, 1534.

temples. He understands friendship as being essential to the fabric of human life. It is due, “almost as much reverence as to the rituals of the immortal gods” since, as public welfare depends on these rituals and traditions, so too the private welfare of individuals depends on networks of friendships. This inspires Valerius to compare the two, “As temples are the sacred domiciles of the one, so the loyal hearts of men are like shrines of the other, filled with a holy spirit” (atque ut illarum aedes sacra domicilia, harum fida hominum pectora quasi quaedam sancto spiritu referta templa sunt).⁶⁴⁰ Similarly, in the second century Latin novel *Metamorphoses* (or *The Golden Ass*) by Apuleius, there is a reference to one character entrusting knowledge to “the inner temple” of the “god-fearing heart” of another,⁶⁴¹ but with no explicitly philosophical underpinning.

2.9 Conclusions

2.9.1 Temple Language

Many Stoic writers retained a place for physical sacrifices, while emphasizing a pure motivation but I noted a stronger focus on purity of thought and deed in place of sacrifices. Plutarch, whose affinities lie more with Middle Platonism, also speaks of purity in worship but envisages substitutes for sacrifice like trusting in the gods, searching after divine truth and study of divine things. Maximus conceives of prayer and contemplation as a substitute for sacrifice. Plutarch specifically gives the example of returning what is due to parents as being a spiritual

⁶⁴⁰ V. Max., 4.7. ext. 1 (Shackleton Bailey, LCL).

⁶⁴¹ Apuleius, *Metam.* 3.15. {Collins, 1999, #52919} {Hays, 1997, #23416} {Fitzmyer, 2008, #60227} {Keener, 2005, #45253} {Wright, 2013, #36350} {Thiselton, 2000, #27996} {Fee, 2014, #26727} {Harner, 1973, #18361} {Fee, 2014, #26727} {Wallace, 1996, #98519} {Fee, 2014, #26727} {Thiselton, 2000, #27996} {Collins, 2008, #72639} {Witherington III, 1995, #42786} {Conzelmann, 1975, #3318} {Shanor, 1988, #29932} {Garland, 2003, #82700}

sacrifice. Cicero, though a Skeptic, also emphasizes the purity of the worshiper over the purity of the physical sacrifice itself. Apollonius, like his mentor Pythagoras, rejected animal sacrifices and substituted other inanimate offerings or hymns, because of his vegetarianism stemming from his philosophy of the transmigration of souls. Apollonius may have also spoken of pure thought and speech as a sacrifice. Lucretius contrasted the adoption of a tranquil mind with the offering of sacrifices, though as an Epicurean, this would not constitute a spiritual sacrifice, since the gods do not require any kind of sacrifice.

There were few obvious references to metaphorical priests in Stoic writers and none among the Middle Platonists; some of our Stoic examples were ambiguous and another seemed like a rare analogy with no extant parallels among other Stoic authors. Seneca significantly spoke of the universe as being the temple of the gods as did Plutarch. Among the Stoics, Epictetus seems to make a more ready distinction between God and the world. Many Stoics, such as Dio, Epictetus and Marcus, speak of the divine dwelling within the individual, understood as their δαίμων. Hierocles alone uses the image of the home as a temple with parents understood as gods to their children. Plutarch also pictured the individual as a temple, guided by right reason. Alcinous pictures the world as filled with God and Maximus identifies the roles of God and Nature as breathing things into individuals. Cicero's understanding is remarkably similar to the Stoics, placing the same emphases on the world as the temple of the gods (like Seneca and Plutarch), the filling of the universe with the divine intelligence, and the place of god or a daemon within the individual soul.

2.9.2 The Nature of the Divinity

God is often identified in a pantheistic way with Nature, Fate, Fortune and Reason within Stoicism. Reason is also spoken of using divine language, dwelling within a person. God is immanent in the world and identified with it and there is a close likeness between God and people. Later Stoics like Epictetus and Marcus make a closer identification of God with intelligence. The Middle Platonists, Alcinous and Maximus seem to take this further and speak of God as simply intelligence. Alcinous emphasizes the abstract nature of God who is preoccupied with his own thoughts. Apollonius also conceives of a God who is at one with the Universe. For the Stoics, the gods are universally viewed as benevolent and governing, though according to Dio, they depend on the law. Cicero goes further and imagines the Law as having god-like characteristics. Maximus and Alcinous stress the perfect qualities of God. For Plutarch, Nature seems to be able to act almost independently of God and appears to be a more dualistic entity, with good and evil flowing from it. Cicero also imagines Nature acting self-sufficiently of God and sustaining the world. Maximus imagines different roles for Nature and Providence, and God governs with the assistance of Chance. Evils are only the indirect consequence of his government. Like the Stoics, the Middle Platonic thinkers speak positively of the gods in their benevolence and envisage roles for daemons and other divinities (as does Cicero). Apollonius emphasizes the gods' beneficence to this who are virtuous.

2.9.3 The Nature of Humanity

Stoics understand humanity alone as being formed of the divine essence and able to have kinship with the gods. The soul is pre-existent and is able to comprehend the divine, yet evil also comes from within (in this, Cicero concurs). Humans have the ability to live according to Nature

(the one things truly are in their unity and comprehensiveness) and can be free of fear and inner disturbance. Soul or Reason is separate from and superior to the body and rules it, responding to both impulses and aversions. Plutarch, Alcinous and Maximus also stresses kinship with God and the capability of the soul to unite with the divine and become like it. Both good and evil come from within. The soul is set free after death and some become daemons. Cicero, though ostensibly a Skeptic holds remarkably similar views on each of these topics. Apollonius spoke of the soul passing from one creature to another, though ultimately a person will become a god.

2.9.4 Living out the Philosophy

The Stoics call their readers to live according to Nature and imitate the gods. People are called to exercise right judgments about the gods, themselves and their own judgments (especially in Epictetus). They are to cultivate inner purity by obeying their inner genius/δαίμων and to avoid wrong sense impressions. They are to seek the good, leave the path of self and do good to others. Cicero concurs that the good person should meditate on the divine, choose the good, think rightly of reality and avoid evil, especially that associated with the body. Although the Middle Platonists do not use the vocabulary of “living according to nature” they do speak of avoiding passions, grasping God’s nature and imitating his character and ways through contemplation of the divine, reason, discipline and education.⁶⁴² Alcinous adds the caveat that it is not the supreme God, but a lesser god that they shall be imitating. Apollonius placed his emphasis on being led by his inner daemon and choosing the path of self-control and virtue.

⁶⁴² Dillon, *Platonists*, 43–44, 122–23 documents the way that Middle Platonist writers like Plutarch, following Eudorus of Alexandria, abandoned the Stoic goal of ‘living in accordance with nature’ in favor of the more Platonic ideal of likeness to, or imitation of, God.

Chapter Three: Metaphorical Temple Language in Philo of Alexandria

3.1 Introduction

I have reserved a separate chapter for Philo of Alexandria (ca. 20 BCE – 50 CE)¹ for two main reasons. Firstly, unlike those writers surveyed in the last chapter, Philo is clearly Jewish. Philo thus stands in a class of his own in relation to my focus in this study. Moreover, he is a legitimate source for our understanding of Hellenistic philosophy, because, like the writers surveyed in the previous chapter, he is strongly influenced by Hellenistic thought and his Judaism is mediated through philosophy.² John M. Dillon’s seminal study *The Middle Platonists*, remains, despite its age, the standard work in this field. He describes Philo as a “fully-fledged Middle Platonist”,³ and devotes a considerable section of his monograph to Philo.⁴ Dillon

¹ Helpful introductions to Philo’s thought and writings include Edwin R. Goodenough, *An Introduction to Philo Judaeus* (2nd ed.; New York: Barnes & Noble, 1963); Samuel Sandmel, *Philo of Alexandria: An Introduction* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979); Idem, “Philo Judaeus: An Introduction to the Man, His Writings, and His Significance,” *ANRW* 21:1: 3–46; Peder Borgen, “Philo of Alexandria,” in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus* (ed. Michael E. Stone; CRINT; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 233–82; Ronald Williamson, *Jews in the Hellenistic World: Philo* (Cambridge Commentaries on Writings of the Jewish and Christian World 200 BC to AD 200 Volume 1, Part 2; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989); Peder Borgen, *Philo of Alexandria: An Exegete for His Time* (NovTSup 86; Leiden: Brill, 1997); Kenneth Schenck, *A Brief Guide to Philo* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2005); Adam Kamesar, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Philo* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), especially the first three chapters, that deal with Philo’s life and times, his works and his hermeneutical method. See also now, Torrey Seland, ed., *Reading Philo: A Handbook to Philo of Alexandria* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014).

² Philo sheds some light on his own philosophical education in *Congr.* 74–76. For recent overviews of this topic, see George W. E. Nickelsburg, “Philo Among Greeks, Jews and Christians,” in *Philo und das Neue Testament: Wechselseitige Wahrnehmungen I. Internationale Symposium Zum Corpus Judaico-Hellenisticum. 1.-4. Mai 2003, Eisenach/Jena* (ed. Roland Deines and Karl-Wilhelm Niebuhr; ed. 172; WUNT 172; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 53–72; Erkki Koskeniemi, “Philo and Classical Education,” in *Reading Philo: A Handbook to Philo of Alexandria* (ed. Torrey Seland; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014), 102–28 and Gregory E. Sterling, ““The Jewish Philosophy”: Reading Moses Via Hellenistic Philosophy According to Philo,” in *Reading Philo: A Handbook to Philo of Alexandria* (ed. Torrey Seland; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014), 129–54, as well as older works such as Goodenough, *Philo*, 90–111 and Borgen, “Philo,” 233–82 at 254–56. For an assessment of Philo’s response to the philosophical challenges encountered by Hellenistic Judaism in comparison to other writings, see David Winston, “Philo and the Hellenistic Jewish Encounter,” *SPhilo* 7 (1995): 124–42.

³ John M. Dillon, *The Middle Platonists: 80 B.C. to A.D. 220* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1977), 143.

⁴ See Idem, *Platonists*, 139–43, and further John Dillon, “Reclaiming the Heritage of Moses: Philo’s Confrontation with Greek Philosophy,” *SPhilo* 7 (1995): 108–23.

understands Philo's thought, "as essentially adapting contemporary Alexandrian Platonism, which was itself heavily influenced by Stoicism and Pythagoreanism, to his own exegetical purposes"⁵ and sees the philosophy of Philo (and Eudorus) as "the true foundation of Middle Platonism."⁶ Furthermore, Philo has a lengthy corpus, is one of our best and most extensive sources for Middle Platonism, and by far the greatest number of references to metaphorical sacrifice, priest and temple language in any ancient writer is found in Philo, as I shall shortly demonstrate.⁷ Unlike the last chapter, I shall not devote separate sections to "The Nature of Divinity", "The Nature of Humanity" and "Living out the Philosophy." This has mainly been done in the interests of space. Moreover, these topics were addressed in the last chapter in relation to other Middle Platonic writers, and insofar as Philo supports the evidence of these writers, it is not essential to revisit them. Because Philo is Jewish, he holds some views that are at variance with other Middle Platonists (such as some of his understanding of God) but he also holds some that are peculiar to him (such as his understanding of the *Logos* in relation to God

⁵ Dillon, *Platonists*, 182; cf. 143–44; and similarly Borgen, "Philo," 233–82 at 256. For a brief survey of the influences of Plato and Stoicism on Philo, see Gretchen J. Reydams-Schils, "Stoicized Readings of Timaeus in Philo of Alexandria," *SPhilo* 7 (1995): 85–102, who argues that the influences of Plato's *Timaeus* and the Stoics converge in Philo, agreeing with earlier works such as Sandmel, *Philo*, 4, 14–16, 19–21, 25–26, 28. In an earlier thesis, the influential Philo scholar Edwin R. Goodenough argued that Philo's religion was akin to a Greek mystery religion in its thought, in Edwin R. Goodenough, *By Light, Light: The Mystic Gospel of Hellenistic Judaism* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1935). However, his pupil and eminent Jewish scholar, Samuel Sandmel opposed this thesis in Sandmel, *Philo*, 140–47. Subsequent Philo scholars have also dissented from Goodenough's position; see e.g. Borgen, *Philo: Exegete*, 1–3; Gregory E. Sterling, "The Place of Philo of Alexandria in the Study of Christian Origins," in *Philo und das Neue Testament: Wechselseitige Wahrnehmungen I. Internationales Symposium Zum Corpus Judaico-Hellenisticum. 1.-4. Mai 2003, Eisenach/Jena* (ed. Roland Deines and Karl-Wilhelm Niebuhr; WUNT 172; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 21–52 at 26–27, and in the same work, Naomi G. Cohen, "The Mystery Terminology in Philo," 173–87; Schenck, *Philo*; Karl-Gustav Sandelin, "Philo as a Jew," in *Reading Philo: A Handbook to Philo of Alexandria* (ed. Torrey Seland; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014), 20.

⁶ Dillon, *Platonists*, 183. For a recent reflection of the debate on Philo and Middle Platonism among senior Philo scholars, see the special section of *Studia Philonica* V (1993): Gregory E. Sterling, "Platonizing Moses: Philo and Middle Platonism," 96–111; David T. Runia, "Was Philo a Middle Platonist? A Difficult Question Revisited," 112–40; David T. Runia, "Response to Runia and Sterling," 141–46; Thomas H. Tobin, "Was Philo a Middle Platonist? Some suggestions," 147–50; John Dillon, "A Response to Runia and Sterling," 151–55. Despite differences of opinion, all agree that Philo is influenced by Middle Platonism and uses its thought in his exegesis.

⁷ E.g. note the comment of Jonathan Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple: Symbolism and Supersessionism in the Study of Ancient Judaism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 142; "Philo's is the most thorough symbolic exposition of sacrificial ritual known from ancient Jewish times."

and humanity). Since recording these views do not serve my purposes (to shed light on Middle Platonism and its use of metaphorical temple language), I have not given special attention to them, although some attention to Philo's distinctive views will appear in passing.

Two more caveats are in order. My main focus will be on metaphorical temple language in order to illustrate what Philo's approach has in common with other Hellenistic philosophical writers and thus a comprehensive survey of Philo's understanding of the cult will not be attempted.⁸ Therefore, my aim is not to propose a thesis that explains all the origins of Philo's metaphorical temple language, especially vis-à-vis Judaism.⁹ Secondly, Philo's expositions concentrate almost exclusively on the Pentateuch (especially Genesis and Exodus); the sacrifices made by Abraham relate to a period before the tabernacle, and the commentary on Exodus describes a period before the temple was built. However, Philo *himself* lived in the second temple era and his language is indebted to this wider motif of temple symbolism that we have surveyed. Philo's corpus also provides the largest exploration of this imagery that is extant for the relevant period and for Middle Platonism.¹⁰

⁸ For the most extensive discussion of Philo's presentation of Jewish worship in all its dimensions (both literal and metaphorical) see Jutta Leonhardt, *Jewish Worship in Philo of Alexandria* (TSAJ 84; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001).

⁹ I noted briefly in Chapter One that the Pseudepigrapha sometimes speaks of a heavenly temple or an eschatological temple that God will build or will send down from heaven at the end of the age (especially in eschatological works such as *1 En.* 14:1–25; 24–26; 71:5; *4 Ezra* 10:25–28; *2 Bar.* 4:1–7). I also surveyed the use of metaphorical sacrifice language in second temple Jewish literature. Additionally, I examined the use of metaphorical temple language in many parts of the Dead Sea Scrolls. All this evidence indicates that other Jewish literature, that does not appear to have been greatly influenced by Hellenistic philosophy, could use metaphorical temple language. However, Philo is also greatly influenced by Hellenistic philosophical thought, as argued above.

¹⁰ I also note that Philo frequently refers to the subject of philosophy in his works. There are over two hundred references that use the φιλόσοφ- root in Philo. Moses himself was trained in philosophy by teachers from various nations (*Mos.* 1.21–23; cf. *Mos.* 1.48; 2.66), later Philo claims that Moses “had attained the very summit of philosophy” (Philo, *Opif.* 8) and he speaks elsewhere of the law as the philosophy according to Moses (κατὰ Μωυσην φιλοσοφοῦσιν) in *Mut.* 223. The creation narrative itself is described as a philosophical account (*Fug.* 68). Philosophy is described as the greatest thing of all for humanity (*Opif.* 53; *Spec.* 1.336; 3.186); even the thing by which man becomes immortal (*Opif.* 77). Philo avers that philosophy leads to virtue (*Leg.* 1.57; cf. *Leg.* 3.72) and is the most perfect of studies (*Ebr.* 51). Indeed, Philo describes his own journey with philosophy (*Congr.* 74–80), which he elucidates as the study of wisdom, itself the knowledge of divine things (*Congr.* 79; cf. *Spec.* 3.1).

3.2 Sacrifice Language

3.2.1 *Literal Sacrifices must be offered with reverence and respect for the rite*

Philo by no means discounts the sacrificial system of the Jerusalem cult. In fact, he affirms the continuing role of the temple as the center of Judaism, the only proper place for sacrifice, and attacks the thought that other altars, whether pagan or otherwise, are legitimate places to offer sacrifice.¹¹ Although Philo's work is notable for allegorizing the various laws on sacrifice,¹² he is at pains to stress that this should not be at the expense of actual practice: "Why, we shall be ignoring the sanctity of the Temple and a thousand other things, if we are going to pay heed to nothing except what is shewn us by the inner meaning of things."¹³ His various commentaries on the scriptures repeatedly emphasize the necessity of a respectful and appropriate approach to the sacrifices. In more than one work, Philo critiques the offering of Cain. In *De agricultura* Philo says of Cain that, "the conditions of his sacrifice had not been holy and perfect" and he was reprimanded for not bringing his offering properly.¹⁴ In *De plantatione*, Philo speaks approvingly of the proper preparations for sacrifice, such as avoiding drunkenness,

Philosophy is also said to have come down from heaven (*Spec.* 3.185). Philo represents Moses as speaking of philosophy as the royal road (ὁδὸς . . . βασιλική) that leads to God (*Post.* 101), which he then equates with the word and reason of God (*Post.* 102).

¹¹ E.g. Philo, *Spec.* 1.67–70; see Borgen, *Philo: Exegete*, 18–21; Schenck, *Philo*, 36–37; Andrea Lieber, "Between Motherland and Fatherland: Diaspora, Pilgrimage and the Spiritualization of Sacrifice in Philo of Alexandria," in *Heavenly Tablets: Interpretation, Identity and Tradition in Ancient Judaism* (ed. Lynn Lidonnici and Andrea Lieber; JSJSup 119; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 193–210 at 198–201; Paul Robertson, "Towards An Understanding of Philo's and Cicero's Treatment of Sacrifice," *SPhilo* 23 (2011): 41–67 at 44–58; Sandelin, "Philo," 19–46, at 33–34.

¹² For more on Philo's allegorical approach to biblical interpretation, see e.g. Sandmel, *Philo*, 17–28; Burton L. Mack, "Philo Judaeus and Exegetical Traditions in Alexandria," *ANRW* 21:1: 227–71 at 250–62; Williamson, *Philo*, 144–75; Ellen Birnbaum, "Allegorical Interpretation and Jewish Identity Among Alexandrian Jewish Writers," in *Neotestamentica et Philonica: Studies in Honor of Peder Borgen* (ed. David E. Aune, Torrey Seland, and Jarl Henning Ulrichsen; NovTSup 106; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 307–29; Adam Kamesar, "Biblical Interpretation in Philo," in *The Cambridge Companion to Philo* (ed. Adam Kamesar; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 65–91.

¹³ Philo, *Migr.* 92 (see more generally *Migr.* 89–93); cf. Everett Ferguson, "Spiritual Sacrifice in Early Christianity and Its Environment," *ANRW* 23:2: 1151–89 at 1160; Williamson, *Philo*, 4. All translations are taken from the Loeb Classical Library, unless otherwise stated.

¹⁴ Philo, *Agr.* 127.

“in order that both the recollection of their sacrifices and their reverence for the place might lead them to celebrate a festivity in actual truth most holy, sinning neither in word nor deed.”¹⁵ Philo speaks in passing of this act as a purification of both body and soul.¹⁶ Thus, Philo by no means discounts literal sacrifices.

3.2.2 *Literal Sacrifices can only be offered with a pious life and spirit*

At the same time, these references also betray a deep concern for the state of mind and life of the worshiper. In *De ebrietate*, Philo alludes to the prohibition on wine given to Aaron when entering the tent of meeting in Lev 10:9 and applies it to all those who may find themselves needing to sacrifice, which he refers to as “sacrifices of thanksgiving”, and he adds, “these need sober abstinence and a close and ready attention.”¹⁷ Philo’s claim that Abraham left country and kindred to sacrifice “in a religious spirit”¹⁸ implies that such a spirit is commendable in worship. In his meditation on Exod 12:8, Philo thinks it appropriate that worship should take place at night, so that only the stars bring glory to the humble worshipers who wish, “to repent and purify their souls.”¹⁹ The worshiper must prepare both soul and body, by giving up themselves to God and in their body, “by abstaining from uncleanness in holiness and purity.”²⁰ As Philo says elsewhere, “For God does not delight in the fleshiness or fatness of animals, but in the blameless (ἀνυπαίτιος) intention (διάθεσις) of the votary,”²¹ or again, “even the least morsel of incense offered by a man of religion is more precious in the sight of God than thousands of

¹⁵ *Plant.* 162.

¹⁶ *Plant.* 162.

¹⁷ *Ebr.* 129.

¹⁸ *Spec.* 1.68.

¹⁹ *QE* 1.13.

²⁰ *QE* 1.2.

²¹ *Spec.* 2.35.

cattle sacrificed by men of little worth.”²² Philo is still speaking of literal offerings, but the emphasis is squarely on the personal piety of the worshiper.²³

3.2.2.1 Consequently the literal sacrifices are of no worth if offered by an impious person

Philo frequently disparages those who offer the prescribed sacrifices but live impure lives, such as drunken men,²⁴ the arrogant²⁵ or those in, “whose heart is the seat of lurking covetousness and wrongful cravings”,²⁶ or as thieves²⁷ or murderers.²⁸ In such a case, Philo says, “if the worshiper is without kindly feeling or justice, the sacrifices are no sacrifices (ἄθυτοι θυσίαι καὶ ἀνίεροι ἱερουργίαι) . . . it is not a remission but a reminder of past sins which they effect.”²⁹ The sacrifices of the wicked can be called, “the first-fruits of unholiness”.³⁰ Similarly, an insincere repentance can actually worsen the condition of the worshiper (who is compared to the goat of the burnt-offering in Lev 10:16–20).³¹ There is no possibility that the righteous judge, “would ever accept the ministries of the impious”.³² So solemn is this charge that, “for such a one it were a sacrilege that he should even from a distance behold the sacred fire.”³³ When such a sinner enters to sacrifice, their sin “invades and violates the most sacred temples”³⁴ making the sacrifices unholy. Their white robes and unblemished animals contrast ironically with the

²² *Spec.* 1.275

²³ cf. Jean Laporte, “Sacrifice and Forgiveness in Philo of Alexandria,” *SPhilo* 1 (1989): 34–42; Leonhardt, *Worship*, 235–53.

²⁴ Philo, *Ebr.* 131.

²⁵ *Spec.* 1.269.

²⁶ *Spec.* 1.270.

²⁷ *Plant.* 107.

²⁸ *Ebr.* 66.

²⁹ *Mos.* 2.107; cf. also *Spec.* 1.215.

³⁰ *Spec.* 1.279.

³¹ *Fug.* 157–60 and see 96 note a, in the same Loeb volume.

³² *Mos.* 2.279; see also *Mos.* 2.162.

³³ *Ebr.* 131. In *Ebr.* 79, Philo implies that had men such as these not followed impious ways, their sacrifices could have been atoning and turned away evil sent by God.

³⁴ *Cher.* 94.

wounds of their souls and their mutilated virtues (ἀρετή).³⁵ The intent of the heart is what counts, and no matter the quantity or quality of the offering made by the sinner, it is the motivation that is judged, “He turns His face away from those who approach with guilty intent, even though they lead to His altar a hundred bullocks every day”.³⁶ To offer sacrifices unwillingly is like making no sacrifice at all, and the worshiper is self-deceived and forgotten (presumably by God).³⁷ Since the mind is “the most essential victim”, it is blemished, and as no blemished thing can approach the altar, a “bad man” cannot really perform a sacrifice.³⁸ The mind that is only concerned with human aspirations rather than divine virtue is compared to the scape-goat that is sent into the wilderness.³⁹ Therefore, the “soul which sacrifices” should have no room in their head for evil and the passions.⁴⁰

3.2.2.2 *A person should take care to offer literal sacrifices with a rational and noble mind*⁴¹

For Philo, the unblemished state of the mind of the worshiper is more significant than the unblemished state of the animal being sacrificed. In fact, in *De specialibus legibus*, Book 1, Philo negates the OT stipulations for worship altogether in order to emphasize this point, “So he who intends to sacrifice must consider not whether the victim is unblemished but whether his

³⁵ *Cher.* 95–97.

³⁶ *Plant.* 108, later adding in the same verse, “He takes no delight in blazing altar fires fed by the unhallowed sacrifices of men to whose hearts sacrifice is unknown. Nay, these sacrifices do but put Him in remembrance of the ignorance and offences of the several offerers.”

³⁷ *QE* 2.50.

³⁸ *Plant.* 164.

³⁹ *Her.* 179; and similarly: *Plant.* 61. The goat used in sacrifice is also understood symbolically in *Her.* 126; *Fug.* 157–60; *Post.* 72; *QG* 3.3.

⁴⁰ *QE* 2.100. For the passions in Philo, see Carlos Lévy, “Philo’s Ethics,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Philo* (ed. Adam Kamesar; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 146–71 at 154–64.

⁴¹ What follows adapts some material from Philip Richardson, “What are the Spiritual Sacrifices of 1 Peter 2:5? Some light from Philo of Alexandria,” *EvQ* 87.1 (2015): 3–17 at 10–14. This section of the article was an earlier and much briefer version of my research that was restricted to Philo’s metaphorical uses of θυσία in relation to spiritual sacrifices. The following sections develop and significantly expand that material with many more examples and more specific categories.

own mind (διάνοια) stands free from defect (όλόκληρος) and imperfection (παντελής).⁴²

Philo's thought, though focused here on the offering of a literal sacrifice, is beginning to move in the direction of the spiritual sacrifices that we shall come to below, "he holds the sacrifice to consist not in the victims but in the offerer's intention (διάνοια) and his zeal (προθυμία) which derives its constancy and permanence from virtue (ἀρετή)",⁴³ and likewise, what is precious to God is not how many victims are sacrificed, "but the true purity of a rational spirit in him who makes the sacrifice."⁴⁴ Similarly, Philo avers that God does not rejoice in sacrifices per se, but in the intent and virtue of the offerer, "He rejoices in the will to love Him and in men that practise holiness".⁴⁵ In a highly allegorical interpretation of Genesis 31 in *De somniis*, Book 1, Philo describes what he sees as the author of Genesis's view of Joseph's offering of a sacrifice, "He held no one worthy of offering sacrifices who has not first come to know himself and comprehended human nothingness, inferring from the elements of which he is composed that he is nothing worth".⁴⁶ In *De migratione Abrahami*, Philo comments on the descriptions of Moses and Aaron's sacrifices, recorded in Leviticus 8 and 9. The various washings are interpreted allegorically as a cleansing of the soul, "that the better portion of the soul, the rational part (λογικός), that is left, may exercise its truly free and noble impulses towards all things beautiful".⁴⁷ In summary, literal sacrifices only have value in so far as the worshiper exhibits the piety of soul seen in one who possesses a rational mind.

⁴² Philo, *Spec.* 1.283. Younger's translation captures the literal sense here: "but whether his mind is sound, and entire, and perfect." (Philo, *The Works of Philo: Complete and Unabridged. New Updated Edition* (trans. C.D. Yonge; Grand Rapids: Hendrickson, 1993), 561.)

⁴³ *Spec.* 1.290.

⁴⁴ *Spec.* 1.261.

⁴⁵ *Spec.* 1.271.

⁴⁶ *Dreams* 1.212.

⁴⁷ *Migr.* 67.

3.2.3 *The True Sacrifice is Spiritual and does not have to be a Literal Sacrifice*

In the following section I shall identify the various categories of spiritual sacrifices described by Philo. He notes that the soul and mind can be offered as a spiritual sacrifice. Purity and virtue can be an offering to God and praise itself can be considered a sacrifice.

3.2.3.1 *The offering of the soul and mind*

Much of Philo's exegetical writings attempt to contextualize OT laws, presenting allegorical interpretations of them which speak to the new context of his Jewish audience but which also make them palatable to the Greek world.⁴⁸ Valentin Nikiprowetzky describes Philo as standing at the crossroads between biblical and Greek philosophical understandings of sacrifice.⁴⁹ In many places Philo speaks of sacrifices that are not physical and literal. Frequently he speaks of the offering of the soul (*ψυχή*).⁵⁰ For instance, in *De somniis*, he asserts, "For that which prays, which gives thanks and offers sacrifice truly without blemish, must be as he says a "one" only, the soul."⁵¹ In the passage just cited, Philo is giving an allegorical interpretation of the grain offering in Lev 2:1–2, and yet *concentrates* on the offering of the soul. However, in *De vita Mosis*, Book 2, Philo goes further, "if he is pure of heart and just, the sacrifice stands firm, though the flesh is consumed, or rather, *even if no victim at all is brought to the altar*. For the

⁴⁸ For more detail on this topic see e.g. Borgen, *Philo: Exegete*, 124–57.

⁴⁹ Valentin Nikiprowetzky, "La spiritualisation des sacrifices et le culte sacrificiel au temple de Jérusalem chez Philon d'Alexandrie," *Sem* 17 (1967): 97–116 at 99 and see generally 97–102.

⁵⁰ For a recent discussion of the concept of *ψυχή* in Philo see Torrey Seland, "The Moderate Life of the Christian *Paroikoi*: A Philonic Reading of 1 Pet 2:11," in *Philo und das Neue Testament: Wechselseitige Wahrnehmungen I. Internationales Symposium Zum Corpus Judaico-Hellenisticum. 1.-4. Mai 2003, Eisenach/Jena* (ed. Roland Deines and Karl-Wilhelm Niebuhr; ed. 172; WUNT 172; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 241–64 at 245–51. For more on Philo's emphasis on the inward and symbolic sacrifice, see e.g. Seland, "The 'Common Priesthood' of Philo and 1 Peter: A Philonic Reading of 1 Peter 2.5, 9," *JSNT* 57 (1995): 87–119 at 114–16; Lieber, "Between Motherland," 193–210 at 202–09.

⁵¹ Philo, *Somn.* 2.72.

true oblation, what else can it be but the devotion (εὐσέβεια) of a soul which is dear to God? The thank-offering of such a soul receives immortality, and is inscribed in the records of God”.⁵²

For Philo, the presence or absence of a ‘victim’ (an animal sacrifice) is irrelevant to determining whether a true sacrifice took place. In this example, it is the piety of the soul being offered which is really important. This piety in life is rooted in the single minded self-offering of the worshiper. In *De specialibus legibus*, Book 1, Philo speaks of the vow of the Nazirite in Numbers 6. According to Philo, the man himself resembles the sacrifice of the entire burnt offering, the sin-offering and the offering for preservation.⁵³ This is so because, “the penitent is preserved and the person preserved from the maladies of his soul repents, and both of them are pressing forward to that *perfect and wholly sound frame of mind* of which the whole-burnt-offering is a symbol.”⁵⁴ The word translated perfect (ὀλόκληρος) and its cognate ὀλοκαύτωμα often appear in the LXX in relation to sacrifices (cf. Lev 23:15; Deut 27:6; Josh 8:31; 1 Macc 4:47).⁵⁵ All of this is concerned with the offering of the whole person to God. The washing and then the burning of a burnt offering on the altar of Lev 9:14 is allegorized in the same way, “for the wise man consecrates his whole soul as being worthy to be offered to God, owing to its freedom from voluntary or involuntary blemish” (ὅλην γὰρ τὴν ψυχὴν ἀξίαν οὖσαν θεῷ προσάγεσθαι διὰ τὸ μηδένα ἔχειν μήθ’ ἐκούσιον μήτ’ ἀκούσιον μῶμον ὃ σοφὸς καθαγιάζει).⁵⁶ The washing of the belly in Lev 8:21 is interpreted to mean a cleansing away of every kind of desire. When that is effected, the worshipper can offer, “the whole burnt offerings of the soul”.⁵⁷

⁵² *Mos.* 2.108.

⁵³ *Spec.* 1.252.

⁵⁴ *Spec.* 1.253.

⁵⁵ Cf. Paul’s use of the word using sacrificial language in a spiritual sense in 1 Thess 5:23: “Now may the God of peace himself sanctify you completely (ὀλοτελής), and may your *whole* (ὀλόκληρος) spirit and soul and body be kept blameless at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ”.

⁵⁶ Philo, *Leg.* 3.141.

⁵⁷ *Migr.* 67.

In *De sacrificiis Abelis et Caini*, Philo recalls that Lev. 2:14 says an offering is to be “new, roasted, sliced, pounded”. These four things are understood allegorically, including, “the fire-tested and invincible reason” and “the persistent practice and exercise in what the mind has grasped”. When the worshipper acknowledges these things to be what God wills, he “will bring an offering of the first-fruits, even the first and best offspring of the soul.”⁵⁸

The image of first-fruits is used elsewhere to describe “the ransom of our souls” that brings liberty,⁵⁹ and “the ripe fruits of the soul” are related to, “everything in the soul that tends to peace and friendship and agreement”.⁶⁰ The first-fruit offering is, “the word of thanksgiving, sent up out of a true and sincere mind.”⁶¹ Likewise, Philo explains that the first-fruit offering of Deut 24:6 concerns the reaping of, “the true harvest of the mind”, when the, “fruit-bearing of ourselves” is offered to God. This is the product of, “the basket of our reasoning faculties”⁶² A similar thought is also found in Philo’s meditation on Lev 27:30, 32 concerning the tithe. We are to offer the first-fruits of the “unreasoning creatures” within (the senses), yet, “the first and best thing in us is the reason, and it is only right that from its intelligence, its shrewdness, its apprehension, its prudence and the other qualities which belong to it, we should offer first-fruits to God, who gave to it its fertility of thinking.”⁶³ When Philo considers the propitiation offered in Lev 5:7ff., he considers the “best and most perfect form of purification” to be the offering of speech and mind together, in true speech that originates in pure thoughts.⁶⁴ Abel’s offering of the firstlings of his flock (Gen 4:4), show that, “the gladness and richness of the soul, all that

⁵⁸ *Sacr.* 87.

⁵⁹ *Sacr.* 117.

⁶⁰ *Migr.* 202.

⁶¹ *Sacr.* 74.

⁶² *Somn.* 272.

⁶³ *Congr.* 98; see generally *Congr.* 96–98.

⁶⁴ *Mut.* 240; see *Mut.* 245–47, 249–51.

protects and gives joy, should be set apart for God.”⁶⁵ In such a case, Philo distinguishes between the parts of the animal related to the body (such as excrement and fat), that should be cast off and the rest that, “show a soul wholly complete in all its parts” that, “should be given in their entirety as a burnt-offering to God.”⁶⁶ These kinds of soul should be completely free from blemish, that is “innocent and purified.”⁶⁷

Philo sometimes compares *specific* sacrifices to the offering of the soul. The libation is one such, that is compared to “the blood of the soul”⁶⁸ or to the mind,⁶⁹ once it abstains from the passions. In *Quis rerum divinarum heres sit*, Philo interprets the division of blood in Exod 24:6 to speak of divine and human wisdom. The divine kind of wisdom, being without mixture is a reflection of God’s own nature, and “therefore is poured as an offering (σπένδω) to God”⁷⁰ (the same verse is expounded elsewhere with reference to the unmixed soul that is consecrated to God).⁷¹ The mind and the soul are spoken of in parallel, as if Philo makes no distinction between them, and when the mind/soul is filled with divine inspiration, free from all mixture and “in its perfect purity” it, “is fitly rendered in its entirety as a holy libation (σπονδή) to Him”.⁷² The goal of the offering is that the mind should be purified from all “objects of sense” and become entirely rational.⁷³ The blood that is poured in a circle around the altar represents, “a libation of the life-principle”. This is explained as concerning the mind “whole and complete” where every word and intention shows that the mind is offered willingly in God’s service.⁷⁴ In Philo’s

⁶⁵ *Sacr.* 136.

⁶⁶ *Sacr.* 139.

⁶⁷ *Fug.* 80.

⁶⁸ *Leg.* 2.56.

⁶⁹ *Ebr.* 152–53.

⁷⁰ *Her.* 182–83; cf. the metaphorical use of σπένδω in Phil 2:17; 2 Tim 4:6.

⁷¹ See *QE* 2.33.

⁷² *Her.* 184.

⁷³ *Her.* 185.

⁷⁴ *Spec.* 1.217.

commentary on Exodus, “every soul desirous of moral excellence is a libation”, which, Philo elaborates, “that is if one first pours out and dedicates one’s virtue to God.”⁷⁵ In *De somniis*, Philo speaks of the person who pours the libation (ὁ σπονδοφόρος), as the great high priest, who offers, “the libation of himself.”⁷⁶

Philo occasionally speaks of incense as a spiritual sacrifice;⁷⁷ the libation just described is also compared to incense,⁷⁸ incense is explicated in one place as, “the incense of consecrated virtues”⁷⁹ (καθαγιαζών ἀρετὰς ἐκθυμιᾶ, using the verb ἐκθυμιάω, to burn as incense),⁸⁰ incense is likened to the offering of reason (λογισμός),⁸¹ the offering of the whole world that is consumed morning and evening in the censer (and also described as an offering of thanks by the world to its maker),⁸² and in one instance he compares incense to the offering of the whole mind to God.⁸³

In the first book of *De specialibus legibus*, the shaving of the Nazirite’s hair in Num 6:18 is described as the consecration of a portion of himself as representative of the whole, “the

⁷⁵ *QE* 2.71. See Jean Laporte, “The High Priest in Philo of Alexandria,” *SPhilo* 3 (1991): 71–82 at 75, 77, on the libation of the soul.

⁷⁶ *Somn.* 2.183. Note the emphatic placing of ἐαυτόν at the end of the sentence, in apposition to the preceding noun phrase ὅλον τὸ σπονδεῖον ἀκράτου μεθύσματος (“an entire libation full of unmixed wine”, Younge), both in the accusative singular, defining the libation as the person himself.

⁷⁷ Cf. Ps 141:2 (Ps 140:2 LXX), which could also be a source for Philo’s thought here.

⁷⁸ *QE* 2.71.

⁷⁹ *Somn.* 2.232.

⁸⁰ “ἐκθυμιάω,” LSJ, 507.

⁸¹ Philo, *Ebr.* 87.

⁸² *Her.* 199–200. Cf. also *Somn.* 1.243 that speaks of the whole world and heaven made a votive offering (ἀνάθημα) to God, which is set in parallel with the offering of “God-beloved souls” (θεοφιλής) who are consecrated to God (cited by Laporte, “Priest,” 71–82 at 75). This is perhaps the only place where a cosmic sacrifice is described (compared to the numerous references to a cosmic/heavenly temple or a cosmic High Priest); noted also by Nijay Gupta, “The Question of Coherence in Philo’s Cultic Imagery: A Socio-literary Approach,” *JSP* 20.4 (2011): 277–97 at 288.

⁸³ Philo, *Leg.* 2.56. See also *Congr.* 114–115, that speaks of a censer of incense that emits “perfumes exhaled by wisdom and every virtue” and *Spec.* 1.171, that portrays the incenses offerings as a symbol of gratitude for the rational spirit of a person and the blood offerings as a thank offering for the physical nature of the person.

votary has vowed to bring himself, . . . that some part of him should be sacrificially offered.”⁸⁴ In another place, Philo compares different sacrifices (here the offerings of Abraham, described in Gen 15:9) with different parts of a person that align themselves with reason and order (so a soul, “which can easily receive guidance and instruction and ruling”, speech that is equipped to defeat sophisms and develop analytical arguments, the sense that relates to the sensible world and the turtle-dove and pigeon that represent “divine and human reason”).⁸⁵ Similarly, in his treatment of the burnt offering in Gen 8:20, *Quaestiones et solutiones in Genesin*, Philo depicts the beasts as the senses and the birds the mind of the wise man, which come to fruition as a thank-offering offered, “as immaculate and unblemished offerings.”⁸⁶ The willing dispositions are equated with first-fruit offerings.⁸⁷ All these parts are indicative of the whole person and their life as it is lived before God, “though the worshippers bring nothing else, in bringing themselves they offer the best of sacrifices, the full and truly perfect oblation of noble living”,⁸⁸ since, Philo asks elsewhere, “what votive offering (ἀνάθημα) is more hallowed or more worthy of reverence than a man?”⁸⁹

Both faith and works can be offered as sacrifices. The one who can bear fruit as their virtue because they understand and receive the fruit that comes from God, will offer to him, “the blameless and fairest sacrifice of faith”. The Loeb translation might suggest a sacrifice produced by faith or a faithful sacrifice, but the Greek is a neuter accusative noun followed by a feminine

⁸⁴ *Spec.* 1.254.

⁸⁵ *Her.* 125–26.

⁸⁶ *QG* 2.52. In *QG* 3.3, Philo interprets the different animals offered in Gen 15:9 as different parts of the universe.

⁸⁷ *QE* 2.50.

⁸⁸ *Spec.* 1.271, also cited below in connection with another topic.

⁸⁹ *Decal.* 133. In *Spec.* 1.66, the stars are compared to votive offerings. This passage is explored in more detail below.

accusative noun, with no genitive involved (ἄμωμον καὶ κάλλιστον ἱερεῖον οἴσει θεῷ πίστιν).⁹⁰ This could be described as an “Accusative in Simple Apposition”⁹¹ so Younge’s translation might be more appropriate: “will bring to God a faultless and most excellent offering, *namely faith*”. Philo also characterizes good deeds done eagerly and without hesitation as a first-fruits offering.⁹²

In several of his works, Philo takes the festival of Passover to depict the life of virtue as a passing over from one state to the next. In one place it is explained as, “the passage from the life of the passions to the practice of virtue”⁹³ and in another, similarly, to the mind passing away from the passions and towards giving thanks to God.⁹⁴ The mention of a tenth offered to Melchizedek by Abram in Gen 14:20 speaks of, “the soul’s passover, the crossing from every passion and all the realm of sense to the tenth, which is the realm of mind and of God”, until the radiant soul offers its own progress as, “innocent and spotless victims”.⁹⁵ What Philo refers to as “the crossing-festival” (διαβατήρια, speaking of the Passover)⁹⁶ represents a crossing, “from the body and the passions”,⁹⁷ as does the lamb of the Passover itself, that symbolizes the progress of the soul towards a harmony that unites “counsel and justice”.⁹⁸ Both the mind and the soul have a kind of Passover; the soul from the passions of ignorance, vice, fear, greed and injustice to education, wisdom, confidence, justice and equality, and the mind from the realm of the senses

⁹⁰ *Cher.* 85.

⁹¹ Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 198–99.

⁹² Philo, *Sacr.* 53.

⁹³ *Sacr.* 63.

⁹⁴ *Migr.* 25.

⁹⁵ *Congr.* 106.

⁹⁶ Cf. *Mos.* 2:224.

⁹⁷ *Spec.* 2.147.

⁹⁸ *QE* 1.3.

to outward looking thoughts that emulate and love others.⁹⁹ Later in the same work, the lamb represents a passing over from the material, passive, bodily and the perceptions of the senses to the active, rational and incorporeal, “more akin to mind and thought” that symbolizes a virtuous soul that desires perfection.¹⁰⁰ This emphasis on a passing over from the corporeal to the incorporeal can also be found in Philo’s contention that the, “true sacrifice of God-loving souls” is from visible splendor to an invisible one.¹⁰¹ To repel the passions that dwell within until they have been completely removed is, “to make atonement over them,” (ἐξιλάσασθαι ἐπ’ αὐτῶν¹⁰² from ἐξιλάσκομαι, to make expiation, that is to appease God).¹⁰³ Once the mind is free from the passions, replaced by good things, it can make its first-fruit offerings to the Lord.¹⁰⁴ Additionally, Ephraim and Manasseh represent two types of groups who offered sacrifices at different times and are compared respectively to “fruitful memory” (those who sacrificed the Passover in the first month and separated themselves immediately from the passions in Egypt) and “recollection” (that is seen as inferior, and thus awarded second place; these are those who looked back to Egypt).¹⁰⁵

3.2.3.2 *The offering of purity and virtue*

In *De specialibus legibus*, Book 1, this single-minded piety is defined as ἀρετή (virtue), which is viewed as the supreme good. Philo says that the person offering a sacrifice must cleanse their soul before their body, “The mind is cleansed by wisdom and the truths of wisdom’s

⁹⁹ *QE* 1.4.

¹⁰⁰ *QE* 1.7–8; cf. also the reference to the Passover lamb in relation to forward motion in *Leg.* 3.165.

¹⁰¹ *QE* 1.13.

¹⁰² *Post.* 72.

¹⁰³ “ἐξιλάσκομαι,” BDAG, 350.

¹⁰⁴ Philo, *Plant.* 97–99.

¹⁰⁵ *Leg.* 3.94.

teaching . . . and by the sacred company of the other virtues and by the practice of them shewn in noble and highly praiseworthy actions.”¹⁰⁶ The goal of this cleansing is “contemplation (θεωρία) of the universe and all that is therein”,¹⁰⁷ the same as in a later section, “the contemplation of things immaterial and conceptual” (πρὸς θεωρίαν τῶν ἀσωμάτων καὶ νοητῶν). This goal is achieved by knowledge (ἐπιστήμη) that guides reason (λογισμός).¹⁰⁸ Here the altar itself is depicted as the soul of the wise person, made up of perfect virtue, upon which the sacred light (wisdom) is kept burning.¹⁰⁹ In the same section, Philo emphasizes the need for both body and soul to be pure before a sacrifice; the body from “passions (πάθος) and . . . every viciousness (κακία) of word and deed”, the body from defilement.¹¹⁰ Unlike an animal sacrifice, the offering of a person is not consumed since, “the holiness of the sacrifice remains, for sacrifice is not flesh but the pure and unstained life of a holy (person).”¹¹¹ The person who cleanses themselves can offer themselves as a sacrifice.¹¹²

In a different work, Philo’s meditation on the head offered with the feet and inner parts in Exod 12:9 leads to the explanation that for a person, “it is fitting for him who is purified to purify his entire soul with his inner desires” and this will lead to words and deeds that accord with this purity.¹¹³ The prohibition against mixing the blood of the sacrifice with leaven in Exod 23:18 is interpreted as a total consecration of the person to God that despises sensual pleasures and conceit.¹¹⁴ It is “cultivated and fruit-yielding virtue”, planted in the soul and bearing fruit free of

¹⁰⁶ *Spec.* 1.269.

¹⁰⁷ *Spec.* 1.269.

¹⁰⁸ *Spec.* 1.288.

¹⁰⁹ *Spec.* 1.287.

¹¹⁰ *Spec.* 1.257, and generally, *Spec.* 1.257–60.

¹¹¹ *QE* 2.98.

¹¹² *Spec.* 1.270.

¹¹³ *QE* 1.17.

¹¹⁴ *QE* 2.14.

blemish that should be placed on the altar of sacrifice (Gen 2:8).¹¹⁵ “Righteous conduct, virtues, and virtuous actions” are “first in worth and value” and should be offered as first-fruits.¹¹⁶ The first-fruit offerings are also compared to the “sacred impulses” in a person that accord with virtue and must be dedicated to God. These perfect virtues, unsullied by any taint of evil, are also compared to the undivided sacrifices and burnt offerings that are presented to God.¹¹⁷ The modesty and chastity of women in marriage reflecting the beauty of their soul, is also compared to first-fruit offerings.¹¹⁸

Philo explains that the young worshipers of Exod 24:5 are the youthful principles of the soul that represent action and complement the elderly principles of the soul that engage in contemplation. Together the two add up to a virtuous life.¹¹⁹ A thank-offering “of those things which belong to a sound life” combines the, “heart of a pious mind” with a soul of, “sound and full reason”.¹²⁰ The blood smeared upon the candidate admitted to the priesthood indicates figuratively that, “the fully-consecrated must be pure in words and actions and in his whole life.”¹²¹ Philo allegorizes the sacrificial regulations concerning purification and unblemished animals this way, “Mind belongs to a genus wholly superior to sense as man is to woman; unblemished and purged, as perfect virtue (ἀρετή) purges, it is itself the most religious of sacrifices and its whole being is highly pleasing to God.”¹²² The mind of the worshiper must be sanctified “by exercise in good and profitable thoughts and judgements” and their life must be

¹¹⁵ *Leg.* 1.49–50.

¹¹⁶ *Sacr.* 73.

¹¹⁷ *Sacr.* 109–11.

¹¹⁸ *Mos.* 2.137–39.

¹¹⁹ *QE* 2.31.

¹²⁰ *QE* 2.99.

¹²¹ *Mos.* 2.150; see more generally *Mos.* 2.148–51.

¹²² *Spec.* 1.201.

consistent with these judgements.¹²³ The same idea is expressed in *De plantatione*, where Philo asserts, “God delights in altars beset by a choir of Virtues (ἀρετή), albeit no fire burn on them.”¹²⁴ Philo compares favorably those who do not perform a literal sacrifice with those who do, since the former demonstrate the highest quality of a sacrifice: the virtues; this is in contrast to those who simply go through the motions, but whose lives are full of the opposite of those virtues: impiety. According to Otto Bauerfeind, in his emphasis on virtue (ἀρετή), Philo is drawing on “a leading tool in the language of Greek moral philosophy . . . (which) formed an important medium in the dealings of Judaism with the Hellenistic world”.¹²⁵ According to Samuel Sandmel, Philo sees the true virtues arising from the soul which contemplates a “generic virtue” which exists in the intelligible, rather than the material and sensible world,¹²⁶ showing again Philo’s debt to Platonic thought. Outward ethical conduct exemplified in obedience to Mosaic law is the counterpart and imitation of the heavenly virtue.¹²⁷

These virtues are linked to other qualities in various places in Philo. In the passage from *De somniis*, Book 2 (cited above), Philo asks, “What then is the offering of an unbodied soul?” “What is the fine wheaten flour?” He answers his own rhetorical question this way, “What but the fine flour, the symbol of a will (γνώμη),¹²⁸ purified by the councils of instruction (παιδεία).”¹²⁹ So the Priest is commanded, “to offer the best of sacrifices, even the whole soul, brimful of truths (δόγμα) of all sincerity (εἰλικρινής) and purity (καθαρός) —a soul, too, rich with fatness,

¹²³ *Spec.* 1.203.

¹²⁴ *Plant.* 108.

¹²⁵ Otto Bauerfeind, “Ἀρετή,” in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament Vol I* (ed. Gerhard Kittel; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964), 457–61 at 458.

¹²⁶ Sandmel, *Philo*, 113–14.

¹²⁷ Goodenough, *Philo*, 118–23. According to Idem, *Philo*, 122, Philo’s concern is both with individual laws as applications of the principle of natural law expressed in the Decalogue, and with how they manifest the primary (Greek) virtues.

¹²⁸ “that which is purposed or intended, purpose, intention, mind, mind-set” according to “γνώμη,” BDAG, 202, and translated “mind” by Younge.

¹²⁹ Philo, *Somn.* 2.73.

gladdened by light divine and perfumed with the breaths exhaled from justice and the other virtues”.¹³⁰ In order to exhibit the virtues, the mind and the soul must have been purified by instruction in the right doctrine. Such a soul can offer up truth as its sacrifice, as Philo recounts in his work *Quod deterius potiori insidari soleat* when describing the expectations of God, “who welcomes genuine worship of every kind . . . Genuine worship is that of a soul bringing simple reality as its only sacrifice”.¹³¹ If a person comes to the shrine full of good (in contrast to the “empty hands” referred to in Exod 23:15) and thus ready to receive spiritual illumination, their soul will be filled with knowledge and wisdom.¹³²

3.2.3.3 The Sacrifice of Praise

In offering up these kind of sacrifices of virtues, the true worshiper is offering a sacrifice of praise,¹³³ in hymns and songs, “And indeed though the worshippers bring nothing else, in bringing themselves they offer the best of sacrifices, the full and truly perfect oblation of noble living (καλοκάγαθία), as they honour with hymns and thanksgivings their Benefactor and Saviour, God, sometimes with the organs of speech, sometimes without tongue or lips, when within the soul alone their minds recite the tale or utter the cry of praise.”¹³⁴ The praise offering of Lev 7:12f. is understood as “hymns and benedictions and prayers and sacrifices”.¹³⁵ Indeed, the noblest of virtues according to Philo, is gratitude, as he recounts in his work *De plantatione*,

¹³⁰ *Somn.* 2.74.

¹³¹ *Det.* 21.

¹³² *QE* 2.7.

¹³³ Of course, Philo does also have a precedent for this in the OT in passages such as Ps 51:15–17 (50:17–19 LXX); Jonah 2:9 (2:10 LXX) and possibly, Pss 50:14 (49:14 LXX); 107:22 (106:22 LXX); 116:17 (115:8 LXX).

¹³⁴ *Spec.* 1.272. Cf. *Spec.* 1.286, “all perfect sacrifices consisted in thanksgiving” (Younge’s translation. The Loeb translation understands πρὸς ἔνδειξιν τοῦ τελείας ἐν εὐχαριστίαις εἶναι a little differently).

¹³⁵ *Spec.* 1.224; cf. *Spec.* 1.193, that says that the practices of worship, such as hymns, prayers, and sacrifices are designed in order to, “make them [the worshiper] enamoured of continence and piety.”; cf. also *Spec.* 1.195–96.

“it is not possible genuinely to express our gratitude to God by means of buildings and oblations and sacrifices . . . for even the whole world were not a temple adequate to yield the honour due to Him. Nay, it must be expressed by means of hymns of praise”.¹³⁶ Yet here too Philo has not relapsed into counting the mere singing of hymns a sacrifice, since this would be as great an error as counting physical offerings a sacrifice, so he is at pains to explain that the hymns of which he is speaking, are to be sung, “and these not such as the audible voice shall sing, but strains raised and re-echoed by the mind too pure for eye to discern.”¹³⁷ Philo’s narrative continues with an “old story” concerning the creation of the world, where the only thing wanting in the perfection of all that God had made was, according to one of his heavenly ministers, “namely the word to sound their praises”.¹³⁸ In response to this wise answer, God creates a people who, “should be capable of receiving all learning and of composing hymns of praise”.¹³⁹ Even here, when speaking of praise, Philo is drawn back to the beauty of the rational mind and the ability to praise is fundamentally tied to the reasoning powers of the worshiper, as he goes on, “the mind that blesses God . . . was himself the fruit that is really “holy and for praise to God,” fruit borne not by earth’s trees but by those of a rational and virtuous nature.”¹⁴⁰ In another instance, a cultivated spirit of thanksgiving purifies the worshiper of wrong and washes away the filthiness that defiles both thought and deed.¹⁴¹

¹³⁶ *Plant.* 126. Leonhardt, *Worship*, contends that thanksgiving is at the heart of Philo’s understanding of worship, and makes this the central theme of her study.

¹³⁷ *Plant.* 126.

¹³⁸ *Plant.* 128. Young translates this as, “namely for reason, which should be able duly to praise it all”.

¹³⁹ *Plant.* 129 (Younge’s translation).

¹⁴⁰ *Plant.* 134.

¹⁴¹ *Deus.* 7.

3.2.3.4 *Summary of Sacrifice Language*

For Philo it is never sufficient merely to perform the right sacrifices in the manner prescribed by the OT. Rather, a sacrifice must be offered with due reverence for the occasion and in accord with the personal piety of the worshiper, as demonstrated in a holy life. The converse of this sentiment is also true; the sacrifices of an impious person count for nothing. Therefore, a person must offer sacrifices with a mind and reason that is pure and noble. Here we see a development that is closer to the Hellenistic thought-world of the Diaspora than it is to the context of Israelite religion. Moreover, Philo agrees with Stoics such as Seneca and Dio Chrysostom and Platonists such as Plutarch and Maximus of Tyre (as well as Cicero) that a true sacrifice can be spiritual rather than literal. This is exemplified in the offering of the whole of one's mind and soul to God as well as the offering of purity and virtue in thought, speech and deed. Praise and thanksgiving can also constitute a sacrifice (as we also find in Maximus of Tyre).

3.3 Priest Language

3.3.1 Priest represents divine direction in the soul

Philo uses priest language for an internal guide who speaks to the person from God.¹⁴² He characterizes this guide in several different ways, although each of these seem to be a different way of speaking of the same thing, or at least something very similar.

¹⁴² For an excellent and comprehensive analysis of the role of the High Priest in Philo, see Laporte, "Priest," 71–82. Note also Seland, "Common Priesthood," 87–119 at 87–99.

3.3.2 Priest as Reason

In his meditation on Melchizedek the priest (Gen 14:18–20), Philo identifies the wine offered by Melchizedek with the strong drink suitable for souls, “For he is a priest, even Reason (λόγος), having as his portion Him that is, and all his thoughts of God are high and vast and sublime” (ἱερεὺς γάρ ἐστι λόγος κληῖρον ἔχων τὸν ὄντα καὶ ὑψηλῶς περὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ ὑπερόγκως καὶ μεγαλοπρεπῶς λογιζόμενος).¹⁴³ A little further on, Philo speaks of the Reasoning faculty (here λογισμός) entering the Holy Place when Aaron himself enters, acting as Priest.¹⁴⁴ Philo speaks of this λογισμός almost synonymously with his reference to Reason (λόγος) a little earlier,¹⁴⁵ and in parallel with the mind (νοῦς) just afterwards.¹⁴⁶ In *De somniis*, Book I, Philo refers to two temples (addressed below). The High Priest of the temple of the universe is, “His First-born, the divine Word” (ὁ πρωτόγονος αὐτοῦ θεῖος λόγος) and that of the “rational soul” (λογικὴ ψυχὴ) is the “real Man”.¹⁴⁷ Unusually for Philo, two High Priests are pictured; one who ministers to the universe and one to the soul, but in both cases words with the λογ– root are used and the emphasis is on word and reason. In an allegorical passage in *De ebrietate*, Philo compares “moderate learning” with a mother and Reason with a Father.¹⁴⁸ Those who adhere closely to the words of the Father, “right reason” (ὁ ὀρθὸς λόγος) judges worthy of the priesthood, seen as the highest honor.¹⁴⁹ The true Priesthood is for those who obey right reason and resist false arguments and the impulses of the flesh.¹⁵⁰ None can be a true priest who

¹⁴³ Philo, *Leg.* 3.82.

¹⁴⁴ *Leg.* 3.125.

¹⁴⁵ *Leg.* 3.123.

¹⁴⁶ *Leg.* 3.126.

¹⁴⁷ *Somn.* 1.215. The “real man” seems to be a picture of the perfect man, set in contrast with the one who is still progressing towards perfection; see Laporte, “Priest,” 71–82, at 80.

¹⁴⁸ e.g. *Ebr.* 68, which places Father (πατήρ) and “right reason” (ὁ ὀρθὸς λόγος) in apposition, both in the dative case.

¹⁴⁹ *Ebr.* 65.

¹⁵⁰ See *Ebr.* 68–76.

is still at war with the vain opinions contrary to reason.¹⁵¹ A little further on in the same work, Philo identifies Aaron the Priest directly with the reason, “He is the reason (λογισμός) whose thoughts are lofty and sublime, not with the empty inflated bigness of mere vaunting, but with the greatness of virtue (ἀρετή)”.¹⁵² The one who stays away from the path of indiscipline and folly and instead follows the path of “sober abstinence” will gain “the greatest of headships, the priesthood.”¹⁵³ The High Priest is also identified as Reason in *De migratione Abrahami*, where ἀρχιερεύς is placed in apposition with λογισμός, both in the accusative singular.¹⁵⁴ Thus, the Holy place is discernible by the intellect alone (νοητός),¹⁵⁵ that is, “which only mind can apprehend”.¹⁵⁶ Philo stresses that it is the soul (ψυχή) that enters the holy place and the “necessaries” that it requires are, “the good things of the mind”.¹⁵⁷ Just as Reason (λόγος), sometimes portrayed as divine reason, entered the holy place, now it is the mind/soul that enters.

3.3.3 Priest as Judge of Conscience

Elsewhere in *De fuga et inventione*, Philo explicitly states that, “the High Priest is not a man, but a Divine (θεῖος) Word (λόγος)”.¹⁵⁸ In an elaborate allegory, the father of the High Priest (who is the Divine Word) is God and his mother is Wisdom. His anointing means that, “his ruling faculty (ἡγεμονικός) is illumined with a brilliant light”,¹⁵⁹ his mind is purified, and he

¹⁵¹ *Ebr.* 76.

¹⁵² *Ebr.* 128. We will have more to say about the identification of the Priesthood with virtue below.

¹⁵³ *Ebr.* 125–29.

¹⁵⁴ *Ebr.* 102.

¹⁵⁵ *Ebr.* 103. That is “falling within the province of νοῦς”, according to “νοητός,” LSJ, 1178.

¹⁵⁶ Philo, *Ebr.* 104. Despite the translator using the word “mind” instead of “intellect”, as he did earlier, both words translate the same Greek adjective νοητός (cf. Young is clearer here, by using “intellect” both times).

¹⁵⁷ *Ebr.* 105. Indeed νοητός is used six times in this short passage (*Ebr.* 102–105).

¹⁵⁸ *Fug.* 108, the latter word obviously the same translated “Reason” in other works by Philo. For commentary on *Fug.* 106–112, see Williamson, *Philo*, 138–43.

¹⁵⁹ Philo, *Fug.* 110.

is “betrothed” to a pure virgin, like one wedded to virtue.¹⁶⁰ He is incapable of committing involuntary sin.¹⁶¹ Philo then advises his reader to pray that this High Priest should dwell in their soul, that is as “Monitor” (ἔλεγχος) “on the seat of justice”.¹⁶² In the second book of *De somniis*, Philo refers to a High Priest who is himself the libation (cf. the previous section on sacrifice). This High Priest receives bounties from God and pours them out as himself.¹⁶³ He is not only, “able to sow the seed of undefiled and virgin thoughts, but a father also of holy intelligences.”¹⁶⁴ The Loeb translator, F. H. Colson explains in two notes how this role symbolizes the relation of the *Logos* to God.¹⁶⁵ This same High Priest is understood as πρύτανις and δημιουργός, translated by Colson as “its president, its chief magistrate”.¹⁶⁶ Colson writes of the latter, “The term, used in various Greek states, would be quite familiar to Philo through Thucydides and Demosthenes”,¹⁶⁷ and his figure represents “a whole judgement-court, a whole senate”,¹⁶⁸ emphasizing his judicial role in relation to the soul.¹⁶⁹ In *Quod Deus sit immutabilis*, the priest is explicitly identified with “divine reason” (ὁ θεῖος λόγος). Prior to his entry into the soul of a

¹⁶⁰ *Fug.* 114–15.

¹⁶¹ *Fug.* 115.

¹⁶² *Fug.* 118; ἔλεγχος appears twice in this passage, translated in one place as “conscience” and in another as “judge and convictor” by Younge.

¹⁶³ *Somn.* 2.183.

¹⁶⁴ *Somn.* 2.185.

¹⁶⁵ See Philo. *On Flight and Finding. On the Change of Names. On Dreams*. Translated by F. H. Colson, G. H. Whitaker. LCL 275. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1934, 524 note a; 529 note c. Philo’s understanding of *Logos* has generated much discussion, see e.g. Goodenough, *Philo*, 100–110; Dillon, *Platonists*, 154–65; Sandmel, *Philo*, 94–99; Borgen, “Philo,” 233–82 at 273–74; David Winston, *Logos and Mystical Theology in Philo of Alexandria* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1985); Williamson, *Philo*, 103–43; M. Barker, “Temple Imagery in Philo: An Indication of the Origin of the Logos?,” in *Templum Amicitiae: Essays on the Second Temple Presented to Ernst Bammel* (ed. W. Horbury; JSNTSup 48; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), 70–102; Laporte, “Priest,” 71–82; Schenck, *Philo*, 58–62; Cristina Termini, “Philo’s Thought Within the Context of Middle Judaism,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Philo* (ed. Adam Kamesar; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 95–123 at 97–101; Scott D. Mackie, “Seeing God in Philo of Alexandria: the Logos, the Powers, or the Existent One?,” *SPhilo* 21 (2009), 25–47; Roberto Radice, “Philo’s Theology and Theory of Creation,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Philo* (ed. Adam Kamesar; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 124–45 at 135–40.

¹⁶⁶ *Somn.* 2.187.

¹⁶⁷ (529 note a. in the foregoing translation).

¹⁶⁸ *Somn.* 2.188.

¹⁶⁹ Later in *Somn.* 2.189 and 2.230–32, the High Priest is understood to be transformed into a kind of perfected man, whose thoughts are transfixed on God alone.

person there is no sense of guilt for shameful thoughts and actions, for there is no understanding of sin.¹⁷⁰ But when the true priest arrives, twice named as “Conviction” (ἐλεγχος), he exposes the condition of the soul with a pure ray of light, in order that it be healed.¹⁷¹

3.3.4 Priest as Purity of the soul

In his *Legum allegoriae*, Philo notes that Aaron did not wear his robe when he entered into the Holy of Holies (Lev 16:1–4), and compares the idea of the high priest, “laying aside the garment of opinions and impressions of the soul” to that of the soul that loves God disrobing itself of the body and all that is dear to it, in order to gain a foundation in the perfect doctrines of virtue.¹⁷² Similarly, in *Quis rerum divinarum heres sit*, Philo speaks of a man who is divine, not human (οὐκ ἔστιν ἀνθρώπινος, ἀλλὰ θεῖος) when his mind ministers to God in purity.¹⁷³ He is like a High Priest whose heart is perfect; that is, one whose soul turns towards God and away from the body, as a stranger sojourning in a foreign land on this earth.¹⁷⁴ Similarly, Philo elsewhere compares the body of a priest with an immortal soul. Philo’s interest lies not in the body, but in the need for the soul to be unblemished just as the Priest’s body is required to be unblemished by the Levitical laws.¹⁷⁵

¹⁷⁰ *Deus.* 134.

¹⁷¹ *Deus.* 135.

¹⁷² *Leg.* 2.55–56.

¹⁷³ *Her.* 84.

¹⁷⁴ *Her.* 82–85. Like the work we explored in the previous chapter (such as Plato, *Exil.* 607D; Plutarch, *Is. Os.* 353A; Maximus of Tyre, *Or.* 7.5; 9.6; 10.9), we see Platonic influences in references to “the prison-houses of the body” (*Her.* 85).

¹⁷⁵ *Spec.* 1.82

3.3.5 Priest represents different actors

The Priest can represent the Universe acting as a “fellow-ministrant” (συλλειτουργέω) with the High Priest,¹⁷⁶ just as the Priest’s garment can transform him, “from a man into the nature of the world.”¹⁷⁷ Angels, who are pure intelligent bodiless souls, are described as priests in the temple of the universe.¹⁷⁸ The nation of Israel acts like a priest during the Passover (ἱεράομαι) and yet is guiltless,¹⁷⁹ just as they are priest to the whole world.¹⁸⁰ As a microcosm of this image, each household or congregation can act as a pure priest who sacrifices, “with one character and one soul.”¹⁸¹

3.3.6 Garments of the Priest

3.3.6.1 Garments are a symbol of the soul that is pure inside and out

The two robes of the Priest are interpreted as symbols of a soul that is pure, both inwardly in its relations to God and outwardly in its relations to the world of the senses and to other people.¹⁸² Philo returns to the garments of Aaron described in Lev 16:4, and claims that the passage speaks in riddles (αἰνίσσομαι), but its symbolic meaning concerns those who worship in purity without deceit (ἄδολος), and reject that which is merely human (ἀνθρώπειος), mortal (θνητός) and false (ψευδής), that is dear to the darkness, and instead aim at immortality (ἀφθαρσία) and live in the light of truth.¹⁸³

¹⁷⁶ *Spec.* 1.95; cf. *Spec.* 1.96.

¹⁷⁷ *Mos.* 2.135.

¹⁷⁸ *Spec.* 1.66.

¹⁷⁹ *Spec.* 2.145.

¹⁸⁰ *Spec.* 2.163.

¹⁸¹ *QE.* 1.10. On the role of macrocosm and microcosm in Philo’s use of cultic imagery, see the helpful analysis and chart in Gupta, “Question,” 277–97 at 291–95.

¹⁸² *Mut.* 44.

¹⁸³ *Somn.* 1.218.

3.3.6.2 *Garments are associated with Reason*

As we have already seen, the High Priest is identified as the Logos, but his garments are also said to owe their source to powers of the mind (νοητός) and the senses (αἰσθητός).¹⁸⁴ The signet/seal and the flowers and bells are also related to the former and latter respectively.¹⁸⁵ In *Quaestiones et solutiones in Exodum* Book II, the garments of the High Priest represent truth,¹⁸⁶ the *Logos*,¹⁸⁷ that described as Reason, restrains the passions.¹⁸⁸

3.3.6.3 *Garments represent the virtues*

The garments can represent the virtues such as prudence and truth¹⁸⁹ or simply all the virtues.¹⁹⁰ Truth adorns the robe of the high priest in the sacred place where the soul resides. Truth and δῆλωσις (“clear showing” in the Loeb translation or “manifestation” in Younge) are placed together and represent the inner and outer qualities or thoughts and actions that are in accord with wisdom.¹⁹¹

3.3.6.4 *Garments represent the world*

The garments of the Priest represent the whole world when the Priest enters the sanctuary, since different aspects of the garments correspond to different element of the

¹⁸⁴ *Migr.* 102.

¹⁸⁵ *Migr.* 103.

¹⁸⁶ *QE* 2.107, 116.

¹⁸⁷ *QE* 2.110, 111, 116, 117, 118, 122, 124.

¹⁸⁸ *QE* 2.115; cf. *QE* 2.118. Cf. also *Mos.* 2.124–25, 127–30.

¹⁸⁹ *Ebr.* 361–63.

¹⁹⁰ *QE* 2.112.

¹⁹¹ *Spec.* 4.69.

universe.¹⁹² Their arrangement signifies the rational ordering of the universe in accord with reason,¹⁹³ and express to the mind, “the philosophical conceptions which its parts suggest.”¹⁹⁴

3.3.7 Summary of Priest Language

The Priest is often pictured by Philo as an internal guide that provides direction to the soul. It is most often described as Reason, who can act as a judge or arbiter of the conscience and enacts purity within the soul. In other places the Priest is compared to the universe, angels, the nation of Israel and even the household itself. Philo also concentrates attention on the garments of the priest that can symbolize the purity of a soul in relation to God and to the world. The garments are sometimes associated with Reason and can represent the virtues as well as representing the cosmos itself. I found very little evidence of metaphorical Priest language in other Hellenistic writers with which to compare this, but Philo’s emphasis on Reason, virtue and inward purity accords generally with what we find in Hellenistic philosophy.

3.4 Temple Language

3.4.1 The soul is the dwelling place of God

In common with other Middle Platonic texts cited in the previous chapter, Philo frequently refers to the soul as the dwelling place of God. However, the soul must be prepared, just as a temple must be set apart as a dwelling place fit for a holy God. Philo urges his readers to make their souls, “as beautiful as we may, to be a lodging fit for God.”¹⁹⁵ The word used for “lodging” is ἐνδιαίτημα, which does not have a specific cultic connotation. However, it is used

¹⁹² *Mos.* 2.133, 135; *Fug.* 110; *QE* 2.109, 112–114, 120.

¹⁹³ *Spec.* 1.88–89, 93

¹⁹⁴ *Spec.* 1.95.

¹⁹⁵ *Cher.* 98.

at least once in Philo with reference to the tabernacle,¹⁹⁶ and elsewhere with reference to the temple of the soul¹⁹⁷ and in our present passage, Philo follows this comment by averring that even a temple is not sufficient for God, but “One worthy house there is—the soul that is fitted to receive Him”¹⁹⁸ It is important to build the house of the soul in right order; first, laying the foundations of goodness and teaching, then the virtues and noble actions are built upon these and finally the whole building is ornamented with “the reception of the learning of the schools” (ἡ ἀνάληψις τῶν ἐγκυκλίων προπαιδευμάτων).¹⁹⁹ Philo compares the soul to a dwelling place (ἐστία) into which the divine reason (ὁ θεῖος λόγος) enters.²⁰⁰ Philo asks rhetorically what house in all creation could be worthier of God’s dwelling than a soul that is “perfectly purified” and considers the “only good” to be “moral beauty”,²⁰¹ that is, virtue.²⁰² In *De somniis* Book I, Philo makes reference to Lev 26:12 to assert that a soul must be purged of evil “to the utmost” (ἄκρως),²⁰³ in order that God may dwell within. He speaks as if to himself, “Be zealous therefore, O soul, to become a house of God, a holy temple, a most beautiful abiding-place” (σπούδαζε οὖν, ὦ ψυχή, θεοῦ οἶκος γενέσθαι, ἱερὸν ἅγιον, ἐνδιαίτημα κάλλιστον).²⁰⁴ The same Levitical passage is expounded in his second book, where the city in which God will walk is understood to be the soul.²⁰⁵ It is worth noting that Paul seems to allude to this very passage from Leviticus in 2 Cor 6:16 with reference to the Corinthians as the temple of God. Philo also speaks

¹⁹⁶ *Congr.* 116.

¹⁹⁷ *Somn.* 1.149, covered below and also in *Spec.* 1.270, addressed earlier, where ἐνδιαίτημα is in apposition to the spiritual temple where a person offers himself as a sacrifice.

¹⁹⁸ *Cher.* 100.

¹⁹⁹ *Cher.* 101; cf. 1 Cor 3:10–15 that also speaks of building a house with right foundations prior to Paul’s temple metaphor in 1 Cor 3:16–17.

²⁰⁰ *Deus.* 134.

²⁰¹ *Sobr.* 62; cf. *Sobr.* 68.

²⁰² Agreeing here with the Stoics; see Dillon, *Platonists*, 148.

²⁰³ From ἄκρον; see “ἄκρον,” BDAG, 40; “ἄκρον,” LSJ, 57.

²⁰⁴ *Somn.* 1.149.

²⁰⁵ *Somn.* 2.248.

of the “rational soul” (λογικός ψυχή) as a temple of God.²⁰⁶ In an allegorical exposition of Gen 23:9, 11, Philo compares the body and soul to a “double cave”. The virtuous man shuts himself off from the outer cave. Reason reigns within his “god-loving soul”, “receiving holiness and purity and the possession of a blameless life” and this is compared to the holy of holies within the tabernacle.²⁰⁷ Philo also speaks of a divine inspiration (using θεοληπτέομαι),²⁰⁸ that sometimes possesses his soul.²⁰⁹

3.4.2 *The mind is the dwelling place of God*

In one place Philo describes the mind (διάνοια) of a wise man as, “a palace and house of God.”²¹⁰ In another, Philo warns the one who purifies his body and yet enter temples with an impure soul and an unrepentant heart, “he shall never escape the eye of Him who sees into the recesses of the mind (διάνοια) and treads its inmost shrine.”²¹¹ The word translated “shrine” in LCL is ἄδυτον, the neuter of ἄδυτος, which is often used substantively for the innermost sanctuary or shrine.²¹² Younge translates the noun as “secret places”, which might cast doubt on its cultic connotations but there are numerous instances in Philo where it is clearly used in the context of a temple,²¹³ and the comparison with the literal temple in context makes the referent very likely. In *De vita Mosis* Book 2, Philo uses the same word (ἄδυτον) again to speak of τὰ

²⁰⁶ *Somn.* 1.215.

²⁰⁷ *QG* 4.80.

²⁰⁸ “θεοληπτέομαι,” LSJ, 790; cf. Philostratus, *Vit. Apoll.* 1.2.3.

²⁰⁹ *Cher.* 27.

²¹⁰ *Praem.* 123.

²¹¹ *Deus.* 9 (see *Deus.* 8–9 more generally).

²¹² “ἄδυτος,” LSJ, 25.

²¹³ See Philo, *Leg.* 1.62; *Cher.* 95; *Post.* 173; *Ebr.* 135; *Her.* 82; *Congr.* 168; *Fug.* 162; *Somn.* 2.232; *Mos.* 2.87, 95, 152, 154, 174, 178; *Spec.* 1.84, 231, 274, 275, 297; *Praem.* 75; *Legat.* 188, 306, 308. It is worth noting that each of these examples is translated by Younge with a cultic sense, such as “innermost shrine” or “holy of holies”. The term never appears in the LXX, and in the Pseudepigrapha it appears only in *Sib. Or.* 8.56, 487; 12.170, each time in a clearly cultic context.

ἄδυτα τῆς σκηνῆς (the inmost sanctuary of the tabernacle) as symbolically (συμβολικῶς) referring to the mind (νοητός).²¹⁴ Indeed, Philo claims that when God was looking to establish his goodness among people, “He found no worthier temple on earth than the reasoning faculty” (νεῶν ἀξιοπρεπέστερον οὐχ εὔρεν ἐπὶ γῆς λογισμοῦ, here using λογισμός).²¹⁵

Similarly, Philo cautions against seeking for Jerusalem and its temple (the “vision of peace”) on earth, “for what grander or holier house could we find for God in the whole range of existence than the vision-seeking mind . . .?”²¹⁶ The mind is promised that if it rejects passions and all evils and instead “art worthily initiated and canst be consecrated to God,” then it may become “an animate shrine of the Father.” A divine vision of holiness is possible for the person who makes their soul “a sanctuary and altogether a shrine of God.”²¹⁷ Philo views the mind (νοῦς) as “an inseparable portion [ἀπόσπασμα] of that divine and blessed soul”²¹⁸ and there are tantalizing references to the head being the temple of the mind,²¹⁹ that are not further developed.

3.4.3 People in their embodiment described as temples

In two places Philo seems to come closer to Paul’s understanding of the body as temple than other ancient writers. In his account of the creation of humanity after God’s image in Gen 1:26–27, Philo pictures God selecting only the very best materials for “his structure”, which in context seems to be a clear reference to the human body, “for a sacred dwelling-place²²⁰ or

²¹⁴ *Mos.* 2.82.

²¹⁵ *Virt.* 188. In his commentary on this verse Walter T. Wilson, *Philo of Alexandria. On Virtues: Introduction, Translation, and Commentary* (PACS 3; Leiden: Brill, 2011), 389 also cites *SVF* 1.146: “It is not necessary to build temples for the gods, but to have the divine in the mind alone.”

²¹⁶ Philo, *Somn.* 2.250–51.

²¹⁷ *QE* 2.51.

²¹⁸ *Det.* 90.

²¹⁹ *QG* 1.5; *QE* 2.100.

²²⁰ Or more literally, “abode” (Younge) translating οἶκος.

shrine²²¹ was being fashioned for the reasonable soul, which man was to carry as a holy image [ἀγαλατοφορέω],²²² of all images [ἄγαλμα] the most Godlike [θεοειδής].²²³ The reader has already been told that the divine (θεῖος) breath or spirit (πνεῦμα) has been breathed into this being,²²⁴ so the overall image is closer to 1 Cor 3:16; 6:19 than any other Hellenistic writer we have examined.²²⁵ A very similar concept is described in Philo’s exposition of the life of Moses, when Moses’ audience is astonished at the control of his reason over the impulses of his soul. His mind is pictured as dwelling in his body, “like an image in its shrine” (ἀγαλατοφορέω).²²⁶ In one place the congregation itself is described as a temple. Philo explains that in the time of Moses, there being no temple at that time, “the dwelling together of several good persons in the home was a temple and altar”.²²⁷

3.4.4 *The Universe as Temple*

3.4.4.1 *The World is a temple*

Philo describes the whole created order as a temple in a number of places.²²⁸ In *De plantatione*, Philo describes the world as, “God’s house in the realm of sense-perception”, which he explicates as, “a sanctuary” (ἀγίασμα) an outshining of sanctity, so to speak, a copy of the

²²¹ Actually two words, “νεὸς ἱερόν”, so better, “sacred temple” (Younge).

²²² On this, an example of compound words much loved by Philo (see David T. Runia, *Philo of Alexandria. On the Creation of the Cosmos According to Moses: Introduction, Translation, and Commentary* (PACS 1; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 103), consult Idem, *Creation*, 141, 227, 254, 335.

²²³ *Opif.* 137.

²²⁴ *Opif.* 135. See Runia, *Creation*, 326 on the role of πνεῦμα in Philo, Plato and Stoicism.

²²⁵ Similarly, note in agreement the remarks of Idem, *Creation*, 335. However, Seland, “Common Priesthood,” 87–119 at 93 notes that Philo is reluctant to speak of a man and his body as a temple, and asserts that the idea is only used of Adam and not of human beings in general, who are only copies of the archetypal man.

²²⁶ Philo, *Mos.* 1.27.

²²⁷ *QE* 1.10.

²²⁸ George W. MacRae, “Heavenly Temple and Eschatology in the Letter to the Hebrews,” *Sem* 12 (1978): 179–99 at 184 speaks of the notion of a “Temple-structured Universe” in Philo.

original”²²⁹ that has been prepared “by the “hands” of God”.²³⁰ Here Philo seems to accept both the Stoic theory of sense-perceptions/impressions²³¹ and the Platonic understanding of otherworldly archetypes that form a pattern or model for earthly phenomena.²³² In one place Philo claims that there are two temples of God; the soul and the world itself,²³³ and in another the “whole universe” (ὁ σύμπας κόσμος).²³⁴ When discussing the furnishings of the temple in Exod 26:1, Philo claims that the world existed as a universal temple before the holy temple existed.²³⁵ In a number of places, Philo expresses the view that even the whole world is not a temple sufficient for God’s honor.²³⁶ Finally this world is described as “that greatest of houses or cities.”²³⁷ Although in the latter citation the metaphor is not that of the temple (and the word used is οἰκία not οἶκος), it does comport with the previous references to the house as a temple and, for our purposes, it is of interest that the metaphor makes reference to the material and construction of the house and of God as its builder or architect (δημιουργός).²³⁸

²²⁹ A likely reference to the heavenly temple, cf. Philo, *Leg.* 1.78, discussed below.

²³⁰ *Plant.* 50; cf. the reference to the temple “not made with [human] hands” (ἀχειροποίητος,) in Mk 14:58; cf. also 2 Cor 5:1.

²³¹ Though here using the adjective αἰσθητός rather than the one more commonly used in Stoic thought; καταληπτικός. See Dillon, *Platonists*, 146.

²³² See e.g. R.J. McKelvey, *The New Temple: The Church in the New Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969), 38–40; MacRae, “Temple,” 179–99 at 283–92.

²³³ Philo, *Somn.* 1.215.

²³⁴ *Spec.* 1.66.

²³⁵ *QE* 2.85.

²³⁶ *Plant.* 33, cf. also *Plant.* 126; *Leg.* 1.44.

²³⁷ *Cher.* 127.

²³⁸ Cf. the reference in 1 Cor 3:10–17 to God as the master builder of the house that is described as a temple in 1 Cor 3:16–17.

3.4.4.2 Heaven is a temple

Heaven alone is sometimes pictured as a temple.²³⁹ When God created heaven and earth (Gen 1:1), he made heaven first because, “it was destined to be the most holy dwelling-place (pairing οἶκος with ἱερός) of manifest and visible gods”.²⁴⁰ Elsewhere, the stars are described as divine images that God placed in heaven, which are explicitly compared to a temple, “as in the purest temple belonging to corporeal being.”²⁴¹ In a reference just cited, Philo distinguishes between the universe as a temple (ἱερόν) and its sanctuary, that is heaven (using ναός, which is often specified as the holy of holies).²⁴²

3.4.4.3 God fills all things

As we saw in the previous chapter, Stoic writers referred to God filling the whole universe with his presence.²⁴³ Philo expresses similar sentiments in a number of places, and these accord with the idea of the universe being the dwelling place of God. Philo writes that, “God fills and penetrates all things, and has left no spot void or empty of His presence”,²⁴⁴ he, “has left

²³⁹ For more detail, see e.g. Carl Werman, “God’s House: Temple Or Universe,” in *Philo und das Neue Testament: Wechselseitige Wahrnehmungen, I. Interationales Symposium zum Corpus Judaico-Hellenisticum, 1.-4. Mai 2003, Eisenach /Jena* (ed. Roland Deines and Karl-Wilhelm Niebuhr; WUNT 172; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 309–22. For the OT and ANE background that would also have provided a source for Philo’s thought, see Gregory K. Beale, *The Temple and the Church’s Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God* (NSBT 17; Downers Grove, Ill.: IVP, 2004), 31–60.

²⁴⁰ Philo, *Opif.* 27, speaking of the stars. See Runia, *Creation*, 160, for this surprising concession to Hellenistic thought.

²⁴¹ *Opif.* 55; cf. the influence of Plato in passages such as *Tim.* 37c7, also reflected in Seneca, *Ep.* 90.28, cited by Runia, *Creation*, 204.

²⁴² *Spec.* 1.66. Here we see the occasional privileging by Philo of heaven as a temple above the universe as a whole; see e.g. Gupta, “Question,” 277–97 at 282.

²⁴³ E.g. Cicero, *Div.* 1.49.110; 1.52.118; *Leg.* 2.11.28; Alcinous, *Handbook*, 165.10.3.1–2 (18).

²⁴⁴ *Leg.* 3.4; see also *Fug.* 75.

nothing empty or destitute of Himself, but has completely filled all things”,²⁴⁵ or to put it another way, he has filled the universe with himself.²⁴⁶

3.4.5 *The Dwelling of Wisdom*

Wisdom, or prudence (φρόνησις) can be either particular or general. The particular prudence that dwells in an individual is destined to die with them, but universal prudence, “has for its abode the wisdom of God (here σοφία) and His dwelling-place” and it is imperishable, because “it abides in an imperishable dwelling-place”.²⁴⁷ Within the wider context of second temple Judaism, the reference to an imperishable house, though not specified, is most likely to refer to a temple.²⁴⁸ Wisdom can also be compared to the tabernacle or tent in which the wise man “tabernacles (κατασκηνύω) and dwells (ἐνοικέω)”.²⁴⁹ In another work, Reason itself (λόγος) appears to be identified with the “high and heavenly doctrine” and also with a “house” or abode (ἐνδιαίτημα), “which “Thou hast wrought as a Holy Place””.²⁵⁰

²⁴⁵ *Post.* 6; see also *Conf.* 137–38.

²⁴⁶ *Post.* 14, 30. *Gig.* 27 is another possible reference but it depends on whether the sense is that the Spirit fills all things or that the Spirit is “filled up in all its parts, so as to have no interstices and thus be indivisible”, according to Philo. *On the Cherubim. The Sacrifices of Abel and Cain. The Worse Attacks the Better. On the Posterity and Exile of Cain. On the Giants.* Translated by F. H. Colson, G. H. Whitaker. LCL 275. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1929, 459 note a.

²⁴⁷ *Leg.* 1.78.

²⁴⁸ E.g. 1 Chr 29:16; 2 Chr 36:14; Ps 5:7 (5:8 MT); Isa 56:7; 64:11 (64:10 MT); 66:20; *I En.* 14:10, 13, 15, 21; 25:5 and throughout the Dead Sea Scrolls, as highlighted in the first chapter.

²⁴⁹ *Leg.* 3.46

²⁵⁰ *Plant.* 53.

3.4.6 Tabernacle Language²⁵¹

In one place Philo contrasts the tabernacle unfavorably as a symbol of what is earthly, mutable and changeable with the temple that represents heaven, that is unchangeable and consistent.²⁵² The tabernacle can also be spoken of as the world where God dwells, but without being compared negatively with heaven.²⁵³ However, elsewhere the tabernacle figuratively represents human virtue,²⁵⁴ incorporeal virtue,²⁵⁵ wisdom,²⁵⁶ and truth (with its contents “a representation and copy of wisdom”), and the presence of the tabernacle in the midst of uncleanness enables the people to wash away all that defiles them.²⁵⁷

3.4.7 Summary of Temple Language

Philo frequently speaks of the soul or the mind as the dwelling place of God, as do Stoics like Seneca, Epictetus, Dio Chrysostom and Marcus Aurelius and Middle Platonists like Plutarch and Maximus of Tyre. There is also an exceptional reference to a person in their embodiment compared to a temple (though Seland contends that this is only used of the original human, Adam, and not of humanity in general). Philo also compares the whole universe to a temple, or contrasts the heaven and the earth as temples, or the heaven as the sanctuary (or holy of holies) of the universe. We hear that God fills all things and Wisdom is said to dwell as in a temple.

Tabernacle language is also used for the world and for virtue, wisdom, purity and truth. This

²⁵¹ MacRae, “Temple,” 179–99 at 181 argues that we can legitimately speak of temple symbolism when discussing the use of tabernacle imagery in both Philo and Hebrews, “not only because the biblical accounts of the tabernacle are generally thought to reflect temple structure, but because both authors are strongly influenced by contemporary temple symbolism in their exegesis.”

²⁵² *QE* 2.83. Just as in *QG* 2.4, Noah’s ark is understood as corruptible, compared to the ark of the Temple that symbolizes incorruptibility, stability and the divine nature.

²⁵³ *QE* 2.51.

²⁵⁴ *Det.* 160.

²⁵⁵ *Ebr.* 134.

²⁵⁶ *Congr.* 116–117.

²⁵⁷ *Her.* 112–113.

cosmic language has analogues with the language and thought of Stoics such as Seneca and Marcus Aurelius and Middle Platonists like Plutarch and Alcinous.

3.5 Conclusions

My purpose in this chapter has not been to provide a definitive account of Philo's understanding of the cult or even to defend a particular thesis for the origin of his metaphorical sacrifice, priest and temple imagery. Nor am I claiming that Philo is influenced purely by Hellenistic philosophy in his use of imagery. Clearly, many of Philo's emphases could be seen as a legitimate development of the critique of sacrifices and the emphasis on spiritual sacrifices found in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, and indeed in the OT itself. Rather, my more limited aim has been to examine the use of metaphorical temple imagery in Philo in order to see to what extent his language is consonant with the emphases *already* found in other Hellenistic philosophical writings. Here we have noted similar concepts to those found in Stoic and Middle Platonic writers; namely that the soul and the mind can be a sacrifice, as can purity and virtue in thought, speech and deed; and that the soul can be a temple for reason, or God, just as the universe itself (or one of its components) is a temple for God, who fills all things. Additionally, Philo's almost unique use of metaphorical Priest language echoes similar themes to those found in Hellenistic writers, emphasizing the place of reason, virtue and purity. My next task will be to compare my findings with the use of these themes in 1–2 Corinthians, to see how Paul's application of metaphorical temple language might speak to an audience whose familiarity with such language originated in a very different world view.

Chapter Four: Metaphorical Temple Language in 1 Corinthians

4.1 Introduction

I shall address Paul's use of metaphorical temple language in First Corinthians in this chapter, by comparing Paul's use of this imagery to convey a particular message within *his* worldview and context, with the use of temple imagery in the worldview and context that I examined in the previous two chapters.¹ Paul was using language that would have spoken to an audience familiar with Hellenistic philosophy.² However, this is not to claim that he borrows from Stoicism or Platonism. Rather, the language and imagery that Paul chose was used for his own purposes to express his own theology but both resonated with and challenged those influenced by the philosophical milieu of the day.³

¹ Given the number of issues discussed in this epistle and the variety of potential backgrounds proposed for each issue, there is little scholarly agreement on any of them. It is hardly surprising then that the scholarly literature on First Corinthians continues to multiply at an extraordinary rate. Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (NICNT; Revised ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014), xvi–xvii, commenting on the twenty-five year gap between the first edition of his commentary and the second, remarks, “in terms of articles in the scholarly journals alone, the bibliography has in the past twenty-five years multiplied over 300 percent in relationship to all such material in the preceding two centuries!” Therefore, I will be necessarily selective in citing scholarly literature, given that I am commenting, not only on the relevant passages (1 Cor 3:16–17; 6:19), but on the letter as a whole.

² Bruce M. Metzger, *The New Testament: Its Background, Growth, and Content* (New York: Abingdon, 1965), 64, speaks of the Paul presented by Luke in Acts as, “one fluent in the popular philosophies of the day and able to turn his knowledge of them to missionary advantage as a point of contact with the audience” (cited by David deSilva, “Paul and the Stoa: A Comparison,” *JETS* 38.4 (1995): 549–64 at 549). deSilva notes that Metzger evaluates the Paul of his letters quite differently, concluding that parallels between Paul and Stoic teaching were limited to words, not ideas. deSilva tests out this theory by examining not only verbal parallels but possible conceptual parallels, common *topoi* and figures, and common forms. deSilva's survey concludes that Paul was familiar with Stoic teaching but deployed this language and forms within a different theological framework.

³ See the similar comments of Michelle V. Lee, *Paul, the Stoics, and the Body of Christ* (SNTSMS 137; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 23–24, especially: “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” (24). Timothy A. Brookins, *Corinthian Wisdom, Stoic Philosophy, and the Ancient Economy* (SNTSMS 159; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 104–52, tries to reconstruct the social world of Corinth to question the conclusions of Bruce W. Winter and others that Corinth was thoroughly Roman in this period. Rather, Brookins contends, Greek and Roman influences overlapped and he suggests that some elite members of the Corinthian church could have had access to Greek philosophical training. Idem, *Wisdom*, 153–200, ambitiously attempts to relate every issue in the letter to Stoicism. Nathan J. Barnes, *Reading 1 Corinthians with Philosophically Educated Women* (Eugene, Ore.: Pickwick Publications, 2014), 122–40, provides a helpful summary of the evidence for the philosophical heritage of Corinth, concluding, “Corinth . . . had always been tolerant of the most popular philosophies in the ancient world . . . The Isthmian games attracted philosophers . . . and Corinth produced many Cynics and Stoics” (165). Robert S. Dutch, *The Educated Elite in 1 Corinthians*:

I shall explore Paul's use of temple imagery in 1 Cor 3:16–17 and 6:19. I will note that in 1 Cor 1:10–4:17 Paul contrasts wisdom of any kind outside of the revelation of the Spirit with the identity of the Corinthians as the temple in which the Spirit dwells (3:16–17). I will seek to demonstrate the corporate dimension of Paul's understanding of this temple there and its exclusiveness to those who belong to Christ and are indwelt by the Spirit, in sharp contrast to the philosophical understanding of indwelling, which is more individual and inclusive. In my discussion of 6:19 and its setting I shall stress Paul's focus on the body and its importance as the place where holiness is expressed. Paul's unashamed use of body language, in which the body is the location of the indwelling Spirit, is very different from the indifference or even disdain shown to the body in philosophy. Additionally, Paul maintains the emphasis on the exclusive nature of this temple and its corporate identity, even when discussing individual bodies. Finally, I shall explore some of these themes as they are taken up in the letter as a whole, including Paul's strong opposition to idolatry that contrasts with the philosophical acceptance of multiple gods. I will conclude the chapter by comparing and contrasting the understanding of God, humanity and what it means to live out their philosophy, in both Paul and the philosophers.

Education and Community Conflict in Graeco-Roman Context (JSNTSup 271; London: T&T Clark, 2005), especially 95–167, makes a strong case for the opportunities for a Greek gymnasium education for the educated elite in Corinth. Brookins, *Wisdom*, 132–52 agrees with Dutch and seeks to extend his case, especially with relationship to a philosophical education. We might note the caution of Timothy A. Brookins, “Reading 1 Corinthians with Philosophically Educated Women” *Review of Biblical Literature* 7 (2015): No Pages. Cited 2 October 2015. Online: http://www.bookreviews.org/pdf/9820_10852.pdf, that there might not have been any “elite” in Corinth, strictly speaking. Nevertheless, a more educated minority (1 Cor 1:26) may have had access to this education and could have influenced others. For the co-existence of both Greek and Roman influences in Corinth to support the case of Brookins and Dutch, see e.g. Steven J. Friesen, Daniel N. Schowalter, and James C. Walters, eds., *Corinth in Context: Comparative Studies on Religion and Society* (NovTSup 134; Leiden: Brill, 2010), Chapters Two, Three, Four and Five.

4.1.1 Paul's Introduction to 1 Corinthians

Before I consider the metaphorical temple references in First Corinthians, it is important to set them in their proper context within the epistle. Most commentators recognize at least 1 Cor 1:1–9 as Paul's introduction to his letter,⁴ set apart from Paul's address that begins in 1 Cor 1:10;⁵ further, others who pay special attention to the epistolary forms used in Greco-Roman letters, have identified 1 Cor 1:1–3 separately as the epistolary prescript.⁶ Paul's concern for purity appropriate to a temple is evident from the outset of the letter since it features in this prescript. His address to the church in 1 Cor 1:2 is unique for such a prescript in a Pauline epistle

⁴ I am assuming that First Corinthians is a single letter. Although this has been disputed in works such as Walter Schmithals, *Gnosticism in Corinth: An Investigation of the Letters to the Corinthians* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1971), and Robert Jewett, "The Redaction of 1 Corinthians and the Trajectory of the Pauline School," *JAARSup* 46 (1978): 398–444, the case for unity has been convincingly argued by, among others, John C. Hurd, *The Origin of 1 Corinthians* (London: SPCK, 1965), 43–47; Margaret M. Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1991), *passim*; Wolfgang Schrage, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther: 1 Kor 1,1-6,11* (EKKNT 7.1; Zürich: Benziger, 1991), 63–71; Anthony C. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 36–39 and Fee, *1 Corinthians*, 16.

⁵ E.g. Archibald Robertson and Alfred Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St Paul to the Corinthians* (ICC; 2d ed.; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1914), xxv; C. K. Barrett, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (BNTC; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1968), 28–29; Roy E. Ciampa and Brian S. Rosner, *The First Letter to the Corinthians* (PNTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), vi–xii; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 32; Yale University Press, 2008), viii–ix; Fee, *1 Corinthians*, vii–xi.

⁶ Hans Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians: A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Hermeneia; trans. James W. Leitch; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975), vi–viii; Friedrich Lang, *Die Briefe an die Korinther* (NTD 7G; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986), 15; Mitchell, *Rhetoric*, x–xi; Schrage, *1 Korinther: 1,11-6,11*, 97; Ben Witherington III, *Conflict and Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), vi–ix; Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians* (SP 7; Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1999), vii–x; Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, v–xiii; David E. Garland, *1 Corinthians* (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003), vii–viii; Craig S. Keener, *1–2 Corinthians* (NCBC; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 20; Eckhard J. Schnabel, *Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther* (Wuppertal: R. Brockhaus, 2006), 55; Dieter Zeller, *Die erste Brief an die Korinther* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010), 48; cf. also David E. Aune, *The New Testament in Its Literary Environment* (LEC; Philadelphia: Westminster John Knox, 1987), 163, 170; Linda L. Belleville, "Continuity or Discontinuity: A Fresh Look at 1 Corinthians in the Light of First-Century Epistolary Forms and Conventions," *EvQ* 59.1 (1987): 15–37 at 16–18 (noting "The major concerns and themes of the letter often appear in the modifying phrases of the basic A to B, χάρις . . . formula of the Pauline letter opening (16), noting that four of the major themes of the letter are introduced in 1 Cor 1:1–3 (16–17)).

since, in addition to addressing them as κλητοῖς ἁγίοις (“to [the] called holy people/ones”),⁷ it combines this with ἡγιασμένοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ (“to those who are sanctified in Christ Jesus”).⁸ Paul appropriates language used for the people of God in the LXX and applies it to a largely Gentile congregation,⁹ while stressing the fact that they have been set apart for God. Other epistles begin by addressing the congregation as those called holy (Rom 1:7; cf. 2 Tim 1:9) or as holy ones (2 Cor 1:1; Phil 1:1; cf. Eph 1:1; Col 1:1) but only here do we find *two* cognate terms sharing the same root as ἅγιος (ἅγιος and ἀγιάζω), denoting that which is set apart or consecrated for cultic purposes and commonly used by the LXX to translate the Hebrew שָׁדֵק.¹⁰ This unusual opening for Paul is suggestive of a major concern that permeates the letter and relates closely to my topic. As Paul will demonstrate, the Corinthians need reminding that they are the temple of God and are supposed to be *set apart* from all that would defile them (the kinds of issues addressed in subsequent chapters).

Paul’s succinct exhortation in 1:10 functions as a thesis statement or the *propositio* or *prothesis* in rhetorical terms¹¹ and names the immediate problem confronting the Corinthians as

⁷ 1 Cor 1:2 is usually taken as a verbless clause, with εἶμι supplied in the infinitive, and translated as if κλητός was functioning like a participle form of καλέω: “those called to be saints” (something still to be attained). But the phrase makes sense as it stands in apposition to what precedes (ἡγιασμένοις ἐν Χριστῷ). The Corinthians are the “called saints”, the same people who form the Church in Corinth; those sanctified in Christ Jesus. This is recognized in the translation of Collins, *1 Corinthians*, 41 and the explanation of 46; cf. also recently N. T. Wright, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2013), 1027; and also recognized in the explanations (even if not necessarily reflected in the translations) of Richard B. Hays, *First Corinthians* (Int; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997), 15; Keener, *1–2 Corinthians*, 21; Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 126.

⁸ Taking the perfect participle to emphasize present result.

⁹ κλητός is often combined with ἅγιος in the LXX to speak of a “holy convocation” in the phrase κλητὴ ἀγία found in e.g. Exod 12:16; Lev 23:2–37; Num 28:25 (also noted by Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 22 note 32. God’s people are described as holy in Exod 19:5–6 and subsequently in passages such as Deut 7:6; 26:19; Jer 2:3; Dan 7:18–27; *Pss. Sol.* 17:26, as noted by Fee, *1 Corinthians*, 29 and Ciampa and Rosner, *Corinthians*, 56. Paul also uses the phrase κλητοῖς ἁγίοις in addressing the Romans (Rom 1:7).

¹⁰ “ἀγιάζω,” BDAG, 9–10; “ἅγιος,” BDAG, 10–11; Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 76; Zeller, *Korinther*, 73. Schnabel, *Korinther*, 61, links this passage with the identity of Israel as priests to God in Lev 19:6; similarly Collins, *1 Corinthians*, 52, noting its “cultic or political connotations”. Fee, *1 Corinthians*, 28–29, comments, “Believers are set apart for God, just as were the utensils in the Temple.”

¹¹ See Mitchell, *Rhetoric*, 68–70, 198–200; Witherington III, *Conflict*, 98–99; Collins, *1 Corinthians*, 69.

σχίσμα (cf. also 11:18; 12:25).¹² For this reason, Margaret M. Mitchell has made a strong and convincing case for unity as a dominant topic throughout the letter; in her view, the controlling theme of the epistle.¹³ Yet, while her case is well made, the concern for unity in 1:10 is not always the main issue in the letter as a whole¹⁴ (e.g. Paul’s forceful case for the resurrection in 1 Cor 15¹⁵) and even when it clearly has a strong part to play in passages such as 1 Cor 8:1–11:1 (though even here, the central emphases of 1 Cor 9:1–10:22 seem very different) or 1 Cor 11:17–34, Paul sometimes appears to side with the weaker against the stronger party (e.g. 1 Cor 8:9–13; 10:14–22, 28–29).

In relation to this question, Roy E. Ciampa and Brian S. Rosner document something of an emerging consensus among recent commentators on 1 Corinthians: that Paul is addressing a number of problems that appear to stem from the continuing influence of Roman/Corinthian culture and values on the church.¹⁶ I would concur with Ciampa and Rosner that purity, and thus

¹² For further exploration of this topic, see e.g. Mitchell, *Rhetoric*, 71–74 and Schrage, *1 Korinther: 1, 11–6, 11*, 138–39.

¹³ Mitchell, *Rhetoric*, *passim*.

¹⁴ Keener, *1–2 Corinthians*, 23, perhaps expresses a note of caution in referring to 1 Cor 1:10 as the thesis, “(at least for the immediate matter)”.

¹⁵ Note the comment of Keener, *1–2 Corinthians*, 12, “the issues in 1 Cor 15, for example, do not easily reduce to this theme”; and see the concerns of Ciampa and Rosner, *Corinthians*, 20–21, 73.

¹⁶ Idem, *Corinthians*, 4–6, citing the work of Bruce W. Winter, Richard B. Hays, Wolfgang Schrage, Anthony Thiselton, R. B. Terry and David E. Garland and see the evaluation of N. T. Wright, *The Resurrection of the Son of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003), 279–80. Dale B. Martin, *The Corinthian Body* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 38–86 posits a division between “high” and “low” status Christians as a comprehensive explanation for the various issues faced (following Gerd Theissen, *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity: Essays on Corinth* (trans. John H. Schütz; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982), 69–119 and others). While 1 Cor 11:22 gives credence to the position that some inevitably had more wealth (such as the ability to take others to court in 1 Cor 6:1; for which see e.g. Bruce W. Winter, *After Paul Left Corinth: The Influence of Secular Ethics and Social Change* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), 58–75; John K. Chow, *Patronage and Power: A Study of Social Networks in Corinth* (JSNTSup 75; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992), 38–112, 123–30; Andrew D. Clarke, *Secular and Christian Leadership in Corinth: A Socio-Historical and Exegetical Study of 1 Corinthians 1–6* (AGJU 18; Leiden: Brill, 1993), 59–71) and status than others (see Theissen, *Setting*, 145–74; although 1 Cor 1:26 suggests that the majority did not), Martin’s explanation is not the most likely one for every issue, although it was undeniably one of the factors in many of the situations Paul addressed (such as 1 Cor 6:1–8; 8:1–11:1; 11:17–34). John M. G. Barclay, “Thessalonica and Corinth: Social Contrasts in Pauline Christianity,” *JSNT* 47 (1992): 49–74 at 65 note c, suggests, “It is quite possible that the Corinthians . . . were . . . combining their Hellenistic theological

the need to draw careful boundaries, are central to Paul's discourse, and that the rejection of sexual immorality and idolatry (the two intertwined vices singled out in both Jewish and Christian literature as most likely to lead God's people astray from worship and service) are prominent in this letter.¹⁷ I will also aim to show that the temple references in this letter stress both the corporate and bodily nature of God's people and that this agrees with another central concern for Paul.

4.2 1 Corinthians 3:16

4.2.1 1 Corinthians 3:16–17: Literary Context

Our first temple reference, 1 Cor 3:16–17 takes its place within a section that most commentators regard as a distinct unit, 1 Cor 1:10–4:21.¹⁸ Paul counters the obvious divisions in the church (1:11–12)¹⁹ with the message of the cross (1:18), which is contrasted with the wisdom of the world (e.g. 1:20). Between the transitional verse 1 Cor 1:17 (concluding the *narratio* of

culture with Jewish terms and traditions taught by Paul.” Brian J. Tucker, “The Role of Civic Identity on the Pauline Corinth,” *Didaskalia* 72.8 (2008): 71–91 has developed Barclay's point about the Corinthians' lack of external opposition, by exploring the transitional nature of civic identity in Corinth that may have influenced the Corinthian Christians.

¹⁷ Ciampa and Rosner, *Corinthians*, 21–25 with supporting literature. They cite these two vices as the sins common to NT passages such as Acts 15:20, 29; 21:25; Gal 5:19–21; Eph 5:5; Col 3:5; Rev 22:15.

¹⁸ E.g. Barrett, *1 Corinthians*, 28–29; Mitchell, *Rhetoric*, x–xi; Witherington III, *Conflict*, vi–ix; Collins, *1 Corinthians*, vii–x; Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, v–xiii; Garland, *1 Corinthians*, vii–viii; Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, viii–x; Fee, *1 Corinthians*, viii.

¹⁹ It falls outside the scope of this chapter to survey the complex debate and the various attempts to identify the different parties, but for a helpful analysis, see e.g. Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 123–33; cf. also Helmut Merklein, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther. Kapitel 1–4*. (OTKNT 6/1; Gütersloh: G. Mohn, 1992), 134–48; Adams and Horrell, *Corinth*, 13–16, 51–9, 61–70, 79–84, 85–95; Schrage, *1 Korinther: 1,11–6,11*, 142–52. Contributors to this discussion have considered how far Corinthian divisions may have been affected by differences in social stratification, e.g. Theissen, *Setting*, 54–67, 69–119; David G. Horrell, *The Social Ethos of the Corinthian Correspondence: Interests and Ideology from 1 Corinthians to 1 Clement* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996), 112–17; 131–37. Other studies have considered the influence of “secular” models of leadership on the perceptions of the Corinthians (Clarke, *Leadership*, 89–107); the influence of patrons within the congregation (Chow, *Patronage, passim*) and the influence of the sophists, who propagated a competitive spirit and won adherents to them as individual teachers (see Bruce W. Winter, *Philo and Paul Among the Sophists: Alexandrian and Corinthian Responses to a Julio-Claudian Movement* (2d ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 180–202 and Idem, *Corinth*, 31–43.

1:11–17 and also introducing the section that begins with 1:18),²⁰ and the end of the section (1 Cor 3:23), there are a high preponderance of words with the σοφ- root. Σοφία (wisdom) appears in 1 Cor 1:17, 19, 21, 22, 24, 30; 2:1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 13; 3:19 (as well as later in 12:8 in a very different context). In each of these verses a wisdom that is described as of this world (κόσμος in 1:20, 21; 3:19) or “human” (ἄνθρωπος in 2:5) is contrasted with the wisdom of God (1:20, 21, 24; 2:7), which is revealed as Christ himself (1:24) who has become wisdom from God for the Corinthians themselves (1:30). Even the wisdom of the wise (τὴν σοφίαν τῶν σοφῶν) is judged worthy only of destruction (1:19, citing Isa 29:14). Paul goes so far as to imply that to preach the gospel in a word of wisdom (ἐν σοφίᾳ λόγου) would be to empty it of its power (1:17 cf. 2:5). By contrast, Paul’s speech is quite deliberately presented as lacking the kind of wisdom sought by those who value eloquent speech or superiority (ὑπεροχή in 2:1; cf. 1:17; 2:1, 4, 5, 13). In particular, Paul targets the wise person (σοφός; e.g. 1:19, 20, 26, 27; 3:18, 19, 20; cf. 6:5 which uses the word in quite a different context).

A number of recent studies have connected the reference to the σοφός with the place of Greco-Roman rhetoric in the culture and identify Paul’s critique with the kind of itinerant orators whose use of rhetorical convention and persuasive strategies contrast with Paul’s presentation of the gospel.²¹ Bruce W. Winter has further argued that the targets of Paul’s argument are the self-serving Sophists of the “Second Sophistic”, for which evidence can be found in the mid-first

²⁰ Agreeing with Keener, *1–2 Corinthians*, 27;

²¹ E.g. Stephen M. Pogoloff, *Logos and Sophia: The Rhetorical Situation of 1 Corinthians* (SBLDS 134; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1992), *passim*; A. Duane Litfin, *St. Paul’s Theology of Proclamation: 1 Corinthians 1–4 and Greco-Roman Rhetoric* (SNTSMS 79; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), especially 137–209; Jeffrey S. Lamp, *First Corinthians 1–4 in Light of Jewish Wisdom Traditions: Christ, Wisdom and Spirituality* (Studies in Bible and Early Christianity 42; Lewiston, NY.: Edwin Mellen Press, 2000), 114–15.

century.²² Winter's use of evidence has been recently critiqued by Timothy A. Brookins, who contends that some references to σοφός in Winter's sources refer to philosophers not sophists *per se*,²³ and that all of Winter's arguments for a pre-second century date for the sophistic movement rely on late first and early second century sources (at least forty years after Paul's letter was written.²⁴ At the very least, Paul's comment that *Greeks* (Ἕλληνας) seek wisdom (1:22), and his contrast between the wisdom of the world and of this age (αἰών in 2:6) and the wisdom that comes specifically from the Spirit (2:10, 13), granted by revelation alone (2:7, 10, 14), suggests an implicit wider critique of worldly (philosophical) wisdom, not restricted *merely* to the sophists and orators of the day.²⁵ This critique would naturally apply to Greek philosophy (1:22) in its claim to have discovered wisdom by natural means.²⁶ Additionally, the *hapax legomenon* συζητητής in 1:20 is related to the verb συζητέω and in the Greek philosophical tradition it could be used in relation to a philosopher, or a seeker after the truth in philosophy.²⁷ Paul's dismissal of philosophy would have contrasted sharply with the overwhelmingly positive view of

²² See Winter, *Philo*, 180–202, applied to 1 Cor 1:10–4:21; followed by Witherington III, *Conflict*, 124–26; Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 163.

²³ Brookins, *Wisdom*, 41–42, 46–47.

²⁴ *Idem*, *Wisdom*, 49–50.

²⁵ *Idem*, *Wisdom*, 8–61 provides a critique of the theses of Pogoloff, Litfin and Winter, arguing from primary sources that “wisdom language was associated in a technical way with philosophy in way that it apparently was not with rhetoric.” (43) George H. van Kooten, *Paul's Anthropology in Context: The Image of God, Assimilation to God, and Tripartite Man in Ancient Judaism, Ancient Philosophy and Early Christianity* (WUNT 232; Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 2008), 262–68 provides strong evidence that philosophical writers like Plato, Plutarch, Epictetus, Dio Chrysostom and Philostratus disparaged sophism by comparison with philosophy, and compares this to Paul's rhetorical strategy in both First and Second Corinthians. But, could it be that, in fact, Paul is lumping both sophism and philosophy together, as it were, so that his critique covers *every* wisdom of *this age*?

²⁶ Cf. Keener, *1–2 Corinthians*, 28, “The specific quest for wisdom, however, is attributed especially to Greeks, known for their philosophy (1:22)” and a possible reference to Greek philosophy in general is also alluded to by Lang, *Korinther*, 29, 30; Hays, *Corinthians*, 30; Fee, *1 Corinthians*, 74–75; 77–78; Pogoloff, *Logos*, 115–19; Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 170; Schnabel, *Korinther*, 121.

²⁷ See H. Greeven, “ζητέω, ζητησις, κτλ,” TDNT 2:892–96 at 893; Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 69; Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 156; Zeller, *Korinther*, 108.

philosophy that I highlighted in chapter two;²⁸ a view that seemed to hold little regard for *which* philosophy was being discussed.²⁹ As noted in the same chapter, philosophy was sometimes described specifically as wisdom, or as a search for wisdom.³⁰ Yet for Paul the only true wisdom is the wisdom of God (2:7), which has been revealed in Christ and his cross (1:23–24, 30; 2:2).

Paul apparently includes the Corinthians with himself as those who have received the Spirit of wisdom and revelation (2:10, 12),³¹ he then addresses them as “brothers” (fellow Christians in 3:1a),³² and ultimately identifies them as the temple of the same Holy Spirit (3:16–17). It is therefore striking that he also refers to them as those who are “fleshly” (σάρκινος in 3:1 and σαρκικός in 3:3), and behaving in a merely human rather than spiritual way (κατὰ ἄνθρωπον περιπατεῖτε in 3:3). In many ways, Paul’s depiction of his audience in 3:1, 3 sounds suspiciously like those described as unspiritual (pertaining to ψυχικός) in 2:14. Yet they are clearly those who are sanctified (1:2) and not lacking any χάρισμα (1:2). Paul’s frustration with them was already made clear in 1:10–17 (reiterated at 3:3–4); he should be able to address them as the spiritual person of 2:15; those who are mature (2:6 from τέλειος) but instead he must address them as infants (from νήπιος in 3:1). Paul has repeatedly stressed that the πνεῦμα is at work in believers,

²⁸ See, e.g. Cicero, *Leg.* 1.22.58; *Tusc.* 1.26.64; 3.3.5–6; 3.6.13; 5.2.5; Seneca, *Ep.* 31.8; 53.8, 9; 90.1–3; *Brev. vit.* 14.1; 15.4; Plutarch, *An. corp.* 501A; *Virt. prof.* 81E; Maximus of Tyre, *Or.* 1.2–3; 22.6; 26.1; 37.2; Marcus Aurelius, *Med.* 2.17; Dio Chrysostom, 2 *Glor.* 1.

²⁹ Seneca, *Ep.* 16.5.

³⁰ Seneca, *Ep.* 89.1–6; Alcinous, *Handbook*, 3, 152.2–5.

³¹ Taking the “ἡμῖν” of 2:10 and the “ἡμεῖς” of 2:12 to be inclusive, speaking of the Corinthians as well as Paul and his co-workers; with Robertson and Plummer, *1 Corinthians*, 43, 45; Schrage, *1 Korinther: 1, 11–6, 11*, 256; Witherington III, *Conflict*, 126; Collins, *1 Corinthians*, 132, 134; Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 255, 261–62; Andreas Lindemann, *Der Erste Korintherbrief* (HNT 9.1; Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 2000), 68; Schnabel, *Korinther*, 145; Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 179; Ciampa and Rosner, *Corinthians*, 121 note 10; Fee, *1 Corinthians*, 117, 120; against Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 65. As Thiselton, Fee and others note, the most obvious referent of the personal pronoun in 2:10 is the “those who love him” of 2:9 and the recipients of the δόξα in 2:7. Within the immediate context of Paul’s description of his ministry and message to the Corinthians (2:1–16 as a whole), it would seem unlikely that they are excluded from this, or that this is merely the self-description of an elite few. Those who receive the things “ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ χαρισθέντα” (from χαρίζομαι; 2:12) are most likely those “μὴ ὑστερεῖσθαι ἐν μηδενὶ χαρίσματι” (from χάρισμα; 1:7), which clearly describes all the Corinthians.

³² Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 186.

given by God himself, who grants them revelation and understanding that is not available from σοφία (2:4, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14; see especially 2:13 where Paul pointedly contrasts the ἀνθρώπινος nature of wisdom with the divine source of the Spirit noted in 2:12, 14).

This sharp contrast between human wisdom and the divine Spirit at work in them prepares the way for Paul's point in 1 Cor 3:16–17: they are failing to live in accordance with their true identity, as one unified temple of the Holy Spirit. In preparation, Paul emphasizes that all share a common work (3:5–9) since the one who assigns them their task is one κύριος (3:5) and θεός (3:6–7).³³ In one pithy phrase, Paul uses three images to summarize his argument and to mark the transition to the next. Paul depicts the apostles as fellow workers (συνεργοί as in 3:5–8) and the Corinthians as the field in which they worked (γεώργιον as in 3:6–8),³⁴ who he further describes with the metaphor explicated in the new few verses, the building (οἰκοδομή). The building image is elaborated upon in 3:10–15. For the purposes of this discussion I note that Paul describe himself as a master-builder (ἀρχιτέκτων),³⁵ modified by the adjective σοφός (in context meaning “skilled”, yet the implicit comparison with those who have merely human wisdom in

³³ It seems likely that at this juncture κύριος refers to Jesus Christ rather than sharing the same referent as θεός in 3:7; cf. Collins, *1 Corinthians*, 145. So far in the epistle, κύριος has either been used unambiguously of Jesus (1:2, 3, 7, 8, 9, 10; 2:8) or seems the likely referent on contextual grounds (in 1:31 referring back to the subject of 1:30); see Robertson and Plummer, *1 Corinthians*, 28; Jacob Kremer, *Der Erste Brief an die Korinther* (RNT; Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1997), 47; Collins, *1 Corinthians*, 113; Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 165; Fee, *1 Corinthians*, 91; and in 2:16a, in parallel to Χριστός in 2:16b; see Robert Jewett, *Paul's Anthropological Terms: A Study of Their Use in Conflict Settings* (Leiden: Brill, 1971), 377; Schrage, *1 Korinther: 1, 11–6, 11*, 267; Collins, *1 Corinthians*, 137; Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 275–76; Ciampa and Rosner, *Corinthians*, 137–38; Fee, *1 Corinthians*, 127; against Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 194.

³⁴ There was sometimes an association between the Temple and the garden in Jewish literature; see Albert L. A. Hogeterp, *Paul and God's Temple: A Historical Interpretation of Cultic Imagery in the Corinthian Correspondence* (Biblical Tools and Studies 2; Leuven: Peeters, 2006), 318; Cecilia Wassen, “Do You Have to be Pure in a Metaphorical Temple? Sanctuary Metaphors and Construction of Sacred Space in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Paul's Letters,” in *Purity, Holiness, and Identity in Judaism and Christianity: Essays in Memory of Susan Haber* (ed. Carl S. Ehrlich, Anders Runesson, and Eileen Schuller; WUNT 305; Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 2013), 55–86 at 73, and particularly Gregory K. Beale, *The Temple and the Church's Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God* (NSBT 17; Downers Grove, Ill.: IVP, 2004), 26, 48, 66–78, 123–29 and especially 246–50 on 1 Cor 3.

³⁵ For more detail, see J. Shanor, “Paul as Master-BUILDER: Construction Terms in First Corinthians,” *NTS* 34 (1988): 461–71.

1:19–20 cannot be ignored); that the foundation of the building is Jesus Christ (3:11); and that in view of the testing (δοκιμάζω) of the coming judgment, it is critical to build with the right materials, and that those listed of great value (3:12a) correspond to the ones used in the building of Solomon’s temple (cf. 1 Chron 29:2; 22:14–16; 2 Chron 3:6).³⁶ Additionally, we can note that, though the fire of eschatological judgment (3:13, 15) has clear and numerous parallels in Judaism, it could also have spoken to an audience influenced by Stoicism of the great fiery conflagration to come.³⁷ This building imagery sets the scene for Paul’s temple metaphor in 3:16–17 and underscores the vital importance of living rightly as the temple of God that Paul will develop subsequently. Paul’s use of the rhetorical device Οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι” (also in 5:6; 6:2, 3, 9, 15, 16, 19; 9:13, 24) to introduce 3:16–17 expresses strong feelings of dismay at their lack of knowledge of something fundamental.³⁸

4.2.2 1 Corinthians 3:16–17: Main Features

For the purposes of my topic I note the following features of 3:16–17 that might have struck an audience influenced by philosophy. Firstly, I observe that Paul’s image is corporate.³⁹ He is at pains to emphasize that the *congregation* is the temple of God/the Spirit, rather than the

³⁶ D. R. deLacey, “οἵτινές ἐστε ὑμεῖς: The Function of a Metaphor in Paul,” in *Templum Amicitiae: Essays on the Second Temple presented to Ernst Bammel* (ed. William Horbury; JSNTSup 48; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), 391–409 at 404; Collins, *1 Corinthians*, 150–51; Ciampa and Rosner, *Corinthians*, 150–53 in some detail; Fee, *1 Corinthians*, 152 note 396.

³⁷ E.g. Wolfram Strack, *Kultische Terminologie in ekklesiologischen Kontexten in den Briefen des Paulus* (BBB 92; Weinheim: Beltz Athenäum, 1994), 229; deLacey, “Metaphor,” 391–409 at 405; Hogeterp, *Temple*, 321 note 76. For more on Greco-Roman understandings of judgment, see David W. Kuck, *Judgement and Community Conflict: Paul’s Use of Apocalyptic Judgement Language in 1 Corinthians 3:5–4:5* (NovTSup 66; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 96–149, who concludes that within Hellenistic philosophy, those influenced by Plato maintained the classical notion of postmortem judgment, but other philosophical schools rejected it (115–20).

³⁸ See especially Fee, *1 Corinthians*, 158; John R Lanci, *A New Temple for Corinth: Rhetorical and Archaeological Approaches to Pauline Imagery* (Studies in Biblical Literature 1; New York: Peter Lang, 1997), 119–20.

³⁹ Agreeing with e.g. Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 316.

individual (see my comments below on 6:19). The verb οἶδα appears in the second person plural, as does the verb εἶμι and the final ὑμῖν. Secondly, Paul uses the word ναός rather than ἱερόν, almost certainly because ναός typically (though not exclusively) indicates the inner sanctuary, whereas ἱερόν is always used for the whole temple, including its precincts and other buildings.⁴⁰ The word order suggests that ναός is in an emphatic position; that is, Paul is drawing attention to it.⁴¹ It is also unlikely, according to Daniel B. Wallace’s study of “Colwell’s Construction”, that ναός is to be understood as indefinite (i.e. *a* temple of God).⁴² Thirdly, it is the πνεῦμα that constitutes the Corinthians as the ναός τοῦ θεοῦ,⁴³ and in the preceding discussion the πνεῦμα is only given to certain people, not all. These people are those who have received the πνεῦμα who gives revelation (2:10–14), and a spiritual person (πνευματικός) cannot be evaluated by other people (2:15) for the spiritual person has received the mind of the Lord, that is the mind of Christ. The Spirit, therefore, is tied very specifically to Jesus Christ. This also connotes the strongest possible association between Christ with God and the Spirit.⁴⁴ The Spirit that produces the mind of Christ, who is identified as *Lord* (2:15), is the same Spirit whose presence signifies that the temple belongs to God.⁴⁵ Fourthly, as well as speaking of God’s presence, the temple

⁴⁰ “ἱερόν,” BDAG, 470; “ναός,” BDAG, 365–66; O. Michel, “ναός,” TDNT 4:880–90; cf. Witherington III, *Conflict*, 134; Fee, *I Corinthians*, 158–59.

⁴¹ See Stephen H. Levinsohn, *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek: A Coursebook on the Information Structure of New Testament Greek* (2d ed.; Dallas: SIL International, 2000), 38, citing this example.

⁴² Wallace, *Grammar*, 256–70, especially at 269–70, draws on Philip B. Harner, “Qualitative Anarthrous Predicate Nouns: Mark 15:39 and John 1:1,” *JBL* 92.1 (1973): 75–87, maintaining that anarthrous pre-verbal predicate nouns are rarely indefinite and that this conclusion is even more likely when the construction is a-copulative (lacking a verb altogether), as in the case of 1 Cor 3:16 (however, when Wallace, *Grammar*, 261 cites “Harner’s study” of “all pre-verbal predicate nominatives”, in context this only means all pre-verbal predicate nominatives in Mark and John, not the NT as a whole. Harner also spends little time on the potential indefiniteness of these nouns).

⁴³ Johannes Weiss, *Der erste Korintherbrief* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1910), 85 speaks of the καί in 3:16 as explicative, that is, they are the temple of God because the Spirit of God dwells in them.

⁴⁴ As was noted above in the discussion of references to κύριος in First Corinthians.

⁴⁵ See this theme developed in Gordon D. Fee, *God’s Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1994), 112–18.

image speaks of his holiness, and those who are responsible for the temple's destruction will themselves be destroyed (3:17a).⁴⁶ This indicates that the temple is sacred and has very strict boundaries and that to defile the temple in any way brings very serious consequences. John R. Levison rightly notes how striking it is that the man who has sexual intercourse with his father's wife will only be ostracized temporarily (5:1–8) but, here in 1 Cor 3:17, “dividers of the Church are subject to destruction or severe damage, torn apart as they have torn apart the Church . . . It is inconceivable that the spirit of God should dwell in a portion of the holy of holies without filling the whole of it.”⁴⁷ The reference to this temple is sandwiched between two discussions that give it its wider context. The foundation of this building (temple) is Christ (3:11). The quality of the work done on the building will be evaluated and revealed for its true worth in a coming judgment (3:12–15). Their labor as the temple has eternal significance. True wisdom does not boast in human terms/matters (3:21a). Rather the Corinthians should recognize that all things belong to them corporately (3:21b–22; so the temple is not to be divided up among them nor claimed by

⁴⁶ The verb used here, φθείρω, has a semantic range including “destroy, ruin, corrupt, spoil” (“φθείρω,” BDAG, 1054; “φθείρω,” LSJ, 1928) but contextually it is more likely that the formula with the repeated verb means “If anyone destroys the temple, God will destroy them” than “If anyone corrupts the temple, God will corrupt them.” Arguments have been made for the meaning “damage” rather than “destroy” here (see Shanor, “Master-BUILDER,” 461–71, at 470–71 & Lanci, *Temple*, 66–68, followed by Raymond F. Collins, *The Power of Images in Paul* (Collegeville, MN.: Liturgical Press, 2008), 161; Yulin Liu, *Temple Purity in 1-2 Corinthians* (WUNT 2/ 343; Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 2013), 122–23. Liu avers that the verb is used with the sense “to corrupt” in other NT passages, but two of the texts he cites, 2 Pet 2:12 and Jude 10, are usually translated “to destroy”, and later Idem, *Purity*, 134–35 supports a different argument by citing with approval the translation “destroy” for φθείρω when used by Brian Rosner and David Raymond Smith. Cf. the similar formulas of LXX Gen 9:6 and especially Josh 9:5 and the well-rounded arguments for the contextual meaning of “destroy” made by Kent L. Yinger, *Paul, Judaism, and Judgment According to Deeds* (SNTSMS 105; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 224–25, supported by G. Harder, “φθείρω,” TDNT 9:93–106 at 102; and followed by Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 71, 78; Witherington III, *Conflict*, 134–35; Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 317–18; Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 120–21; Fee, *1 Corinthians*, 160–61. Earlier, Robertson and Plummer, *1 Corinthians*, 67, argued for the same translation, adding, “all sin is a defiling of the Temple and is destructive of its consecrated state.” There is a minor textual variant here, with the second instance of φθείρω read as the present tense φθείρει rather than the future tense φερεῖ. The external support for the NA²⁸ reading is strong (p⁴⁶ A B C) and the main variant can best be explained as a replication of the present tense of φθείρει immediately before it; cf. Bruce Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (2d ed.; Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1994), 484; Fee, *1 Corinthians*, 157 note 417.

⁴⁷ John R. Levison, “The Spirit and the Temple in Paul’s Letters to the Corinthians,” in *Paul and His Theology* (ed. Stanley Porter; Pauline Studies 3; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 189–215 at 192.

any one person),⁴⁸ yet they belong to Christ, who is of God (3:23). Thus the discussion ends with God himself, again in the closest possible association with Christ, to whom the Corinthians belong. Their identity is centered in God, Christ and the Spirit.

4.2.3 Comparing 1 Cor 3:16–17 with Hellenistic Philosophy

4.2.3.1. Philosophy

How would this have compared to the understanding of an audience influenced by philosophy? In the writings of Philo I noted one reference to a *group* of people who were counted as a temple and altar prior to the building of the Jerusalem temple.⁴⁹ However this is an isolated incident and peculiar to this particular strand of Hellenistic *Judaism*. Within different strands of philosophy we see two common emphases instead: divine indwelling in an individual or divine indwelling in the cosmos as a whole, so that everything is filled with the divine presence.

Firstly, to summarize the most pertinent of the evidence I have already presented, some writers speak simply of God or a divine spirit dwelling in a person,⁵⁰ and specifically of a good⁵¹ or wise person.⁵² This presence is sometimes named as a δαιμόνιον,⁵³ and at other times as

⁴⁸ The names in εἶτε Παῦλος εἶτε Ἀπολλῶς εἶτε Κηφᾶς (3:22) intentionally pick up on three of the four used in 1 Cor 1:12 and appear in the same order. It is noteworthy that Χριστός is removed from the first list and instead appears at the climax of the discussion in conjunction with the name of θεός to whom he belongs, yet in a different category than any human figure.

⁴⁹ Philo, *QE* 1.10

⁵⁰ Seneca, *Ep.* 41.1; 83.1; 110.2; *Ben.* 6.23.6; Marcus Aurelius, *Med.* 3.5.1; Philo, *Somn.* 1.149, 215; 2.248, 250–51; *Virt.* 188; *Det.* 90. Philo speaks of the temple of the soul: *Somn.* 1.149; *Spec.* 1.270; Epictetus, *Diatr.* 2.8.14; 2.16.33.

⁵¹ Seneca, *Ep.* 31.2; 41.1–2; 73.16; 120.14; Cicero, *Leg.* 2.11.26–28; Philo, *Cher.* 98, 100; *Sobr.* 62, 68; *Praem.* 123; *QG* 4.80; *QE* 2.51.

⁵² Seneca, *Ep.* 92.3; DL 7.1.119; Philo, *Leg.* 3.46.

⁵³ Cicero, *Div.* 1.54.122; Dio, *4 Regn.* 139; Marcus Aurelius, *Med.* 2.17; 5.10; Epictetus, *Diatr.* 1.14.14.

Reason, or a divine spirit or element.⁵⁴ Many writers make no real distinction between this δαιμόνιον, θεός or λόγος (or its cognates), or intelligence.⁵⁵ Some speak of this Reason, δαιμόνιον or genius as residing in each person, regardless of the person’s goodness or wisdom.⁵⁶ Other writers see such a close fusion between the person and the divinity that dwells within, that there is little to distinguish the two; a person’s motions are that of God; their faculty is equal to that of God.⁵⁷ Still other writers speak of either a loyal heart being a temple,⁵⁸ or of a god-fearing one.⁵⁹ Paul describes the Corinthians as a temple of the πνεῦμα. Either πνεῦμα⁶⁰ or its equivalent in Latin (Spiritus)⁶¹ are described as dwelling within a person in the philosophers.

As I noted earlier, Philo envisages the soul as a building with three layers: the foundations of goodness and teaching; a ground floor of virtues built upon it, and the reception of right teaching as its crowning glory.⁶² Similarly, Plutarch compares a person’s life to a holy temple whose life has a “golden foundation”, and who builds upon it with the right materials. This is the person who makes progress in the path of virtue.⁶³ This concept has some parallels with Paul’s metaphor of the building of the church, whose foundation is Jesus Christ and upon which the right materials must be carefully chosen by the builder, since the Day of judgment will prove the materials by fire (1 Cor 3:10–15).

⁵⁴ Seneca, *Ep.* 66.12; Cicero, *Leg.* 1.22.59; *Tusc.* 1.24.56; 1.25.62; 1.26.65; 1.27.66–67; 1.30.74; *Parad.* 1.14; Marcus Aurelius, *Med.* 3.12, 16; 4.1, 12; 6.35.

⁵⁵ Cf. Marcus Aurelius, *Med.* 2.13, 17; 3.3.2; 3.6.2; 3.12, 16; 3.5.1; 3.6.2; 4.1; 5.10; 5.27; 10.38; 12.1.2, 26; Philo, *Cher.* 27; Maximus, *Or.* 31.4.

⁵⁶ Epictetus, *Diatr.* 1.14.12; 2.8.11, 15–17; Marcus Aurelius, *Med.* 2.1 (speaking of an evil doer); 4.38; 7.16; 8.43, 61; 9.7; 11.20; 12.1.

⁵⁷ See Epictetus, *Diatr.* 1.14.6, 12; *Frag.* 3 (explored further below in relation to the philosophers’ conception of divinity).

⁵⁸ V. Max., 4.7. ext. 1.

⁵⁹ Apuleius, *Metam.* 3.15, though here not in the context of a philosophical writing.

⁶⁰ *SVF*, 2.473.

⁶¹ Seneca, *Ep.* 41.2; 66.12; Cicero, *Resp.* 6.24.26.

⁶² Philo, *Cher.* 101.

⁶³ Plutarch, *Virt. prof.* 86A (Babbitt, LCL).

The second common theme in the philosophers is that God fills all things,⁶⁴ or less personally, that the universe is filled with eternal intelligence or the divine mind.⁶⁵ The πνεῦμα is said to hold the cosmos together⁶⁶ and the world itself is described as the temple of the gods.⁶⁷

4.2.3.2 Paul

When I compare my findings from the philosophical writers with Paul's words in 1 Cor 3:16–17, a number of points stand out. Firstly, some philosophers speak of the divine presence inhabiting the life of the individual. This is the natural consequence of the doctrine that God's presence fills all things. Paul, by contrast, speaks corporately of the Corinthians, not simply of them as individuals. This is indicated by the second person plurals that I observed but also by the context, that pictures the Corinthians as together making up a building (3:10–15). It is noteworthy that, although the philosophers certainly had very distinct schools or groups (such as the Stoics and Epicureans), they do not see membership of those specific groups as the basis for divine indwelling, since none of them refer to the theme in relation to their own group.⁶⁸

Secondly, some writers speak of a divine presence inhabiting all individuals, whereas others stress this presence in the good or the wise. For Paul, the temple of God are those who are sanctified and called holy people (1:2a). We have already had cause to note the critiques of the wisdom of the world Paul makes in 1 Cor 1:18–2:16, and in 3:18–19 (the verses that immediately follow our text) but the Corinthians have the spirit of God dwelling within them, not because many of them were wise (1:26) or good and certainly not because of their impressive

⁶⁴ Marcus Aurelius, *Med.* 7.9; Alcinous, *Handbook*, 165.10.3.1–2 (18); Cicero, *Leg.* 2.11.26; Philo, *Leg.* 3.4; *Fug.* 75; *Post.* 6, 14, 30; *Conf.* 137–38.

⁶⁵ Cicero, *Div.* 1.49.110; 1.52.118.

⁶⁶ E.g. citing Zeno in *SVF*, 2.473.

⁶⁷ Cicero, *Leg.* 2.10.26; *Resp.* 6.15.15; Seneca, *Ben.* 7.7.3; *Ep.* 90.29.

⁶⁸ I owe this observation to Dr Craig S. Keener.

growth as spiritual people (3:1–3), but because they have been set apart as God’s people (1:2), as those who call upon the name of their Lord Jesus Christ (1:2b) and for whom Jesus Christ is the foundation of the οἰκοδομή (3:9), that is, his temple (3:16). Unlike the philosophers, for whom the πνεῦμα sustains and fills the cosmos, for Paul τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ κόσμου (2:12a) is to be avoided. Rather the spirit of God (2:12b) dwells only in spiritual people who have been taught by the Spirit (2:12–15). They are those in whom the Spirit of God dwells, as the presence of God dwells in a temple (3:16).⁶⁹ Finally, it is the temple as God’s people (ὑμεῖς in 3:17b) that is holy and distinct. It is not every individual in the world, or particularly good individuals or indeed the world itself without distinction. Rather, these people are a sacred dwelling who belong to Christ as he belongs to God (3:17b, 23) and if anyone is to cause destruction to come upon this temple, God will destroy them (3:17a). This warning is posed to those who threaten the sanctity of the community; quite a different understanding from the Stoic view of the world’s conflagration or the Middle Platonic notion of the destruction of the individual’s body.⁷⁰

4.3 1 Corinthians 6:19

4.3.1 1 Corinthians 6:19: Literary Context

I now turn to the second metaphorical temple reference in First Corinthians, 1 Cor 6:19.

Firstly, we need to examine the wider literary co-text of this verse. The overwhelming majority

⁶⁹ Wright, *Faithfulness*, 1369–1370 and Sang-Won (Aaron) Son, *Corporate Elements in Pauline Anthropology: A Study of Selected Terms, Idioms, and Concepts in the Light of Paul’s Usage and Background* (AnBib; Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2001), 139, both note the distinction between the Stoic pantheistic divine indwelling and the select blessing of the Spirit envisaged by Paul. See the excellent essay: James Ware, “Moral Progress and Divine Power in Seneca and Paul,” in *Passions and Moral Progress in Greco-Roman Thought* (ed. John T. Fitzgerald; New York: Routledge, 2008), 267–83 for a succinct exploration of what this means for Seneca and how it can be distinguished from Paul’s theology, despite some surface structural similarities.

⁷⁰ The reader from a non-Jewish background might also have been struck by the emphasis on *the* temple, rather than the multiplicity of temples found in cities in the Greco-Roman world (with e.g. R. J. McKelvey, *The New Temple: The Church in the New Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969), 102), but this is not so relevant to my own study since I am necessarily limited to *metaphorical* temple references in Hellenistic Philosophy.

of commentators recognize 1 Cor 5:1 as the start of a new section. Following Paul’s response to the divisions and immaturity of the church in 1 Cor 1:10–4:21, Paul turns to a number of specific issues that have come to his attention through a variety of means. In 5:1–13 he refers to a report of πορνεία among them that has reached his ears (5:1), during which he seems to address a possible misunderstanding of a previous letter (5:9–13). In 6:1 he turns his attention to another topic altogether, involving lawsuits. Paul cites what might be a Corinthian slogan in 6:12 and then deals with another topic that has been brought to his attention,⁷¹ before responding to a matter that seems to have been raised by the Corinthians themselves, signaled by the use of Περί δὲ (7:1).⁷² Most commentators would class 1 Cor 5:1–6:20 as a unit,⁷³ with some including 1 Cor 7:1–40 within that same section.⁷⁴ Scholars propose quite different reasons for dividing up the material as they do. Anthony C. Thiselton treats 5:1–6:20 as a distinct unit because the topics dealt with “expound what for Paul constitute clear-cut moral and ethical issues” whereas 7:1–11:1 addresses more “grey areas”.⁷⁵ Gordon Fee takes 5:1–6:20 as sharing a common theme: a “crisis of authority” in which Paul’s apostolic authority is challenged in a number of different areas.⁷⁶ I would agree with Raymond Collins and Ciampa & Rosner in seeing connections within 5:1–7:40 that speak of the purity of God’s holy people.⁷⁷ They note that sexual immorality is a pervasive theme, as is exemplified by the recurrence of words with the πορν- root in this section

⁷¹ E.g. Collins, *1 Corinthians*, 205; Ciampa and Rosner, *Corinthians*, 192–94.

⁷² A view held by Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 115; Ciampa and Rosner, *Corinthians*, 272 and Fee, *1 Corinthians*, 295 as just a few modern examples of a long history of interpretation. The formula is used again in 1 Cor 7:25; 8:1; 12:1 and 16:12, with περί used by itself but in a similar way in 8:4. Margaret M. Mitchell, “Concerning Περί δὲ in 1 Corinthians,” *NovT* 31.3 (1989): 229–256 and Idem, *Rhetoric*, 190–91 has argued convincingly that the formula is a topic marker that Paul uses to introduce his own chosen topics rather than indicating the issues about which the Corinthians wrote, but either way they help to signal a new topic in the letter.

⁷³ E.g. Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, vii–viii; Witherington III, *Conflict*, vi–ix; Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, v–xiii; Garland, *1 Corinthians*, vii–viii; Fee, *1 Corinthians*, viii.

⁷⁴ E.g. Mitchell, *Rhetoric*, x–xi; Collins, *1 Corinthians*, vii–ix; Ciampa and Rosner, *Corinthians*, vi–xiii.

⁷⁵ Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 381.

⁷⁶ Fee, *1 Corinthians*, 212.

⁷⁷ Ciampa and Rosner, *Corinthians*, 21–25; Collins, *1 Corinthians*, 203–04.

(5:1 [twice], 9, 10, 11; 6:9, 13, 15, 16, 18 [twice]; 7:2). It should also be noted that at the start of Paul's reply to the issue raised in 1 Cor 7:1, the problem of πορνεία is given as the grounds for Paul's advice in what follows (7:2).⁷⁸ Purity issues and the proper boundaries in relation to purity, the Christian community and those outside of it, are a notable motif (e.g. 5:1, 2, 5, 6–8, 9–13; 6:1–8, 9–11, 12–20; 7:12–16, 34 etc). This concern is even present in 6:1–11, a passage that is frequently seen as the “odd one out” because its subject matter is the law courts rather than the body and sexual relationships.⁷⁹ There are also frequent references to the σῶμα in this section (e.g. 6:13 [twice], 15, 16, 18 [twice], 19, 20; 7:4 [twice], 34 [twice]), and in general Paul is concerned with the use and abuse of the body in 5:1–13; 6:9–20. The considerable attention that Paul pays to the whole question of marriage and celibacy in 1 Cor 7 speaks of his concern for life in the body, as well as the proper place for sexual relationships and attachments, by contrast with the improper ones described in 5:1–13 and 6:12–20.

From the outset of this section, Paul's stated concern is with an instance of πορνεία (5:1), and the puffed up attitude of the Corinthians (5:2).⁸⁰ In chapter one, I noted good indicators that the Corinthians are a majority gentile congregation, so it is striking that Paul should say such immorality is not even (οὐδέ) among the Gentiles/the nations (ἔθνος), considering that his

⁷⁸ For negative evaluations of πορνεία in both the Jewish and Greco-Roman world, see e.g. Liu, *Purity*, 146–53.

⁷⁹ Commentators have struggled to make sense of the place of 6:1–11 (or more properly 6:1–8) within the sequence found in 5:1–6:20. Ciampa and Rosner, *Corinthians*, 192–93 are the latest in a line of interpreters to see loose connections between references to judging and legal matters in 5:1–13 and 6:1–11; e.g. Barrett, *1 Corinthians*, 134–35; Fee, *1 Corinthians*, 213, 250; R. Kempthorne, “Incest and the body of Christ, a study of 1 Corinthians 6:12–20,” *NTS* 14:4 (1968): 568–69. Will Deming, “The Unity of 1 Corinthians 5–6,” *JBL* 115 (1996): 289–312 postulates that 1 Cor 5–6 is Paul's response to the failed attempt by some of the Corinthians to take the incestuous man of 1 Cor 5:1–13 to court (hence 1 Cor 6:1–8), that resulted in disunity in the Church. Peter Richardson, “Judgment in Sexual Matters in 1 Corinthians 6:1–11,” *NovT* 25.1 (1983): 37–58 had previously argued that 6:1–11 addressed a sexual matter which related to 7:1–7 rather than 5:1–13. Richardson's article is very wide-ranging in its attempt to deal with the whole of the letter and multiple possible backgrounds and is necessarily very speculative.

⁸⁰ Whether this is over the sin of the “such a one” in 5:1 or over his social status; see Chow, *Patronage*, 130–41 and Clarke, *Leadership*, 73–88.

audience *are* Gentiles. This is a clear indicator that they are to be distinct and set apart from others. Paul elaborates on the implications of the *πορνεία* by insisting that the offender should be removed (*αἶρω*, 5:2) from among them. Within the confines of this discussion, I cannot consider the question of what precisely Paul means by, “to hand this man over to Satan for the destruction of the flesh” (5:5),⁸¹ but whatever the exact referent, the Corinthians are to be purified by his removal. The parabolic saying of 5:6–7 confirms this interpretation. According to Thiselton, Paul’s illustration of the leaven shows, “the disastrous consequences of letting the church become distorted and misshaped by a tainting element which permeates the whole”.⁸² At the end of the chapter, Paul adds further confirmation with a command from Deut 17:7 (LXX) to drive out the evil doer from their midst. As Richard B. Hays notes, a command, originally given to Israel, is applied quite unselfconsciously by Paul to this majority Gentile congregation.⁸³ They are now the saints of God who must not be contaminated by evil. This has implications for how they are to live, meaning that they must exclude the influence of a *πόρνος* from their midst (5:9–11),⁸⁴ and illustrated by a sacrificial metaphor in 5:7–8 that makes clear reference to Passover (*πάσχα*). This is not a case of the Corinthians making a spiritual sacrifice, since it is Christ who has *already* been sacrificed (*θύω*) as the Passover lamb (though no reference is made here to a lamb, *Χριστός* must be understood as the object of sacrifice in apposition to *πάσχα* and thus, the

⁸¹ For a thorough survey, see Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 393–400.

⁸² *Idem*, *1 Corinthians*, 401; cf. Fee, *1 Corinthians*, 236–37; Schrage, *1 Korinther: 1, 11–6, 11*, 379–85; following C. L. Mitton, “New Wine in Old Wineskins: iv, Leaven,” *ExpTim* 84 (1973): 339–43 and J. K. Howard, “‘Christ our Passover’: A Study of the Passover-Exodus theme in 1 Corinthians,” *EvQ* 41.2 (1969): 97–108.

⁸³ Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993), 96–97, cited by Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 417–18; and see now, in more depth, Richard B. Hays, *The Conversion of the Imagination: Paul as Interpreter of Israel’s Scripture* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 1–24.

⁸⁴ Additionally, Brian J. Rosner, “Temple Prostitution in 1 Corinthians 6:12–20,” *NovT* 40 (1998): 336–51 thinks that 1 Cor 3:16–17 provides the “theological framework” for understanding the expulsion of the immoral man in 1 Cor 5:1–13 and traces the progression from purifying the temple in 5:1–6 to celebrating the Passover in 5:7–8. Liu, *Purity*, 127–45 seeks to provide further support for this argument.

Passover lamb).⁸⁵ Nevertheless, the Corinthians are to *celebrate* this Passover festival and to do so with ἄζυμος (the opposite of which, ζύμη, leaven, from 5:7–8, often stands for that which negatively permeates and influences those around them, e.g. Matt 16:6; Lk 12:1; Gal 5:9), which is explicated as ἐν (in/with) εἰλικρίνεια (sincerity or purity of motif) and ἀλήθεια, or in other words, their celebration consists of a pure and truthful life. I have already noted that in Philo, Passover can represent a multitude of different “passings”: a passing over from passions to virtue,⁸⁶ that might include a crossing away *from* the body,⁸⁷ and for the soul from senses to thoughts,⁸⁸ a passing over to thankfulness to God⁸⁹ or the offering of the soul’s own progress as a passover sacrifice.⁹⁰ In Philo, the Passover lamb itself can symbolize the progress of the soul towards a harmony of counsel and justice.⁹¹ I shall note shortly that Paul’s “passover” does not emphasize the soul at the expense of the body, in contrast to Philo, and other writers influenced by Platonism.

4.3.2 1 Corinthians 6:19: The Context of 1 Corinthians 6:12–20

The very beginning of 1 Cor 6 sets up the contrast that is at the heart of this chapter: between the ἄδικος and the ἅγιος. Although the subject matter of 6:1–8 differs greatly from that of 6:12–20, this distinction between those who belong to Christ and God (3:23) is fundamental to both issues. Between the discussion of the two topics stands 6:9–11 which opens with the familiar phrase οὐκ οἴδατε, drawing attention to their neglect of a fundamental principle

⁸⁵ Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 405; Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 242; Collins, *1 Corinthians*, 214; in more detail: Dean O. Wenthe, “An Exegetical study of 1 Corinthians 5:7b,” *The Springfielder* 38.2 (1974): 134–140.

⁸⁶ Philo, *Sacr.* 63.

⁸⁷ *Spec.* 2.147.

⁸⁸ *QE* 1.4 cf. *QE* 1.7–8, where the Passover lamb is spoken of using similar language.

⁸⁹ *Migr.* 25.

⁹⁰ *Congr.* 106.

⁹¹ *QE* 1.3; cf. also *QE* 1.13; *Post.* 72.

(interestingly, six of the ten uses of this phrase occur in this chapter: 6:2, 3, 9, 15, 16, 19). What they should have known is that ἄδικοι θεοῦ βασιλείαν οὐ κληρονομήσουσιν (6:12). At the head of the list of those unrighteous ones are the two types that I highlighted in my introduction, the πόρνοι and the εἰδωλολάτραι, who are often associated in Jewish thought. 1 Cor 8:1–11:1 deals with the latter, but 1 Cor 6:12–20 focuses on the former.⁹² Paul reaffirms their identity as distinct from the unrighteous, reminding them in distinctly cultic language that they have been washed (ἀπολούω),⁹³ set apart (ἀγιάζω) and justified, again carefully connecting God and Jesus. This time it is in the name of the Lord Jesus and “in” or “by” (taking ἐν as a preposition of agency or instrument)⁹⁴ the Spirit of “our” God (6:11). I note the kind of incipient trinitarianism found here⁹⁵ with Jesus, God and the Spirit intertwined and the emphasis on the empowering of the Holy Spirit,⁹⁶ a theme that could be derived from the earlier passage I examined (3:16), and appears in the passage I will shortly explore (6:19).

One of the immediate challenges an interpreter faces in 6:12–20 is knowing which words reflect the views of Paul and which reflect the views of the Corinthians (or possibly Paul’s characterization of their views). This issue must be addressed if we are to rightly contrast the philosophical views that could have influenced the Corinthians with Paul’s own position. There is considerable unanimity among scholars that the opening statement Πάντα μοι ἔξεστιν (6:12,

⁹² B. J. Oropeza, “Situational Immorality: Paul’s ‘Vice Lists’ at Corinth,” *ExpTim* 110.1 (1998): 9–10 argues that these vices were actually being practiced in Corinth.

⁹³ See the evidence presented in Nijay K. Gupta, *Worship That Makes Sense to Paul: A New Approach to the Theology and Ethics of Paul’s Cultic Metaphors* (BZNW 175; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2010), 71–72.

⁹⁴ E.g. Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 455; Fee, *1 Corinthians*, 270; Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 258.

⁹⁵ Witherington III, *Conflict*, 167; Fee, *1 Corinthians*, 271, developed especially in relation to Romans 8:9–11 in Idem, “Christology and Pneumatology in Romans 8:9–11 – and Elsewhere: Some Reflections on Paul as a Trinitarian,” in *Jesus of Nazareth: Lord and Christ: Essays on the Historical Jesus and New Testament Christology* (ed. Joel B. Green and Max Turner; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 312–31; Ciampa and Rosner, *Corinthians*, 244; Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 258.

⁹⁶ Fee, *1 Corinthians*, 272–73.

“All things are permitted for me”⁹⁷ reflects the position of the Corinthians (cited again in 10:23, which strengthens this case).⁹⁸ However, there is disagreement about the verse that follows. The vast majority of commentators would agree that in 6:12 Paul twice quotes the Corinthian maxim I have just noted, followed each time by his response, and that 6:13a is another Corinthian slogan. However, most translations’ omission of quotation marks around ὁ δὲ θεὸς καὶ ταῦτην καὶ ταῦτα καταργήσει (“and God will destroy both one and the other”; 6:13b) suggest that they consider these words to belong to Paul,⁹⁹ though most modern scholars attribute the phrase to the Corinthians.¹⁰⁰ The subject becomes even more disputed in regard to later verses in this same passage.

⁹⁷ The sense is nicely captured by translations like “Liberty to do anything” (Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 461) or “I have the right to do anything” (Ciampa and Rosner, *Corinthians*, 245).

⁹⁸ E.g. see Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 461 note 192, who cites J. C. Hurd’s list of twenty-three writers up to 1965, including himself, who held the phrase to be a Corinthian slogan. Thiselton himself agrees with this position and also cites Wolfgang Schrage, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther: 1 Kor 6,12-11,16* (EKKNT 7.2; Zürich: Benziger, 1995), 17; Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 251 and Collins, *1 Corinthians*, 243 in agreement. To Thiselton’s list, we can also add Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 108; Witherington III, *Conflict*, 167; Hays, *Corinthians*, 102; Keener, *1–2 Corinthians*, 57; Schnabel, *Korinther*, 333; Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 263; Ciampa and Rosner, *Corinthians*, 252. Fee, *1 Corinthians*, 280–81 proposes “a perfect parallelism (with chiasm in the first member of each)” (280). In both Cynic and Stoic circles the wise were free to act as they wish, though often this was circumscribed by the assumption that the wise or the good person understands what is either forbidden by law or is regarded as improper; see for instance Epictetus, *Diatr.* 4.1.1, 4, 14, 18; Dio, *1 Serv. lib.* 17–18; cited by Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 227–28 and the wider discussion at 225–29.

⁹⁹ E.g. RSV, NEB, NRSV, ESV, NLT, HCSB, with the NIV 2011 bucking the trend. This is also the position of Fee, *1 Corinthians*, 281 note 294; Witherington III, *Conflict*, 168 is ambivalent. Jan Lambrecht, “Paul’s Reasoning in 1 Corinthians 6:12–20,” *ETL* 85.4 (2009): 479–486 at 481, 485 accepts that this is Paul’s position, with the caveat that Paul means that the stomach (κοιλία) will be destroyed; the destiny of the body is different.

¹⁰⁰ E.g. Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 110; Robert H. Gundry, *Sōma in Biblical Theology with Emphasis on Pauline Anthropology* (SNTSMS 29; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 54–56; Brendan Byrne, “Sinning against One’s Own Body: Paul’s Understanding of the Sexual Relationship in 1 Corinthians 6:18,” *CBQ* 45.4 (1983): 608–16 at 611–612; Schrage, *1 Korinther: 6,12-11,16*, 20; Hays, *Corinthians*, 102; Collins, *1 Corinthians*, 245; Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 462–63, following the earlier Idem, “Realized eschatology at Corinth,” *NTS* 24.4 (1978): 510–26, at 517; Karl Olav Sandnes, *Belly and Body in the Pauline Epistles* (SNTSMS 120; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 191–99; Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 264; Denny Burk, “Discerning Corinthian Slogans through Paul’s Use of the Diatribe in 1 Corinthians 6:12–20,” *BBR* 18.1 (2008): 99–121; Jerome Murphy-O’Connor, “Corinthian Slogans in 1 Corinthians 6:12–20,” in *Keys to First Corinthians: Revisiting the Major Issues* (ed. Jerome Murphy O’Connor; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 22–25; Ciampa and Rosner, *Corinthians*, 252; Brookins, *Wisdom*, 84–85; and more generally on the question of method, see Jay E. Smith, “Slogans in 1 Corinthians,” *BSac* 167 (2010): 68–88. Benjamin Fiore, “Passion in Paul and Plutarch: 1

I want to give close attention to 1 Cor 6:18b (πᾶν ἀμάρτημα ὃ ἐὰν ποιήσῃ ἄνθρωπος ἐκτὸς τοῦ σώματός ἐστιν, that is, “Every sin that a person commits is outside the body”) because of its relevance to 6:19 and the comparison between temple language used by Paul and its use by philosophers. Might 6:18b reflect the Corinthian position and on what basis can we evaluate these claims? C. F. D. Moule thought it “possibly worth considering” that 6:18b might reflect the Corinthian position.¹⁰¹ Jerome Murphy O’Connor drew attention to the parallels found in the structure of 6:13–14, the contrast between καταργέω (13) and ἐξεγείρω (14), and the proliferation of the particle δέ in these verses to suggest that Paul takes up the Corinthians’ *own words* each time in formulating his response. Thus 6:13b (using καταργέω) is a Corinthian slogan. Murphy O’Connor takes 6:18b as another Corinthian slogan which displays the same lack of concern for the body (found in 6:13), which is “morally irrelevant”.¹⁰²

Corinthians and 5–6 and the Polemic Against Epicureans,” in *Greeks, Romans, and Christians: Essays in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe* (ed. David L. Balch, Everett Ferguson, and Wayne A. Meeks; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990), 135–43 speculates that Paul is confronting Epicurean influence in 1 Cor 5–6 and especially here, relying on Plutarch’s treatise against the Epicureans. It is possible that this is a factor, but more than this is hard to say, and I would not wish to restrict the influences on the Corinthians to the Epicureans. Graham Tomlin, “Christians and Epicureans in 1 Corinthians,” *JSNT* 68 (1997): 51–72 explores the possible influence of Epicureanism more comprehensively and makes a convincing case for the contribution that it could have made to the problems discussed in 1 Cor 5–7 (62–64) while recognizing that Corinth was a melting point for various philosophical and religious influences (70–71).

¹⁰¹ C. F. D. Moule, *An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek* (2d ed.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959), 196–97.

¹⁰² Murphy-O’Connor, “Slogans,” 20–31 at 22. This would also explain the need to argue for a physical resurrection against those who dispute it in 1 Cor 15:12 (24). The article was originally published in *CBQ* 40 (1978), 391–96. Murphy O’Connor is followed by UBS Translation Consultant Roger L. Omanson, “Acknowledging Paul’s quotations,” *BT* 43.2 (1992): 201–13 at 207; Collins, *1 Corinthians*, 248; Hays, *Corinthians*, 105. Jay E. Smith, “The Roots of a ‘Libertine’ Slogan in I Corinthians 6:18,” *JTS* 59.1 (2008): 63–95 at 65 note 6, notes the mixed signals found in Thiselton (cf. Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, comparing 459 with 471–74). Keener, *1–2 Corinthians*, 58 indicates that he is open to the possibility. Kempthorne, “Incest,” 568–74 at 571–72 agrees with Moule and Murphy-O’Connor that 6:18b is a Corinthian slogan but takes σώμα to mean the body of believers, argued also by E. Schweizer, “σῶμα, σωματικός, σύσσωμος,” *TDNT* 7:1070. Mitchell, *Rhetoric*, 120 note 338 assumes that the “body of Christ” metaphor is a “prevailing image” of the letter and that 6:15 refers to this, and to the Corinthians’ prior instruction in the matter. This seems unlikely in light of the presence of τὸ ἴδιον in 6:18b and since σώμα in 6:18a is clearly used of the physical body. Gundry, *Sōma*, 73, asks pointedly, “did Paul expect the Corinthians to read ch. 12 before ch. 6?” This difficulty is recognized by Fee, *1 Corinthians*, 283 note 300 and 289 note 323.

However, scholars such as Gordon Fee follow Brendan Byrne in arguing that the slogan is Paul's,¹⁰³ and Fee proposes that the $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ is "exceptive" (suggesting the translation "all *other* sins", where the word *other* is supplied).¹⁰⁴ Yet, Denny Burk draws attention to the authoritative study of J. William Johnston of the NT uses of $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$, which concludes that there can be no exceptions implied in 6:18.¹⁰⁵ Further grammatical analysis by Jay E. Smith also provides compelling reasons for doubting the likelihood of this "exceptive" sense.¹⁰⁶ Smith seeks to provide extensive supporting evidence from the Hellenistic-Roman background, especially from Stoicism to demonstrate that, "the philosophical 'raw materials' were present for the Corinthians to construct [such] a slogan"¹⁰⁷ Burk also draws attention to the diatribal features of 6:12–20 that strongly suggest the dialogical nature of the passage, with the difference that Paul is interacting with real slogans, not with an imaginary opponent.¹⁰⁸ None of these scholars can establish with certainty that 6:18b are the words (or position) of the Corinthians but they do provide compelling

¹⁰³ Byrne, "Sinning," 608–16 at 609–10 and followed by Alistair Scott May, *The Body for the Lord: Sex and Identity in 1 Corinthians 5–7* (JSNTSup 278; London: T&T Clark, 2004), 123–27.

¹⁰⁴ Fee, *1 Corinthians*, 290, agreeing with Gundry, *Sōma*, 73–74 and argued on other grounds by Bruce Fisk, "Porneuein as Body Violation: The Unique Nature of Sexual Sin in 1 Corinthians 6:18," *NTS* 42.4 (1996): 540–558 at 544 (reflected also by the RSV: "Every other sin . . ." and followed by Brian S. Rosner, *Paul, Scripture and Ethics: A Study of 1 Corinthians 5–7* (AGJU 22; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 144 and Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 236). Burk, "Discerning," 99–121 at 118 finds no evidence for this usage in any of the major Greek grammars. Lambrecht, "Reasoning," 479–486 at 484–86 cautiously affirms that 6:18b is Paul's position, based on his structural analysis of 6:12–20.

¹⁰⁵ Cited in Burk, "Discerning," at 118 note 61.

¹⁰⁶ Jay E. Smith, "A Slogan in 1 Corinthians 6:18b: Pressing the Case," in *Studies in the Pauline Epistles: Essays in Honor of Douglas J. Moo* (ed. Matthew Harmon and Jay E. Smith; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2014), 74–98 at 82–83, as well as the difficulties of making sense of 6:18b as a Pauline statement in the context of the letter in 84–87. Smith also tries to propose evidence for seeing $\alpha\mu\acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\eta\mu\alpha$ as a non-Pauline word (understanding the vocabulary of Rom 3:25 as a pre-Pauline formula, with most commentators) in 87–91.

¹⁰⁷ Idem, "Roots," 69, with evidence from Stoicism presented in 69–77, stressing the prime place given to intention over action in Stoic thought, with supporting evidence from Epictetus, Cicero, Marcus Aurelius, Stobaeus and Sextus Empiricus, and the evidence typically provided for Stoic views in 1 Cor 6:12a from Diogenes Laertius, Dio Chrysostom and Philo as well as from scholars of Stoicism such as F. H. Sandbach and E. V. Arnold. Smith also sees a possible background in a kind of incipient gnosticism and postulates the possible misunderstanding of the sayings preserved in Mark 7:14–23 (see Idem, "Roots," 77–84 for the former and 84–95 for the latter.) By contrast, Bruce Fisk seeks to demonstrate that the ethos of 6:18b is in agreement with what we find in the Jewish wisdom tradition (Fisk, "Porneuein," 540–558 at 541, with evidence provided in 545–46).

¹⁰⁸ Burk, "Discerning," 99–121 at 102–110. Brookins, *Wisdom*, 85–86, 188–89 also takes this position.

evidence for its likelihood based on a variety of both literary and cultural factors and I shall assume this position here.

Looking at 6:12–20 as a whole, Paul begins by quoting a Corinthian slogan with which many have identified Stoic and Cynic parallels.¹⁰⁹ He counters this focus on individual rights or freedom (ἔξῃσιν) with what builds up the community instead.¹¹⁰ For my purposes I wish to note that the passage has a relentless focus on the physical body. The σῶμα rightly belongs to ὁ κύριος (13), last named as the Lord Jesus Christ (11). Having already identified πόρνοι as the first in a list of offenders who will not inherit the kingdom of God (9), Paul contrasts πορνεία with ὁ κύριος (13). The body is not intended for πορνεία but for the Lord.¹¹¹ ὁ θεός and ὁ κύριος continue to be the subject of 6:14, as does the focus on the supremacy of ὁ θεός (he is the one who does the destroying in 6:13 and who raises ὁ κύριος in 6:14; cf. my discussion of 1:23 earlier). Paul hints at a later theme that will be dealt with expansively in 1 Cor 15: God raised the Lord and he will raise *us* through his power (14).¹¹² This is clearly a reference to the raising of

¹⁰⁹ Including D.L. 6.72; 7.125; see e.g. Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 108–09; Terence Paige, “Stoicism, Ἐλευθερία and Community At Corinth,” in *Worship, Theology and Ministry in the Early Church: Essays in Honor of Ralph P. Martin* (ed. Michael J. Wilkins and Terence Paige; JSNTSup 87; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992), 180–93 and Brookins, *Wisdom*, 174–75. Winter, *Corinth*, 76–96 locates the setting more in the ethics of the elite.

¹¹⁰ On which see particularly, Mitchell, *Rhetoric*, *passim*; Lanci, *Temple*, *passim*.

¹¹¹ Robertson and Plummer, *1 Corinthians*, contend that 6:14–15 depicts a hypothetical scenario. Fee, *1 Corinthians*, 275–77, is representative of most scholars, who differ. Rosner, “Prostitution,” 336–51 and Ciampa and Rosner, *Corinthians*, 246–249 lay out the various options and argue for temple prostitution; Kempthorne, “Incest,” 568–74 and Deming, “Unity,” 289–312 argue that Paul is returning to the problem of incest identified in 1 Cor 5:1; Bruce W. Winter, “Gluttony and Immorality at Élitist Banquets: The Background to 1 Corinthians 6:12–20,” *Jian Dao* 7 (1997): 77–90 makes the case that the elite indulged in sexual immorality in Roman banquets. Martin, *Body*, 176, asserts that the πόρνη “is not a person in her own right (as if such a thing is imaginable for Paul) but a representative of the cosmos that is estranged and opposed to God and Christ” (see 176–79 generally) but Martin’s whole discussion seems scarcely more imaginable than his dismissal of a concrete circumstance (especially in light of references to the specific πόρνοις in 5:9–10, using a cognate word).

¹¹² The textual tradition is evenly split between three tenses of the verb ἐξήγειρεν (aorist), ἐξεγείρει (present) and ἐξεγερεῖ (future: the reading of the NA²⁸), but the context seems to demand the future reading (Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 486–87; Fee, *1 Corinthians*, 274 note 262) although Philip W. Comfort, *New Testament Text and Translation Commentary: Commentary on the Variant Readings of the Ancient New Testament*

some kind of body, since Paul pointedly addresses the Corinthians directly with the familiar accusatory topic marker οὐκ οἶδατε ὅτι (15) in order to draw attention to the fundamental place that the physical body plays in God’s economy. Here the references are plural; it is their bodies that are members of Christ (15a). Thus, Paul’s incredulity that they might even make *these* members become members of ἡ πόρνη is signaled by another familiar Pauline phrase of disbelief, and though grammatically a volitive optative (a wish expressed almost like a prayer), it expresses more a note of abhorrence, μὴ γένοιτο (6:15; “May it never be” or “Certainly not!”).¹¹³ It would be unthinkable to join (κολλάω) these members of Christ with ἡ πόρνη, signaled by Paul’s second use of μὴ γένοιτο, because to do so would create a one body (ἐν σῶμά) relationship with her, or one flesh (6:16; citing Gen 2:24 LXX). Although the “one flesh” relationship (using σάρξ) almost certainly would have been well known from the LXX and from early Christian tradition,¹¹⁴ Paul’s focus in this discourse is on the σῶμα, (eight times in 6:12–20) not the σάρξ. Yet, strikingly, Paul’s immediate assertion is that the one joined to the Lord is ἐν πνεῦμά (6:17). Although *one spirit* could mean something like *one in spirit*, referring to the human spirit (as in 2:11a), the immediate context would seem to demand a forward pointing reference to the Holy Spirit, both in 6:19, and then in the discussion that begins with 12:4.¹¹⁵ Therefore Paul issues a strong warning to flee πορνεία (6:18). As argued earlier, I see good

Manuscripts and How they Relate to the Major English Translations (Carol Stream, Ill.: Tyndale House, 2008), 495, argues for the present reading as the original, following the “process exhibited in the corrections of p⁴⁶”.

¹¹³ “γίνομαι,” BDAG, 196–99, at 4.a, 97; Ernest De Witt Burton, *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1900), 79 [§177], discussed in Wallace, *Grammar*, 481–82. For its use uniquely in the diatribes of Epictetus and Paul, see Abraham J. Malherbe, *Paul and the Popular Philosophers* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989), 25–33.

¹¹⁴ cf. Matt 19:5; Mk 10:8; Eph 5:31 (which of course, *may* have been written by Paul), and the marriage imagery between God and his people is drawn on by Paul in 2 Cor 11:2–3.

¹¹⁵ Fee, *1 Corinthians* 87, 260; followed by Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 469. Comfort, *Commentary*, 495–96 however, argues that “spirit” should not be capitalized since what is described is a union of the divine Spirit with the human spirit and manuscripts p⁴⁶ and p¹¹ support this, since the scribes did not write πνεῦμα as a nomen sacrum.

reason for taking 6:18b as the objection (whether actual or or hypothetical) of the Corinthians: that sin as an act has no reference to the body. Paul then uses πορνεύω in participle form as a substantive (the one who engages in sexual immorality) to make a radical claim to an audience influenced by philosophical thought, whether Stoic or Platonic: that such an act would be to sin against their own body (6:18b). Fisk is surely right to note that 6:12–20 is tied together by a “focus on the corporeal” (with the multiple descriptors σῶμα, κοιλία and σάρξ), whether that is *purely* related to the physical body or to the person as a whole “viewed particularly as a physical being”.¹¹⁶

4.3.3 1 Corinthians 6:19: Main Features

I come now to the next metaphorical temple reference. For the purposes of my discussion I would note the following points about Paul’s words. Firstly, the explicit referent of the temple of the Holy Spirit is the human σῶμα. This goes beyond the sense of 3:16, where the reference to the person could conceivably have been understood by Paul’s audience only with respect to the soul. Secondly, although the reference is clearly to the individual body of Christians,¹¹⁷ Paul chooses not to use the plural of σῶμα here. Instead, he expresses himself very carefully with ὃ σῶμα ὑμῶν, which Moulton and Turner class as a *distributive singular* (something that belongs to each person in a group).¹¹⁸ This makes clear that the reference is to the body of the individual (who may or may not choose to unite with ἡ πόρνη) but at the same

¹¹⁶ Fisk, “Porneuein,” 548.

¹¹⁷ Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 238.

¹¹⁸ J. H. Moulton and Nigel Turner, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek. Vol. III: Syntax* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1963), 23.

time keeps the corporate dimension of the temple very much in focus, just as in 3:16.¹¹⁹ Thirdly, the Spirit is specifically defined as ἅγιος. In the earlier discussion, Paul had defined the temple as holy (3:17), and as the place of God’s Spirit (3:16). Now he unites the two to provide definition to his characterization of the Spirit. Fourthly, Paul makes even more explicit one inference of 3:16–17: you are not your own; you are like slaves of a different master (6:19b), who have been acquired with a price (and thus possess value).¹²⁰ Fifthly, such people are under obligation, consequently, to glorify (δοξάζω) God in the body; again using the singular form of σῶμα with the possessive plural personal personal ὑμῶν (6:20).

4.3.4 Comparing 1 Corinthians 6:19 with Hellenistic Philosophy

4.3.4.1 Philosophy

I have already observed certain of these emphases in relation to 1 Cor 3:16–17; the most obvious one being that the temple is still a corporate image in 6:19 (though applied to the individual bodies of those within the community). I noted earlier that the indwelling references found in the philosophers related either to the universe as a whole or to the individual. It is not always clear whether these references to the individual could include the body. In Epictetus there is a hint that they may do so. When he admonishes his hearers with the notion that they are nourishing God and exercising God whenever they take physical exercise, or when he speaks of

¹¹⁹ Agreeing with Gupta, *Worship*, 73–75; Idem, “Which “Body” is a Temple (1 Corinthians 6:19)? Paul beyond the Individual/Communal Divide,” *CBQ* 72.3 (2010): 518–36 at 523 and see the article as a whole for a balanced presentation of this subject; also e.g. McKelvey, *Temple*, 102; Hogeterp, *Temple*, 340; Wassen, “Temple,” 55–86 at 74–75.

¹²⁰ For the background to this metaphor and its use in a context more explicitly concerned with slavery in Paul’s day (1 Cor 7:23), see Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 475–79; 561–65; and specialist studies such as S. Scott Bartchy, *Μᾶλλον χρεῖσται: First Century Slavery and the Interpretation of 1 Corinthians 7:21* (SBLDS 11; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1973), and Dale B. Martin, *Slavery as Salvation: The Metaphor of Slavery in Pauline Christianity* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990), *passim*.

“bearing God about with you”¹²¹ such that God sees the motions of the human soul as corresponding to his own motions so that they are “of one body with Himself”,¹²² it is hard not to hear overtones of a physical aspect.¹²³ I have already drawn attention to places in Philo that refer to the human body as a sacred dwelling-place or shrine for the soul, which is the image of God.¹²⁴ However, I noted earlier the caution of Torrey Seland that this corporeal reference only appears in one place in Philo and it is with reference only to Adam, not to human beings in general. Despite each of these references in Epictetus and Philo, it is the norm that philosophers only speak of the divine indwelling in the soul or mind. Philo is the only *Jewish* Hellenistic philosopher that I am considering and so we might imagine that he would have a more positive view of the body than pagan Stoic and Middle Platonic thinkers. In fact, for Philo, it is strictly the mind, not the body, that is a temple or dwelling place of God.¹²⁵ Philosophy tends to stress that the divine dwells in the soul,¹²⁶ or that a δαίμων dwells in the soul of each person.¹²⁷

The special emphasis we find on the soul in philosophy is contrasted with the place of the body. Sometimes the body is spoken of almost with indifference; it is something to which the mind or soul should pay no attention.¹²⁸ The soul should have as little association as it is possible to have with the body during its earthly existence.¹²⁹ In fact, the body and its inclinations are to be resisted.¹³⁰ The body has dwelling within it not only good, but also evil.¹³¹ As in the writings

¹²¹ Epictetus, *Diatr.* 2.8.12 (Oldfather, LCL).

¹²² Epictetus, *Diatr.* 1.14.6 (Oldfather, LCL).

¹²³ Seneca, *Ep.* 31.2 and 66.12 and Cicero, *Resp.* 6.24.26 could also be read in this way.

¹²⁴ Philo, *Opif.* 137 (see for context; *Opif.* 135).

¹²⁵ Philo, *Praem.* 123; *Deus.* 8–9; *Mos.* 2.82; *Virt.* 188; *Somn.* 2.250–51; *Det.* 90.

¹²⁶ E.g. Seneca, *Ep.* 110.2; 120.14; Cicero, *Leg.* 2.11.27–28; *Tusc.* 1.24.56; 1.25.62; Philo, *Cher.* 98, 100; *Deus.* 134; *Sobr.* 62; *Somn.* 1.149; 2.215, 248; *QG* 4.80; see also Hogeterp, *Temple*, 342–44.

¹²⁷ E.g. Dio, *4 Regn.* 139; Epictetus, *Diatr.* 1.14.12, 14; Marcus, *Med.* 2.13, 17; 3.3.2; 3.12, 16; 5.10.2; 5.27; Cicero, *Div.* 1.54.122.

¹²⁸ E.g. Marcus, *Med.* 6.32;

¹²⁹ E.g. Plutarch, [*Cons. Apoll.*] 108CD.

¹³⁰ E.g. Marcus, *Med.* 7.55.1–2; Alcinous, *Handbook*, 172.16.2.10–19 (26); 182.4.3–8 (38); cf. Plato, *Tim.* 42AB.

of Plato, later philosophers viewed the body as a prison house for the soul; a time when the soul is in exile.¹³² The soul is the instrument of God; the body, merely the instrument of the soul.¹³³ Therefore, the soul that detaches itself from the things of the body and the earth will enjoy a speedier release from its prison than that of others.¹³⁴ The mind's life can be godlike, but only if it is free from the body.¹³⁵ In the meantime, Epictetus can even speak of the body as a corpse, in view of its final destiny.¹³⁶ Thus the body is like unwanted clothing; only fit to be cast off and thrown away.¹³⁷ For the Pythagoreans, this was enshrined in their creeds, since the soul moves (transmigrates) from one body to another, showing the body to be non-specific to the soul.¹³⁸

In respect to my third point, some philosophers spoke of the spirit as holy. I noted in chapter two that Seneca avers, “a holy spirit indwells within us (*sacer intra nos spiritus sedet*)”,¹³⁹ perhaps an extension of the Stoic view that a *spiritus* permeates all there is.¹⁴⁰ I have already noted that for Zeno, the *πνεῦμα* holds all things together, including individuals.¹⁴¹

Timothy A. Brookins sees the phrase οὐκ . . . ἑαυτῶν (1 Cor 6:19b) as a subversion of a Stoic position, citing the use of the expression in Stoic writers but with a different meaning.¹⁴² For the Stoic the body was not their own because it was part of a larger whole, it belonged to the cosmos, or, “because the self was located not in the body but the soul . . . and especially because the body resided outside the individual's own control, liable as it was to disease, lameness, and

¹³¹ Plutarch, *Virt. prof.* 122E, cf. Homer, *Od.* 4.392.

¹³² E.g. Plutarch, *Exil.* 607D; Maximus, *Or.* 7.5; 9.6; 10.3–5; cf. 10.9.

¹³³ E.g. Plutarch, *Sept. sap. conv.* 163E.

¹³⁴ E.g. Seneca, *Marc.* 23.1–2; *Polyb.* 9.3, 8; *Helv.* 11.6; *Ep.* 41.5

¹³⁵ Cicero, *lib. inc. fr.* 2; cf. *Div.* 1.57.129.

¹³⁶ Epictetus, *Frag.* 26; *Diatr.* 2.1.17; cf. Plutarch, *Quaest. plat.* 2, 1002C.

¹³⁷ E.g. Maximus, *Or.* 11.11.

¹³⁸ Philostratus, *Vit. Apoll.* 3.19.1.

¹³⁹ Seneca, *Ep.* 41.2 (Gummere, LCL).

¹⁴⁰ Seneca, *Nat.* 2.6.5; 6.16.1; 3.29.2; *Helv.* 8.3.

¹⁴¹ *SVF*, 2.473; cf. *SVF*, 2.552–53, 634.

¹⁴² Brookins, *Wisdom*, 189, citing Epictetus, *Diatr.* 3.20.1; 3.22.21, 34, 40–41; 4.1.66, 78, 87, 104, 158; 4.7.17, 31–32; *Ench.* 1.1; Seneca, *Ep.* 120.18–19.

most of all the whims of “tyrants”.¹⁴³ Paul on the contrary attributes great value to the body (6:20a) because it matters to God, who is the master of those who belong to Christ, in whom the Spirit dwells exclusively. The philosophers also speak of a certain obligation to glorify God (cf. 6:20b). For the middle Platonists, the goal was to know and to imitate God and to submit to God’s direction in all things,¹⁴⁴ but other writers (including Stoics) also spoke of the need to imitate the example of the gods.¹⁴⁵ The response to the gods should also be a life oriented towards virtue,¹⁴⁶ that includes a life characterized by self-control,¹⁴⁷ with the goal to please God.¹⁴⁸ A person’s desire for purity before God¹⁴⁹ should lead to an inward purification¹⁵⁰ and the destruction of all thoughts that would tend away from purity.¹⁵¹ This means being led by and keeping pure your inner δαίμων¹⁵² by honoring him.¹⁵³ As I described in the previous two chapters, purity in both thought, word and action could be described as a sacrifice, and thus an offering of worship.¹⁵⁴

4.3.4.2 Paul

When I compare these findings with 1 Cor 6:19, there are a number of points to consider. Firstly, whereas the human body is spoken of by philosophers (whether Stoic or Platonic) at best

¹⁴³ Idem, *Wisdom*, 189.

¹⁴⁴ E.g. Plutarch, *Sept. sap. conv.* 163E.

¹⁴⁵ E.g. Alcinous, *Handbook*, 181.28.22–30 (37); 182.4.3–8 (38); Maximus, *Or.* 35.2; cf. 26.9; also in Stoic writers like Seneca, *Ben.* 4.25.1; *Vit. beat.* 15.6; 16:1–2; *Ep.* 95.50; cf. *De otio.* 5.8; *Vit. beat.* 3.3; 8.1; Dio, *3 Regn.* 82; Epictetus, *Diatr.* 2.14.13; 2.16.42;

¹⁴⁶ DL 7.1.88, 89, 93–117; Seneca, *Prov.* 1.5; cf. *Ep.* 31.9; Cicero, *Leg.* 1.7.25.

¹⁴⁷ Dio, *4 Regn.* 23.

¹⁴⁸ Epictetus, *Diatr.* 1.30.1.

¹⁴⁹ Epictetus, *Diatr.* 2.18.19; 2.19.26.

¹⁵⁰ Epictetus, *Diatr.* 4.1.112.

¹⁵¹ Epictetus, *Diatr.* 2.8.12–13; 4.1.175; Apollonius, *Vit. Apoll.* 3.42.1–2; Marcus Aurelius, *Med.* 7.54

¹⁵² Apollonius, *Vit. Apoll.* 1.18.1; 2.39.3; Marcus Aurelius, *Med.* 2.13, 17; 3.5.1; 3.6.2; 3.12; 3.16; 5.27.

¹⁵³ Epictetus, *Diatr.* 2.8.18–22.

¹⁵⁴ E.g. Cicero, *Nat. d.* 2.28.71; Dio, *Exil.* 35; *Leg.* 2.8.19; 2.10.24, 25; Philostratus, *Vit. Apoll.* 6.11.3; Philo, *Spec.* 1.201, 203, 257–60, 269–271, 283, 287; *QE.* 1.17; 2.31, 98–99; *Sacr.* 73; 109–111; *Mos.* 2.137–39, 148–51; *Plant.* 108; *Somn.* 2.73–74.

with indifference and at worst with disdain, Paul sees the body itself as the temple of the Holy Spirit, a sacred place where God's presence dwells.¹⁵⁵ Again, I noted the corporate implications of Paul's use of the second person possessive plural in referring to the body, by contrast to the individual focus of temple references that I have surveyed. Thirdly, the πνεῦμα or *spiritus* inhabits the whole universe in the philosophers, and this includes every individual that dwells within it. By contrast, it is those who have been washed, sanctified and justified in the name of the Lord Jesus and by the spirit of their God who are a temple of the Holy Spirit in Paul (6:11; cf. 1:2; 2:10–13; 3:16–17, 21–23; 12:3). For Paul, the spirit is not the possession of all people irrespective of their relationship to Jesus. Correspondingly, among the philosophers there is no sense that one set of people belong to God in a way that others may not. Finally, the philosophers would concur with Paul that there is an obligation to glorify God (or the gods) by imitating their example, in inward and outward purity. However, Paul adds to the injunction to glorify God ἐν τῷ σώματι ὑμῶν (6:20b). This short phrase encapsulates the heart of the difference between Paul and the philosophers: unlike Platonism and Stoicism, he emphasizes a defined group with boundaries set by their relationship to Jesus Christ and stresses the corporeal dimension to identification with and obedience to God.¹⁵⁶

4.4 Corresponding Emphases in 1 Corinthians

The key emphases I have identified here can also be found elsewhere within the epistle. In this next section I shall comment briefly on a number of other important places in the letter that relate to the issues identified in 1 Cor 3:16–17 and 6:19. I shall be selective and aim to

¹⁵⁵ For more on this theme, see e.g. Fee, *Presence*, 134–37.

¹⁵⁶ May, *Body*, 130 suggests that this phrase connotes the sense that each temple is set apart for the divinity whose image dwells within, “the temple is the property of the resident divinity”.

address only those areas that may have been notable for an audience influenced by philosophy, such as the need for holiness to be expressed in the body, idolatry rather than the acceptance of multiple gods, and Paul's positive view of the body and his willingness to use indwelling imagery with material language.

4.4.1 Holiness in the Body

The concern for holiness and for its expression within the body comes to the fore in 1 Cor 7, where Paul gives most of his attention to the question of marriage and whether to marry or remain unmarried. The question, apparently raised by the Corinthians,¹⁵⁷ of whether to touch (ἅπτω) a woman (γυνή)¹⁵⁸ is expressly concerned with sexual relations (7:1),¹⁵⁹ and thus matters of the body. Paul's foundational principle is that each spouse (ἐξουσιάζω) has authority over the body of the other (7:4).¹⁶⁰ Taking up the language of 1:2, Paul proclaims that an unbelieving

¹⁵⁷ The position of most commentators, see Lang, *Korinther*, 89; Schrage, *1 Korinther: 6,12-11,16*, 59; Collins, *1 Corinthians*, 252–55, 257; Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 498–500; Schnabel, *Korinther*, 352; Fee, *1 Corinthians*, 303–08; Ciampa and Rosner, *Corinthians*, 272. Barrett, *1 Corinthians*, 154 and Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 278 cautiously express the view that Paul may be in agreement with the sentiment, but this seems unlikely in the context of the wider discussion and the way that Paul answers Corinthian slogans in other passages.

¹⁵⁸ Though this could equally be translated “wife”, but most adopt the more neutral “woman”, see Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 500; Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 278.

¹⁵⁹ For evidence for the use of ἅπτεσθαι in the middle voice with the genitive, as a euphemism in Greek literature for sexual intercourse, see Gordon D. Fee, “1 Corinthians 7:1 in the NIV,” *JETS* 23.4 (1980): 307–314; Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 500; Collins, *1 Corinthians*, 258; Fee, *1 Corinthians*, 301–06. Idem, “1 Corinthians 7:1–7 Revisited,” in *Paul and the Corinthians: Studies on a Community in Conflict. Essays in Honour of Margaret Thrall* (ed. Trevor J. Burke and J. Keith Elliott; NovTSup 109; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 197–213 restates his case in opposition to the more recent attempt to revive the argument that γυναῖκός μη ἅπτεσθαι is a metonymy for marriage, argued by C Caragounis, ““Fornication” and “Concession”? Interpreting 1 Cor 7, 1–7,” in *The Corinthian Correspondence* (ed. R Bieringer; BETL; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1996), 543–60 at 543–49. More recently, an interesting and persuasive argument has been put forward that the euphemism specifically applied to cases of acting on sexual passions motivated by pleasure or passion, not for procreation; see Ciampa and Rosner, *Corinthians*, 272–75 and for fuller details, Roy E. Ciampa, “Revisiting the Euphemism in 1 Corinthians 7.1,” *JSNT* 31.3 (2009): 325–38.

¹⁶⁰ For the significance of this for Paul's theology of the body and its radical disjunction with contemporary views of the body in marriage see e.g. Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 504–06; Schrage, *1 Korinther: 6,12-11,16*, 63–66. For a discussion of the possibility that Paul is interacting with a wider Stoic-Cynic debate over marriage, see David L. Balch, “1 Corinthians 7:32–35 and Stoic Debates about Marriage, Anxiety, and Distraction,” *JBL* 102.3 (1983):

spouse in a marriage is sanctified (ἀγιάζω) by the believer, rendering the children holy (ἅγιος) rather than unclean (ἀκάθαρτος) in 7:14.¹⁶¹ Paul repeats the language of 6:20 (last used in connection with the temple image), in reminding the Corinthians again that they have been bought with a price (ἀγοράζω), that they might not be slaves of people (τιμῆς ἠγοράσθητε in 7:23 and ἠγοράσθητε . . . τιμῆς in 6:20b). I also note in passing that in Paul's understanding, the single person's goal is ἵνα ἢ ἀγία καὶ τῷ σώματι καὶ τῷ πνεύματι (7:34). Holiness must be expressed *in the body* as well as the spirit; Paul is never concerned with matters of the soul alone, but the whole person.¹⁶² Finally in this chapter, Paul places one condition on those who remarry after widowhood, μόνον ἐν κυρίῳ (7:39), which I would understand as meaning that the new spouse must be a member of this community set apart for Jesus Christ.¹⁶³

4.4.2 Idolatry

First Corinthians 8:1–11 is an immensely complex section of the letter and so I can only briefly touch on the areas that relate to the themes of idolatry, purity and temples, while neglecting other important areas of Paul's discussion.¹⁶⁴ Paul introduces the section with the

429–39 and Will Deming, *Paul on Marriage and Celibacy: The Hellenistic Background of 1 Corinthians 7* (2d ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), *passim*.

¹⁶¹ Within the confines and narrow focus of this work I do not have space to discuss the interpretation of this contentious verse, for which see Schrage, *1 Korinther: 6,12-11,16*, 104–09; Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 527–33; Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 299–301; Ciampa and Rosner, *Corinthians*, 296–302; Fee, *1 Corinthians*, 330–333.

¹⁶² See Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 134 note 32; Schrage, *1 Korinther: 6,12-11,16*, 180; Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 320; Ciampa and Rosner, *Corinthians*, 353–54. Collins, *1 Corinthians*, 292 and Barrett, *1 Corinthians*, 181 speculate that this is a quotation from the Corinthians but there is no evidence for this and it fits comfortably within Paul's argument in the chapter.

¹⁶³ This is disputed by e.g. J. B. Lightfoot, *Notes on Epistles of St. Paul* (ed. J. B. Harmer; Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1895), 235; Barrett, *1 Corinthians*, 186 but held by most commentators, so Robertson and Plummer, *1 Corinthians*, 161; Collins, *1 Corinthians*, 303; Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 604; Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 329; Fee, *1 Corinthians*, 392. Ciampa and Rosner, *Corinthians*, 365–66 also understand this as the meaning but are cautious about its universal application.

¹⁶⁴ For more detail, see the monographs listed in the first chapter and the relatively recent and comprehensive survey of the literature, found in John Fotopoulos, *Food Offered to Idols in Roman Corinth: A*

words *Περὶ δὲ τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων* (8:1).¹⁶⁵ Although many vital topics are discussed along the way, it is essential to always keep in mind that the *subject* of this section is things offered to idols, and more broadly, idolatry. Jerome Murphy O'Connor describes the problem of idol offerings as, “of very limited interest” compared to, “the nature of Christian freedom, the place of the believer in a non-Christian society, and the education of the conscience.”¹⁶⁶ For J. C. Brunt, “the specific question of idol meat is transcended by the consideration of love’s responsibility.”¹⁶⁷ Yet the fact that these topics are introduced *in order* to further Paul’s treatment of idolatry is overlooked.¹⁶⁸ Idolatry was a pressing issue for the Corinthians.

Many recent commentators agree that Paul addresses two contexts: meals eaten in or around pagan temples (8:1–10:22) and food sold in the marketplace and eaten at home (10:23–11:1).¹⁶⁹ While it was once common to claim that a distinction could be made between what Bruce Fisk refers to as “harmless social events” at the temple and activities that were “blatantly

Social-Rhetorical Reconsideration of 1 Corinthians 8:1-11:1 (WUNT 2/ 151; Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 2003), 1–48, including the very helpful chart comparing the views of different scholars, found on 41–48.

¹⁶⁵ See the discussions of εἰδωλόθυτα in Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 617–20 and dining in Roman Corinth in Witherington III, *Conflict*, 191–95.

¹⁶⁶ Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, “Freedom Or the Ghetto: (1 Corinthians 8:1–13; 10:23–11:1),” in *Keys to First Corinthians: Revisiting the Major Issues* (ed. Jerome Murphy O'Connor; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 87–128 at 87.

¹⁶⁷ J. C. Brunt, “Rejected, Ignored or Misunderstood? The Fate of Paul’s Approach to the Problem of Food Offered to Idols in Early Christianity,” *NTS* 31 (1985): 113–24 at 121.

¹⁶⁸ Note the criticisms of Peter D. Gooch, *Dangerous Food: 1 Corinthians 8–10 in Its Context* (Waterloo, Ont.: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1993), xvii, 47–48; A. T. Cheung, *Idol Food in Corinth: Jewish Background and Pauline Legacy* (JSNTSup 176; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 18–19.

¹⁶⁹ E.g. Gordon D. Fee, “Εἰδωλόθυτα Once Again: An interpretation of 1 Corinthians 8–10,” *Bib* 61.2 (1980): 172–97; Theissen, *Setting*, 121–43; Wendell L. Willis, *Idol Meat in Corinth: The Pauline Argument in 1 Corinthians 8 and 10* (SBLDS 68; Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1985), 265–71; Gooch, *Food*, 73–97; Witherington III, *Conflict*, 186–91; Idem, “Not So Idle Thoughts about Eidolothuton,” *TynBul* 44.2 (1993): 237–54; Derek Newton, *Diety and Diet: The Dilemma of Sacrificial Food at Corinth* (JSNTSup 169; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 389–91; Cheung, *Food*, 82–164 (with some qualifications); Joop F. Smit, “About the Idol Offerings”. *Rhetoric, Social Context and Theology of Paul’s Discourse in First Corinthians 8:1–11:1* (CBET 27; Leuven: Peeters, 2000), 41; Fotopoulos, *Food*, 38; Fee, *1 Corinthians*, 394–400.

idolatrous”, even Fisk concedes that, “lines . . . were fuzzy, if drawn at all.”¹⁷⁰ The study of Peter D. Gooch examined archeological and literary evidence for the cult of Demeter and Kore and the place of dining rooms at Lerna in relation to the Asklepios and concluded that idol sacrifice went hand in hand with meals of social significance.¹⁷¹ Gooch’s research has been comprehensively updated (and, in places, corrected) by John Fotopoulos, who provides a very thorough discussion of the archeological evidence and concludes that meals in both the temple and its courts would have involved eating idol food with a religious connotation, and that further many meals were accompanied by sexual encounters¹⁷² (so involving the threat of both idolatry and sexual immorality that I highlighted as a constant concern for Jewish writers, including Paul in this letter). Paul therefore is severe in his warnings against participation in idolatry, focused on alternative temples in Corinth. He does so by drawing on the very heart of Jewish monotheism, the *Shema* (Deut 6:4), for which he provides a “Christological” reinterpretation (8:6),¹⁷³ reminiscent of his words in 3:23, in which θεός and κύριος are conjoined once more, and the relationship between the Corinthians and this God and Lord is reaffirmed. Paul draws on his Jewish roots and its universal condemnation of idolatry,¹⁷⁴ but also both the tradition that idols have no objective reality (8:4a, 5a, drawing on the tradition found in e.g. Deut 32:21; Pss 115:4–

¹⁷⁰ Bruce Fisk, “Eating Meat Offered to Idols: Corinthian Behavior and Pauline Responses in 1 Corinthians 8–10 (A Response to Gordon Fee),” *TrinJ* 10 (1989): 49–70, at 63; Willis, *Meat*, 47 expresses a similar sentiment, that “social conviviality and good cheer” was the focus of religious associations meeting in the temple for meals.

¹⁷¹ Gooch, *Food*, 1–46; followed by Cheung, *Food*, 27–38; Smit, *Offerings*, 49–52.

¹⁷² See the evidence provided in Fotopoulos, *Food*, 49–178.

¹⁷³ The wording of N. T. Wright, “Monotheism, Christology and Ethics: 1 Corinthians 8,” in *The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology* (ed. N. T. Wright; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991), 120–36 at 125–29.

¹⁷⁴ Cheung, *Food*, 39–81; cf. Peter J. Tomson, *Paul and the Jewish Law: Halakha in the Letters of the Apostle to the Gentiles* (CRINT 3.1; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990), 151–77, although Tomson notes a spectrum of views on the severity of attitudes towards, and interpretations of, idolatry. This work has been supplemented by Richard Liong-Seng Phua, *Idolatry and Authority. A Study of 1 Corinthians 8:1–11:1 in the Light of the Jewish Diaspora* (JSNTSup 299; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2005), *passim*, whose study contends that in the Jewish diaspora there were various interpretations of what constituted idolatry and so, a variety of responses. See also Paul’s vehement attacks on idolatry in other letters such as Rom 1:21–32; 2:22; 2 Cor 6:16; Gal 4:8; 1 Thess 1:9.

8; 135:15–18; Isa 40:19–20; 44:9–17) combined with the subjective experience of idols for those who formerly encountered them as pagans, and were influenced by demons through them (8:7, 10, drawing on the tradition found in Deut 18:11; 32:17; Ps 106:37; Isa 8:19; 19:3).¹⁷⁵ Some consider it their ἔξουσία (“right” in the context of 8:9) to eat idol food in temple contexts. Whether or not this is a Corinthian term, it certainly encapsulates what is probably a Corinthian catchphrase (Πάντα μοι ἔξεστιν in 6:12 and 10:23). For a Corinthian to eat in an idol temple may “build up” (in an ironic sense: οἰκοδομέω in 8:10; cf. 8:1; 10:23; 14:4, 17) the brother to follow their example. The end result will be destructive (8:11) rather than constructive, and will also constitute a sin against Christ (8:12, emphasizing the unity between believers and believers that is also a vital theme for the letter). Paul’s argument in 8:7–13 is not simply about relationships between believers. It is noteworthy that he uses temple language (μολύνω) to describe the polluting effect on a person of weak conscience who is led into eating idol food (8:7).¹⁷⁶

Paul’s discussion of his rights (1 Cor 9) actually constitutes a *de facto* prohibition of the Corinthians’ exercise of their rights rather than an affirmation of their freedom.¹⁷⁷ Paul never claims his right to eat idol food just as he never argues that πορνεία (cf. 6:18 with 6:12) would be permissible in different circumstances. The tone and direction of Paul’s discussion from 8:7–13 through to the end of 1 Cor 9 is intended to dissuade the Corinthians from such

¹⁷⁵ Cheung, *Food*, 151–52.

¹⁷⁶ Both uses of μολύνω highlighted by “μολύνω,” BDAG, 657, relate to purity, defilement and holiness in connection with temple worship; cf. Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 640. Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 345, comments that the conscience is defiled because in eating εἰδωλόθυστα, “precisely, “as sacrificed to idols,” that person’s conscience is stained by an idolatrous act.”

¹⁷⁷ *Contra* “Freedom,” 87–128 at 99. Note the study of Peter Richardson, “Temples, Altars and Living From the Gospel,” in *Gospel in Paul: Studies on Corinthians, Galatians and Romans for Richard N. Longenecker* (ed. L. Ann Jervis and Peter Richardson; JSNTSup 108; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 89–110, who suggests that Paul refused support from the community precisely because other patrons were offering the Corinthian community idol food and Paul wants neither himself nor the community as a holy temple to be tainted by eating.

participation.¹⁷⁸ Paul’s examples from scripture in 10:1–13¹⁷⁹ warn the Corinthians that their spiritual ancestors had their own kind of “baptism” and “communion” (cf. 10:14–22; 11:17–34) but their dalliance (10:7) came at a terrible cost (10:11–11). The idols are not gods but to participate in idol worship is to enter into κοινωνία with demons (10:19–22).¹⁸⁰ Therefore Paul urges the believers to flee idolatry (φεύγετε ἀπὸ τῆς εἰδωλολατρίας) in 10:14. The other use of the verb φεύγω is in 6:18 in relation to πορνεία, thus demonstrating the twin dangers of idolatry and immorality highlighted by Paul).¹⁸¹ I would agree with A. T. Cheung that Paul’s very different arguments in 8:1–13 and 10:1–22 are not contradictory nor evidence of partition,¹⁸² but rather evidence of a two stage argument, that presses home the point that Paul prohibits the eating of idol food “with the awareness of their idolatrous origins”, especially in idol temples but even in homes.¹⁸³ All this means that for those who constitute the temple of the Holy Spirit, there cannot be even the hint of contact with idolatry. As Gordon Fee puts it, “fundamental allegiance is at stake”.¹⁸⁴ This perspective would have clashed sharply with the worldview of philosophy

¹⁷⁸ See Cheung, *Food*, 90, 140; Smit, *Offerings*, 64, 88, 90, 92–120; Gooch, *Food*, 84. Paul does use temple language in 9:13 but this is an illustration of literal temple service, drawn from the LXX (cf. Lev 6:16, 26; 7:6; Num 5:9, 10; 18:8–20; Deut 8:1) rather than a temple metaphor, so I shall not consider it in my discussion.

¹⁷⁹ Drawing on passages such as Exod 13:21–22; 14:22–29; 16:4; 17:6; 32:6; Num 11:4, 34; 14:16, 23, 29–30; 20:11 and others.

¹⁸⁰ Bruce W. Winter, “Identifying the Offering, the Cup and the Table of the ‘Demons’ in 1 Cor 10:20–21,” in *Saint Paul and Corinth: International Scientific Conference Proceedings, Corinth, 23–25 September, 2007* (ed. C. Belezos, S. Despotis and C. Karakolis. Athens: Psychogios, 2009), 847–68 identifies the δαιμόνιον in 10:20–21 with imperial gods, in line with his understanding of the meals as Roman banquets in imperial temples (see below). Within the limited confines of this study, I will not be able to interact with his proposal.

¹⁸¹ I shall return to consider the words related to idolatry in 1 Cor 8:1–11:1 a little more closely when I examine 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 in the next chapter.

¹⁸² *Contra* Khiok-Khng Yeo, *Rhetorical Interaction in 1 Corinthians 8 and 10: A Formal Analysis with Preliminary Suggestions for a Chinese, Cross-Cultural Hermeneutic* (BibInt 9; Leiden: Brill, 1995), *passim*.

¹⁸³ Cheung, *Food*, 96, 104–09, 116–17, 297; confirmed by rhetorical analysis throughout Smit, *Offerings*, *passim*. This is in contrast to treatments of the passage that stress the “horizontal” emphasis almost to the exclusion of the “vertical”. One modern example would be Newton, *Diety*, e.g. 115–276, 290, 305–06, 341, 363, 367 who repeatedly speaks as if “community consciousness” was Paul’s only interest; cf. the critique of Smit, *Offerings*, 21–23.

¹⁸⁴ Fee, *1 Corinthians*, 524.

that was happy to accommodate many gods; speaking at times of θεός and at other times of θεοὶ, and at home with temples dedicated to different gods, including to the emperor.¹⁸⁵

Furthermore, the Corinthians' worship is to be distinct and worthy of the Lord, avoiding that which is contrary to nature and imitates Roman cultic practice (11:2–16).¹⁸⁶ Similarly as a Spirit empowered body, they will no longer follow the practice of pagans, who led astray by idols, curse Jesus (or possibly utter a curse in the name of Jesus in 12:3).¹⁸⁷ Incidentally it is notable that Paul refers to them as ἔθνη (12:2) or “nations, Gentiles” in the past tense, even though the majority of the congregation are still Gentiles.¹⁸⁸ In the past they were “were being led, being carried away to mute idols” but by implication they have a new identity that precludes any relation to other gods/idols.

4.4.3 Body language

Next, I shall briefly consider the place of body language in First Corinthians since this has a bearing on the use of σῶμα in 1 Cor 6:19 and the place of the body in philosophy. Firstly, I note in passing that Paul views the breaking of bread as a κοινωνία in the body (σῶμα) of Christ, and this participation makes them one σῶμα (10:16–17). Paul revisits this image in 11:27–29

¹⁸⁵ cf. Bruce Winter who contends that the problem faced by Paul's converts was the pressure to dine in a temple dedicated to the emperor, caused by the establishing of a federal imperial cult in Corinth itself and the re-siting of the Isthmian Games in Corinth. Both of these events probably happened between Paul leaving Corinth and him writing 1 Corinthians according to Winter, *Corinth*, 269–86.

¹⁸⁶ See the evidence set out in Idem, *Corinth*, 121–41.

¹⁸⁷ See Idem, *Corinth*, 164–83, for the latter. Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 918–23 identifies as many as twelve different explanations offered for the use of the phrase Ἀνάθεμα Ἰησοῦς, not counting Winter's position, which is to suggest that we translate “Jesus [Grants] a Curse” (Winter, *Corinth*, 174–76). Winter sees a precedent for this translation in other curse inscriptions that he describes. However, the most natural translation would be to supply εἶμι in either subjunctive (“Jesus be cursed”) or indicative mood (“Jesus is cursed” in parallel with “Jesus is Lord”) as noted by Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 918; Ciampa and Rosner, *Corinthians*, 565 note 15; see the telling critique of Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 456 that Winter's interpretation depends on inscriptions missing some of the words from the original (unlike Paul, who has simply omitted the verb intentionally).

¹⁸⁸ Hays, *Conversion*, 9; Wright, *Faithfulness*, 416 note 225, 541, 1107, 1446 and Ciampa and Rosner, *Corinthians*, 563.

where Paul avers that those who eat the bread and drink the cup in an unworthy manner (ἀναξίως) will be answerable for the body and blood of the Lord. Judgment is pronounced on those who eat and drink μὴ διακρίνων τὸ σῶμα (“without discerning the body”, 11:29).¹⁸⁹ In speaking of the Eucharist in both passages, Paul is willing to use a metaphor drawn from the human body to positively describe the relationship between the Corinthian believers and Christ.

This metaphor is elaborated upon at length in 12:1–31, where the believers are explicitly compared to a body with members (τὰ μέλη in 12:12). Just as the Corinthians are the temple of God (3:16a) by virtue of God’s spirit (3:16b; 6:19), so too they are members of one body because of the one Spirit (12:13), who energizes all the activities of the body (12:4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11). There is one body, just as there is one temple.¹⁹⁰ Paul makes evident the fact that that his metaphor is drawn from the human body by his references to specific members: the foot, the hand (12:15), the ear, the eye (12:16), and by implication, the nose (using ὄσφρησις for “sense of smell” in 12:17d).¹⁹¹ Remarkably, Paul even draws attention to the unpresentable parts (τὰ ἀσχήμονα in 12:23) of the human body and compares them in a positive way to members of the Corinthian

¹⁸⁹ For a helpful excursus on this much debated phrase, see Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 891–94;

¹⁹⁰ Raymond F. Collins, “Constructing a Metaphor. 1 Corinthians 3,9b-17 and Ephesians 2,19-22,” in *Paul et L’Unité des Chrétiens* (ed. Jacques Schlosser; Colloquium Oecumenicum Paulinum 19; Leuven: Peeters, 2010), 193–216 at 207.

¹⁹¹ Recent scholarship has rightly drawn attention to the *topos* of the body in political rhetoric; see the survey in Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 992–94, drawing upon works such as Mitchell, *Rhetoric*, 68–83, 157–64 and Martin, *Body*, 38–68, 87–103, citing Plutarch, Epictetus, Dio Chrysostom and Dionysius of Halicarnassus among others. I am not denying Paul’s use of this common *topos*, nor the political resonances it might have had for his readers. I am merely recognizing that the source of this metaphor was the human body, and although other writers used the analogy of various body parts and internal organs, Paul speaks unashamedly, although obliquely, of its most private members (12:23). For more on the whole relationship between this metaphor in Stoicism and Paul, see Lee, *Stoics, passim*.

church whose status or background might naturally afford them less respect.¹⁹² In fact, God himself gives greater honor in particular to those parts (12:24).

Finally, Paul reserves the longest discussion of a single topic (not counting 8:1–11:1, whose arguments and flow are a little more varied) to his argument for the resurrection in 15:1–58.¹⁹³ It is evidently the climax to the variety of topics dealt with in the letter, followed by a brief rounding up of unfinished business in 1 Cor 16. Paul is responding to another issue, either raised by the Corinthians themselves (15:12) or reported back to Paul (cf. 1 Cor 1:11). Paul is at pains to stress that Christ was raised from the dead and appeared to the apostles as proof of this (15:3–9).¹⁹⁴ This is evidence that there will be a future resurrection of the dead ones (15:12). Christ’s own resurrection is the ἀπαρχή of the harvest (15:20; cf. 16:15: the household of Stephanas were the first of many converts in the province of Achaia) and the rest of the chapter continues this argument for the future resurrection of those who belong to Christ (15:20–23). Paul’s discussion does raise the question of whether the σῶμα πνευματικόν (15:44b) is in some way not physical, since it is contrasted with the σῶμα ψυχικόν (15:44a) and the man who is χοϊκός (earthy, predicated of the ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος ἐκ γῆς (15:47). This is especially pertinent for my discussion, since when Paul discusses different types of body he gives the example of the heavenly bodies (ἐπουράνιος in 15:40), after which he immediately lists the sun and the stars (15:41) among his illustrations. In Hellenistic philosophy, it was believed that some became stars

¹⁹² See Martin, *Body*, 94–96; “ἀσχήμων,” BDAG, 147, which draws attention to the word’s application to sexual matters in LXX Deut 24:1 and cf. Dio Chrysostom, *Conc. Apam.* 29, and its use for genitalia here. “ἀσχήμων,” LSJ, 266, provides definitions such as “misshapen, ugly” or “unseemly, shameful”.

¹⁹³ Within the constraints of my topic I cannot provide adequate discussion of this lengthy chapter. Wolfgang Schrage, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther: 1 Kor 15,1-16,24* (EKKNT 7.4; Zürich: Benziger, 2001), devotes over four hundred pages to the chapter and Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 1169–1313 provides extensive discussion, excurses and multiple bibliographies of significant works.

¹⁹⁴ See Idem, *1 Corinthians*, 1197–1203 who interacts with the discussion of the relationship between belief in Christ’s resurrection and the empty tomb tradition, in 15:3–5.

(viewed as gods) after their death, sometimes spoken of as “bodies”.¹⁹⁵ Dale Martin has in fact revived an older view that a body of πνεῦμα is referring to the kind of ethereal substance of which that body consists, referring to it as, “a stuff of a thinner, higher nature.”¹⁹⁶ Paul’s point at this juncture though is not to identify the precise material of such a body but to make the more general point that God designs appropriate bodies for the environments to which they are suited. In this instance, the point about the σῶμα πνευματικόν is its appropriateness to the resurrection mode of existence; a mode empowered and sustained by the Spirit.¹⁹⁷ Gordon Fee avers, “the transformed body is not composed of ‘spirit’; it is a *body* adapted to the eschatological existence that is under the ultimate domination of the Spirit”¹⁹⁸ or as Anthony Thiselton puts it, “Paul uses the adjective πνευματικός in its regular Pauline sense to denote that which pertains to the Holy Spirit of God”¹⁹⁹ and “the totality of the mode of life of the resurrection body is more than physical but not less”.²⁰⁰ It is evident throughout Paul’s discussion that the body itself is critical

¹⁹⁵ See the evidence presented in Martin, *Body*, 117–20; examples from philosophy would include Seneca, *Marc.* 25.3; *Ep.* 65.17; 102.21, 28.

¹⁹⁶ Martin, *Body*, 128, and generally 124–29. See the discussion of Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 1276 on precedents to this view. In this, Martin has been followed by Troels Engberg-Pedersen, *Cosmology and Self in the Apostle Paul: The Material Spirit* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), *passim*, who also wishes to speak of *pneuma* as material, and of what has been typically understood as metaphorical language in Paul (e.g. the *body* of Christ) as literal. Engberg-Pedersen himself admits that not every specialist agrees with his understanding of Stoicism generally, even citing the words of Tad Brennan’s analysis of his earlier work on Stoicism: “impressive but, I believe, wholly misguided” (Idem, *Cosmology*, 249 note 10). In the same note, Engberg-Pedersen claims that “the doyen of modern Stoic studies”, A. A. Long, is in far closer agreement with my understanding”, citing A. A. Long, *Stoic Studies* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 177–78, but Long’s comments are not as positive as Engberg-Pedersen’s assessment of them might imply. In fact, elsewhere in the same compendium of Long’s writings, he accuses Engberg-Pedersen of paying “insufficient regard to the physical and theological underpinning of Stoic ethics.” (Idem, *Studies*, 155, and see 154–55 generally). Other scholars of Stoicism have been trenchant in their criticism of Engberg-Pedersen’s methodology, assumptions and reliance on Cicero, e.g. Teun Tieleman, review of Troels Engberg-Pedersen, *The Stoic Theory of Oikeiosis: Moral Development and Social Interaction in Early Stoic Philosophy*, *Mnemosyne* 48 (1995): 226–32; cf. also the critique in Wright, *Faithfulness*, 1392–1406.

¹⁹⁷ As Witherington III, *Conflict*, 308 puts it, “the resurrection body will be animated and empowered by the Spirit, just as the present physical body (*the sōma psychikon*) is animated and empowered by a physical life principle or force”.

¹⁹⁸ Fee, *1 Corinthians*, 869.

¹⁹⁹ Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 1275.

²⁰⁰ Idem, *1 Corinthians*, 1277; see more fully the discussion of 1276–1281.

to his argument. The word $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$ is used nine times between 15:35–44, but in any case, references to resurrection, which are repeated throughout the chapter, would have been understood throughout the ancient world as involving a return of a physical body, as has been comprehensively demonstrated by N. T. Wright.²⁰¹ Paul embraces and argues passionately for a bodily understanding of life beyond death at the final resurrection. In Paul’s articulation of the need for the bonded holiness and the purity of believers in 1 Cor 7 (in addition to the passages I explored earlier in 1 Cor 5–6), his challenge to those who would participate in some kind of temple/idol related activities in 1 Cor 8:1–11:1 and his positive emphasis on the physical body in 1 Cor 11, 12 and 15, Paul’s message would have challenged those from a background influenced by philosophy. Instead of the easy acceptance of temples and gods in that worldview, Paul demonstrates the threat to the very existence of Christ-centered life that they pose. Instead of the indifferent or even dismissive attitude to the body held within philosophy, Paul positively celebrates it and uses it as a central metaphor for their present existence (as the *body* of Christ) as well as the hope of their future existence (a *body* patterned on the resurrection body of Christ).²⁰²

4.5 Comparing the Theologies of 1 Corinthians with Hellenistic Philosophy

In the last two chapters I have considered how the philosophers’ understanding of the nature of divinity, the nature of humanity and how they should live out their philosophy in practice. In the following section I aim to offer the briefest of sketches of what Paul has to say on

²⁰¹ Wright, *Resurrection*, especially 32–84 on the contrast with paganism.

²⁰² Albert V. Garcilazo, *The Corinthian Dissenters and the Stoics* (Studies in Biblical Literature 106; New York: Peter Lang, 2007), *passim* argues that the denial of the resurrection of the dead stems from the influence of Roman Stoicism on the Corinthians. In my view, Garcilazo’s case is weakened by his over-reliance on a small number of texts from Seneca.

these topics in First Corinthians so that I can compare them with the philosophical positions identified previously.²⁰³

4.5.1 Paul's Understanding of God in 1 Corinthians

God has called Paul an apostle in line with his will (1:1) and he has called the Corinthians into the closest possible participation (κοινωνία) with Jesus Christ (1:9). Paul's reference to those who call upon the *name* of the *Lord* evokes allusions to OT examples of this phrase (1:2; cf. Ps 99:6; Joel 3:5 LXX). Yet in Paul's case, the κύριος is the Lord *Jesus Christ*, bringing Jesus into the closest possible connection, or even identity, with God. This "name" of Jesus, identifying him with the one called upon in the NT, appears again in 1:10. God is the *father* to the Corinthians (1:3), and again the fact that he is invoked here in tandem with Jesus suggests their essential unity. God is also described specifically as the *father* of Jesus (1:9). Where the OT might have spoken of the day of the Lord, referring to Yahweh (e.g. Joel 2:31; Isa 2:12; 13:6, 9; Amos 5:18; Zeph 1:17–18) and of God's appearing (cf. Mal 3:2), Paul pairs these two events by making Jesus the subject (1:7–8). God gives grace (χάρις in 1:3–4) so that the Corinthians lack no gift (χάρισμα in 1:7; the verb χαρίζομαι in 2:12); enriching all in speech and knowledge (1:5). He is faithful (1:9) and will sustain/establish (βεβαιώω) those who belong to Christ until his

²⁰³ My aim here is the limited one of simply noting what Paul has to say in one letter. For attempts to address Paul's theology of God, his understanding of humanity (and its predicament), and for Pauline ethics, some modern significant works would include especially James D. G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998); Ben Witherington III, *Paul's Narrative Thought World: The Tapestry of Tragedy and Triumph* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994); Thomas R. Schreiner, *Paul, Apostle of God's Glory in Christ: A Pauline Theology* (Downer's Grove, Ill.: IVP Academic, 2006), and, somewhat differently, Wright, *Faithfulness*. For a celebrated and more limited attempt to compare the theology of God, humanity and human relations in Paul with that of one important Stoic philosopher, Seneca (who was his near contemporary), see J. N. Sevenster, *Paul and Seneca* (NovTSup 4; Leiden: Brill, 1961), and for a succinct comparison of the writings and worldview of Paul and Seneca, see J. B. Lightfoot's essay "St Paul and Seneca" in J. B. Lightfoot, *Saint Paul's Epistle to the Philippians* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1913), 270–333.

return (1:8). God's wisdom and power is greater than all (1:21, 25; 2:5, 7; 3:18–20) and he manifested it in Christ (1:24; 2:7–8), by choosing those despised by others (1:26–28; 2:6–8) to know wisdom, righteousness, sanctification and redemption from him through Christ (1:30; 2:9–16) and the message of his cross (1:18, 23; 2:2) so that people might only give credit to God (1:29, 31; 2:5). God reveals himself through his Spirit but only to the spiritual person (2:10–16).

God gives the growth in spiritual work; though he has servants who work with him (3:6–9), all the credit belongs to him (3:7) and Corinthian believers belong to him uniquely, described as God's field, God's building (3:9), God's temple (3:16). The foundation of God's work is Jesus Christ (3:11; reminiscent of earlier references that unite the two) and God is a God of judgment (implied by 3:13–15, 17 and stated in 4:4–5). All things belong to God and again the unique place of Christ is stressed (3:22–23). The Lord is the revealer of hearts who will bring everything into the light when he comes (4:5). Everything comes from God (4:7). God's reign comes with power (4:20) and he will be the judge, especially of those outside the church (5:13). God does not give his kingdom to the unrighteous but he has justified, washed and sanctified the Corinthians (6:9–11). The body belongs to the Lord, who does not intend it for πορνεία; he will raise up the Corinthians bodily by his power (6:13–14; cf. 6:19),²⁰⁴ and he is to be glorified in the body (6:20).

It is God who gives gifts to individuals (χάρισμα in 7:7; cf. 1:7). God calls his people to peace (7:15) and assigns different circumstances to different people (7:17). God has bought his people with a price (7:22; cf. 6:20) and calls his people to be both freed persons in the Lord and slaves of Christ (7:22–23). Anyone who loves God is known by him (8:3). There is only one God and all other seeming-gods are not real (8:4–6). All things exist from God and for him, and

²⁰⁴ I have already noted and argued for the view that the statement “God will destroy” the stomach/body (6:13b) was made by the Corinthians, not Paul.

through the agency of Jesus Christ (8:6), who, yet again is spoken of in intimate connection with God. Food itself and the eating of it is indifferent to God (8:8). Christ died for the “weak” believer as well as for the “strong” (8:11). Christ is intimately connected with his people, such that to sin against one of them is to sin against him (8:12). In fact, in Paul’s retelling of the wilderness wanderings of the Israelites, Christ is viewed as the rock that sustained them (10:4) and the one who must not be put to the test (10:9),²⁰⁵ both characteristics that would ordinarily be used of God. God is both the one who judges (by overthrowing those who engaged in both idolatry and in immorality; *πορνεύω*, in 10:5–8), and the one who is faithful to empower the believer to resist temptation (10:12–13). Everything belongs to God (10:26; 11:12b; cf. 3:22–23; 4:7; 8:6, noted earlier).

The head of man is Christ and the head of Christ is God, underlining Christ’s intimate connection with God again, his supremacy over people and yet again placing God above Christ in the order of things (11:3; cf. 1:30; 3:22–23; 6:14; 8:6). It is possible to be liable for the body and blood of the Lord by taking the bread or cup of the Lord’s supper in an unworthy manner (11:27; cf. 10:21–22). Paul’s dire warning in 11:29–32 reminds again of the judgment of the Lord, though here his purpose to discipline (*παιδεύω*) is stressed (cf. 5:5). In 1 Cor 12:4–6 *πνεῦμα*, *κύριος*, and *θεός* are clearly placed in parallel when speaking of the different workings of the Spirit (12:7), and God is named as the source of these activities (12:6b). Just as the Corinthians are a temple of the Holy Spirit (3:16; 6:19), so too they are a body (of Christ) immersed in the Spirit (12:12–13, 27). God orders the body the way that it is and does not

²⁰⁵ The textual tradition is split between manuscripts that have *Χριστόν* and others that have *κύριον* or *θεόν*. However *Χριστόν* appears to be the reading that best explains the others as it is, “attested by the oldest Greek manuscript (p⁴⁶) as well as by a wide diversity of early patristic and versional witnesses” and plausible reasons can be given for changing *Χριστόν* to one of the other readings (Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 494; cf. also Comfort, *Commentary*, 506–07)

consider one part inferior to the others (12:18, 22, 24). Although 1 Cor 13 does not mention God, if love alone never comes to an end and is the greatest quality that there is (13:8, 13), Paul must be implying that God is a God of love.

In 1 Cor 14, we learn that God can be spoken to (14:2), that God is not a God of disorder (ἀκαταστασία) but of peace (14:33), and that he can cause the secrets of unbelievers' hearts to be exposed so that they confess that, "God is really among you." (14:25, which is obviously seen by Paul as an accurate statement). This is another indicator that the Corinthian believers have become the place where God's presence can be found.²⁰⁶ In 1 Cor 15 Paul spells out a number of important points about God that have already been stated or implied earlier in the epistle. Christ died for their sins (15:3; implied by 1:13b, 17–18, 23, 30; 2:2, 8; 5:7b; 8:11; 10:16; 11:23–25), he was raised (15:4, presumably a "divine passive", meaning "raised *by God*" as in 15:15b, cf. 6:14). Life comes through Christ (15:22), and at his coming all shall be made alive who belong to him (15:23), yet in another instance of his subordination to "God the Father" (15:24), at the end of Christ's reign, he will destroy all other powers and deliver the kingdom to God at the end (15:24–28) so that God "may be all in all" (cf. 3:23; 11:2). To each of his creatures, God gives the body as he has chosen (15:38) and to his people he gives the victory through their Lord Jesus Christ (15:57)

4.5.2 Paul's Understanding of Humanity in 1 Corinthians

Here we must distinguish between Paul's view of humanity in general and his view of the church in particular. As God's temple in Corinth, the Corinthians have many God-given privileges in Christ (regardless of the behavior of some of them, for which they are chastised

²⁰⁶ I. H. Marshall, "Church and Temple in the New Testament," *TynBul* 40 (1989): 203–22 at 213.

frequently in the epistle). They are set apart in Christ (1:2) and called saints (1:2, 24, 26). They are the ones enriched in him in all speech and knowledge (1:5) and they are not lacking any gift as they await the revealing of Christ (1:7), having been called into the fellowship (κοινωνία) of *his* son, who is *their* Lord Jesus Christ (1:9). They are in (ἐν) Christ Jesus, who has become for them their wisdom from God, righteousness, sanctification and redemption (1:30). They have been enabled to understand the things of God because the Spirit interprets those things for them (2:6–16). Jesus Christ is the foundation of their identity (3:11); they are God’s field, building (3:9 and temple (3:16–17). All things belong to them and they belong to Christ (3:21–22). People’s hearts have hidden motivations that God will judge on the final day (4:4–5). The body is meant for the Lord (6:13) and the bodies of the Corinthians are members of Christ (6:15) and will be raised up at the last day (6:14). The Corinthians belong to God and their bodies are a temple of the Holy Spirit (6:19–20). They have been bought (a redemption image) and belong to the Lord as a slave, while also being a “freedman” of his (6:19b–20; 7:22–23). The body of a husband belongs to his wife and vice versa (7:4); they are bound to one another (7:39), unless a believing partner chooses to separate (7:15) but otherwise the unbelieving members of the family are sanctified by the believing spouse (7:14). By contrast, to unite with a prostitute is to become one body with her (6:15–16). All things are created by God (8:4; 10:26) and exist from and for him and through Jesus Christ (8:6). A person’s conscience can be defiled (8:7, 12) and they themselves can be destroyed by idolatrous actions (8:10–11). Christ is the head of every man and the head of woman is man (11:3). Man (as opposed to woman here) is the image and glory of God (11:7). Man and woman are not independent of one another in the Lord (11:11). Overall Paul teaches that men and women have their place in the divine hierarchy and in relationship to one another (11:2–16). A person is nothing without love (1 Cor 13). The obverse of 15:18 (its

implication) is that without Christ, people perish (cf. also 15:19: we are most to be pitied if only hope in Christ for this life).

In one of the richest sections of the letter for our understanding of humanity, we learn that death came through a man; Adam (15:21) and “in Adam”, that is, by virtue of their share in his humanity (the man from the dust of earth: 15:47) and the consequences of his actions, all die (15:21–22a). Yet, death and all powers will finally be destroyed (15:20–24) and those who are in Christ will be raised (15:22, 42–55).

Paul paints a very different picture of humanity outside of Christ. They are the ones perishing (τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις in 1:18), regardless of whether they are considered to be the wise, the discerning, the scribe or the scholar by the age in which they live (1:19–20). The human standards of the world (κατὰ σάρκα in 1:26) are disregarded by God, and its wisdom is coming to nothing (2:6). Instead, God brings to shame the wisdom and strength of the world, revealing its lack of value (1:26–28). Those of the world are unable to understand the things of God because they lack the Spirit (2:6–16). First Corinthians 5:9–10 implies that there are *at least some* (perhaps *many*) immoral people in world and those who are unrighteous will not inherit the kingdom of God (6:9–10). Paul implies that all need to be saved in 1 Cor 9:19–23. Some have no knowledge of God (15:34) and flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God (15:50).

4.5.3 *Living as the Temple in 1 Corinthians*

So much of 1 Corinthians deals with practical instruction so I shall attempt to deal simply with the most pertinent instructions applicable beyond their immediate context, in summary form. The Corinthians are urged to act as a united body (1:10; cf. 1 Cor 12) and, by implication, to live according to the wisdom of God, the Spirit of God and the word of the cross (1:18–2:16).

The image of the Corinthians as God's building in 3:9 imagines each person *still* building upon the foundation of Christ. Each of them is urged to take care when building upon this foundation (3:10–15), to be mindful of what they are (God's building, field, temple), that they may not destroy the temple (3:17) and grow into spiritual maturity (the obverse of 3:1–3). The Corinthians should not make judgments before the coming of the Lord (4:5; 11:32) but imitate Paul (4:16, in the light of Paul's example in 4:1–4, 10–13, 17; cf. 11:1). They should mourn over πορνεία (5:2; cf. the warnings over arrogance and boasting in 1:29; 3:21; 4:8–10, 18–19; 5:2). They are not to associate with the immoral who claim to be one of them (5:4–5), so that they are not polluted by them (5:6–8) but equally they are not to judge those outside the church and be willing to associate with them (5:9–13). They will judge the world (6:2) and so matters for judgment within the church should be settled there, rather than with judges outside the church (6:1–8). They are called to identify as righteous, and (implicitly) not to indulge in the practices enumerated in 6:9–10. They are to flee immorality (6:18) and recognize that their body belongs to God as his temple; thus they should glorify him there (6:13, 19–20).

Husbands and wives should honor one another in marriage (7:3–5) and both married and unmarried should remain in the state to which they have been assigned, if at all possible (7:8–14, 17–40). Ultimately they should keep the commandments of God (7:19). Love for God (8:3) and for the brother in Christ (implied by 8:7–13) ought to be the hallmark of the body. This love should build others up first and foremost (8:1; 10:23). This ought to involve putting the consciences of others first and doing nothing to put harm in anyone's way rather than the Corinthians claiming their 'right/authority' to do something. First Corinthians 9 holds up the example of Paul as an apostle who chose not make use of his rights for the sake of others and their salvation (cf. also 10:32–33). Therefore they should not seek their own good but the good

of others and their consciences (10:23–30). The Corinthians should run to obtain the prize of their calling by living a life of self-discipline characterized by the athlete (9:24–27). They should be careful not to participate in idolatry (10:7–22; cf. implied in 12:3) and immorality (8:7) and in this, do everything to the glory of God (10:31).

While we have already seen warnings against judging others, they are to make judgments for themselves, especially concerning themselves and their behavior (e.g. 11:13, 31–32). First Corinthians 12:1–31 constitutes an implicit call to unity. They should value members of the body equally, and recognize that all comes from God (12:4–6, 18, 24, 28–30). They are to seek the greater gifts (12:31), especially to prophesy (14:1), which is needed by the church (14:6). Overall they must do everything for the building up of the church (14:3–5, 12, 17, 26). Everything should be done out of love (1 Cor 13; 14:1) and so they must be eager to excel in gifts that build up the church (14:12). Therefore, they must be mature, not infants in their thinking (14:20) and come to the assembly ready to share the gifts of God; especially the ones that communicate God’s revelation to the congregation (14:26).²⁰⁷ They should stand firm in the gospel by which they are saved and believe in the resurrection of Christ from the dead and the future resurrection (1 Cor 15). Their hope in Christ must not be just for this life (15:19). They should come to themselves and reject wrong teaching about the resurrection (the implication of 15:34) but always be steadfast in the work of the Lord (15:58). In the final chapter of the letter, Paul exhorts them to

²⁰⁷ I leave aside the injunction of Paul towards women in 14:33b–36, partly because it is highly contested but also because I understand it to be highly specific to a particular situation, though authentically Pauline with e.g. Witherington III, *Conflict*, 287–88; Dunn, *Paul*, 591–92; Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 1146–62; Collins, *1 Corinthians*, 516; Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 666, 673; Keener, *1–2 Corinthians*, 117–20; against e.g. Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 246; Lang, *Korinther*, 199; Hays, *Corinthians*, 246–47; Wolfgang Schrage, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther: 1 Kor 11,17–14,40* (EKKNT 7.3; Zürich: Benziger, 1999), 481–84; Fee, *1 Corinthians*, 780–789; Horrell, *Ethos*, 184–95; Jerome Murphy-O’Connor, *Keys to First Corinthians: Revisiting the Major Issues* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 265–68, 282–84.

keep alert, stand firm in their faith, be courageous and strong (16:13) and to let all that they do be done in love (16:14; cf. 1 Cor 13).

4.6 The contrast between Paul's understanding and the Philosophers' understanding

4.6.1 Divinity

I have already noted some features that the Philosophers would share with Paul. The gods are merciful and forgiving (Seneca and Epictetus), pure and undefiled (Epictetus) and perfect in every way (Alcinous, Hierocles). God orders all things, governs the world with care and is referred to with names such as Father, King and Protector (Dio Chrysostom, Epictetus, Plutarch, Alcinous and Maximus of Tyre). He is friends with people and reveals himself to them (especially those who study philosophy). He is benevolent and gentle. There are notable differences too. Many writers identified God with the universe (such as Chrysippus, Marcus Aurelius and Seneca) or identify the universe as divine or infused with divinity (e.g. Plutarch). Writers like Seneca and Marcus Aurelius make little distinction between God, Nature, Reason, Fate and Providence and use these nouns interchangeably. Nature is sometimes given the role that Paul would attribute to God, such as governing and sustaining the world (in the case of the early Stoics, Marcus Aurelius and Cicero). At the same time, Gods can seem dependent on a pre-existent law (Cicero and Dio), that governs the universe (Cicero). Plutarch speaks of God binding together the substance of the world and Alcinous holds that God endowed the pre-existent world with wisdom or intellect and brought order to the world soul. Marcus says that Intelligence or Universe or Reason is the source of all that is. For Maximus of Tyre, as for other writers, daemons are the bridge between God and people, since the gods dwell in the heavens and not upon the earth, and people are able to become daemons after death.

Paul's doctrine of God is quite unlike the philosophers' at important points. For instance, 1 Cor 8:4–6 stands in contrast to the philosophers' views of many gods. Paul says that all things (πάντα) exist *from* God and *for* him, *through* the agency of Jesus, but he does not say that all things exist *in* him (pantheism). Although philosophical writers will refer to πνεῦμα as what infuses the whole universe,²⁰⁸ in 1 Corinthians it is those who belong exclusively to Christ who are the temple of the Holy Spirit in whom the Spirit dwells in a unique way and to whom the Spirit reveals the things of God.²⁰⁹ The role of Christ in close proximity and equality to God (though subordinated to him in the ultimate eschatological plan) is unequalled in what I found philosophy and there are no obvious analogues in the references I have surveyed.²¹⁰ The Corinthians have a distinct identity in relation to God that is different to others in the world by means of their relationship to Christ, described, among other images, as a building laid on his foundation or as his body. They belong to him in a way that others outside the church do not.

²⁰⁸ See e.g. the sources cited in Lee, *Stoics*, 49–54.

²⁰⁹ Stanley K. Stowers, "Does Pauline Christianity Resemble a Hellenistic Philosophy?," in *Paul Beyond the Judaism-Hellenism Divide* (ed. Troels Engberg-Pedersen; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001), 81–102 at 89–102 identifies seven closely connected areas in which Pauline Christianity resembles a Hellenistic philosophy, including an exclusive adherence to a teacher (such as Epicurus) or a set of doctrines/way of life (like Stoicism), that can almost be classed as a conversion and exclusive adherence to one community. Abraham J. Malherbe, "Conversion to Paul's Gospel," in *The Early Church in Its Context: Essays in Honor of Everett Ferguson* (ed. Abraham J. Malherbe, Frederick W. Norris, and James W. Thompson; NovTSup; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 230–44 also compares some accounts of conversion to philosophy recorded in Lucian of Samosata, Dio Chrysostom and Musonius Rufus with Paul's accounts of the conversion of Gentiles in his writings. However, my focus has been on ideas common to several traditions and I also note that, in practice, many followers of philosophy were eclectic (as Middle Platonism was itself), and not necessarily strictly attached to one philosophy (e.g. Cicero). Malherbe also notes that Paul's account in 1 Thess 1:9–10 stresses turning from idols to serve one God, which required a change in understanding of the divine and service to God, whereas a conversion to philosophy retained a belief in multiple gods and rarely involved a call to moral transformation that was linked to religion (239–40).

²¹⁰ As I have already noted, some philosophers equate Fortune, Providence, Nature etc. with God but this is different from the personal relationship and equality that the person of Jesus Christ enjoys with God. Dr Fredrick J. Long has drawn my attention to Seneca, *Clem.* 1.5.1, that pictures the young ruler as the soul of the Roman state, which is his body. Since Roman emperors came to be seen as divine, it could be said that this is very similar to the divine filling the world (or at least the Roman world). Dr Long has also pointed out to me that the emperor most represents/epitomizes the gods on earth, and so is something like a high priest figure in relation to the Roman empire. Since my focus has been on the various philosophies such as Stoicism and Middle Platonism, I am unable to explore this further here.

4.6.2 Humanity

Seneca describes humanity on the one hand as good but on the other he avers that all have sinned. The soul is pre-existent and grants humans a knowledge of divinity not possessed by the rest of creation (Seneca and Alcinous). Although all have immortal souls, only good (Cicero and Apollonius) or wise (Seneca) men are divine, or at least, like gods (Seneca). All humanity are God's children (Epictetus). Human beings are united to the divine by indwelling reason (Epictetus, Marcus and Maximus) that awakens the self-knowledge of the soul so that it can accurately perceive reality (Maximus) by making correct use of sense impressions (Epictetus and Marcus). Philosophers speak of ruling reason that directs them (found in many writers such as Marcus, Alcinous, Maximus and Cicero). Humans have the ability to make right moral choices (Epictetus, Marcus and Cicero) although they need God's help to overcome vice (Maximus). The soul is variously described as in exile or in prison while in the body but after death it is set free from its cage.²¹¹ Different philosophers speculate as to its ultimate destiny; some say that it is made divine by the Gods after death (Cicero; Apollonius); others that it is set free from the body to become a daemon (Plutarch, Maximus); or to travel to the imperishable realm where God is king (Plutarch; Maximus). Some refer to rewards and punishments meted out to the soul after death (Plutarch; Maximus) and Neopythagoreanism taught the transmigration of souls (Apollonius).²¹²

By contrast with the philosophers, Paul understands there to be two groups of humanity; those who are in Christ and those who are not. Those who are outside do not possess divinity or a

²¹¹ See also the discussion and references cited by David E. Aune, "Human Nature and Ethics in Hellenistic Philosophical Traditions and Paul: Some Issues and Problems," in *Paul in His Hellenistic Context* (ed. Troels Engberg-Pedersen; SNTW; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994), 291–312 at 294–97, 305–09.

²¹² See recently Brookins, *Wisdom*, 185–88, 192–96 who compares the body-soul dualism of the Stoics with Paul's teaching here on the resurrection.

knowledge of the divine that is salvific. The wisdom of the age is to be rejected rather than studied and lived out (as it is in the philosophers). Only those who are part of the temple of the Holy Spirit receive this revelation and knowledge. It is the Spirit, not reason, or the person's daemon, that unites them to God and the foundation of their lives is Jesus Christ, not reason.²¹³ Paul's focus is very much on the sanctified community, not on the individual and rather than seeking release from the body, that is despised, Christian life is embodied at its very heart and this is confirmed by humanity's final destiny: the resurrection of the body.

4.6.3 *Living Out the Philosophy*

The goal of Stoic thinkers is to live in accordance with nature (e.g. Zeno, Seneca, Epictetus; Marcus) while that of the Platonists is to know and imitate God (e.g. Plutarch, Maximus), and thus to please Him (Epictetus), though many Stoics also urge their hearers to imitate the example of the gods (Seneca, Epictetus and Alcinous). This means indifference to what nature is indifferent to, which includes the body (Marcus). So, people are urged to resist bodily inclinations (Marcus), have as little to do with the body as possible (Plutarch) and distance themselves from worldly concerns and sensations that would attach to them from the body (Alcinous, Seneca). A person who does these things will enjoy a speedy journey to the gods

²¹³ In this Troels Engberg-Pedersen, *Paul and the Stoics* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2000), 35 is right to say that a commitment to philosophy for the Stoics meant a change in the individual's perception of their identity, that now revolved around reason. Engberg-Pedersen sees an equivalent in Paul, in that, in the place of reason for the Stoic stands "God and Christ" (35) for the Christian. In this he is partly right, except that the Spirit takes the place of reason in communicating God's presence to his people. Yet I would question whether this also transformed the Stoic's self-awareness from "I" to "we" to the same degree as the Pauline communities, who Paul is teaching to see themselves *corporately* as the temple of God. I would not agree with Engberg-Pedersen's claim that Paul looked to Stoic ethics for his model. I concur with Wright, *Faithfulness*, 1395–97 that Paul was certainly not "converted" from a self-centered individualistic lifestyle to one opened up to others (*contra* Engberg-Pedersen), in that "His whole pre-conversion identity was . . . *corporate*" (1396) and that by comparison the Stoics were nothing like as community orientated as the Pauline churches, a fact that even Engberg-Pedersen himself admits (Idem, *Faithfulness*, 1396–97, citing Engberg-Pedersen, *Stoics*, 78).

(Seneca). The goal of life should be virtue (Zeno and Seneca), which is the only thing of value. Devotion to one's own intelligence/genius leads to a life of virtue (Marcus and Apollonius) but a moral education is needed (Maximus), enabling a person to know right principles (Cicero). This will be attained through training in philosophy (Alcinous), that can fan into flame the spark in human nature (Maximus). It is assumed that all humanity possess this reason.²¹⁴ The true philosopher should be ruled by Reason and God (Epictetus, Marcus and Dio) and devoted to the mind (Epictetus) and thus reject the passions (Plutarch). In order to do this they should honor the one within (Epictetus and Apollonius), keeping pure their inner daemon (Marcus, Apollonius), purifying their judgments and their outer life (Epictetus), that leads to virtue. The contemplation of God/things on high (Seneca and Alcinous) leads to freedom from disturbance (Seneca and Epictetus) and fear, and freedom from the wrong impulses (Marcus), making a person a friend of God (Epictetus and Marcus) so that they can achieve a kind of likeness to the divine (e.g. Alcinous) or contemplation of God (Maximus and Cicero). Those who seek to be loved by Gods are called sons of God and live self-controlled lives (Dio). The Stoic should will everything to be as it should (Epictetus, Seneca and Marcus). The true student of philosophy should not compare themselves with others but run for the goal while at the same time, seeking the common interest, through avoiding evil and dealing rightly with their neighbor (Marcus). Marcus sees each person as a limb of an organized body of rational things.

Paul, like the philosophers, urges a love for the neighbor, a rejection of evil speaking and thinking, self-control and virtue. However, Paul's foundation is not Reason or the guidance of a daemon, but the empowering of the Holy Spirit, with Jesus Christ and the wisdom of his cross as the foundation. Although Marcus does once use the image of a body, the body consists of all

²¹⁴ See further Lee, *Stoics*, 60–83.

rational things, whereas for Paul the body is limited to the Christian community, joined to Christ. Whereas both Stoics and Platonists treat the body with indifference or disdain and seek to distance themselves from it, Paul urges an active confrontation with sexual immorality and devotes much of his letter to matters involving the physical body, especially in sexual relationships (e.g. 1 Cor 5:1–13; 6:9–20; 7:1–40). He devotes his longest chapter to a celebration of the embodied life of the resurrection in stark contrast to the philosophers' anticipation of a bodiless life. While philosophers seek contemplation of the gods, Paul urges to readers to shun idolatry (10:14).

4.7 Conclusions

I have observed a number of contrasts between the philosophers' use of metaphorical temple language, and its implications for their worldview and practice, and the emphases found in First Corinthians. In philosophy, the *pneuma* is typically that which infuses the whole universe and within it, each individual, regardless of their beliefs. Reason is the divine guide that enables the life of virtue to be led and it dwells in each individual, although it needs to be cultivated. Wisdom is to be sought from philosophy wherever it is found. The body is spoken of either disparagingly or with indifference and the goal of each individual is to pay the body as little attention as possible in the present life and to escape it in the next. Within philosophy the existence of many gods is accepted and tolerated.

The main features of Paul's metaphorical temple references in First Corinthians also find corresponding emphasis in the letter as a whole and stand in contrast to my findings from Hellenistic philosophy. The temple is corporate, in contrast to the largely individual referents for metaphorical temple language in the philosophers. It is holy and distinct from the world around

it. The temple is sacred and must not be destroyed or defiled. It is constituted by the Spirit, and the Spirit that dwells within it is the Holy Spirit. The Spirit dwells only in those who are this temple, whose foundation is Jesus Christ. The Spirit empowers the life that glorifies God in the body. The wisdom and spirit of the world are foolishness; the true wisdom is found in Christ and his cross. God is distinct from his body and there are clear roles and distinct relationships between God, Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit. There is only one God; other so-called gods are not real and to worship them is to fall into idolatry and be led astray by (evil) demons. The physical body of all those who constitute the believers at Corinth is a temple. In the letter as a whole I also observed a strong emphasis on the exclusive, bounded nature of the community. Paul frequently stresses the holiness of the body and the importance of keeping it free from defilement, whether that be from immorality or idolatry. Paul uses body language in a number of places, both to describe the nature of the community as it exists now and to contend for the physical nature of believers' existence beyond death.

Chapter Five: Metaphorical Temple Language in 2 Corinthians

5.1 Introduction

To a greater extent than any other Pauline epistle, Second Corinthians has often been treated as a collection of letters rather than a single letter.¹ Although there is no consensus on the topic, perhaps the most commonly recognized division is between 2 Cor 1–9 and 2 Cor 10–13. The largest single grouping of modern commentators recognize the chapters as having been written in that sequence. Some propose that 2 Cor 10–13 was a separate letter, sent by Paul shortly after the letter now recognized as 2 Cor 1–9.² A smaller but growing group of scholars detect a rhetorical and thematic unity to the whole epistle³ (with some positing a small pause between Paul’s writing of 2 Cor 1–9 and 2 Cor 10–13).⁴ Since the majority of scholars treat 2 Cor 2:14–7:4 as a discrete unit,⁵ and because of constraints of space, unlike the previous chapter, I shall largely confine my remarks to the relationship of 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 to its context in 2 Cor

¹ For comprehensive summaries of the scholarly debate and the various advocates of partition theories, see e.g. Margaret E. Thrall, *2 Corinthians 1-7: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians* (ICC; London: T&T Clark, 1994), 3–49; Murray J. Harris, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 8–51.

² E.g. Victor Paul Furnish, *II Corinthians. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 32a; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984), 35–41, following the earlier commentaries of Windisch, Bruce and Barrett.

³ Examples include: James L. Price, “Aspects of Paul’s Theology and Their Bearing on Literary Problems of Second Corinthians,” in *Studies in the History and Text of the New Testament in honor of Kenneth Willis Clark, Ph.D.* (ed. Boyd L. Daniels and M. Jack Suggs; SD 29; Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1967), 95–106; Frances Young and David F. Ford, *Meaning and Truth in 2 Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 27–36; Ben Witherington III, *Conflict and Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 328–39; Paul Barnett, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 17–25; Jan Lambrecht, *Second Corinthians* (SP 8; Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1999), 7–9; David R. Hall, *The Unity of the Corinthian Correspondence* (JSNTSup 251; London: T&T Clark, 2004), 86–112; Fredrick J. Long, *Ancient Rhetoric and Paul’s Apology: The Compositional Unity of 2 Corinthians* (SNTSMS 131; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 1–14; Craig S. Keener, *1–2 Corinthians* (NCBC; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 146–51; Harris, *2 Corinthians*, 8–51; Mark A. Seifrid, *The Second Letter to the Corinthians* (PNTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014), xxix–xxxi; George H. Guthrie, *2 Corinthians* (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015), 23–32.

⁴ E.g. Ralph P. Martin, *2 Corinthians* (WBC 40; 2d ed.; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2014), 68–69.

⁵ E.g. Thrall, *2 Corinthians 1-7*, xiii; Barnett, *2 Corinthians*, 51; Lambrecht, *2 Corinthians*, v; J. D. H. Amador, “Revisiting 2 Corinthians: Rhetoric and the Case for Unity,” *NTS* 46.1 (2000): 92–111 at 110; Harris, *2 Corinthians*, x; Guthrie, *2 Corinthians*, 50, and many specialist studies.

2:14–7:14 rather than treating the whole canonical epistle. Although I incline to the view that Second Corinthians is a single letter, my focus on 2 Cor 2:14–7:4 means that a different hypothesis would have little impact on my conclusions. As with the previous chapter, I shall examine Paul’s use of temple language in the epistle and then compare it to my earlier findings from Hellenistic philosophy. I shall also seek to demonstrate the way that some of the themes present in 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 are emphasized elsewhere in the Corinthian correspondence and consider how they would have spoken to a reader influenced by philosophy. Finally, I shall also briefly address Paul’s theology of God, humanity and Christian living in this section, as it relates to the themes I have discussed.

5.1.1 *The Contested Place of 2 Corinthians 6:14–7:1*

The place of 2 Corinthians 6:14–7:1 in 2 Corinthians has been such a battleground for interpreters that its relation to Paul and the epistle must be addressed before I can continue. Whilst there is no evidence that the text was ever omitted from manuscripts of 2 Corinthians nor placed anywhere other than its current position,⁶ the interpretation of 6:14–7:1 has been dominated by the question of its origins and its placement within the epistle. It is frequently argued that the pericope is an interpolation and therefore Paul is not its author.⁷ The effect of this

⁶ See Harris, *2 Corinthians*, 22–25; and noted earlier by Alfred Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St Paul to the Corinthians* (ICC; 2d ed.; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1914), 205; Philip E. Hughes, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1962), 244.

⁷ In fact, so confident of this was Bultmann, that his commentary contains the sub-heading “[6:14–7:1 is an interpolation]” and the passage is not discussed. Later he classes the passage as “An insertion” and six sentences are devoted to speculation concerning its origins, but nothing on exegesis; see Rudolf Bultmann, *The Second Letter to the Corinthians* (trans. Roy A. Harrisville; Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1985), 175, 180. Important works that have argued for this position from a variety of standpoints include, J. A. Fitzmyer, “Qumran and the Interpolated Paragraph in 2 Cor 6,14 – 7,1,” *CBQ* 23 (1961): 271–80; Joachim Gnilka, “2 Cor 6:14–7:1 in the Light of Qumran Texts and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,” in *Paul and Qumran: Studies in New Testament Exegesis* (ed. Jerome Murphy-O’Connor; London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1968), 48–68; H. D. Betz, “2 Cor 6:16 – 7:1: An Anti-Pauline Fragment?,” *JBL* 92 (1973): 88–108; N. A. Dahl, “A Fragment and Its Context: 2 Corinthians 6:14 – 7:1,” in *Studies in Paul: Theology for the Early Christian Mission* (ed. N. A. Dahl; Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1977), 62–69; P.

discussion has been a tendency to neglect the place and theology of the passage within the Corinthian correspondence. It may say something about the lack of attention that the passage has received “in its own right” that while numerous articles have been devoted to the passage, most of them focus on the controversy over its origins and context. Few full length monographs have been published that deal with the passage’s subject matter in the context of Second Corinthians. It may also say something about the comparative neglect of the passage that the bibliography of William J Webb’s 1993 book length study of 2 Cor 6:14–7:1, *Returning Home*, cites no other monographs prior to his that concentrate on the pericope.⁸ In the intervening years, there has been only one other published monograph (that of J. Ayodeji Adewuya, published in 2003) and none since.⁹

Since the rise of the historical-critical method in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, scholars began to contend for the fragmentary nature of Second Corinthians. In time this led to the proposal that our passage is, at best, dislocated from its original position elsewhere within either First or Second Corinthians, or at worst, a non-Pauline interpolation.¹⁰ The discoveries at Qumran that were made available during the 1950s led scholars such as Joseph Fitzmyer and Joachim Gnilka to note numerous parallels between the pericope and the Qumran

B. Duff, “The Mind of the Redactor: 2 Cor. 6:14 – 7:1 in Its Secondary Context,” *NovT* 35 (1993): 160–80; Paul Brooks Duff, “2 Corinthians 1–7: Sidestepping the Division Hypothesis Dilemma,” *BTB* 24 (1994): 16–26 at 16–21; W. O. Walker Jr, “The Burden of Proof in Identifying Interpolations in the Pauline Letters,” *NTS* 33 (1987): 610–18; Idem, “2 Cor 6.14–7.1 and the Chiasmic Structure of 6.11–13; 7.2–3,” *NTS* 48.1 (2002): 142–144; C. Heil, “Die Sprache Der Absonderung in 2 Kor 6,17 Und Bei Paulus,” in *The Corinthian Correspondence* (ed. R. Bieringer; BETL; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1996), 717–29 and Stephen J. Hultgren, “2 Cor 6.14–7.1 and Rev 21.3–8: Evidence for the Ephesian Redaction of 2 Corinthians,” *NTS* 49.1 (2003): 39–56, as well as Friedrich Lang, *Die Briefe an die Korinther* (NTD 7G; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986), 310–11; Hans-Josef Klauck, *2. Korintherbrief* (NEchtB 8; Echter: Würzburg, 1986); Outi Leppä, “Believers and Unbelievers in 2 Corinthians 6:14–15,” in *Lux Humana, Lux Aeterna: Essays on Biblical and Related Themes in Honour of Lars Aejmelaes* (ed. Antti Mustakallio; Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society, 2005), 374–90.

⁸ William J. Webb, *Returning Home: New Covenant and Second Exodus as the Context for 2 Corinthians 6:14–7:1* (JSNTSup 85; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993).

⁹ J. Ayodeji Adewuya, *Holiness and Community in 2 Cor 6:14-7:1: Paul’s View of Communal Holiness in the Corinthian Correspondence* (Studies in Biblical Literature 40; New York: Peter Lang, 2001).

¹⁰ See the helpful survey of Webb, *Returning*, 18–21.

literature, leading to suggestions of some kind of influence.¹¹ Between the late 1960s to the early 1980s Margaret Thrall, Gordon Fee and Jan Lambrecht each offered a different theory arguing for the passage's integration within 2 Corinthians.¹² Webb claims that the decade prior to the publication of his own research saw a consensual mediating position emerge from the leading commentators of that period, such as Victor Furnish and Ralph Martin. They posit that Paul has taken over a fragment, which has been influenced in some way by Qumran thought.¹³ Webb

¹¹ Idem, *Returning*, 21–22 and see Gnllka, “2 Cor 6,” 48–68 and Fitzmyer, “Paragraph,” 271–80. See also Bertil E. Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament: A Comparative Study in the Temple Symbolism of the Qumran Texts and the New Testament* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965), 49–55; Robert J. Daly, *Christian Sacrifice: The Judaeo-Christian Background Before Origen* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1978), 256–61; Hans-Josef Klauck, “Kultische Symbolsprache Bei Paulus,” in *Freude am Gottesdienst. Aspekte ursprünglicher Liturgie* (ed. J. Schreiner; Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1983), 107–18 at 109 for the same kind of argument. Other specialist studies have questioned the idea of direct dependence, e.g. R. J. McKelvey, *The New Temple: The Church in the New Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969), 96–97; E. Schüssler Fiorenza, “Cultic Language in Qumran and in the New Testament,” *CBQ* 38 (1976): 159–77 at 171–72; Michael Newton, *The Concept of Purity at Qumran and in the Letters of Paul* (SNTSMS 53; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 110–12 and more recently, Sang-Won (Aaron) Son, *Corporate Elements in Pauline Anthropology: A Study of Selected Terms, Idioms, and Concepts in the Light of Paul's Usage and Background* (AnBib; Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2001), 142–44 (following Pierre Benoit, “Qumran and the New Testament,” in *Paul and Qumran: Studies in New Testament Exegesis* (ed. Jerome Murphy-O'Connor; Chicago: Priory Press, 1968), 1–30 at 2); Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, *Keys to Second Corinthians: Revisiting the Major Issues* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 121–39 (who notes that Paul's language is simply at home within the thought-world of Hellenistic Judaism; e.g. parallels found with the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs and Philo are even closer than those of Qumran); Peter J. Tomson, “Christ, Belial, and Women: 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 Compared With Ancient Judaism and With the Pauline Corpus,” in *Second Corinthians in the Perspective of Late Second Temple Judaism* (ed. Reimund Bieringer et al.; CRINT 14; Leiden: Brill, 2014), 79–131; George J. Brooke, “2 Corinthians 6:14–7:1 Again: A Change in Perspective,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Pauline Literature* (ed. Jean-Sébastien Rey; STDJ 102; Leiden: Brill, 2014), 1–16 at 12–16, notes parallels in the thought world and language of Jewish literature in the Graeco-Roman world generally.

¹² Webb, *Returning*, 23–26; Margaret E. Thrall, “The Problem of 2 Cor vi. 14–vii. 1 in Some Recent Discussion,” *NTS* 24 (1977): 132–48; Gordon D. Fee, “II Corinthians VI.14 – VII.1 and Food Offered to Idols,” *NTS* 23 (1977): 140–61; J Lambrecht, “The Fragment 2 Corinthians 6,14–7,1: A Plea for Its Authenticity,” in *Studies On 2 Corinthians* (ed. Reimund Bieringer and Jan Lambrecht; BETL 112; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1994), 531–549.

¹³ Furnish, *II Corinthians*, 375–83; Martin, *2 Corinthians*, 46–47, 356–60, following, though modifying, D Rensberger, “2 Corinthians 6:14 – 7:1 – A Fresh Examination,” *Studia Biblica et Theologica* 8 (1978): 25–49. Georg Klinzing, *Die Umdeutung des Kultus in der Qumrangemeinde und im Neuen Testament* (SUNT 7; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971), 179–82 earlier posited that Paul used a source, perhaps found in a Qumran baptismal exhortation; see, similarly, Klauck, *2. Korintherbrief*, 60–61 and Christian Wolff, *Der zweite Brief des Paulus an die Korinther* (THKNT 8; Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1989), 146–50.

himself sees the passage as Pauline, and explained by, “conceptual threads which tie together the Old Testament traditions”.¹⁴

Recent work by Murray J. Harris and Adewuya has helpfully summarized the various reasons the pericope is often considered un-Pauline (including the claim that 6:14–7:1 disrupts the flow of thought from 6:13 to 7:2 suggested by the verbal links either side of the passage, un-Pauline language, parallels with Qumran literature, an un-Pauline exclusivism, and an abundance of *hapax legomena*) and the proposals made to answer these objections.¹⁵ Margaret Thrall identifies verbal and conceptual links between this pericope and other sections of the letter, notably 2 Cor 4:3–6; 5:11, 18–21.¹⁶ Gordon Fee argues that Paul’s “rhetorical flourishes” elsewhere (including in the Corinthian correspondence) tend to include a high proportion of *hapax legomena* (e.g. 1 Cor 4:7–13),¹⁷ and that on closer examination, most of them come from the OT citation, while other terms are related to verbs found elsewhere in the Pauline corpus or are paralleled by Paul’s preference for similar $\sigma\upsilon\gamma(\mu)$ compounds in his letters.¹⁸

Adewuya summarized the discussion up to 2003 in his “Current State of Research”.¹⁹ In addition to the summaries of Harris and Webb, he notes that the claim by Betz that this is an “Anti-Pauline fragment”,²⁰ has been rebutted in recent studies and has not gained a following.²¹ While there is nothing approaching a consensus, many recent studies and the most significant of

¹⁴ Webb, *Returning*, 28 and see 26–28 generally. Webb also cites G. K. Beale, “The Old Testament Background of Reconciliation in 2 Corinthians 5–7 and Its Bearing on the Literary Problem of 2 Corinthians 6:14–7:1,” *NTS* 35.4 (1989): 550–81, who came to a similar conclusion independently and using different methodology.

¹⁵ For a comprehensive survey, see Harris, *2 Corinthians*, 15–21, and the summary in Adewuya, *Holiness*, 16–17 and more generally, 13–43.

¹⁶ Thrall, “Problem,” 132–48 at 144–45.

¹⁷ Fee, “Food,” 140–61 at 144.

¹⁸ *Idem*, “Food,” 140–61 at 145–47. See the earlier comments of Plummer, *1 Corinthians*, 204 on the abundance of uncommon vocabulary in three other Pauline epistles, although two of them are from the disputed Paulines (Ephesians and Colossians).

¹⁹ Adewuya, *Holiness*, the name of his second chapter, 13–43.

²⁰ Betz, “Fragment,” 88–108.

²¹ See Adewuya, *Holiness*, 17–18 for examples.

recent exegetical commentaries have broadly defended the placement of the pericope in its context in 2 Corinthians by Paul and in most cases, Pauline authorship.²² In particular, the resurgence of rhetorical-critical approaches has provided credible alternatives to interpolation theories to explain the place of 6:14–7:1 within the epistle.²³ The usefulness of these recent studies is that, having made this claim, they are able to consider the reason for Paul's

²² Idem, *Holiness*, 25–29 and similarly Harris, *2 Corinthians*, 15, 21–25, as well as commentaries such as Thrall, *2 Corinthians 1-7*, 25–36; Furnish, *II Corinthians*, 375–83; William L. Lane, “Covenant: The Key to Paul's Conflict with Corinth,” *TynBul* 33 (1982): 3–29 at 22–25; Reimund Bieringer, “2 Korinther 6,14–7,1 Im Kontext Des 2. Korintherbriefes: Forschungsüberblick Und Versuch Eines Eigenen Zugangs,” in *Studies On 2 Corinthians* (ed. Reimund Bieringer and Jan Lambrecht; BETL 112; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1994), 551–70; Barnett, *2 Corinthians*, 15–24; Frank J. Matera, *II Corinthians: A Commentary* (NTL; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2003), 29–32; Seifrid, *2 Corinthians*, 287–89; Martin, *2 Corinthians*, 46–47, 355–60; Guthrie, *2 Corinthians*, 26–27, 346–47. Martin, *2 Corinthians*, 46 rightly states the conundrum for the advocates of interpolation, “It is equally as difficult to understand why the compiler placed the text amidst an apparently irrelevant exhortation as it is to explain why Paul digressed on an ethical homily.” (see, similarly, Webb, *Returning*, 162–63). Now see also e.g. Beale, “Background,” 550–81 at 566–75; James M. Scott, *Adoption as Sons of God: An Exegetical Investigation into the Background of $\nu\acute{\iota}\theta\epsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$ in the the Pauline Corpus* (WUNT 2/ 48; Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1992), 215–20, and more fully Idem, *Adoption*, 73–99 at 88–96; David deSilva, “Recasting the Moment of Decision: 2 Corinthians 6:14–7:1 in Its Literary Context,” *AUSS* 31 (1993): 3–16 (adapted in David Arthur deSilva, *The Credentials of an Apostle: Paul's Gospel in 2 Corinthians 1-7* (N. Richland Hills, Tex.: Bibal, 1998), 14–29); Amador, “Revisiting,” 92–111; Albert L.A. Hogeterp, *Paul and God's Temple: A Historical Interpretation of Cultic Imagery in the Corinthian Correspondence* (BITS 2; Leuven: Peeters, 2006), 365–73; Timothy Wardle, *The Jerusalem Temple and Early Christian Identity* (WUNT 2/ 291; Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 2010), 212; Nijay K. Gupta, *Worship That Makes Sense to Paul: A New Approach to the Theology and Ethics of Paul's Cultic Metaphors* (BZBW 175; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010), 96; David I. Starling, *Not My People: Gentiles as Exiles in Pauline Hermeneutics* (BZBW 184; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011), 61–101; Jeffrey W. Aernie, *Is Paul Also Among the Prophets?: An Examination of the Relationship between Paul and the Old Testament Prophetic Tradition in 2 Corinthians* (LNTS 467; London: T&T Clark, 2012), 221–22; David Starling, “The ἄπιστοι of 2 Cor 6:14: Beyond the Impasse,” *NovT* 55 (2013): 45–60 at 45–50; Yulin Liu, *Temple Purity in 1-2 Corinthians* (WUNT 2/ 343; Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 2013), 196–98; Paul Han, *Swimming in the Sea of Scripture: Paul's Use of the Old Testament in 2 Corinthians 4:7-13:13* (LNTS 519; London: T&T Clark, 2014), 107–110; and Emmanuel Nathan, “Fragmented Theology in 2 Corinthians: The Unsolved Puzzle of 6:14–7:1,” in *Theologizing in the Corinthian Conflict: Studies in the Exegesis and Theology of 2 Corinthians* (ed. Reimund Bieringer et al.; BITS 16; Leuven: Peeters, 2013), 211–228 who exhaustively tabulates all known scholars on this issue up to 1994 on 214–15, and provides a synopsis of each scholarly source from 1994 to 2006 (216–22). In *Second Corinthians in the Perspective of Late Second Temple Judaism* (CRINT 14; ed. Reimund Bieringer et al.; Leiden: Brill, 2014), many, though not all of the articles, find the concept of one integrated letter the best working hypothesis for their respective studies. The earlier commentaries of Philip E. Hughes, C. K. Barrett and F. F. Bruce also argued for Pauline authorship and against the interpolation hypothesis.

²³ A number of scholars speak of the paragraph as a digression (*egressio*), such as Thrall, “Problem,” 132–48 at 144; Frederick W. Danker, *II Corinthians* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1989), 18; Witherington III, *Conflict*, 402–06; Amador, “Revisiting,” 92–111 at 100–05; Murphy-O'Connor, *Keys Second Corinthians*, 116–20; others prefer to speak of a climactic argument in relation to a section beginning at 2:1 (e.g. Long, *Ancient Rhetoric*, 169–72). Rhetorical approaches are also highlighted in favor of the unity of the epistle by Young and Ford, *Meaning*, 36–44; Barnett, *2 Corinthians*, 17–19; deSilva, *Credentials*, 8–14, 36–43, following on from David deSilva, “Meeting the Exigency of a Complex Rhetorical Situation: Paul's Strategy in 2 Corinthians 1 through 7,” *AUSS* 34.1 (1996): 5–22 (on the rhetorical unity of 2 Cor 1–7); James W. Thompson, “Paul's Argument From *Pathos* in 2 Corinthians,” in *Paul and Pathos* (ed. Thomas H. Olbricht and Jerry L. Sumney; SBLSymS 16; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001), 127–45.

exhortations and promises in their literary context. In an important article, Gordon Fee noted the points of contact between the present passage and 1 Cor 8:1–11:1 and proposed that here Paul is reinforcing his prohibition against participation in temple gatherings and idolatry in general.²⁴ David DeSilva’s exploration of the literary context of 2 Corinthians led him to a different conclusion, arguing that Paul is warning the Corinthians to disassociate from the false preachers/apostles of 2 Cor 2:17 and 5:12 (noting a parallel with Gal 1:6–9 and previous disassociation language in 1 Cor 5:1–13, meaning that 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 need not be a “non-Pauline” oddity).²⁵ Adewuya’s own thesis is that Paul’s argument seeks to emphasize communal holiness in the light of the Levitical “holiness code”, reflecting God’s own holiness, the relationship between God and his people (of which his relationship with Israel was supposed to be the paradigm) and the call to be distinct and separate, found elsewhere in the Corinthian correspondence (e.g. 1 Cor 3:16; 5:1–13; 6:1–20).²⁶

5.2 2 Corinthians 6:14–7:1

5.2.1 2 Corinthians 6:14–7:1: Main Features

For the purposes of my topic I note the following features of 6:14–7:1 that might have struck an audience influenced by philosophy. The passage begins emphatically with a prohibition. A present tense imperative (γίνεσθε) carrying general application, but applicable specifically to the problem of idolatry (cf. 1 Cor 8:1–11:1), is combined with a participle in a

²⁴ Fee, “Food,” 140–61 at 143–44, 148–61; Witherington III, *Conflict*, 402–06, agrees with Fee, speaking of the “entangling alliances”, including with unbelievers in pagan temples and sees 6:16 as a reference to “spiritual profligacy in the form of attendance at idol feasts in pagan temples” (406). Barnett, *2 Corinthians*, 347 identifies unbelievers as unconverted Gentiles “in their characteristic cultic life that involved both idolatry and temple prostitution.” Hogeterp, *Temple*, 376–77 also comments, “we should rather understand 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 as serving a more comprehensive purpose of condemning all aspects in relationships with unbelievers which could cause an unbalanced situation by tending to the pagan, idolatrous side.”

²⁵ deSilva, “Recasting,” 3–16.

²⁶ See the “Summary and Conclusions” in Adewuya, *Holiness*, 193–200.

periphrastic construction.²⁷ According to Fredrick J. Long, the use of γίνομαι rather than εἶμι makes the construction more marked and therefore more prominent.²⁸ The use of the periphrastic participle (from ἕτεροζυγέω) draws attention to the verbal action.²⁹ The command warns against being unevenly yoked or mismatched³⁰ with ἀπίστοι. The question of how this is to be understood is answered, to a certain extent, by the conjunction γάρ, which provides the explanatory grounds for what precedes,³¹ with the questions that follow substantiating the implied grounds of the command (i.e. that being yoked, rightly understood, with the ἀπίστοι, is impossible for Paul's audience). The theme is developed in terms of a strong dualism; such that a partnership between the two groups is ruled out.³² Paul piles up terms for partnership in this section, using *hapax legomena* such as μετοχή (14a), συμφώνησις (15a) and συγκατάθεσις (16a) as well as κοινωνία (14c) and μερίς³³ (15b). People are divided into two groups: unbelievers (presuming an implied group of believers),³⁴ lawless(ness) and righteousness, darkness and light, Christ and Βελιάρ. Paul then returns to the opening theme with πιστός and ἄπιστος used

²⁷ Fredrick J. Long, *2 Corinthians: A Handbook on the Greek Text* (BHGNT; Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2015), 121.

²⁸ Idem, *2 Corinthians*, 121.

²⁹ Idem, *2 Corinthians*, 21, introducing this feature in relation to 2 Cor 1:9 and citing for support, Stanley E. Porter, *Idioms of the Greek New Testament* (2d ed.; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994) 46.

³⁰ “ἕτεροζυγέω,” BDAG, 399.

³¹ Stephen Levinsohn explains that this feature, “constrains the reader to interpret the material it introduces as strengthening an assertion or assumption that has been presented in or implied by the immediate context” (Stephen H. Levinsohn, *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek: A Coursebook on the Information Structure of New Testament Greek* (2d ed., Dallas: SIL International, 2000) 69, cited in relation to 2 Cor 1:8 by Long, *2 Corinthians*, 18.

³² This is not as un-Pauline as is sometimes claimed, as C. K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians* (BNTC; New York: Harper & Row, 1973), 197 exposes the claim by comparing this pericope to Rom 6:19, which contains the same contrast between ἀνομία and δικαιοσύνη as found in 2 Cor 6:14. Thrall, *2 Corinthians 1-7*, 474 notes the contrast between believers as υἱοὶ φωτός and σκότος in 1 Thess 5:5, to which we could also add passages such as Rom 13:12 and Eph 5:8, if Pauline; similarly see e.g. J. Ayodeji Adewuya, “The People of God in a Pluralistic Society: Holiness in 2 Corinthians,” in *Holiness and Ecclesiology in the New Testament* (ed. Kent E. Brower and Andy Johnson; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 201–18 at 210.

³³ Although μερίς might appear to be an exception, the sense here is what one party shares with another, (see “μερίς,” BDAG, 632.2).

³⁴ I shall return below to the question of the referent of ἄπιστος in 2 Cor 6:14–15.

substantively to speak of a believer and an unbeliever (15b), before concluding with the contrast between *ναός* and *εἴδωλα* (16a).

It is notable that unbelievers and believers (assuming that the group being addressed in 6:14 are taken to be believers) appear twice; at the start of the series of rhetorical questions and before the concluding question. This suggests that Paul's contrasts between images like light and darkness, or concepts like righteousness and lawlessness come down to a contrast between those who believe and those who do not believe. But who or what is the object of their faith? As Long points out, it is probably not accidental that *Χριστός* and *Βελιάρ* are placed at the center of the five rhetorical questions beginning with *τίς*.³⁵ This observation would suggest that Christ is the one in whom the first group believe, distinguishing them from those who do not believe in him. *Βελιάρ* is clearly conceived as a being in direct opposition to Christ, just as *Βελιάρ*, or the variant *Βελιάλ*, appears as an adversary opposed to God in second temple Jewish literature, especially in the Dead Sea Scrolls.³⁶ This would suggest that those characterized as aligned with *Βελιάρ* are

³⁵ Long, *2 Corinthians*, 126.

³⁶ See the summaries in “*Βελιάρ*,” BDAG, 173; W. Foerster, “*Βελιάρ*,” *TDNT* 1:607; and commentaries including Hans Windisch, *Der Zweite Korintherbrief* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1924), 215; Furnish, *II Corinthians*, 362, 373; Lang, *Korinther*, 309; Wolff, *Korinther*, 150; Thrall, *2 Corinthians 1-7*, 474; Barnett, *2 Corinthians*, 347–48; Erich Grässer, *Der Zweite Brief an Die Korinther Kapitel 1, 1–7, 16* (Ökumenischer Taschenbuchkommentar zum Neuen Testament 8/1; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2002), 260; Harris, *2 Corinthians*, 503. More recently Fredrick J. Long, “Roman Imperial Rule Under the Authority of Jupiter-Zeus: Political-Religious Contexts and the Interpretation of ‘the Ruler of the Authority of the Air’ in Ephesians 2:2,” in *The Language of the New Testament: Context, History, and Development* (ed. Stanley E. Porter and Andrew W. Pitts; LBS 6; Leiden: Brill, 2013), 113–54; Idem, *2 Corinthians*, 122; Idem, “‘The God of This Age’ (2 Cor 4:4) and Paul’s Empire-Resisting Gospel,” in *The First Urban Churches 2: Roman Corinth* (ed. James R. Harrison and L. L. Welborn; WGRWS; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, forthcoming), followed and expanded by Paavo Tucker, “Reconsidering *Βελιάρ*: 2 Corinthians 6:15 in Its Anti-Imperial Jewish Apocalyptic Context,” *JSPL* 4.2 (2014): 169–85 understand Paul’s language for demonic beings here as “Jewish apocalyptic demonization of the Roman Empire and ruler cult” and Tucker has argued that *Βελιάρ* in 2 Cor 6:15 is “a reference to Nero as the representative of the power of Satan in opposition to Christ.” (Idem, “Reconsidering,” 169–85 at 171), noting also how Paul can speak of human representatives of Satan in 2 Cor 1:14–15; 12:7 (Idem, “Reconsidering,” 185 note 66). I would observe the close connection between 2 Cor 6:14–15 and *T. Levi* 19:1, that offers a choice between *σκοτός* and *φώς*, *ἢ ἔργα Βελιάρ* or *ἢ νόμον κυρίου* (cf. the reference to *ἀνομία* as the opposite of *δικαιοσύνη* in 2 Cor 6:14; cf. *T. Naph.* 2:6, that depicts the same contrast). *T. Zeb.* 9:8 provides a tantalizing glimpse of the redemption of humanity from the spirit of Beliar and the consequent appearance of God in human form in the temple. This would provide a neat backdrop for Paul’s words in 2 Cor 6:15–16 but the OTP translation signifies that *ἐν σχήματι ἀνθρώπου*, is a

more than simply “faithless”. The term ἄπιστος appears frequently with a substantive sense in the Corinthian correspondence (cf. 1 Cor 6:6; 7:12, 13, 14, 15; 10:27; 14:22, 23, 24; 2 Cor 4:4; 6:14, 15) and clearly carries the meaning “unbeliever” or “unbelieving” in each of these instances. In its only other use in this letter, the ἄπιστοι are the ones whose eyes ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου has blinded so that they cannot see the gospel of the glory of Christ (2 Cor 4:4); in other words they are precisely those who do not believe in Christ; they are non-Christians or “pagans”.³⁷ Therefore, the first thing that might strike our audience is that the ναός signifies those who believe in Christ. Those who do not believe are not the temple. Secondly, the ναός is at the heart of the passage and appears twice (16a and 16b). This ναός is specifically contrasted with εἰδωλα. Idolatry is therefore central to this passage (see further below).³⁸

Therefore, to add to what has been said concerning the metaphorical temple language in 1 Cor 3:16 and 6:19, this temple is contrasted with idolatry; and here the idols are *plural* but the temple is *singular*. Unlike 1 Cor 3:16 and 6:19 that use the *second person plural*, Paul’s address in 2 Cor 6:16 adopts the *first person plural*, according to the UBS⁵/NA²⁸ text. Both of these claims need to be addressed in light of two significant variants that appear in the manuscripts of 2 Cor 6:16. There is a variant that substitutes ναοί for ναός in only a handful of witnesses. As well as the weak external evidence, this variant does not agree with Paul’s singular use in First Corinthians,³⁹ and is probably a correction to bring the noun into line with the plural pronoun

restoration of the text and “[ἐν ναῶ]” is not translated, as it may not be original. The possibility of Christian interpolation in *T. Zeb.* 9:8 also remains.

³⁷ See the thorough survey of Webb, *Returning*, 184–99, who comes to the same conclusion.

³⁸ As recognized by, among others, Fee, “Food,” 140–61; Webb, *Returning*, 193–94, 202–04, 209–11, 213–15; Thrall, *2 Corinthians 1-7*, 475–76; Barnett, *2 Corinthians*, 341, 347–48, 351, 356; Matera, *II Corinthians*, 162; Harris, *2 Corinthians*, 500–501, 504–05, 508.

³⁹ It is rejected by Bruce Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (2d ed.; Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1994), 512; Philip W. Comfort, *New Testament Text and Translation Commentary: Commentary on the Variant Readings of the Ancient New Testament Manuscripts and How they Relate to the Major English Translations* (Carol Stream, Ill.: Tyndale House, 2008), 543, as well as the commentators.

and verb.⁴⁰ A more important issue is whether to read ἡμεῖς (NA/UBS) or ὑμεῖς. The variant has reasonable external support from p46² ⳨C D² F G and Tertullian. The text reading is supported by B D* L and more miniscules than the variant. Although the evidence is fairly evenly split if we only count the *quantity* of manuscripts, ἡμεῖς has stronger support from a wide range of both Alexandrian and Western witnesses,⁴¹ and, on balance, it is more likely that a later scribe made the change to conform the reading to 1 Cor 3:16, as well as guided by the context of verses 14 and 17 (if the alteration was intentional).⁴² Assuming the correctness of this text critical decision, Paul’s language is inclusive; he includes himself and others in the “we” rather than referring to *them* only, as he does in the other metaphorical temple references. This same inclusiveness is also emphasized in the quotation “καὶ ὑμεῖς ἔσεσθέ μοι εἰς υἱοὺς καὶ θυγατέρας” (6:18) by the addition of θυγατέραι to the text alluded to in 2 Sam 7:14.⁴³ Unlike 1 Cor 3:16 and 6:19, there is no reference to the Holy Spirit; rather God is described as ὁ θεός ζῶν (6:16). Paul elsewhere in First Corinthians cites or alludes to the LXX freely, suggesting that, despite his audience being majority Gentile, he assumes that they would recognize these allusions.⁴⁴ The phrase “living God” frequently appears in polemical contexts in the LXX, emphasizing the contrast with dead idols and the gods of the other nations,⁴⁵ and in this passage it appears in contrast to εἰδῶλα (16a). In addition, the reference to them as the temple of the God who is *living* is a reminder of

⁴⁰ Guthrie, *2 Corinthians*, 36; Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 512.

⁴¹ Idem, *Textual Commentary*, 512.

⁴² Idem, *Textual Commentary*, 512; although Comfort, *Commentary*, 543 is more ambivalent, averring that a scribe could have changed the reading to the first person plural under the influence of 2 Cor 5:1–7. The UBS⁴ upgraded its confidence rating from a C to B (Long, *2 Corinthians*, 122).

⁴³ The reference to θυγατέραι is probably taken from Isa 43:6, e.g. Beale, “Background,” 550–81 at 572; Harris, *2 Corinthians*, 510; Thrall, *2 Corinthians 1-7*, 479.

⁴⁴ Latterly, there has been fresh interest in allusions to the LXX in Second Corinthians too. See e.g. Aernie, *Prophets* and Han, *Swimming*, especially 80–110.

⁴⁵ E.g. Josh 3:10; 1 Sam 17:36; 2 Kgs 19:4, 16; Isa 37:4, 17; Dan 4:22; 5:23; *Jos. Asen.* 8:2, 5; 11:10; 19:8. For development of this theme, see Mark J. Goodwin, *Paul: Apostle of the Living God* (Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 2001), 42–108.

his living presence within them, which in light of the two previous temple references, could indicate that the Spirit dwells within. Three crucial references to “God says/said” underscore the divine authority of this teaching (6:16b, 17a, 18b) and the third, climactic reference, is emphasized by the use of παντοκράτωρ (“Almighty”), again stressing his pre-eminence and superiority over other Gods, as well as recalling the frequent use of this term for God in the LXX as the all-powerful Lord.

The theme of God’s presence among the Corinthians is also emphasized by the use of verbs for God dwelling (ἐνοικέω) and walking among them (ἐμπεριπατέω), conflating Lev 26:12; Ezek 37:27 (16b). In addition to the inclusive first person plural used in 6:16b, Paul also uses these OT texts to highlight the inclusive relationship that the Corinthians have with their God, καὶ ἔσομαι αὐτῶν θεὸς καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔσονται μοι λαός (6:16c) and then in 6:18 by applying the words of 2 Sam 7:8, 14, combined with the emphasis on θυγατέρας found in texts like Isa 43:6, καὶ ἔσομαι ὑμῖν εἰς πατέρα καὶ ὑμεῖς ἔσεσθέ μοι εἰς υἱοὺς καὶ θυγατέρας (6:18), as well as affirming the welcome they will receive (citing Ezek 20:34), κἀγὼ εἰσδέξομαι ὑμᾶς (6:17d). They are treated as sons and daughters of the same father (addressed also as ἀγαπητοί in 7:1), and it is striking that these mainly Gentile former-pagans are addressed using the words reserved in the OT for the people of Israel.

These Gentile Christians are now God’s people, so it is ironic and notable that Paul cites words from the OT (Isa 52:11) that once would have been used to urge separation from the nations surrounding Israel (using ἀφορίζω as well as the command to come out, ἐξέλθατε) and applies them to these Corinthians who *are* from the other nations (17), continuing the separation theme of 6:14–16a. These words also take up the language of impurity with the command to

touch no unclean thing (καὶ ἀκαθάρτου μὴ ἄπτεσθε).⁴⁶ The passage concludes with an exhortation. This hortatory subjunctive is in the first person plural, like the temple reference of 16b, emphasizing the inclusive calling laid upon both Paul and the Corinthians. As 6:17c used impurity language, so 7:1 appropriates both purity and impurity language with its call *negatively* to cleanse themselves from every defilement of flesh and spirit (καθαρίσωμεν ἑαυτοὺς ἀπὸ παντὸς μολυσμοῦ σαρκὸς καὶ πνεύματος) and *positively* to perfect holiness (ἐπιτελοῦντες ἁγιωσύνην), which, like the implicit call to persuade others in 5:11, has as its motivation the fear of the Lord (ἐν φόβῳ θεοῦ). Although the noun used for the concept of defilement, μολυσμός is a *hapax legomenon*, the cognate verb μολύνω appears in the context of Paul’s discussion of the dangers of idolatry in 1 Cor 8:7. The repetition of this defilement terminology used in First Corinthians has the effect of confirming the implicit context of idolatry that lies behind 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 (see below), even if the application of Paul’s teaching is not limited by this context. Finally, Paul reassures his readers that the promises of 6:16–18 are certain (7:1), as he previously assured them that all God’s promises are confirmed in Christ (1:20).⁴⁷

5.2.2 Comparing 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 with Hellenistic Philosophy

5.2.2.1 Philosophy

If I consider some of these themes as they appear in Hellenistic philosophy,⁴⁸ the first comment to make is that, as we saw in the previous chapter, sometimes the emphasis is that the

⁴⁶ Which, in its original context, contrasts with τὰ σκεύη κυρίου (Isa 52:11 LXX) so the opposition between priestly purity and idolatry is readily apparent, see Harris, *2 Corinthians*, 508; Guthrie, *2 Corinthians*, 356.

⁴⁷ For a more detailed exploration of the passage with a focus on holiness, see Adewuya, *Holiness*, 89–128.

⁴⁸ Two more recent published dissertations have engaged Hellenistic philosophy in relation to Second Corinthians. Ivar Vegge, *2 Corinthians – a Letter about Reconciliation: A Psychagogical, Epistolographical and Rhetorical Analysis* (WUNT 2/ 239; Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 2008), examines the use of Praise and Idealization for rhetorical purposes in the moral philosophers (especially at 54–70) and V. Henry T. Nguyen, *Christian Identity*

divine presence dwells in the whole world and thus in every individual. However, in other texts certain individuals are said to be those in whom God dwells in a way that, it is assumed, he does not in others, or at least not to the same extent. Since God fills all things in the universe,⁴⁹ which itself is the temple of the gods,⁵⁰ it logically follows that the divine dwells inside each individual.⁵¹ Indeed, the essence of the human mind is divine,⁵² so people are divine.⁵³ Elsewhere, there is a different emphasis, even within the same writers: the divine dwells especially in a wise⁵⁴ or good⁵⁵ person. Secondly, the philosophers, rather than speaking of “idols”, assume the reality and validity of multiple gods, even if they do not necessarily argue for it. The gods are spoken of in the same language that the philosophers use for the God who pervades the universe, that is, similar qualities are attributed to them. For instance, the gods govern all things,⁵⁶ are merciful, forgiving and just,⁵⁷ send providential blessings upon all people,⁵⁸ and lend their aid to humanity,⁵⁹ although they look upon the upright with special

in Corinth: A Comparative Study of 2 Corinthians, Epictetus and Valerius Maximus (WUNT 2/ 243; Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 2008), addresses issues of social identity and social conflict in relation to Second Corinthians, through the exploration of the idea of *persona* found in Epictetus and Valerius Maximus.

⁴⁹ E.g. Marcus Aurelius, *Med.* 7.9; Alcinoüs, *Handbook*, 165.10.3.1–2 (18); Cicero, *Leg.* 2.11.26; Philo, *Leg.* 3.4; *Fug.* 75; *Post.* 6, 14, 30; *Conf.* 137–38; Seneca, *Ben.* 4.7.1; Plutarch, *Quaest. plat.* 2, 1002C; *Quaest. plat.* 8.

⁵⁰ Cicero, *Leg.* 2.10.26; *Resp.* 6.15.15; Seneca, *Ben.* 7.7.3; *Ep.* 90.29; Plutarch, *Tranq. an.* 477C.

⁵¹ E.g. Cicero, *Leg.* 1.22.59; Seneca, *Ep.* 92.30; 110.2 (describing the views of the Stoics); Marcus Aurelius, *Med.* 5.10.2; and see this theme repeated throughout Epictetus, e.g. *Diatr.* 1.14.14; 2.8.11–17; even evildoers, see Marcus Aurelius, *Med.* 2.1.

⁵² Seneca, *Helv.* 6.8; Cicero, *Div.* 1.32.70; 1.49.110.

⁵³ Plutarch, *Gen. Socr.* 593A; Cicero, *Leg.* 1.7.24.

⁵⁴ DL 7.1.119; Seneca, *Ep.* 92.3; Philo, *Somn.* 2.248.

⁵⁵ Seneca, *Ep.* 31.2; 41.2; 73.16; 120.14; Plutarch, *Virt. prof.* 86A; Cicero, *Leg.* 2.11.27; Philo, *Cher.* 98, 100.

⁵⁶ Cicero, *Nat. d.* 2.29.73–2.30.77; Plutarch, *Adv. Col.* 1124F.; for God governing the universe, see e.g. Epictetus, *Diatr.* 2.14.25–26; 2.16.33; Dio Chrysostom, *1 Regn.* 42, 56; *3 Regn.* 50; Marcus Aurelius, *Med.* 10.1. Plutarch, *Quaest. plat.* 2, 1002C; *Is. Os.* 381–82B; *Exil.* 601B; *Adv. Col.* 1124F; Maximus of Tyre, *Or.* 13.7.

⁵⁷ Seneca, *Clem.* 1.7.1–2; *Ira.* 2.27.1; Plutarch, *Def. orac.* 413F; for the same language used for God, see e.g. Dio Chrysostom, *1 Regn.* 16, 39; *Dei cogn.* 22, 74, 75; *Borysth.* 32. Plutarch, *Is. Os.* 381B; *Def. orac.* 423D; *Superst.* 167F.

⁵⁸ Cicero, *Nat. d.* 2.65.164–2.66.166; *Leg.* 2.7.15–16; Seneca, *Ben.* 4.25.1; 4.26.1–3; 4.28.1, 3; Marcus Aurelius, *Med.* 2.3; 9.27. The same language is used of a supreme deity in Epictetus, *Diatr.* 2.14.11; 3.13.7; 3.26.28; Dio Chrysostom, *2 Regn.* 26; *Hom.* 12.

⁵⁹ Maximus of Tyre, *Or.* 2.1.

favor.⁶⁰ The gods reveal themselves to people.⁶¹ They are pure and holy.⁶² I have already dealt with the theme of God’s presence in the individual soul at some length in Chapter Two, but I note that Philo uses one of the verbs found in 2 Cor 6:16 (ἐνοικέω) to speak of Wisdom as the tabernacle in which the wise man dwells.⁶³ In some places God is described as the father of all of humanity (as well as gods)⁶⁴ and so there is a special kinship between God and people.⁶⁵ As I noted in Chapter Three, Philo also refers to Lev 26:12, the same passage that Paul appears to cite in 2 Cor 6:16. Philo makes the connection between God “walking” and purity, writing, “Now the God and governor of the universe does by himself and alone walk about invisibly and noiselessly in the minds (διάνοιαι) of those who are purified in the highest degree.”⁶⁶ This act of walking fulfills Lev 26:12, which is described by Philo as a prophecy or oracle (θεοπρόπιον). In others, who are yet to fully cleanse themselves, angels or divine words walk. In these souls it is specified that their heavy bodies defile and stain them (κεκηλιδωμένην ἐν σώμασι βαρέσι),⁶⁷ and so “troups of evil tenants” must be driven out, in order for them to become a holy temple of God.⁶⁸ A soul that is “perfectly purified” can be a house in which God can dwell.⁶⁹ Philo also pictures the tabernacle itself as the symbolical representation of divine virtue and wisdom sent from heaven in order that people can be purified and washed from everything that defiles their

⁶⁰ Seneca, *Prov.* 1.5.

⁶¹ Philostratus, *Vit. Apoll.* 1.1.1–3, 7; 2.5.3.

⁶² Epictetus, *Diatr.* 4.11.3.

⁶³ Philo, *Leg.* 3.46.

⁶⁴ Cleanthes, *Hymn to Zeus* (*SVF* 1.537), 1; Epictetus, *Diatr.* 1.3.1; 1.9.7.

⁶⁵ Epictetus, *Diatr.* 1.9.1–7, 22–26; Cicero, *Leg.* 1.7.24; Philostratus, *Vit. Apoll.* 8.7.20.

⁶⁶ Philo, *Somn.* 1.148 (Younge’s translation). Lev 26:12 is also cited by Philo, *Somn.* 2.248 speaking of God dwelling in the soul of a wise man.

⁶⁷ *Somn.* 1.148.

⁶⁸ *Somn.* 1.149.

⁶⁹ *Sobr.* 62; see also Epictetus, *Diatr.* 2.18.19; 4.11.3, 5; cf. Philostratus, *Vit. Apoll.* 2.5.3; 3.42.1–2. From a Jewish perspective, Philo recognizes the need for purity of soul in passages such as *Plant.* 162; *QE* 1.13; *Spec.* 1.257–61; *Mos.* 2.108; *Her.* 184; *QE* 2.98; *Sobr.* 62; and cf. the warning of *Deus.* 9.

life.⁷⁰ Elsewhere in philosophy, true worship of the gods should include purity of speech and thought,⁷¹ judgments,⁷² mind⁷³ and action,⁷⁴ and impurity in others is taken to indicate their lack of piety.⁷⁵ The philosopher has a duty to keep their inner daemon pure.⁷⁶ Philo views wisdom, virtue,⁷⁷ instruction⁷⁸ and a spirit of thanksgiving⁷⁹ as the agents that can cleanse the mind. The unblemished soul is compared to a priest in Philo.⁸⁰

5.2.2.2 Paul

When I compare these findings with 2 Cor 6:14–7:1, there are a number of points to consider. Firstly, again I note that the temple is corporate: God dwells in his people rather than only in the souls of individuals (as documented at greater length in previous chapters). Instead of many gods and many temples, there is one God and one temple. Whereas the philosophers speak of the gods using the same language as they do for “God” (often ascribing to them the same attributes and qualities of character), Paul, unsurprisingly, sees only *idols* rather than gods (cf. 1 Cor 8:4–7). I noted in a previous chapter that many philosophers will urge their hearers to seek philosophy, almost regardless of which philosophy (and its understanding of divinity) is being discussed. The existence of gods and the worship of them is taken for granted, whether by those who would identify as Stoics, or others more influenced by Middle Platonism.

⁷⁰ *Her.* 112–13.

⁷¹ Cicero, *Nat. d.* 2.28.71; see also Philo, *Mut.* 240.

⁷² Epictetus, *Diatr.* 4.1.112.

⁷³ Cicero, *Leg.* 2.10.24

⁷⁴ Epictetus, *Diatr.* 2.8.12–13; Philo, *Mos.* 2.148–51.

⁷⁵ E.g. Arthur J. Pomeroy, ed., *Arius Didymus: Epitome of Stoic Ethics* (SBLTT 44; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1999), 5b, 5–21 (26); 11k, 4–14, 18–20, 26–29 (84).

⁷⁶ Marcus Aurelius, *Med.* 2.13, 17; 3.12, 16.

⁷⁷ Philo, *Spec.* 1.269; *Sobr.* 62.

⁷⁸ *Somn.* 2.73.

⁷⁹ *Deus.* 7.

⁸⁰ *Leg.* 2.55–56; *Spec.* 1.82; *Her.* 84.

However, for Paul, partnership with gods rather than the one true God, revealed through Jesus Christ and experienced by the indwelling Spirit, is as different as darkness is from light (2 Cor 6:14c). God is the κύριος παντοκράτωρ (6:18c); the rest are idols. Paul, like the philosophers, speaks of God dwelling in a person and making himself present to them. Yet, for Paul the presence of the “living God” is restricted only to those who are in Christ (6:15a; cf. 1:21; 5:19). For Paul there is both inclusiveness and separateness. Like the philosophers who speak of God’s presence dwelling within each individual, there are no restrictions for Paul: both sons and daughters (6:18b) and Gentiles (not just Jews) can be his temple. Paul does not place himself above his congregations as one who is better or wiser; instead he makes no distinction between groups in the church or between them and him as their apostle; “we are the temple of the living God” (6:16b). Unlike the philosophers, being wise or good by others’ estimation does not signify that God’s presence dwells within. It is those who *believe* in Christ who are his temple. It is not the case that all have divine minds that make them divine. Rather, those who relate to idols rather than being indwelt with the presence of the living God are simply described as *unbelievers*. Purity, and cleansing from defilement, matters both for Paul and for the philosophers in their relationship to God. For the philosophers, a person can cleanse themselves or keep their daemon pure by right thinking and action. However, for Paul, those who are in Christ can do so in the light of all God’s promises that find their fulfillment in Christ (1:20) and that guarantee a relationship as intimate as that between “the Father of mercies and God of all comfort” (1:3) and his sons and daughters (6:18). Believers can be cleansed because God dwells and walks among them (6:16).

5.3. Corresponding Emphases in the Corinthian correspondence

Some of the key emphases I have identified here can also be found elsewhere within the Corinthian correspondence as a whole. In this next section I shall comment briefly on a number of other important places in the letters that relate to the issues identified in 2 Cor 6:14–7:1. I shall be selective and aim to address only those areas that may have been notable for an audience influenced by philosophy.

5.3.1 Idolatry

Although εἶδωλον is the only idol-related word to appear in Second Corinthians, such words (beginning with the εἶδωλ- stem) are common in First Corinthians. The word εἶδωλον appears in 1 Cor 8:4, 7; 10:19; 12:2; εἶδωλεῖον (idol temple) is used in 1 Cor 8:10; εἶδωλόθυτος (something offered to idols) is the topic of discussion in 1 Cor 8:1–11:1, appearing in 1 Cor 8:1, 4, 7, 10; 10:19; εἶδωλολατρία (idolatry) in 1 Cor 10:14 and εἶδωλολάτρης (idolater) in 1 Cor 5:10, 11; 6:9; 10:7. Eleven occurrences of these cognate terms take place in 1 Cor 8:1–11:1. The prominence of the term εἶδωλον here may suggest that the presenting issue of 1 Cor 8:1–11:1 has not been fully resolved (though this passage need not be limited to that concern).⁸¹ Gordon Fee has presented strong arguments that 1 Cor 8:1–11:1 provides the context for an ongoing dispute between Paul and the Corinthians over idol food and idolatry, represented in the stern warnings of 2 Cor 6:14–7:1.⁸² Paul had warned in 1 Cor 8:7 that some eat food as if offered to an idol and their consciences, being weak, are “defiled” and the verb used here, μολύνω, is cognate

⁸¹ E.g. Thrall, *2 Corinthians 1-7*, 475; Harris, *2 Corinthians*, 500–01; Webb, *Returning*, 202–03; Fee, “Food,” 140–61.

⁸² Idem, “Food,” 140–61, supported by M.D. Goulder, “2 Cor. 6:14–7:1 as an Integral Part of 2 Corinthians,” *NovT* 36 (1994): 47–57 at 50–51.

with the noun *μολυσμός* (2 Cor 7:1) that Paul urges the Corinthians to cleanse themselves from in our passage.⁸³

5.3.2 Separation for the sake of purity

Many scholars see Paul's call not to associate with "unbelievers" as problematic given Paul's emphasis on not withdrawing from the immoral of this world (1 Cor 5:10; cf. 5:12).⁸⁴ The majority of those who do so understand the use of *ἄπιστοι* here to refer to "faithless" apostles (presumably the ones spoken of in 2 Cor 10–13, e.g. 11:13)⁸⁵ or faithless Christians.⁸⁶ The problem with this theory is that it violates the principle of consistency: every other use of *ἄπιστος* by Paul in the Corinthian correspondence refers unambiguously to non-Christians.⁸⁷

⁸³ Fee, "Food," 140–61 at 145 also makes this connection.

⁸⁴ E.g. E.-B. Allo, *Saint Paul: Seconde Épître aux Corinthiens* (EBib; 2d ed.; Paris: Gabalda, 1956), 189; Rensberger, "Examination," 25–49 at 29–31, 37.

⁸⁵ E.g. J. -F. Collange, *Enigmes de la Deuxieme Epitre de Paul aux Corinthiens: Etude Exegetique de 2 Cor 2,14 – 7,4* (SNTSMS 18; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972), 305–06, 316–17; Dahl, "Fragment," 62–69; Rensberger, "Examination," 25–49; Daniel Patte, "A Structural Exegesis of 2 Corinthians 2:14–7:4 With Special Attention on 2:14–3:6 and 6:11–7:4," in *Society of Biblical Literature 1987 Seminar Papers* (ed. Kent Harold Richards; SBLSP 26; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 45 note 59; Wolff, *Korinther*, 146–50; deSilva, "Recasting," 3–16; Franz Zeilinger, "Die Echtheit von 2 Cor 6:14–7:1," *JBL* 112 (1993): 71–80; deSilva, *Credentials*, 17–19, 105–06; Murphy-O'Connor, *Keys Second Corinthians*, 128–29.

⁸⁶ Young and Ford, *Meaning*, 33–34; Goulder, "2 Cor 6:14–7:1," 47–57 at 53–54.

⁸⁷ 1 Cor 6:6; 7:12, 13, 14, 15; 10:27; 14:22, 23, 24; 2 Cor 4:4; see further e.g. Plummer, *1 Corinthians*, 206–08; Windisch, *Korintherbrief*, 218; C. K. Barrett, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (BNTC; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1968), 195; Thrall, "Problem," 132–48 at 143; also supported by Webb, *Returning*, 184–99; Fee, "Food," 140–61; Furnish, *II Corinthians*, 362–63, 371–72, 382; Witherington III, *Conflict*, 404; Barnett, *2 Corinthians*, 342, 345; Matera, *II Corinthians*, 162; Harris, *2 Corinthians*, 499; Aernie, *Prophets*, 219; Volker Rabens, "Paul's Rhetoric of Demarcation: Separation From 'Unbelievers' (2 Cor 6:14–7:1) in the Corinthian Conflict," in *Rhetologizing in the Corinthian Conflict: Studies in the Exegesis and Theology of 2 Corinthians* (ed. Reimund Bieringer et al.; BITS 16; Leuven: Peeters, 2013), 229–53 at 233–36; Martin, *2 Corinthians*, 361, 365–66; Han, *Swimming*, 85–87. Rabens, "Demarcation," 229–53 at 243–53 also argues for a *secondary* referent to idolatrous people *inside* the church (including the false apostles of 11:13) as well as *outside* the church (Idem, "Inclusion of and Demarcation From 'outsiders': Mission and Ethics in Paul's Second Letter to the Corinthians," in *Sensitivity Towards Outsiders: Exploring the Dynamic Relationship between Mission and Ethics in the New Testament and Early Christianity* (ed. Jacobus Kok et al.; WUNT 2/ 364; 2014), 290–323 at 294–317 is very similar to the preceding article). Similarly, Adewuya, *Holiness*, 101–103 posits an inclusive reference: both to pagans and those who behave like them; Starling, "ἄπιστοι," 45–60 identifies unbelievers as idolatrous pagans but also suggests that *contextually* it is implied that in embracing the false apostles they are becoming "mismatched" with the pagans in their attitudes (59–60). Liu, *Purity*, 202–04 starts from the other end, identifying unbelievers with "false brothers", but concludes that the advice could also apply to pagans. Gupta, *Worship*, 99–100 argues contextually

Given the contrast between Christ and Beliar in 6:15a, the contrast between ὁ πιστός and ὁ ἄπιστος in 6:15b that elaborates upon 6:15a would suggest that one representative person is aligned with Christ and the other with Beliar. In fact, the sole other use of the term ἄπιστος in this letter, in 2 Cor 4:4, is defined in apposition to οἱ ἀπολλύμενοι (4:3), who, elsewhere in the Corinthian correspondence, are depicted as the antithesis of οἱ σωζόμενοι (1 Cor 1:18; 2 Cor 2:15).⁸⁸ The reference to δικαιοσύνη in 6:14 recalls another occurrence of a cognate term in Paul's first letter where he warns them that the ἄδικοι will not inherit the kingdom of God (6:9), in contrast with the present state of the Corinthians who have been justified (δικαιώω). I have already noted the theme of idolatry and the impossibility of believers having a share (μετέχω in 1 Cor 10:21, cognate to μετοχή in 2 Cor 6:14) in the table of demons or being a partner with them (κοινωνός in 1 Cor 10:18, 20, cognate to κοινωνία in 2 Cor 6:14).⁸⁹ There is also precedent for the emphasis on separation from that which defiles (2 Cor 6:17; 7:1) in Paul's injunctions in 1 Cor 5:6–13 (especially at 5:7, 13).⁹⁰ It is true that in 1 Cor 5, Paul clarifies that he does not oppose the believers mingling/associating with (συναναμίγνυμι) the immoral of this world (5:10) but with the immoral brother (5:11, and thus believer). At the same time, Paul speaks of the unbelieving husband being made holy (ἀγιάζω) by his believing wife, stating that if not for the faith of the wife, both husband and children would be unclean (ἀκάθαρτος in 7:14). The problem of the believer who is already married to an unbeliever is clearly an exceptional case; hence Paul's need to address it (1 Cor 7:12–16). However if a believer were to enter into a new

that, 'unbelievers' is Paul's counter-claim against those who accuse him of being unfaithful to the law (i.e. Jews and perhaps Jewish Christians), following Lambrecht, *2 Corinthians*, 62.

⁸⁸ Murphy-O'Connor, *Keys Second Corinthians*, 117. The question is explored in some detail by Webb, *Returning*, 184–99, itself a revision of Idem, "Unequally Yoked with Unbelievers, Part 1: Who are the Unbelievers (ἄπιστοι) in 2 Corinthians 6:14?," *BSac* 149 (1992): 27–44.

⁸⁹ Both points noted by Goulder, "2 Cor 6:14–7:1," 47–57 at 50–51.

⁹⁰ See Idem, "2 Cor 6:14–7:1," 47–57 at 51–52. Webb, *Returning*, 190 helpfully contrasts the *purposes* given for the different advice in 1 Cor 5:10 and 2 Cor 6:17; see also Barnett, *2 Corinthians*, 341 note 23.

marriage they should marry μόνον ἐν κυρίῳ (1 Cor 7:39b) since someone outside of the Lord would not be set apart for him. It seems then that Paul must mean something different by speaking of ἑτεροζυγέω in 2 Cor 6:14, rather than συναναμίγνυμι (1 Cor 5:10, 11). Paul is not prohibiting social contact with unbelievers, but instead warning against making “a mismatched covenant” with them.⁹¹ The succession of words that follow emphasize partnership, sharing and fellowship; something stronger than mere association.⁹² In light of the explicit contrast between the “living God” and idols, it seems likely that Paul prohibits any kind of activity “which establishes a covenant-like bond with pagans and their literal idols (either through physical or metonymical idolatry)— an action which seriously violates the reader’s existing covenant with God.”⁹³

5.3.3 *The theme of Indwelling in 2 Corinthians*

There are a number of passages in the epistle that highlight the theme of divine indwelling. In the context of speaking of the believer’s union with Christ⁹⁴ (εἰς Χριστὸν in 1:21), Paul speaks of God as the one who has sealed (σφραγίζω) the Corinthians as his own and given

⁹¹ C. Spicq, *Theological Lexicon of the New Testament* (trans. J. Ernest; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1994), 2.80–81, speaking of the figurative sense; or “be yoked in unequal partnership” (cf. “ἑτεροζυγέω,” LSJ, 701) cf. “ἑτεροζυγέω,” BDAG, 399; K. H. Rengstorf “ζυγός, ἑτεροζυγέω,” *TDNT* 2.896–901. Philo speaks in *Leg.* 3.193 of the person who yoked themselves to the chariot of passions that produced boastfulness and arrogance (using the noun ζυγός) or of pleasure personified who struggles to break free from the yoke (using a cognate verb, ζυγομαχέω). See also e.g. Plummer, *1 Corinthians*, 206; Windisch, *Korintherbrief*, 212–13; Furnish, *II Corinthians*, 361; Harris, *2 Corinthians*, 501; Rabens, “Demarcation,” 229–53 at 241.

⁹² See also Webb, *Returning*, 190–92.

⁹³ Idem, *Returning*, 211, and see generally 200–15, itself based on his earlier article, Idem, “Unequally Yoked with Unbelievers, Part 2: What is the Unequal Yoke (ἑτεροζυγοῦντες) in 2 Corinthians 6:14?,” *BSac* 149 (1992): 162–79. Despite Webb’s persuasive arguments against a reference to mixed marriages (Idem, *Returning*, 205–09), he hesitantly allows that the passage, “lends itself in a secondary sense to a mixed marriage application” (209) and I would agree with Harris, *2 Corinthians*, 501 note 32 that the contracting of a mixed marriage (cf. 1 Cor 7:39) would certainly be included; see also Witherington III, *Conflict*, 405–06; Thrall, *2 Corinthians 1-7*, 473; Alistair Scott May, *The Body for the Lord: Sex and Identity in 1 Corinthians 5-7* (JSNTSup 278; London: T&T Clark, 2004), 228 note 63; Keener, *1–2 Corinthians*, 193–94; Han, *Swimming*, 87–89.

⁹⁴ Thrall, *2 Corinthians 1-7*, 155–58; Harris, *2 Corinthians*, 205; Martin, *2 Corinthians*, 164.

them the ἀρραβών (down payment, pledge guaranteeing what is to come),⁹⁵ probably best seen as exegetical, that is, *consisting of* the Spirit⁹⁶ ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν (1:22). The Spirit dwells, not just in their midst, but in their hearts.⁹⁷ Similarly, Paul calls the Corinthians an ἐπιστολή Χριστοῦ (letter of Christ, 3:3), that has been written πνεύματι θεοῦ ζῶντος, by the Spirit of *the living God* on tablets of fleshly hearts (“ἐν πλαξίν καρδίαις σαρκίνας”, 3:4). This is the same living God language that is used in 6:14, and affirms that the Corinthians are a letter of Christ precisely because the life-giving Spirit⁹⁸ of God has made them so *within*, in changing them from pagans to bearers of his Spirit.⁹⁹ Space does not permit me to properly examine 2 Cor 3:4–18 and the exegetical issues it presents.¹⁰⁰ However, it is clear that the new covenant era, that Paul contrasts with the old, surpasses it in glory and involves a new found ἐλευθερία (3:17).¹⁰¹ This freedom comes from the Lord, the Spirit, who transforms (μεταμορφώω) believers into τὴν αὐτὴν εἰκόνα (3:18), which I take to be the divine image; the image of God found in Christ that is referred to only a few verses later (4:4).¹⁰² Gordon Fee’s comment on Paul’s use of “the Lord”

⁹⁵ With the NIV: “a deposit, guaranteeing what is to come”; see Harris, *2 Corinthians*, 207.

⁹⁶ With e.g. Furnish, *II Corinthians*, 137; Gordon D. Fee, *God’s Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1994), 293; Harris, *2 Corinthians*, 207; Guthrie, *2 Corinthians*, 115; Long, *2 Corinthians*, 38.

⁹⁷ Fee, *Presence*, 294.

⁹⁸ See the translations of Thrall, *2 Corinthians 1-7*, 227; Harris, *2 Corinthians*, 264; Keener, *1–2 Corinthians*, 167.

⁹⁹ Drawing on the promise of new covenant life found in places such as Ezek 11:19; 36:26; Jer 38:33 LXX (31:33 MT), as well as an allusion to God writing on tablets of stone in passages such as Exod 31:18; Deut 4:13; Deut 5:22. See with more detail, Goodwin, *Living God*, 161–89.

¹⁰⁰ The section has attracted a great deal of scholarly interest. Among full length monographs, see e.g. Carol Kern Stockhausen, *Moses’ Veil and the Glory of the New Covenant: The Exegetical Substructure of II Cor 3, 1–4, 6* (AnBib 116; Roma: Pontificio Istituto Biblica, 1989); Linda L. Belleville, *Reflections of Glory. Paul’s Polemical Use of the Moses-Doxa Tradition in 2 Corinthians 3:1-18* (Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 52; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991); Scott J. Hafemann, *Paul, Moses, and the History of Israel: The Letter/Spirit Contrast and the Argument from Scripture in 2 Corinthians 3* (WUNT 2/ 81; Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1995); and see the up-to-date bibliography in Martin, *2 Corinthians*, 197–99.

¹⁰¹ A notion that would appeal to those influenced by Stoicism, as noted by Collange, *Enigmes*, 113–14 and followed by Thrall, *2 Corinthians 1-7*, 276.

¹⁰² Pace e.g. W. C. van Unnik, “‘With Unveiled Face,’ an Exegesis of 2 Corinthians iii 12–18,” *NovT* (1963): 153–69; followed by Belleville, *Reflections*, 290, 296; N. T. Wright, *The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991), 175–92, who each speak of transformation into the

in the phrase “the Lord (Yahweh) is the Spirit” is apposite for the audience I am considering here, “This usage presupposes the Spirit as the fulfillment of the Presence of God motif in a thoroughgoing way. The Lord to whom Moses turned is the one whose “Presence” tabernacled in the midst of his people Israel . . . the “Lord” to whom God’s newly constituted people turn, whose “Presence” is now in their hearts, is none other than the life-giving Spirit of the living God.”¹⁰³

In 2 Cor 4, Paul uses a number of indwelling images. Firstly, he speaks of the divine illumination that has entered the hearts of the Corinthians, granting them the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ (4:6). Then Paul speaks of the frail humanity of his readers¹⁰⁴ as ὀσπράκινη σκεύη in which the θησαυρός (probably referring to the gospel in the context of the repeated references to it in 4:3–4 and allusions to it in 4:1, 6)¹⁰⁵ is carried. This might have reminded some readers of the way that sacred items, manifesting the presence of the deity, were carried in contemporary religious processions.¹⁰⁶ By contrast the Corinthians carry Christ and his gospel within their frail human bodies. Thirdly, after enumerating the ways in

image of *one another*, but *with* the majority of modern commentators. For those influenced by middle Platonism, this also would also speak to them of the common notion of being transformed into the image of the deity by contemplating that image; see Thrall, *2 Corinthians 1-7*, 290, 294–95; Keener, *1–2 Corinthians*, 170–71; a recurring theme in Maximus of Tyre and Philo of Alexandria, among our sources influenced by Middle Platonism. See the sources cited by J. Behm, “μεταμορφώω,” TDNT 4:755–7; Donald A. Hagner, “The Vision of God in Philo and John: A Comparative Study,” *JETS* 14:2 (1971): 81–93; Craig S. Keener, “Transformation through Divine Vision in 1 John 3:2–6,” *Faith & Mission* 23 (2005): 13–22; Idem, “Heavenly Mindedness and Earthly Good: Contemplating Matters Above in Colossians 3.1–2,” *JGRChJ* 6 (2009): 175–90; Idem, “We Beheld His Glory! (John 1:14),” in *John, Jesus, and History, Volume 2: Aspects of Historicity in the Fourth Gospel* (ed. Paul N. Anderson, Felix Just, and Tom Thatcher; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 15–25 and Volker Rabens, *The Holy Spirit & Ethics in Paul: Transformation & Empowering for Religious-Ethical Life* (WUNT 283; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 184–86.

¹⁰³ Fee, *Presence*, 313.

¹⁰⁴ Probably including their weak earthly bodies, but perhaps not restricted to this referent; see Plummer, *1 Corinthians*, 127; Thrall, *2 Corinthians 1-7*, 323; Harris, *2 Corinthians*, 340.

¹⁰⁵ Thrall, *2 Corinthians 1-7*, 321; Harris, *2 Corinthians*, 339; Timothy B. Savage, *Power through Weakness: Paul’s Understanding of the Christian Ministry in 2 Corinthians* (SNTSMS 86. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 164–67.

¹⁰⁶ See Paul Brooks Duff, “The Transformation of the Spectator: Power, Perception, and the Day of Salvation,” in *Society of Biblical Literature: 1987 Seminar Papers* (ed. Kent Harold Richards; SBLSP 26; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 233–37; Idem, “Apostolic Suffering and the Language of Processions in 2 Corinthians 4:7–10,” *BTB* 21.4 (1991): 158–65 at 160; Long, *2 Corinthians*, 82.

which this treasure is displayed in frailty (4:8–9), Paul uses another indwelling image: that they always carry around in their bodies the νέκρωσις¹⁰⁷ of Jesus so that the life of Jesus might be manifested in their bodies (4:10). I note here that in addition to further indwelling imagery (both the death/dying and the life of Jesus are to be φανερώω – manifested, same verb in both 4:10, 11), Paul is unashamed about associating this revelation with his physicality. He stresses that the life and death of Jesus are revealed ἐν τῷ σώματι (4:10) and ἐν τῇ θνητῇ σαρκί (4:11), clearly placed in parallel. Paul could have simply used σῶμα but the addition and combination of σάρξ with θνητός, according to Murray J. Harris, has the effect, “of emphasizing the transitory, creaturely, and weak nature of the body that, paradoxically, is the very place where Jesus’ powerful risen life is on display.”¹⁰⁸ Although it is difficult to be sure whether Paul’s reference to τὸ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα τῆς πίστεως (4:13) alludes to the disposition of the Psalmist¹⁰⁹ or to the Holy Spirit, a good case can be made for the Holy Spirit, as the one who produces faith, in light of other Pauline usage and to the references to the Spirit in the co-text of 2 Cor 3 and 2 Cor 5:5 (who then arguably produces the faith of 5:7).¹¹⁰ The picture of the inner self being renewed daily, in its context, also suggests the work of the Spirit bringing about an internal transformation and would have been very suggestive to an audience influenced by Stoic and Platonic thought.¹¹¹

¹⁰⁷ Which may be intended to mean both the *state* of deadness and the *process* of dying, see John T. Fitzgerald, *Cracks in an Earthen Vessel: An Examination of the Catalogues of Hardships in the Corinthian Correspondence* (SBLDS 99; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1988), 178–79; though many commentators understand Paul to be emphasizing the *process* of dying e.g. J. B. Lightfoot, *2 Corinthians and 1 Peter: A Newly Discovered Commentary* (Lightfoot Legacy Set 3; ed. Ben Witherington III and Todd D. Still; Downers Grove, Ill.: IVP, forthcoming), on 2 Cor 4:10 (my thanks to Dr Ben Witherington III for sharing with me his pre-publication manuscript of Lightfoot’s commentary); Plummer, *1 Corinthians*, 130; Harris, *2 Corinthians*, 345; Guthrie, *2 Corinthians*, 359–60, while Collange, *Enigmes*, 154–55, followed by Thrall, *2 Corinthians 1-7*, 332, think the *state* of deadness may be intended, since Paul’s only other use of this noun (Rom 4:19) has this nuance.

¹⁰⁸ Harris, *2 Corinthians*, 349.

¹⁰⁹ As argued by e.g. Thrall, *2 Corinthians 1-7*, 338–39; Guthrie, *2 Corinthians*, 262.

¹¹⁰ See the citations and arguments provided by e.g. Collange, *Enigmes*, 162–63; Barrett, *2 Corinthians*, 142; Furnish, *II Corinthians*, 257–58; Fee, *Presence*, 323–24; and tentatively Keener, *1–2 Corinthians*, 175.

¹¹¹ See especially Thrall, *2 Corinthians 1-7*, 348–51; also Furnish, *II Corinthians*, 261; Fee, *Presence*, 324 and the philosophical references cited by Keener, *1–2 Corinthians*, 177–78.

This inner transformation is evidenced in the way that Paul endures hardships (6:4–5) and the qualities he displays in the midst of these (6:6–7), including ἀγνότης (purity) generated by the Holy Spirit (6:6).¹¹²

5.4 Comparing the Theologies of 2 Corinthians with Hellenistic Philosophy

5.4.1 Paul's Understanding of God in 2 Corinthians

In this and the following sections, I shall briefly make reference to passages that corroborate my findings from the previous chapter, rather than attempting to provide a comprehensive summary. God is the one who characteristically raises the dead (1:9),¹¹³ and who, like in First Corinthians, is intimately associated with Jesus Christ his son (1:3), who is also Lord (1:2–3; 4:5; cf. 1 Cor 8:5–6 on other Lords and 2 Cor 4:4 on the opposing ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου), through whom all God's promises are fulfilled (1:19–20). God has ownership of, and resides in, his people by his Spirit (1:22). He has written on the hearts of the Corinthians by his Spirit (3:3) to give them life (3:6) and identifies fully with the Spirit as Lord (3:17–18). God's purposes are accomplished through Christ, his image (3:18; 4:6), the agent of revelation (3:14), in whom the Corinthians reveal the knowledge of God to the world (2:14–15; 4:10–11). Like First Corinthians, there is a strong emphasis on Jesus as the one who was raised and God as the one who raised him (1:9; 4:14; 5:15), and who will raise the Corinthians with him (4:14; cf. 5:1–10). God urges people to be reconciled with him (5:11–21) since through Christ he has

¹¹² See Fee, *Presence*, 332–35; Thrall, *2 Corinthians 1–7*, 460. Most English translations also follow the variant reading ἐν ἀγιότητι rather than ἐν ἀπλότητι found in 1:12. If this is correct, as Windisch, *Korintherbrief*, 54; Comfort, *Commentary*, 534; Margaret E. Thrall, “2 Corinthians 1:12: Ἀγιότητι Or Ἀπλότητι?,” in *Studies in New Testament Language and Text: Essays in Honour of George D. Kilpatrick on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (ed. J. K. Elliott; NovTSup 44; Leiden: Brill, 1976), 366–72; Idem, *2 Corinthians 1–7*, 130–31, 32–33 and Harris, *2 Corinthians*, 183 convincingly argue, this would provide another example of Paul's stress on purity/holiness in behavior in the letter; see also Starling, “ἄπιστοι,” 45–60 at 54–55.

¹¹³ Noting the present participle with Harris, *2 Corinthians*, 157.

reconciled the world to himself (5:18–21). This grace must be received now (6:1–2) in light of the coming judgment enacted by Christ on God’s behalf (5:10). As we observed in the first letter, Paul connects God and his people very closely with bodily resurrection. He dwells through Christ by his Spirit, only in his people who believe and who have been reconciled to him, and not in all people.¹¹⁴

5.4.2 Paul’s Understanding of Humanity in 2 Corinthians

Although 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 is well known for its contrasts between believers and unbelievers and what they represent, these same contrasts appear more generally in 2 Cor 2:14–7:4 as a whole. There are some who are being saved and others who are perishing (2:15), and the Gospel is veiled to the latter group (4:3) since the god of this age has blinded their minds so that they cannot see the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ (4:4). All will be judged for what was done in their body (5:10) and the bodies of all will be destroyed (5:1). The world has been reconciled to God through Christ (5:19) but this grace must be received through Christ (5:20; 6:1–2) for people to be transformed into Christ’s likeness (3:18; 4:10–18) and finally, to receive the resurrection body (5:1). The goal is not freedom for the soul from the body or absorption into the universe, as in much philosophy, but new creation (5:17).

5.4.3 Living as the Temple in 2 Corinthians

There are at least two other places in the letter where Paul may be using metaphorical temple language. The images used in 2:14–16 clearly draw on the well documented occurrences of Roman triumphal processions. In this passage, Paul uses ὄσμή (2:14b, 16) and εὐωδία (2:15),

¹¹⁴ For a more comprehensive survey, see Young and Ford, *Meaning*, 235–61; Harris, *2 Corinthians*, 115–17.

that are often combined in the Septuagintal formula ὁσμὴ εὐωδίας (e.g. Gen 8:21; Exod 29:18; Lev 4:31; Num 15:5 etc.). However, for some scholars, Paul’s avoidance of the *exact* formula, which he does employ elsewhere to speak of sacrifices (in Phil 4:18 – and Eph 5:2 – if the latter is Pauline), indicates that Paul is still making use of the triumph motif, imagining himself and his colleagues as incense-bearers in the parade.¹¹⁵ For others, however the use of these commonly associated words signals a shift to the image of OT sacrifice.¹¹⁶ Given the very close conjunction of two terms very commonly associated with sacrifice in the LXX, the possibility of a sacrificial referent should not be ruled out. The conjunction of the two terms is rare in Hellenistic literature,¹¹⁷ but appears in philosophical literature in connection with incense,¹¹⁸ or a fragrance

¹¹⁵ See especially Guthrie, *2 Corinthians*, 165–73 and more detail provided in Idem, “Paul’s Triumphal Procession Imagery (2 Cor 2.14–16a): Neglected Points of Background,” *NTS* 61 (2015): 79–91, and previously Plummer, *1 Corinthians*, 71; Harold W. Attridge, “Making Scents of Paul: The Background and Sense of 2 Cor 2:14–17,” in *Early Christianity and Classical Culture: Comparative Studies in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe* (ed. John T. Fitzgerald, Thomas H. Olbricht, and L. Michael White; NovTSup 110; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 71–88 at 83–88. Paul Brooks Duff, “Metaphor, Motif, and Meaning: The Rhetorical Strategy behind the Image ‘Led in Triumph’ in 2 Corinthians 2:14,” *CBQ* 53 (1991): 79–92, reads the whole image in relation to epiphany processions in the Greco-Roman world, rather than to the Triumph in particular (for which see also Idem, “Transformation,” 233–43 at 241. Long, ‘God’, will argue that 2 Cor 2:14–7:2 has been constructed to reflect the triumphal procession, that culminates at the temple (in 6:14–7:1). My thanks to Dr. Fredrick J. Long for sharing his forthcoming article with me.

¹¹⁶ E.g. Scott J. Hafemann, *Suffering and the Spirit: An Exegetical Study of II Cor 2:14–3:3 within the Context of the Corinthian Correspondence* (WUNT 2/ 19; Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1986), 40–58, who argues that, “the technical term ὁσμὴ εὐωδίας as a metonymy for sacrifice seems to have been so well established by the post-exilic period . . . when used in the same context, the terms could also be *separated* and used as *synonyms*” and in Sir 24:15, like 2 Cor 2:14–15, “the *terminus technicus* has been split up, but the two terms have nevertheless retained their sacrificial meaning” (48); supported also by e.g. Collange, *Enigmes*, 30–31; James I. H. McDonald, “Paul and the Preaching Ministry: A Reconsideration of 2 Cor 2:14–17 in its Context,” *JSNT* 17 (1983): 35–50 at 39–42; Thrall, *2 Corinthians 1–7*, 197–98; Harris, *2 Corinthians*, 248; Gupta, *Worship*, 87–90; Long, *2 Corinthians*, 57. Roger David Aus, *Imagery of Triumph and Rebellion in 2 Corinthians 2:14–17 and Elsewhere in the Epistle: An Example of the Combination of Greco-Roman and Judaic Traditions in the Apostle Paul* (Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 2005), 41 connects the imagery to the triumph but sees one referent as the use of incense in sacrifices of thanksgiving at the end of the procession; Furnish, *II Corinthians*, 176–77 denies the sacrificial referent.

¹¹⁷ Plutarch, *Quaest. conv.* 626B is perhaps the only example that does not clearly post-date the New Testament period significantly.

¹¹⁸ E.g. Dio Chrysostom, *2 Regn.* 41; Plutarch, *Is. Os.* 383A–D; *Tranq. an.* 477B. Plutarch, *Quaest. conv.* 645E speaks of μύρον (perfume) as if it is εὐσέβεια (piety, godliness), so providing an example of a sweet smell used metaphorically.

that indicates the presence of a god in a shrine,¹¹⁹ or generally in relation to offerings and washings for purification performed at a shrine.¹²⁰ For a Corinthian audience influenced by Hellenistic philosophy, Paul's image of himself and his colleagues spreading the fragrance of the knowledge of Christ would certainly have been comprehensible in a sacrificial context.¹²¹

Secondly, there is a possible temple/tabernacle allusion at 2 Cor 5:1. This verse and the verses that follow comprise one of the most disputed passages in the letter, and space does not permit to consider the timing of the reception of the οἰκοδομή that Paul contrasts with the current ἡ ἐπίγειος ἡμῶν οἰκία τοῦ σκηνῶν (5:1) nor the relationship between 1 Cor 15 and 2 Cor 5.¹²² However, what does seem relatively clear is that while Paul, in common with Hellenistic writings, sees the temporary existence of the earthly body as something from which he longs to be freed (5:1–2),¹²³ his hope is not in freedom for the soul from the body, but rather for a body from heaven that will be infinitely superior. While some philosophical writers speak of the body as a house for the soul,¹²⁴ with the eager expectation that it will finally be cast off,¹²⁵ Paul looks forward to a house (οἰκία) from heaven that is a body. In Scipio's vision (*Somnium Scipionis*) in Cicero's *De republica*, Scipio is told by his dead father that the universe is God's temple and the earth is the centre of that temple. His final destiny in this universe is to escape from the bondage

¹¹⁹ Plutarch, *Def. orac.* 437C.

¹²⁰ Plutarch, *Pyth. orac.* 402C–D.

¹²¹ David Renwick, A., *Paul, the Temple, and the Presence of God* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991), 75–94, thinks the cultic reference most likely when placing the pericope in the context of cultic images in Second Corinthians.

¹²² For which see especially Thrall, *2 Corinthians 1-7*, 357–70; N. T. Wright, *The Resurrection of the Son of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003), 361–71 and Carl N. Toney, “Excursus: Resurrection in 2 Corinthians,” in Martin, *2 Corinthians*, 250–56.

¹²³ See for instance, Wis 9:15 (which uses βαρύνω, cognate to βαρέω in 2 Cor 5:4); Plato, *Phaed.* 81C; [Ax.] 365E; 366A; Philo, *Somn.* 1.122; Cicero, *Tusc.* 1.22.51 cited by e.g. Plummer, *1 Corinthians*, 142; Thrall, *2 Corinthians 1-7*, 357–58.

¹²⁴ Such as Philo, *Somn.* 1.122 (using οἶκος); Cicero, *Tusc.* 1.22.51 (using domus).

¹²⁵ Cicero, *Tusc.* 1.22.51 contrasts the alien home (the body) of the soul with the home, the free heaven (liberum caelum) where the soul is now set free from the body (divinum animum corpore liberatum cogitatione complecti).

of the body,¹²⁶ and so in his earthly life he should keep his gaze fixed on heavenly things.¹²⁷ Scipio thus resolves to pursue the path to heaven, that will lead to freedom from this prison.¹²⁸ By contrast, ideal existence in Paul’s “vision” of 2 Cor 5:1 is still corporeal existence. Paul’s use of σκῆνος for “tent” is reminiscent of the way that σκηνή can be used in the LXX for “tabernacle” combined with οἶκος in 2 Chr 9:23; Isa 38:12 uses the metaphor of a tent being taken down to depict death and Job 4:19 combines οἰκία with πήλινος (literally made of πηλός, clay) to speak of human bodies (cf. 2 Cor 4:7).¹²⁹ Further, ἀχειροποίητος (not made with hands) is used elsewhere in the NT to refer to the earthly temple or tabernacle (Mk 14:58 and similarly, the use of χειροποίητος negated by οὐ in Acts 7:48; 17:24; Heb 9:11, 24) and given the place of a heavenly temple or future eschatological temple in other Jewish literature,¹³⁰ and in the context of church as temple (1 Cor 3:16) and the body as temple (1 Cor 6:19) in the Corinthian correspondence, this reference to the body ἀχειροποίητος is likely to suggest the idea of temple to Paul’s readers.¹³¹ This might also help prepare the readers for Paul’s use of temple imagery in 6:16.

Some of Paul’s remarks also confirm those areas of his understanding I discussed in relation to First Corinthians that would have struck audiences influenced by philosophy. For instance, Paul expresses his longing that what is θνητός (cf. 4:11) be swallowed up (καταπίνω). This would resonate with those who despised mortal flesh, but in Paul’s case, mortality is to be

¹²⁶ *Resp.* 6.15.15.

¹²⁷ *Resp.* 6.17.17; 6.19.20 (cf. Col 3:1–2).

¹²⁸ *Resp.* 6.24.26.

¹²⁹ Cited by Thrall, *2 Corinthians 1–7*, 357–58.

¹³⁰ McKelvey, *Temple*, 25–41. Examples include *1 En.* 14:1–25; 24–26; 71:5; *4 Ezra* 10:25–28; *2 Bar.* 4:1–7.

¹³¹ With Thrall, *2 Corinthians 1–7*, 359; Harris, *2 Corinthians*, 374; Keener, *1–2 Corinthians*, 180. Collange, *Enigmes*, 183 notes that in the LXX, the opposite, χειροποίητος, is frequently used for idols (e.g. Lev 26:1, 30; Isa 2:8, 10:11). It is at least possible for the Corinthian readers that Paul’s use of ἀχειροποίητος may suggest to them *that* which comes from God, as opposed to *that* which comes from idolatry. See further, Gupta, *Worship*, 90–96.

swallowed up by ζωή (5:4), which is defined here as the life of the resurrection body (5:1–5; cf. the use of the same clothing imagery in respect of the resurrection body in 1 Cor 15:53–54).¹³² Although many other things could be said about 2 Cor 5:10, for my purposes I note that Paul sees the body as the locus of all activity that merits judgment, whether bad *or good* (rather than the body being associated *only* with all that is evil).

More generally in these early chapters of Second Corinthians, I note that Paul again addresses believers in Christ as ἅγιοι (1:1). The believers are uniquely owned and established by God and indwelt by the Spirit, who guarantees the consummation of their salvation (1:22), in a way that others are not. The Corinthians are a letter of Christ, written by the Spirit in their hearts (3:3). They stand by faith (1:24) and their character must be tried by obedience (2:9). Paul’s recounting of the hardships he has encountered (e.g. 4:7–11; 6:4–10) serve as an example to the Corinthians, that the life of Christ should be revealed through them (4:6, 10–11, 16) in the midst of weakness (4:7–9), dying (4:11) and decay (4:16–5:1) in their bodies (4:10), not merely their souls. They also face opposition from Satan (2:11; 4:4; cf. 11:3, 14; 12:7), so, in following Paul’s example (cf. 1 Cor 4:16; 11:1), they should fix their eyes on unseen realities (4:18), make it their aim to please God (5:9), fear him (5:11) and live for Christ (5:15) as his ambassadors (5:20).¹³³

5.5 Conclusions

I have observed a number of contrasts between the philosophers’ use of metaphorical temple language, and its implications for their worldview and practice, and the emphases found in 2 Cor 6:14–7:1. The philosophers often spoke of the divine filling all things and thus

¹³² Harris, *2 Corinthians*, 387 notes that the positive reason for Paul’s groaning in 5:2, 4 is, “not a Hellenistic depreciation of corporeality but an intense longing for investiture with a heavenly body”.

¹³³ For a more comprehensive survey of holiness in the Corinthian correspondence and Paul’s emphasis on communal holiness, see Adewuya, *Holiness*, 129–64.

indwelling each individual. At the same time, some writings speak of the divine dwelling only in those who are good or wise. The imagery either relates to all without exception (all of creation) or specifically to certain individuals. The acceptance of multiple gods is assumed and affirmed. These gods are held to share identical characteristics with God.

The main features of Paul's metaphorical temple references in First Corinthians also find corresponding emphasis in the letter as a whole and stand in contrast to my findings from Hellenistic philosophy. Paul only speaks of the Spirit indwelling those who believe in Christ, rather than every created person or a category of people, such as those who are especially wise or noble. At the same time, the metaphorical temple is spoken of corporately – it is a group of people. On the one hand, this is a very restrictive group; only those who believe in Christ have the indwelling Spirit and the rest are aligned with idolatry. On the other hand, the group includes those formerly counted as pagans, who are now spoken of using language previously applied to Israel. Paul's addition of the word for "daughters" from the Isa 60:4 reference highlights the inclusive nature of the group; male and female, Jew and Gentile are welcomed and included by God. Whereas, for the philosophers the gods share the same beneficent characteristics as God, for Paul, they are simply idols and he associates them with evil, unbelief, darkness and lawlessness, while the Corinthian believers are associated with Christ, belief, light and righteousness.

Chapter 6: Conclusions

6.1 Summary

This study has examined the use of metaphorical temple language in Paul's letters to the Corinthians (1 Cor 3:16–17; 6:19; 2 Cor 6:14–7:1) and compared it to the use of such language in Hellenistic philosophy.

In *Chapter One*, I noted that a number of monographs have considered Paul's own background in Judaism in order to illuminate his use of metaphorical temple language, particularly focusing on the presence of such imagery in the Dead Sea Scrolls, especially as such language is not pervasive in other intertestamental literature. However, more recent studies of the scrolls are less confident than earlier ones that we can trace any direct influence on Paul. In any case, the majority of Paul's readers were Gentiles (see e.g. 1 Cor 6:9–11; 8:7; 12:2) and it is unlikely that the scrolls would have been known to these congregations and would have influenced their understanding of Paul's words. Most scholars writing on the temple language from the 1930s to the 1980s considered the metaphor purely in relation to Paul's own background. A number of recent studies have recognized the significance of the audience's context for the Corinthians' understanding of Paul's language. As Gentiles, they would have been exposed to a variety of religious, cultural and philosophical influences before and after conversion, notably the presence of Roman temples and thus the possibilities of eating idol foods in various contexts (cf. 1 Cor 8:1–11:1). A steady stream of modern studies have examined Paul's advice on idol offerings in relation to the religious and social context of Corinth, and Paul's temple metaphors have been examined in relation to building projects (John Lanci) and local temples (Yulin Liu).

However, I sought to demonstrate that, for Paul's audience, philosophy provided the worldview and guidance for living that people seek from religion today. I also claimed that the influence of Hellenistic philosophy was pervasive in the first century and its ideas would have trickled down to influence those who had never read philosophy. Although others have compared Paul's theology with Stoicism, or compared spiritual sacrifices in the Greco-Roman world with the NT, I noted a lacuna in the literature, with no available comprehensive study of the most relevant sources of metaphorical temple language that could have influenced the Corinthians' thinking. While noting that this was not *Paul's* own background, nor the sole background for the Corinthians, it was nevertheless *one* important background for the audience, that has been neglected and that Paul may have sought to address.

In *Chapter Two*, I surveyed relevant non-Jewish Hellenistic writers' use of metaphorical priest, temple and sacrifice language, beginning with the schools that marked the start of the Hellenistic era and ending with works from the second century C.E. Because neither Epicureanism nor Skepticism had a place for the direct involvement of God in human affairs, the vast majority of references were found in writers influenced by Stoicism or Middle Platonism. There were no unambiguous references to metaphorical priests but plenty of discussion of spiritual sacrifices. Some retained a place for literal sacrifices but placed a greater emphasis on purity of thought and deed as a sacrifice. Substitutes for sacrifices included purity in worship, prayer and contemplation, purity of thought, speech and intention and an attitude that seeks for divine truth or studies divine things. Writers from different traditions spoke of the universe as being the temple of the gods. Some make a fine distinction between God and the world (e.g. Epictetus) but, in speaking of the divine filling all things, others speak of the world in more pantheistic terms. Stoics, in particular, speak of the place of god or a daemon within the

individual soul, and there is some ambiguity as to whether this applies to every individual without exception, or solely, or perhaps to a greater degree, in those who are wise and/or good.

In order to place these references within the worldview of their philosophical systems, I also attempted to sketch out the way such writers understood the nature of divinity, humanity and the application of the philosophy to practical living. I noted how God is frequently equated pantheistically with Nature, Fate, Fortune and Reason and in later Stoics as well as Middle Platonists he is identified simply as intelligence. Many speak of multiple gods who share the same benevolent and governing characteristics with God. Most philosophers see Soul or Reason as separate from and superior to the body, governing its impulses and aversions. The soul is often understood as pre-existent, of divine essence and capable of comprehending the divine and doing the good. Evil also originates in the soul. Humans have the capacity to live in accordance with Nature and to unite with the divine. At death, the soul is set free from the body and may become a daemon. The Stoics exhort followers to live in accordance with Nature and exercise right judgments about the gods, obeying their inner daemon in order to be pure and to avoid wrong sense impressions. The Middle Platonists speak more in terms of imitating God's character and ways through contemplation of the divine and by choosing the good and avoiding the passions.

Chapter Three was devoted purely to the writings of Philo of Alexandria (ca. 20 BCE – 50 CE). Although Philo is Jewish, his Judaism is mediated through Hellenistic philosophy; he provides our largest first century corpus for Middle Platonic thought and there are copious references to metaphorical priest, temple and sacrifice language in his writings. Although Philo, as a good Jew, affirms literal sacrifices, the offerer must have a pure and noble mind and reason. Yet, he also affirms, with the philosophers that a sacrifice can be spiritual, and like them, emphasizes the offering of the mind and soul. Purity and virtue in thought, speech and word can

also be sacrifices. Philo depicts Reason as a priest (rather like the role of the daemon in Stoic or Platonic thought) who acts as internal guide, judge and arbiter of the conscience. The garments of the priest can represent purity of soul, the virtues or the cosmos, and the universe can be compared to a priest (as can the universe, angels, the nation of Israel and a household).

Philo also speaks of both of the mind/soul and of the universe as the dwelling place of God, in agreement with other philosophers. He too speaks of God filling all things and Wisdom dwelling as in a temple. The world, virtue, purity, truth and wisdom are described using tabernacle language. There is a solitary reference to a person in their embodiment as a temple, but this may be restricted to Adam, rather than any individual.

In *Chapter Four*, I compared 1 Cor 3:16–17 and 6:19 with my findings from Hellenistic philosophy. Whereas philosophers speak of the divine presence filling individuals, in 1 Cor 3:16–17, Paul’s understanding of the temple is corporate. The Corinthians as a group are the temple. Philosophy speaks of the divine presence inhabiting all individuals or particularly the good or wise. However, the Corinthians are the temple by virtue of the Spirit who dwells within them. This Spirit is not given to all, nor to the wise or noble per se, but only to those who belong to Christ; who are set apart and called as holy people (1:2). Christ is the foundation of this building (3:9). The temple is sacred and has very strict boundaries, such that defilement of the temple brings destruction (3:17). This warning of destruction upon any who threaten the sanctity of the community contrasts with the Stoic stress on the world’s final destruction or Middle Platonism’s teaching on the destruction of the body. Paul’s use of metaphorical temple language in 1 Cor 6:19 has a distinctive emphasis on the physical body, whereas the philosophers, whether Stoic or Platonic, speak of the body with indifference or even disdain. As in the previous passage, the emphasis is still corporate, despite the reference to the bodies of individuals, as Paul

makes explicit with his use of the second person possessive pronoun. In the philosophers, the πνεῦμα or *spiritus* inhabits the whole universe and thus every individual. In Paul, the Spirit inhabits those who have been set apart and cleansed through Jesus. Philosophy emphasizes the obligation to glorify God but in 6:19 the injunction is specifically to glorify God “in your body”, an unthinkable notion for the Platonic worldview. The Corinthian temple is a group defined by specific boundaries and relationship to Jesus Christ and is viewed with reference to their corporeal obedience to God. I noted that some of these themes were also emphasized in the wider epistle: holiness in the body, the importance of not defiling the temple (especially through idolatry) and the use of body language to describe believers as well as to speak of their final destiny in terms of the physical resurrection body.

Paul’s metaphorical temple language would have challenged any of the Corinthian readers still influenced by the prevailing Hellenistic philosophical worldview. Philosophy spoke of the divine or the gods filling the universe and, with it, every individual, or certain individual souls, and cleansing coming by reason, wisdom or virtue. Paul, however, makes a clear distinction between the true God revealed in Jesus Christ and experienced by the indwelling Spirit and other gods who are merely idols. The corporate nature of the temple as God’s people is always emphasized in the Corinthian metaphorical temple language, and the Spirit dwells only in those who belong to Jesus Christ, although there are no divisions on the basis of hierarchy, race or gender when it comes to inclusion in this temple. In sharp contrast to the disparagement of the physical body seen in philosophy, Paul emphasizes that the physical body is included as the place where God dwells.

6.2 Avenues for further study

There are a number of potential areas that could be further explored using the data from Hellenistic philosophy that I cited earlier. Although recent articles have explored language and imagery that evokes notions of sacrifice¹ or Paul's priestly language in Romans,² my research could be applied to other letters to see how Paul's use of metaphorical temple language there compare to my insights from philosophy. In Romans, Paul speaks of his vocation using two priestly words: his call to be a λειτουργός in priestly service (ἱεουργέω) to make an offering (προσφορά) of the Gentiles (15:16) as well as urging his readers to offer their bodies as θυσίαν ζῶσαν ἁγίαν εὐάρεστον τῷ θεῷ (12:1). In Phil 2:17, Paul paints a picture of himself as a drink offering, using the verb σπένδω in relation to the sacrifice (θυσία) and (cultic) service (λειτουργία) of the Philippians' faith and towards the end of the same letter, in Phil 4:18, Paul calls their gift a fragrant offering, using the same language as 2 Cor 2:14–16 (ὄσμην εὐωδίας), as well as an acceptable sacrifice (θυσίαν δεκτήν). Both congregations were majority Gentile, one in Rome and the other a Roman colony (Philippi), so exploring the use of these phrases in their context in the letter and in Roman society and philosophy would be a fruitful exercise. The same verb, meaning to be poured out as a libation (σπένδω), also appears in 2 Tim 4:6 and could be explored in its context. Ephesians contains a striking parallel to my study in 1–2 Corinthians, with its reference to the people of God growing into “a holy temple in the Lord” (Eph 2:21) with Christ as the center (2:21a) and cornerstone/capstone (2:20), and in whom (2:22a) they are being built into a dwelling place (κατοικητήριον) for God in the Spirit. Given what we know of the

¹ J. Ayodeji Adewuya, “The Sacrificial-Missiological Function of Paul's Sufferings in the Context of 2 Corinthians,” in *Paul as Missionary: Identity, Activity, Theology, and Practice* (ed. Trevor J. Burke and Brian S. Rosner; LNTS 420; London: T&T Clark, 2011), 88–98.

² Richard J. Gibson, “Paul the Missionary, in Priestly Service of the Servant-Christ (Romans 15.16),” in *Paul as Missionary: Identity, Activity, Theology, and Practice* (ed. Trevor J. Burke and Brian S. Rosner; LNTS 420; London: T&T Clark, 2011), 51–62.

religious and philosophical climate in Ephesus (including from Acts 18–19), it would be instructive to examine Eph 2:18–22 both in reference to that environment and the wider themes of the letter relating to cosmic unity (1:10; 2:2:11–22; 3:4–6; 4:6), heavenly and earthly rulers and powers (1:20–22; 2:2; 3:10; 6:10–20) and union with Christ (1:3; 2:1–7; 3:14–21; 4:13; 5:31–32). In the light of these studies, a further study might then be made, comparing the language of spiritual sacrifice and temple in the undisputed Paulines (Romans, 1–2 Corinthians, Philippians) with the references found in the disputed Paulines (perhaps including 1 Tim 3:15, if this is a spiritual temple reference).

Beyond the study of metaphorical temple language applied to Christians, while monographs have been written on Jesus as temple in the Gospels,³ or as a sacrifice in the epistles,⁴ a comparison with the metaphorical temple language in Hellenistic philosophy would illuminate the possible reception of these metaphors among Gentile Christians and others influenced by Hellenism. Similarly, the understanding of Jesus as both Priest and sacrifice and the use of heavenly tabernacle language in Hebrews⁵ could be compared with the relevant material.

³ E.g. Mary L. Coloe, *God Dwells with Us: Temple Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel* (Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 2001); Nicholas Perrin, *Jesus the Temple* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010).

⁴ E.g. Stephen Finlan, *The Background and Content of Paul's Cultic Atonement Metaphors* (SBLAcBib 19; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2004); Jane Lancaster Patterson, *Keeping the Feast: Metaphors of Sacrifice in 1 Corinthians and Philippians* (ECL 16; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2015).

⁵ See e.g. Kiwoong Son, *Zion Symbolism in Hebrews: Hebrews 12:18–24 as a Hermeneutical Key to the Epistle* (Waynesboro, Ga.: Paternoster, 2005).

Bibliography

Reference Works and Primary Sources

Alcinous. *The Handbook of Platonism*. Clarendon Later Ancient Philosophers. Translated by John Dillon. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.

Apuleius. *Metamorphoses*. Translated by J. Arthur Hanson. 2 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1989–1996.

Arius Didymus. *Epitome of Stoic Ethics*. Society of Biblical Literature Texts and Translations 44. Edited by Arthur J. Pomeroy. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1999.

Bauer, W., F. W. Danker, W. F. Arndt, and F. W. Gingrich. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 3d ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001.

Burton, Ernest De Witt. *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1900.

Charlesworth, J. H., ed. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 vols. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2010.

Cicero. Translated by Walter Miller et al. 29 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1913–2010.

Dio Chrysostom. *Discourses*. Translated by H. Lamar Crosby and J. W. Cohoon. 5 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1932–51.

Diogenes Laertius. *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*. Translated by R. D. Hicks. 2 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1925.

Epictetus. *Discourses*. Translated by W. A. Oldfather. 2 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1925–28.

Eusebius. *Preparation for the Gospel*. Part 1: Books 1–9. Translated by Edwin Hamilton Gifford. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1981.

Fronto. *Correspondence*. Translated by C. R. Haines. 2 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1919–20.

García Martínez, Florentino. *Qumran and Apocalyptic: Studies on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 9. Leiden: Brill, 1992.

Gellius. *Attic Nights*. Translated by J. C. Rolfe. 3 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1927.

- Hornblower, Simon, Antony Spawforth and Esther Eidinow, eds. *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*. 4 ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Josephus*. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray et al. 10 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1926–1965.
- Kittel, G., and G. Friedrich, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Translated by G. W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–1976.
- Liddell, H. G., R. Scott, H. S. Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon*. 9th ed. with revised supplement. Oxford, 1996
- Long, A. A., and D. N. Sedley, eds. *The Hellenistic Philosophers*. 2 vols. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1987.
- Lucretius. *On the Nature of Things*. Translated by W. H. D. Rouse. Revised by Martin F. Smith. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1992.
- Lutz, Cora E. *Musonius Rufus, "The Roman Socrates."* New Haven, Yale University Press, 1947.
- Marcus Aurelius*. Translated by C. R. Haines. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1930.
- Maximus of Tyre. *The Philosophical Orations*. Translated by M. B. Trapp. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.
- Moule, C. F. D. *An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek*. 2d ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959.
- Moulton, J. H. and Nigel Turner. *A Grammar of New Testament Greek. Vol. III: Syntax*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1963.
- Nestle, Eberhard., Erwin Nestle, Barbara Aland, Kurt Aland and Holger Strutwolf, eds. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. 27th ed. Stuttgart : Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2013.
- Philo*. Translated by F. M. Colson et al. 10 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1929–1962.
- Philo. *The Works of Philo: Complete and Unabridged. New Updated Edition*. Translated by C.d. Yonge. Grand Rapids: Hendrickson, 1993.
- Philostratus. *Apollonius of Tyana*. 3 vols. Translated by Christopher P. Jones. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2005–06.

- Plato*. Translated by H. N. Fowler et al. 12 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1914–1935.
- Plutarch. *Moralia*. Translated by F C Babbitt 15 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1927–1976.
- Ramelli, Ilaria. *Hierocles the Stoic: Elements of Ethics, Fragments, and Excerpts*. Translated by David Konstan. Society of Biblical Literature Writings from the Greco-Roman World 28. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009.
- Seneca*. Translated by Richard M. Gummere et al. 10 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1917–2004.
- Sextus Empiricus. Translated by R. G. Bury. 4 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1933–1949.
- Spicq, Ceslas. *Theological Lexicon of the New Testament*. Translated and edited by James D. Ernest. 3 vols. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1994.
- Valerius Maximus. *Memorable Doings and Sayings*. 2 vols. Translated by D. R. Shackleton Bailey. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2000.
- Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996.

Secondary Sources

- Amador, J. D. H. “Revisiting 2 Corinthians: Rhetoric and the Case for Unity.” *New Testament Studies* 46.1 (2000): 92-111.
- Adams, Edward and David G. Horrell. *Christianity at Corinth: The Quest for the Pauline Church*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2004.
- Adewuya, J. Ayodeji. *Holiness and Community in 2 Cor 6:14-7:1: Paul’s View of Communal Holiness in the Corinthian Correspondence*. Studies in Biblical Literature 40. New York: Peter Lang, 2001.
- Adewuya, J. Ayodeji. “The People of God in a Pluralistic Society: Holiness in 2 Corinthians.” Pages 201-18 in *Holiness and Ecclesiology in the New Testament*. Edited by Kent E. Brower and Andy Johnson. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- Adewuya, J. Ayodeji. “The Sacrificial-Missiological Function of Paul’s Sufferings in the Context of 2 Corinthians.” Pages 88-98 in *Paul as Missionary: Identity, Activity, Theology, and Practice*. Edited by Trevor J. Burke and Brian S. Rosner. Library of New Testament Studies 420. London: T&T Clark, 2011.

- Aernie, Jeffrey W. *Is Paul Also Among the Prophets?: An Examination of the Relationship between Paul and the Old Testament Prophetic Tradition in 2 Corinthians*. Library of New Testament Studies 467. London: T&T Clark, 2012.
- Algra, Keimpe. "Stoic Theology." Pages 153-78 in *The Cambridge Companion to the Stoics*. Edited by Brad Inwood. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Algra, Keimpe, Jonathan Barnes, Jaap Mansfeld and Malcolm Schofield, eds. *The Cambridge History of Hellenistic Philosophy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Allo, E.-B. *Saint Paul: Seconde Épître aux Corinthiens*. Etudes bibliques. 2d ed. Paris: Gabalda, 1956.
- Asmis, Elizabeth. "The Stoicism of Marcus Aurelius." *ANRW* 36.3:2228-52. Part 2, *Principat*, 36.3. Edited by Wolfgang Haase and Hildegard Temporini. New York: de Gruyter, 1989.
- Atkinson, Kenneth. *An Intertextual Study of the Psalms of Solomon: Pseudepigrapha*. Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity 49. Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen Press, 2001.
- Atkinson, Kenneth. *I Cried to the Lord: A Study of the Psalms of Solomon's Historical Background and Social Setting*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 84. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Attridge, Harold W. "Making Scents of Paul: The Background and Sense of 2 Cor 2:14–17." Pages 71-88 in *Early Christianity and Classical Culture: Comparative Studies in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe*. Edited by John T. Fitzgerald, Thomas H. Olbricht and L. Michael White. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 110. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Aune, David E. *The New Testament in Its Literary Environment*. Library of Early Christianity. Philadelphia: Westminster John Knox, 1987.
- Aune, David E. "Human Nature and Ethics in Hellenistic Philosophical Traditions and Paul: Some Issues and Problems." Pages 291-312 in *Paul in His Hellenistic Context*. Edited by Troels Engberg-Pedersen. Studies of the New Testament and its World. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994.
- Aune, David E. *The Westminster Dictionary of New Testament and Early Christian Literature and Rhetoric*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2003.
- Aus, Roger David. *Imagery of Triumph and Rebellion in 2 Corinthians 2:14–17 and Elsewhere in the Epistle: An Example of the Combination of Greco-Roman and Judaic Traditions in the Apostle Paul*. Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 2005.
- Bailey, D. R. Shackleton. *Cicero. Classical Life and Letters*. New York: Scribner, 1971.

- Balch, David L. "1 Corinthians 7:32–35 and Stoic Debates about Marriage, Anxiety, and Distraction." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 102.3 (1983): 429-39.
- Barclay, John M. G. "Thessalonica and Corinth: Social Contrasts in Pauline Christianity." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 47 (1992): 49-74.
- Barker, M. "Temple Imagery in Philo: An Indication of the Origin of the Logos?" Pages 70-102 in *Templum Amicitiae: Essays on the Second Temple Presented to Ernst Bammel*. Edited by W. Horbury. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series* 48. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991.
- Barnes, Nathan J. *Reading 1 Corinthians with Philosophically Educated Women*. Eugene, Oreg.: Pickwick Publications, 2014.
- Barnett, Paul. *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
- Barrett, C. K. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Black's New Testament Commentaries. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1968.
- Barrett, C. K. "Paul's Opponents in II Corinthians." *New Testament Studies* 17 (1971): 233-54.
- Barrett, C. K. *A Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians*. Black's New Testament Commentaries. New York: Harper & Row, 1973.
- Bartchy, S. Scott. *Μᾶλλον χρεῖσται: First Century Slavery and the Interpretation of 1 Corinthians 7:21*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 11. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1973.
- Bauckham, Richard. "The Parting of the Ways: What Happened and Why." *Studia theologica* 47 (1993): 135-51.
- Bauckham, Richard. "James and the Jerusalem Church." Pages 415-80 in *The Book of Acts in Its Palestinian Setting*. The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting 4. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
- Bauernfeind, Otto. "ἄρετή." Pages 457-61 in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament Vol I*. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Translated by Bromiley, Geoffrey. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964.
- Baumgarten, J. "Sacrifice and Worship among the Jewish Sectarians of the Dead Sea (Qumrân) Scrolls." *Harvard Theological Review* XLVI (1953): 141-59.
- Baumgarten, J. "The Essenes and the Temple – A Reappraisal." Pages 57-74 in *Studies in Qumran Law*. Edited by Joseph M Baumgarten. *Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity* 24. Leiden: Brill, 1977.

- Beale, G. K. "The Old Testament Background of Reconciliation in 2 Corinthians 5–7 and Its Bearing on the Literary Problem of 2 Corinthians 6:14–7.1." *New Testament Studies* 35.4 (1989): 550-81.
- Beale, Gregory K. *The Temple and the Church's Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God*. New Studies in Biblical Theology 17. Downers Grove, Ill.: IVP, 2004.
- Beck, Mark, ed. *A Companion to Plutarch*. Malden, Mass.: Wiley-Blackwell, 2014.
- Becker, Jürgen. "Die Gemeinde als Tempel Gottes und die Tora." Pages 9-25 in *Das Gesetz im frühen Judentum und im Neuen Testament: Festschrift für Christoph Burchard zum 75. Geburtstag*. Edited by Dieter Sanger and Matthias Konrad. *Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus* 57. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006.
- Belleville, Linda L. "Continuity or Discontinuity: A Fresh Look at 1 Corinthians in the Light of First-Century Epistolary Forms and Conventions." *Evangelical Quarterly* 59.1 (1987): 15-37.
- Belleville, Linda L. *Reflections of Glory. Paul's Polemical Use of the Moses-Doxa Tradition in 2 Corinthians 3:1-18*. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series* 52. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.
- Benoit, Pierre. "Qumran and the New Testament." Pages 1-30 in *Paul and Qumran: Studies in New Testament Exegesis*. Edited by Jerome Murphy-O'Connor. Chicago: Priory Press, 1968.
- Best, Ernest. "Spiritual Sacrifice: General Priesthood in the New Testament." *Interpretation* 14 (1960): 273-99.
- Betz, H. D. "2 Cor 6:16 – 7:1: An Anti-Pauline Fragment?" *Journal of Biblical Literature* 92 (1973): 88-108.
- Bieringer, Reimund. "2 Korinther 6,14–7,1 Im Kontext des 2. Korintherbriefes: Forschungsüberblick und Versuch eines Eigenen Zugangs." Pages 551-70 in *Studies On 2 Corinthians*. Edited by Reimund Bieringer and Jan Lambrecht. *Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium* 112. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1994.
- Second Corinthians in the Perspective of Late Second Temple Judaism*. *Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum* 14. Edited by Reimund Bieringer, Emmanuel Nathan, Didier Pollefeyt and Peter J. Tomson. Leiden: Brill, 2014.
- Birnbaum, Ellen. "Allegorical Interpretation and Jewish Identity Among Alexandrian Jewish Writers." Pages 307-29 in *Neotestamentica et Philonica: Studies in Honor of Peder Borgen*. Edited by David E. Aune, Torrey Seland and Jarl Henning Ulrichsen. *Supplements to Novum Testamentum* 106. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

- Bobzien, Susanne. *Determinism and Freedom in Stoic Philosophy*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Borgen, Peder. "Philo of Alexandria." Pages 233-82 in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*. Edited by Michael E. Stone. *Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.
- Borgen, Peder. *Philo of Alexandria: An Exegete for His Time*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 86. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Böttrich, Christfried. "'Ihr Seid der Tempel Gottes': Tempelmetaphorik und Gemeinde bei Paulus." Pages 411-25 in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel: Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*. Edited by Beate Ego, Armin Lange and Peter Pilhofer. *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 118*. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1999.
- Brenk, Frederick E. "An Imperial Heritage: The Religious Spirit of Plutarch of Chaironeia." *ANRW* 36.1:248-349. Part 2, *Principat*, 36.1. Edited by Haase, Wolfgang and Hildegard Temporini. New York: de Gruyter, 1987.
- Brennan, Tad. "Stoic Moral Psychology." Pages 257-94. in *The Cambridge Companion to the Stoics*. Edited by Brad Inwood. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Brooke, George J. "Miqdash Adam, Eden and the Qumran Community." Pages 285-301 in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel: Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*. Edited by Beate Ego, Armin Lange and Peter Pilhofer. *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 118*. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1999.
- Brooke, George J. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005.
- Brooke, George J. "The Ten Temples in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 416-34 in *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel*. Edited by John Day. London: T&T Clark, 2005.
- Brooke, George J. "2 Corinthians 6:14–7:1 again: A Change in Perspective." Pages 1-16 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Pauline Literature*. Edited by Jean-Sébastien Rey. *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 102*. Leiden: Brill, 2014.
- Brookins, Timothy A. *Corinthian Wisdom, Stoic Philosophy, and the Ancient Economy*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 159. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

- Brower, Kent. *Living as God's Holy People: Holiness and Community in Paul*. Eugene, Oreg.: Wipf & Stock, 2009.
- Brunschwig, Jacques. "Stoic Metaphysics." Pages 206-32 in *The Cambridge Companion to the Stoics*. Edited by Brad Inwood. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Brunschwig, Jacques and David Sedley. "Hellenistic Philosophy." Pages 151-83 in *The Cambridge Companion to Greek and Roman Philosophy*. Edited by David Sedley. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Brunt, J. C. "Rejected, Ignored or Misunderstood? The Fate of Paul's Approach to the Problem of Food Offered to Idols in Early Christianity." *New Testament Studies* 31 (1985): 113-24.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. *The Second Letter to the Corinthians*. Translated by Roy A. Harrisville. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1985.
- Burk, Denny. "Discerning Corinthian Slogans through Paul's Use of the Diatribe in 1 Corinthians 6:12-20." *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 18.1 (2008): 99-121.
- Burridge, Richard A. "About People, by People, for People: Gospel Genre and Audiences." Pages 113-45 in *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences*. Edited by Richard Bauckham. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Byrne, Brendan. "Sinning against One's Own Body: Paul's Understanding of the Sexual Relationship in 1 Corinthians 6:18." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 45.4 (1983): 608-16.
- Capes, D. B. *Old Testament Yahweh Texts in Paul's Christology*. WUNT 2 47. Tübingen: Mohr Siehbeck, 1992.
- Caragounis, C. "'Fornication' and 'Concession'?" Interpreting 1 Cor 7, 1-7." Pages 543-60 in *The Corinthian Correspondence*. Edited by R Bieringer. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1996.
- Carmignac, J. "L'utilité ou l'inutilité des sacrifices sanglants dans la "Règle de la Communauté" de Qumrân'." *Revue biblique* 63 (1956): 524-32.
- Chester, Andrew. "The Sibyl and the Temple." Pages 37-69 in *Templum Amicitiae: Essays on the Second Temple presented to Ernst Bammel*. Edited by William Horbury. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 48. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.
- Cheung, A. T. *Idol Food in Corinth: Jewish Background and Pauline Legacy*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 176. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.

- Chow, John K. *Patronage and Power: A Study of Social Networks in Corinth*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 75. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992.
- Ciampa, Roy E. "Revisiting the Euphemism in 1 Corinthians 7.1." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 31.3 (2009): 325-338.
- Ciampa, Roy E. and Brian S. Rosner. *The First Letter to the Corinthians*. Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.
- Clarke, Andrew D. *Secular and Christian Leadership in Corinth: A Socio-Historical and Exegetical Study of 1 Corinthians 1–6*. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 18. Leiden: Brill, 1993.
- Cohen, Naomi G. "The Mystery Terminology in Philo." Pages 173-87 in *Philo und das Neue Testament: Wechselseitige Wahrnehmungen I. Internationales Symposium Zum Corpus Judaico-Hellenisticum. 1.-4. Mai 2003, Eisenach/Jena*. Edited by Roland Deines and Karl-Wilhelm Niebuhr. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 172. Edited by 172. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 2004.
- Colish, Marcia L. *The Stoic Tradition from Antiquity to the Early Middle Ages: I. Stoicism in Classical Latin Literature*. Studies in the History of Christian Thought 34. Leiden: Brill, 1985.
- Collange, J.-F. *Enigmes de la Deuxieme Epitre de Paul aux Corinthiens: Etude Exegetique de 2 Cor 2,14 – 7,4*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 18. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972.
- Collins, John J. *Daniel*. Hermeneia: A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.
- Collins, Raymond F. *First Corinthians*. Sacra Pagina 7. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1999.
- Collins, Raymond F. *The Power of Images in Paul*. Collegeville, MN.: Liturgical Press, 2008.
- Collins, Raymond F. "Constructing a Metaphor. 1 Corinthians 3,9b-17 and Ephesians 2,19-22." Pages 193-216 in *Paul et L'Unité des Chrétiens*. Edited by Jacques Schlosser. Colloquium Oecumenicum Paulinum 19. Leuven: Peeters, 2010.
- Coloe, Mary L. *God Dwells with Us: Temple Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel*. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 2001.
- Comfort, Philip W. *New Testament Text and Translation Commentary: Commentary on the Variant Readings of the Ancient New Testament Manuscripts and How they Relate to the Major English Translations*. Carol Stream, Ill.: Tyndale House, 2008.

- Conzelmann, Hans. *1 Corinthians: A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Hermeneia: A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Translated by James W. Leitch. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975.
- Coppens, J. C. "The Spiritual Temple in the Pauline Letters and its Background." Pages 53-66 in *Studia evangelica. Vol VI: Papers presented to the Fourth International Congress on New Testament Studies held at Oxford, 1969*. Edited by Elizabeth A. Livingstone. Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur 112. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1973.
- Corbeill, Anthony. "Cicero and the Intellectual Milieu of the Late Republic." Pages 9-24 in *The Cambridge Companion to Cicero*. Edited by Catherine Steel. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Corley, Jeremy. "An Intertextual Study of Proverbs and Ben Sira." Pages 155-82 in *Intertextual Studies in Ben Sira and Tobit*. Edited by Jeremy Corley and Vincent Skemp. Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 38. Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2005.
- Dahl, N. A. "A Fragment and Its Context: 2 Corinthians 6:14 – 7:1." Pages 62-69 in *Studies in Paul: Theology for the Early Christian Mission*. Edited by N. A. Dahl. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1977.
- Daly, Robert J. *The Origins of the Christian Doctrine of Sacrifice*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978.
- Daly, Robert J. *Christian Sacrifice: The Judaeo-Christian Background Before Origen*. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1978.
- Daniélou, J. "La Symbolique du Temple de Jerusalem Chez Philon et Joseph." Pages 83-90 in *Le Symbolisme Cosmique des Monuments Religieux: Actes de la Conférence Internationale qui a eu lieu sous les Auspices de l'Is. M.E.O., à Rome, Avril-Mai 1955*. Edited by Raymond Bloch. Serie orientale Roma 14. Roma: Is. M.E.O., 1957.
- Danker, Frederick W. *II Corinthians*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1989.
- Davies, G. I. "The Presence of God in the Second Temple and Rabbinic Doctrine." Pages 32-36 in *Templum Amicitiae: Essays on the Second Temple presented to Ernst Bammel*. Edited by William Horbury. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 48. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.
- deLacey, D. R. "οἰτινές ἐστε ὑμεῖς: The Function of a Metaphor in Paul." Pages 391-409 in *Templum Amicitiae: Essays on the Second Temple presented to Ernst Bammel*. Edited by William Horbury. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 48. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.

- Deming, Will. "The Unity of 1 Corinthians 5–6." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 115 (1996): 289-312.
- Deming, Will. *Paul on Marriage and Celibacy: The Hellenistic Background of 1 Corinthians 7*. 2d ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.
- Derrett, J. D. M. "2 Cor 6,14ff. a Midrash on Dt 22, 10." *Biblica* 59 (1978): 231- 50.
- deSilva, David. "Paul and the Stoa: A Comparison." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 38.4 (1995): 549-64.
- deSilva, David. *4 Maccabees*. Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. London: Continuum, 1998.
- deSilva, David. "Recasting the Moment of Decision: 2 Corinthians 6:14–7:1 in Its Literary Context." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 31 (1993): 3-16.
- deSilva, David. "Meeting the Exigency of a Complex Rhetorical Situation: Paul's Strategy in 2 Corinthians 1 through 7." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 34.1 (1996): 5-22.
- deSilva, David Arthur. *The Credentials of an Apostle: Paul's Gospel in 2 Corinthians 1-7*. N. Richland Hills, Tex.: Bibal, 1998.
- DeWitt, Norman Wentworth. *Epicurus and His Philosophy*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1954.
- Dillon, John. "A Response to Runia and Sterling." *Studia Philonica* V (1993): 151-55.
- Dillon, John. "Reclaiming the Heritage of Moses: Philo's Confrontation with Greek Philosophy." *Studia Philonica* 7 (1995): 108-23.
- Dillon, John. "Plutarch and Platonism." Pages 61-72 in *A Companion to Plutarch*. Edited by Mark Beck. Malden, Mass.: Wiley-Blackwell, 2014.
- Dillon, John M. *The Middle Platonists: 80 B.C. to A.D. 220*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1977.
- Dimant, Devorah. "4Q Florilegium and the Idea of the Community as a Temple." Pages 165-89 in *Hellenica and Judaica: Hommage à Valentin Nikiprowetzky*. Edited by A. Caquot, M. Hadas-Lebel and J. Riaud. Leuven: Peeters, 1986.
- Duff, P. B. "2 Corinthians 1 – 7: Sidestepping the Division Hypothesis Dilemma." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 24 (1994): 16 - 26.
- Duff, P. B. "The Mind of the Redactor: 2 Cor. 6:14 – 7:1 in Its Secondary Context." *Novum Testamentum* 35 (1993): 160-80.

- Duff, Paul Brooks. "The Transformation of the Spectator: Power, Perception, and the Day of Salvation." Pages 233-43 in *Society of Biblical Literature: 1987 Seminar Papers*. Edited by Kent Harold Richards. Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers 26. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.
- Duff, Paul Brooks. "Metaphor, Motif, and Meaning: The Rhetorical Strategy behind the Image "Led in Triumph" in 2 Corinthians 2:14." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 53 (1991): 79-92.
- Duff, Paul Brooks. "Apostolic Suffering and the Language of Processions in 2 Corinthians 4:7–10." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 21.4 (1991): 158-65.
- Duff, Paul Brooks. "2 Corinthians 1–7: Sidestepping the Division Hypothesis Dilemma." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 24 (1994): 16-26.
- Duff, Paul Brooks. "Transformed "from Glory to Glory": Paul's Appeal to the Experience of His Readers in 2 Corinthians 3:18." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 127:4 (2008): 759-80.
- Dunn, James D. G. "2 Corinthians 3:17: the Lord is the Spirit." *Journal of Theological Studies* 21.2 (1970): 309-20.
- Dunn, James D. G. *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Dutch, Robert S. *The Educated Elite in 1 Corinthians: Education and Community Conflict in Graeco-Roman Context*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 271. London: T&T Clark, 2005.
- Engberg-Pedersen, Troels. *Paul and the Stoics*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2000.
- Engberg-Pedersen, Troels, ed. *Paul in His Hellenistic Context*. Studies of the New Testament and its World. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994.
- Engberg-Pedersen, Troels. *Paul Beyond the Judaism-Hellenism Divide*. 1 ed. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001.
- Engberg-Pedersen, Troels. *Cosmology and Self in the Apostle Paul: The Material Spirit*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Enslin, Morton S. and Solomon Zeitlin. *The Book of Judith: Greek text with an English Translation, Commentary and Critical Notes*. Jewish Apocryphal Literature Series 7. Leiden: Brill, 1972.
- Fatehi, Mehrdad. *The Spirit's Relation to the Risen Lord in Paul*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 128. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.

- Fee, Gordon D. "II Corinthians VI.14 – VII.1 and Food Offered to Idols." *New Testament Studies* 23 (1977): 140-61.
- Fee, Gordon D. "1 Corinthians 7:1 in the NIV." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 23.4 (1980): 307-14.
- Fee, Gordon D. "Εἰδωλόθυτα Once Again: An interpretation of 1 Corinthians 8–10." *Biblica* 61.2 (1980): 172-97.
- Fee, Gordon D. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987.
- Fee, Gordon D. *God's Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1994.
- Fee, Gordon D. "Christology and Pneumatology in Romans 8:9–11 – and Elsewhere: Some Reflections on Paul as a Trinitarian." Pages 312-31 in *Jesus of Nazareth: Lord and Christ: Essays on the Historical Jesus and New Testament Christology*. Edited by Joel B. Green and Max Turner. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994.
- Fee, Gordon D. "1 Corinthians 7:1–7 Revisited." Pages 197-213 in *Paul and the Corinthians: Studies on a Community in Conflict. Essays in Honour of Margaret Thrall*. Edited by Trevor J. Burke and J. Keith Elliott. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 109. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Fee, Gordon D. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Revised ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014.
- Ferguson, Everett. "Spiritual Sacrifice in Early Christianity and Its Environment." *ANRW* 23:2:1151-89. Part 2, *Principat*, 23:2. Edited by Hildegard Temporini and Wolfgang Haase. New York: de Gruyter, 1980.
- Ferguson, Everett. *Backgrounds of Early Christianity*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.
- Filson, Floyd Vivian. "The Significance of the Temple in the Ancient Near East. Part IV, Temple, Synagogue, and Church." *Biblical Archaeologist* 7:4 (1944): 77-88.
- Finlan, Stephen. *The Background and Content of Paul's Cultic Atonement Metaphors*. Society of Biblical Literature Academic Biblica 19. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2004.
- Fiore, Benjamin. "Passion in Paul and Plutarch: 1 Corinthians and 5–6 and the Polemic against Epicureans." Pages 135-43 in *Greeks, Romans, and Christians: Essays in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe*. Edited by David L. Balch, Everett Ferguson and Wayne A. Meeks. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.

- Fisk, Bruce. "Eating Meat Offered to Idols: Corinthian Behavior and Pauline Responses in 1 Corinthians 8–10 (A Response to Gordon Fee)." *Trinity Journal* 10 (1989): 49-70.
- Fisk, Bruce. "Porneuein as Body Violation: The Unique Nature of Sexual Sin in 1 Corinthians 6:18." *New Testament Studies* 42.4 (1996): 540-58.
- Fitzgerald, John T. *Cracks in an Earthen Vessel: An Examination of the Catalogues of Hardships in the Corinthian Correspondence*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 99. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1988.
- Fitzmyer, J. A. "Qumran and the Interpolated Paragraph in 2 Cor 6,14 – 7,1." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 23 (1961): 271-80.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. "Glory Reflected on the Face of Christ (2 Cor 3:7-4:6)." Pages 64-79 in *According to Paul: Studies in the Theology of the Apostle*. Mahwah, N.J.: Paulist Press, 1993.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *Tobit*. Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2003.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *First Corinthians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 32. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008.
- Flusser, D. "Two Notes on the Midrash on 2 Sam. vii." *Israel Exploration Journal* 9.2 (1959): 99-109.
- Flusser, David. "The Dead Sea Sect and Pre-Pauline Christianity." Pages 23-74 in *Judaism and the Origins of Christianity*. Edited by David Flusser. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1988.
- Fotopoulos, John. *Food Offered to Idols in Roman Corinth: A Social-Rhetorical Reconsideration of 1 Corinthians 8:1-11:1*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe 151. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 2003.
- Fraeyman, M. "La spiritualisation de l'Idée du Temple dans les Épîtres Pauliniennes." *Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses* XXIII (1947): 378-412.
- Frede, Dorothea. "Stoic Determinism." Pages 179-205 in *The Cambridge Companion to the Stoics*. Edited by Brad Inwood. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Frede, Michael. "On the Stoic Conception of the Good." Pages 71-94 in *Topics in Stoic Philosophy*. Edited by Katerina Ierodiakonou. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Frede, Michael. "Stoic Epistemology." Pages 295-322 in *The Cambridge History of Hellenistic Philosophy*. Edited by Keimpe Algra, Jonathan Barnes, Jaap Mansfeld and Malcolm Schofield. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

- Friesen, Steven J. "The Wrong Erastus." Pages 231-56 in *Corinth in Context: Comparative Studies on Religion and Society*. Edited by Steven J. Friesen, Daniel N. Schowalter and James C. Walters. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 134. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Friesen, Steven J., Daniel N. Schowalter and James C. Walters, eds. *Corinth in Context: Comparative Studies on Religion and Society*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 134. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Furnish, Victor Paul. *II Corinthians. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 32a. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984.
- García Martínez, Florentino. "Priestly Functions in a Community without Temple." Pages 303-19 in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel: Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*. Edited by Beate Ego, Armin Lange and Peter Pilhofer. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 118. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1999.
- Garcilazo, Albert V. *The Corinthian Dissenters and the Stoics*. Studies in Biblical Literature 106. New York: Peter Lang, 2007.
- Gardner, Paul Douglas. *The Gifts of God and the Authentication of a Christian: An Exegetical Study of 1 Corinthians 8–11:1*. Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1994.
- Garland, David E. *1 Corinthians*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003.
- Gärtner, Bertil E. *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament: A Comparative Study in the Temple Symbolism of the Qumran Texts and the New Testament*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965.
- Gera, Deborah Levine. *Judith*. Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2014.
- Gibson, Richard J. "Paul the Missionary, in Priestly Service of the Servant-Christ (Romans 15.16)." Pages 51-62 in *Paul as Missionary: Identity, Activity, Theology, and Practice*. Edited by Trevor J. Burke and Brian S. Rosner. Library of New Testament Studies 420. London: T&T Clark, 2011.
- Gill, Christopher. "The School in the Roman Imperial Period." Pages 33-58 in *The Cambridge Companion to the Stoics*. Edited by Brad Inwood. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Gnilka, Joachim. "2 Cor 6:14–7:1 in the Light of Qumran Texts and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." Pages 48-68 in *Paul and Qumran: Studies in New Testament Exegesis*. Edited by Jerome Murphy-O'Connor. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1968.

- Gooch, Peter D. *Dangerous Food: 1 Corinthians 8–10 in Its Context*. Waterloo, Ont.: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1993.
- Goodenough, Edwin R. *By Light, Light: The Mystic Gospel of Hellenistic Judaism*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1935.
- Goodenough, Edwin R. *An Introduction to Philo Judaeus*. 2nd ed. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1963.
- Goodwin, Mark J. *Paul: Apostle of the Living God*. Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 2001.
- Gorman, Michael J. ““You Shall be Cruciform for I Am Cruciform”: Paul’s Trinitarian Reconstruction of Holiness.” Pages 148–66 in *Holiness and Ecclesiology in the New Testament*. Edited by Kent E. Brower and Andy Johnson. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- Goulder, M. D. “2 Cor. 6:14–7:1 as an Integral Part of 2 Corinthians.” *Novum Testamentum* 36 (1994): 47–57.
- Grant, Robert M. *Paul in the Roman World: The Conflict at Corinth*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001.
- Grässer, Erich. *Der zweite Brief an die Korinther Kapitel 1,1–7,16*. Ökumenischer Taschenbuchkommentar zum Neuen Testament 8/1. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2002.
- Gundry, Robert H. *Sōma in Biblical Theology with Emphasis on Pauline Anthropology*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 29. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.
- Gupta, Nijay. “The Question of Coherence in Philo’s Cultic Imagery: A Socio-literary Approach.” *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 20.4 (2011): 277–97.
- Gupta, Nijay K. *Worship That Makes Sense to Paul: A New Approach to the Theology and Ethics of Paul’s Cultic Metaphors*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 175. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010.
- Gupta, Nijay K. “Which “Body” is a Temple (1 Corinthians 6:19)? Paul beyond the Individual/Communal Divide.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 72.3 (2010): 518–36.
- Guthrie, George H. “Paul’s Triumphal Procession Imagery (2 Cor 2.14–16a): Neglected Points of Background.” *New Testament Studies* 61 (2015): 79–91.
- Guthrie, George H. *2 Corinthians*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015.

- Hadot, Pierre. *The Inner Citadel: The Meditations of Marcus Aurelius*. Translated by Michael Chase. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1998.
- Hafemann, Scott J. *Suffering and the Spirit: An Exegetical Study of II Cor 2:14–3:3 within the Context of the Corinthian Correspondence*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe 19. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1986.
- Hafemann, Scott J. *Paul, Moses, and the History of Israel: The Letter/Spirit Contrast and the Argument from Scripture in 2 Corinthians 3*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe 81. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1995.
- Hagner, Donald A. “The Vision of God in Philo and John: A Comparative Study.” *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 14:2 (1971): 81-93.
- Hall, David R. *The Unity of the Corinthian Correspondence*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 251. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Han, Paul. *Swimming in the Sea of Scripture: Paul’s Use of the Old Testament in 2 Corinthians 4:7-13:13*. Library of New Testament Studies 519. London: T&T Clark, 2014.
- Hankinson, R. J. “Determinism and Indeterminism.” Pages 513-41 in *The Cambridge History of Hellenistic Philosophy*. Edited by Keimpe Algra, Jonathan Barnes, Jaap Mansfeld and Malcolm Schofield. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Hankinson, R. J. “Stoic Epistemology.” Pages 59-84 in *The Cambridge Companion to the Stoics*. Edited by Brad Inwood. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Harner, Philip B. “Qualitative Anarthrous Predicate Nouns: Mark 15:39 and John 1:1.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 92.1 (1973): 75-87.
- Harris, Murray J. *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
- Hays, Richard B. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993.
- Hays, Richard B. *First Corinthians*. Interpretation. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997.
- Hays, Richard B. *The Conversion of the Imagination: Paul as Interpreter of Israel’s Scripture*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
- Hayward, C. T. R. *The Jewish Temple: A Non-Biblical Sourcebook*. London: Routledge, 1996.

- Heil, C. "Die Sprache der Absonderung in 2 Kor 6,17 und bei Paulus." Pages 717-29 in *The Corinthian Correspondence*. Edited by R. Bieringer. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1996.
- Hogeterp, Albert L. A. "Community as a Temple in Paul's Letters: The Case of Cultic Terms in 2 Corinthians 6:14–7:1." Pages 281-95 in *Anthropology and Biblical Studies: Avenues of Approach*. Edited by Louise J. Lawrence and Mario I. Aguilar. Leiden: Deo, 2004.
- Hogeterp, Albert L. A. *Paul and God's Temple: A Historical Interpretation of Cultic Imagery in the Corinthian Correspondence*. Biblical Tools and Studies 2. Leuven: Peeters, 2006.
- Hollander, H. W. and M de Jonge. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary*. Studia in Veteris Testamenti pseudepigrapha 8. Leiden: Brill, 1985.
- Horrell, David. Review of John R Lanci, *A New Temple for Corinth: Rhetorical and Archaeological Approaches to Pauline Imagery*. *Journal of Theological Studies* 50 (1999): 708-11.
- Horrell, David G. *The Social Ethos of the Corinthian Correspondence: Interests and Ideology from 1 Corinthians to 1 Clement*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996.
- Horst, Pieter W. van der and Judith H. Newman. *Early Jewish Prayers in Greek*. Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008.
- Howard, J. K. "'Christ our Passover': A Study of the Passover-Exodus theme in 1 Corinthians." *Evangelical Quarterly* 41.2 (1969).
- Hughes, Philip E. *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1962.
- Hultgren, Stephen J. "2 Cor 6.14–7.1 and Rev 21.3–8: Evidence for the Ephesian Redaction of 2 Corinthians." *New Testament Studies* 49.1 (2003): 39-56.
- Hurd, John C. *The Origin of 1 Corinthians*. London: SPCK, 1965.
- Ierodiakonou, Katerina, ed. *Topics in Stoic Philosophy*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Inwood, Brad. *Ethics and Human Action in Early Stoicism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.
- Inwood, Brad, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to the Stoics*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

- Inwood, Brad and Pierluigi Donini. "Stoic Ethics." Pages 675-738 in *The Cambridge History of Hellenistic Philosophy*. Edited by Keimpe Algra, Jonathan Barnes, Jaap Mansfeld and Malcolm Schofield. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Jacobson, Howard. *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum with Latin Text and English Translation*. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums XXXI Volume Two. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Jewett, Robert. *Paul's Anthropological Terms: A Study of Their Use in Conflict Settings*. Leiden: Brill, 1971.
- Jewett, Robert. "The Redaction of 1 Corinthians and the Trajectory of the Pauline School." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion: Supplement Series* 46 (1978): 398-444.
- Johnson, Luke Timothy. *Among the Gentiles: Greco-Roman Religion and Christianity*. Anchor Yale Bible Reference Library. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.
- Jones, C. P. *The Roman World of Dio Chrysostom*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1978.
- Kamesar, Adam. "Biblical Interpretation in Philo." Pages 65-91 in *The Cambridge Companion to Philo*. Edited by Adam Kamesar. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Kamesar, Adam, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Philo*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Keener, Craig S. "Transformation through Divine Vision in 1 John 3:2-6." *Faith & Mission* 23 (2005): 13-22.
- Keener, Craig S. "Heavenly Mindedness and Earthly Good: Contemplating Matters Above in Colossians 3.1-2." *Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism* 6 (2009): 175-90.
- Keener, Craig S. "We Beheld His Glory! (John 1:14)." Pages 15-25 in *John, Jesus, and History, Volume 2: Aspects of Historicity in the Fourth Gospel*. Edited by Paul N. Anderson, Felix Just and Tom Thatcher. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Keener, Craig S. *1-2 Corinthians*. New Cambridge Bible Commentary. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Keener, Craig S. "The Pillars and the Right Hand of Fellowship in Galatians 2.9." *Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism* 7 (2010): 51-58.
- Kemphorne, R. "Incest and the body of Christ, a study of 1 Corinthians 6:12-20." *New Testament Studies* 14:4 (1968): 568-74.

- Kidd, I. G. "Stoic Intermediaries and the End for Man." Pages 150-72 in *Problems in Stoicism*. Edited by A. A. Long. London: Athlone Press, 1971.
- Klauck, Hans-Josef. "Kultische Symbolsprache bei Paulus." Pages 107-18 in *Freude am Gottesdienst. Aspekte ursprünglicher Liturgie*. Edited by J. Schreiner. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1983.
- Klauck, Hans-Josef. *2. Korintherbrief*. Neue Echter Bibel 8. Echter: Würzburg, 1986.
- Klawans, Jonathan. *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple: Symbolism and Supersessionism in the Study of Ancient Judaism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Klinzing, Georg. *Die Umdeutung des Kultus in der Qumrangemeinde und im Neuen Testament*. Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments 7. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971.
- Knibb, Michael A. *The Qumran Community*. Cambridge Commentaries on Writings of the Jewish and Christian World 200BC to AD200 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Koester, Craig H. "The Spectrum of Johannine Readers." Pages 5-19 in "*What is John?*" *Readers and Readings of the Fourth Gospel*. Edited by Fernando Segovia. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 3. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.
- Koskenniemi, Erkki. "Philo and Classical Education." Pages 102-28 in *Reading Philo: A Handbook to Philo of Alexandria*. Edited by Torrey Seland. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014.
- Kremer, Jacob. *Der Erste Brief an die Korinther*. Regensburger Neues Testament. Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1997.
- Kristeller, Paul Oskar. *Greek Philosophers of the Hellenistic Age*. Translated by Gregory Woods. New York: Columbia University Press, 1993.
- Kuck, David W. *Judgement and Community Conflict: Paul's Use of Apocalyptic Judgement Language in 1 Corinthians 3:5-4:5*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 66. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- Kuhn, Heinz-Wolfgang. "'Gemeinde Gottes' in den Qumrantexten und bei Paulus unter Berücksichtigung des Toraverständnisses." Pages 153-69 in *Das Gesetz im frühen Judentum und im Neuen Testament: Festschrift für Christoph Burchard zum 75. Geburtstag*. Edited by Dieter Sanger and Matthias Konrad. Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus 57. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006.
- Lacey, W. K. *Cicero and the End of the Roman Republic*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1978.

- Laertius, Diogenes. *Lives of Eminent Philosophers, Volume I: Books 1–5*. Loeb Classical Library 184. Translated by R. D. Hicks. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1925.
- Lamberton, Robert. *Plutarch*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001.
- Lambrecht, J. “The Fragment 2 Corinthians 6,14–7,1: A Plea for Its Authenticity.” Pages 531-49 in *Studies On 2 Corinthians*. Edited by Reimund Bieringer and Jan Lambrecht. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium 112. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1994.
- Lambrecht, Jan. “Transformation in 2 Cor 3:18.” *Biblica* 64 (1983): 243-54.
- Lambrecht, Jan. *Second Corinthians*. Sacra Pagina 8. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1999.
- Lambrecht, Jan. “Paul’s Reasoning in 1 Corinthians 6:12-20.” *Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses* 85.4 (2009): 479-86.
- Lamp, Jeffrey S. *First Corinthians 1-4 in Light of Jewish Wisdom Traditions: Christ, Wisdom and Spirituality*. Studies in Bible and Early Christianity 42. Lewiston, NY.: Edwin Mellen Press, 2000.
- Lanci, John R. *A New Temple for Corinth: Rhetorical and Archaeological Approaches to Pauline Imagery*. Studies in Biblical Literature 1. New York: Peter Lang, 1997.
- Lane, William L. “Covenant: The Key to Paul’s Conflict with Corinth.” *Tyndale Bulletin* 33 (1982): 3-29.
- Lang, Friedrich. *Die Briefe an die Korinther*. Das Neue Testament Deutsch 7G. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986.
- Lapidge, Michael. “Stoic Cosmology and Roman Literature, First to Third Centuries a. D.” *ANRW* 36.3:1379-429. Part 2, *Principat*, 36.3. Edited by Wolfgang Haase and Hildegard Temporini. New York: de Gruyter, 1989.
- Laporte, Jean. “Sacrifice and Forgiveness in Philo of Alexandria.” *Studia Philonica* 1 (1989): 34-42.
- Laporte, Jean. “The High Priest in Philo of Alexandria.” *Studia Philonica* 3 (1991): 71-82.
- Lee, Michelle V. *Paul, the Stoics, and the Body of Christ*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 137. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Leonhardt, Jutta. *Jewish Worship in Philo of Alexandria*. Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum 84. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 2001.

- Leppä, Outi. "Believers and Unbelievers in 2 Corinthians 6:14–15." Pages 374-90 in *Lux Humana, Lux Aeterna: Essays on Biblical and Related Themes in Honour of Lars Aejmelaeus*. Edited by Antti Mustakallio. Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society, 2005.
- Levinsohn, Stephen H. *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek: A Coursebook on the Information Structure of New Testament Greek*. 2d ed. Dallas: SIL International, 2000.
- Levison, John R. "The Spirit and the Temple in Paul's Letters to the Corinthians." Pages 189-215 in *Paul and His Theology*. Edited by Stanley Porter. Pauline Studies 3. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Lévy, Carlos. "Philo's Ethics." Pages 146-71 in *The Cambridge Companion to Philo*. Edited by Adam Kamesar. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Lichtenberger, Hermann. "Atonement and Sacrifice in the Qumran Community." Pages 159-71 in *Approaches to Ancient Judaism Volume II*. Edited by William Scott Green. Brown Judaic Studies 9. Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1980.
- Lieber, Andrea. "Between Motherland and Fatherland: Diaspora, Pilgrimage and the Spiritualization of Sacrifice in Philo of Alexandria." Pages 193-210 in *Heavenly Tablets: Interpretation, Identity and Tradition in Ancient Judaism*. Edited by Lynn Lidonnici and Andrea Lieber. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 119. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Lightfoot, J. B. *Notes on Epistles of St. Paul*. Edited by J. B. Harmer. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1895.
- Lightfoot, J. B. *Saint Paul's Epistle to the Philippians*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1913.
- Lightfoot, J. B. *2 Corinthians and 1 Peter: A Newly Discovered Commentary*. Lightfoot Legacy Set 3. Edited by Ben Witherington III and Todd D. Still. Downers Grove, Ill.: IVP, forthcoming.
- Lim, Kar Yong. "Paul's Use of Temple Imagery in the Corinthian Correspondence: The Creation of Christian Identity." Pages 189-205 in *Reading Paul in Context: Explorations in Identity Formation. Essays in Honour of William S. Campbell*. Edited by Kathy Ehrensperger and Brian J. Tucker. Library of New Testament Studies 428. London: T&T Clark, 2010.
- Lim, Timothy H. "Studying the Qumran Scrolls and Paul in their Historical Context." Pages 135-56 in *The Dead Sea scrolls as background to postbiblical Judaism and early Christianity: papers from an international conference at St. Andrews in 2001*. Edited by James R. Davila. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 46. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Lindemann, Andreas. *Der Erste Korintherbrief*. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament 9.1. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 2000.

- Lindgard, Fredrik. *Paul's Line of Thought in 2 Corinthians 4:16–5:10*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe 189. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 2005.
- Litfin, A. Duane. *St. Paul's Theology of Proclamation: 1 Corinthians 1–4 and Greco-Roman Rhetoric*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 79. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Liu, Yulin. *Temple Purity in 1-2 Corinthians*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe 343. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 2013.
- Long, A. A., ed. *Problems in Stoicism*. London: Athlone Press, 1971.
- Long, A. A. "Freedom and Determinism in the Stoic Theory of Human Action." Pages 173-99 in Edited by A. A. Long. London: Athlone Press, 1971.
- Long, A. A. *Hellenistic Philosophy: Stoics, Epicureans, Sceptics*. London: Duckworth, 1974.
- Long, A. A. *Stoic Studies*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Long, A. A. "Stoic Psychology." Pages 560-84 in *The Cambridge History of Hellenistic Philosophy*. Edited by Keimpe Algra, Jonathan Barnes, Jaap Mansfeld and Malcolm Schofield. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Long, A. A. *Epictetus: A Stoic and Socratic Guide to Life*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Long, A. A. "Roman Philosophy." Pages 184-210 in *The Cambridge Companion to Greek and Roman Philosophy*. Edited by David Sedley. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Long, A. A. and D. N. Sedley. *The Hellenistic Philosophers. Volume 2: Greek and Latin Texts with Notes and Bibliography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Long, A. A. and D. N. Sedley. *The Hellenistic Philosophers. Volume 1: Translations of the Principal Sources, with Philosophical Commentary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Long, Fredrick J. *Ancient Rhetoric and Paul's Apology: The Compositional Unity of 2 Corinthians*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 131. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Long, Fredrick J. "Roman Imperial Rule under the Authority of Jupiter-Zeus: Political-Religious Contexts and the Interpretation of 'The Ruler of the Authority of the Air' in Ephesians 2:2." Pages 113-54 in *The Language of the New Testament: Context, History, and*

- Development*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Andrew W. Pitts. Linguistic Biblical Studies 6. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Long, Fredrick J. *2 Corinthians: A Handbook on the Greek Text*. Baylor Handbook on the Greek New Testament. Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2015.
- Long, Fredrick J. “‘The God of this Age’ (2 Cor 4:4) and Paul’s Empire-Resisting Gospel.” in *The First Urban Churches 2: Roman Corinth*. Edited by James R. Harrison and L. L. Welborn. Writings from the Greco-Roman World Supplements. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, forthcoming.
- Mack, Burton L. “Philo Judaeus and Exegetical Traditions in Alexandria.” *ANRW* 21:1:227-71. Part 2, *Principat*, 21:1. Edited by Hildegard Temporini and Wolfgang Haase. New York: de Gruyter, 1984.
- MacKendrick, Paul. *The Philosophical Books of Cicero*. New York: St Martin’s Press, 1989.
- MacRae, George W. “Heavenly Temple and Eschatology in the Letter to the Hebrews.” *Semitica* 12 (1978): 179-99.
- Malherbe, Abraham J. *Paul and the Popular Philosophers*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989.
- Malherbe, Abraham J. “Hellenistic Moralists and the New Testament.” *ANRW* 26.1:267-333. Part 2, *Principat*, 26.1. Edited by Hildegard Temporini and Wolfgang Haase. New York: de Gruyter, 1992.
- Malherbe, Abraham J. “Conversion to Paul’s Gospel.” Pages 230-44 in *The Early Church in Its Context: Essays in Honor of Everett Ferguson*. Edited by Abraham J. Malherbe, Frederick W. Norris and James W. Thompson. Supplements to Novum Testamentum. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Mansfeld, Jaap. “Sources.” Pages 3-30 in *The Cambridge History of Hellenistic Philosophy*. Edited by Keimpe Algra, Jonathan Barnes, Jaap Mansfeld and Malcolm Schofield. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Mansfeld, Jaap. “Theology.” Pages 452-78 in *The Cambridge History of Hellenistic Philosophy*. Edited by Keimpe Algra, Jonathan Barnes, Jaap Mansfeld and Malcolm Schofield. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Marshall, I. H. “Church and Temple in the New Testament.” *Tyndale Bulletin* 40 (1989): 203-22.
- Marshall, Peter. “A Metaphor of Social Shame: θριαμβεύειν in 2 Cor 2:14.” *Novum Testamentum* 25 (1983): 302-17.
- Martin, Dale B. *Slavery as Salvation: The Metaphor of Slavery in Pauline Christianity*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990.

- Martin, Dale B. *The Corinthian Body*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.
- Martin, Ralph P. *2 Corinthians*. Word Biblical Commentary 40. 2d ed. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2014.
- Matera, Frank J. *II Corinthians: A Commentary*. New Testament Library. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2003.
- May, Alistair Scott. *The Body for the Lord: Sex and Identity in 1 Corinthians 5-7*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 278. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- McDonald, James I. H. "Paul and the Preaching Ministry: A Reconsideration of 2 Cor 2:14-17 in its Context." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 17 (1983): 35-50.
- McKelvey, R. J. *The New Temple: The Church in the New Testament*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969.
- McNicol, Allan J. "The Eschatological Temple in the Qumran Peshar 4QFlorilegium 1:1-7." 5.2 (1977): 133-41.
- Mendelson, Alan. *Philo's Jewish Identity*. Brown Judaic Studies 161. Scholars Press, 1988.
- Merklein, Helmut. *Der erste Brief an die Korinther. Kapitel 1-4*. Ökumenischer Taschenbuch-Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 6/1. Gütersloh: G. Mohn, 1992.
- Metzger, Bruce M. *The New Testament: Its Background, Growth, and Content*. New York: Abingdon, 1965.
- Metzger, Bruce M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. 2d ed. Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1994.
- Mitchell, Margaret M. "Concerning Περὶ δὲ in 1 Corinthians." *Novum Testamentum* 31.3 (1989): 229-56.
- Mitchell, Margaret M. *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1991.
- Mitton, C. L. "New Wine in Old Wineskins: iv, Leaven." *Expository Times* 84 (1973): 339-43.
- Moore, Carey A. *Daniel, Esther and Jeremiah: The Additions*. Anchor Bible 44. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1977.
- Moore, Carey A. *Judith: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 40A. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1985.

- Moore, Carey A. *Tobit: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 40A. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1996.
- Most, Glenn W. "Philosophy and Religion." Pages 300-22 in *The Cambridge Companion to Greek and Roman Philosophy*. Edited by David Sedley. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Moule, C. F. D. "Sanctuary and Sacrifice in the Church of the New Testament." *Journal of Theological Studies* 1:1 (1950): 29-41.
- Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome. *Keys to First Corinthians: Revisiting the Major Issues*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome. "Corinthian Slogans in 1 Corinthians 6:12–20." Pages 20-31 in *Keys to First Corinthians: Revisiting the Major Issues*. Edited by Jerome Murphy O'Connor. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome. "Freedom or the Ghetto: (1 Corinthians 8:1–13; 10:23–11:1)." Pages 87-128 in *Keys to First Corinthians: Revisiting the Major Issues*. Edited by Jerome Murphy O'Connor. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome. *Keys to Second Corinthians: Revisiting the Major Issues*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Nathan, Emmanuel. "Fragmented Theology in 2 Corinthians: The Unsolved Puzzle of 6:14–7:1." Pages 211-28 in *Theologizing in the Corinthian Conflict: Studies in the Exegesis and Theology of 2 Corinthians*. Edited by Reimund Bieringer, Ma. Marilou S. Ibita, Dominika A. Kurek-Chomycz and Thomas A. Vollmer. Biblical Tools and Studies 16. Leuven: Peeters, 2013.
- Newton, Derek. *Diety and Diet: The Dilemma of Sacrificial Food at Corinth*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 169. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- Newton, Michael. *The Concept of Purity at Qumran and in the Letters of Paul*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 53. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Nguyen, V. Henry T. *Christian Identity in Corinth: A Comparative Study of 2 Corinthians, Epictetus and Valerius Maximus*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe 243. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 2008.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E. "Philo among Greeks, Jews and Christians." Pages 53-72 in *Philo und das Neue Testament: Wechselseitige Wahrnehmungen I. Internationales Symposium Zum Corpus Judaeo-Hellenisticum. 1.-4. Mai 2003, Eisenach/Jena*. Edited by Roland

- Deines and Karl-Wilhelm Niebuhr. *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 172*. Edited by 172. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 2004.
- Nikiprowetzky, Valentin. “La spiritualisation des sacrifices et le culte sacrificiel au temple de Jérusalem chez Philon d’Alexandrie.” *Semitica* 17 (1967): 97-116.
- O’Brien, Peter T. *Introductory Thanksgivings in the Letters of Paul*. Supplements to *Novum Testamentum* 4. Leiden: Brill, 1977.
- Oakes, Peter. “Made Holy by the Holy Spirit: Holiness and Ecclesiology in Romans.” Pages 167-83 in *Holiness and Ecclesiology in the New Testament*. Edited by Kent E. Brower and Andy Johnson. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- Obbink, Dirk. “The Stoic Sage in the Cosmic City.” Pages 178-95 in *Topics in Stoic Philosophy*. Edited by Katerina Ierodiakonou. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Odell-Scott, David W. *Paul’s Critique of Theocracy: A/Theocracy in Corinthians and Galatians*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 250. London: T&T Clark, 2003.
- Olley, W. “A Precursor of the NRSV? ‘Sons and Daughters’ in 2 Cor 6:18.” *New Testament Studies* 44 (1998): 204-12.
- Omanson, Roger L. “Acknowledging Paul’s quotations.” *The Bible Translator* 43.2 (1992): 201-13.
- Oropeza, B. J. “Situational Immorality: Paul’s ‘Vice Lists’ at Corinth.” *Expository Times* 110.1 (1998): 9-10.
- Otzen, Benedikt. *Tobit and Judith*. Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. London: Continuum, 2002.
- Paige, T. “Philosophy.” Pages 713-18 in *Dictionary of Paul and his Letters*. Edited by Gerald F. Hawthorne, Ralph P. Martin and Daniel G. Reid. Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 1993.
- Paige, Terence. “Stoicism, ἐλευθερία and Community at Corinth.” Pages 180-93 in *Worship, Theology and Ministry in the Early Church: Essays in Honor of Ralph P. Martin*. Edited by Michael J. Wilkins and Terence Paige. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 87. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992.
- Patte, Daniel. “A Structural Exegesis of 2 Corinthians 2:14–7:4 with Special Attention on 2:14–3:6 and 6:11–7:4.” Pages 23-49 in *Society of Biblical Literature 1987 Seminar Papers*. Edited by Kent Harold Richards. Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers 26. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.

- Patterson, Jane Lancaster. *Keeping the Feast: Metaphors of Sacrifice in 1 Corinthians and Philippians*. Early Christianity and Its Literature 16. First ed. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2015.
- Perrin, Nicholas. *Jesus the Temple*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010.
- Phua, Richard Liong-Seng. *Idolatry and Authority. A Study of 1 Corinthians 8:1–11:1 in the Light of the Jewish Diaspora*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 299. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2005.
- Plummer, Alfred. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St Paul to the Corinthians*. International Critical Commentary. 2d ed. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1914.
- Plutarch. *Moralia, Volume VII: On Love of Wealth. On Compliancy. On Envy and Hate. On Praising Oneself Inoffensively. On the Delays of the Divine Vengeance. On Fate. On the Sign of Socrates. On Exile. Consolation to His Wife*. Loeb Classical Library 405. Translated by Phillip H. De Lacy and Benedict Einarson. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1959.
- Pogoloff, Stephen M. *Logos and Sophia: The Rhetorical Situation of 1 Corinthians*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 134. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1992.
- Powell, J. G. F., ed. *Cicero the Philosopher: Twelve Papers*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.
- Powell, J. G. F. "Introduction: Cicero's Philosophical Works and their Background." Pages 1-35 in *Cicero the Philosopher: Twelve Papers*. Edited by J. G. F. Powell. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.
- Price, James L. "Aspects of Paul's Theology and their Bearing on Literary Problems of Second Corinthians." Pages 95-106 in *Studies in the History and Text of the New Testament in honor of Kenneth Willis Clark, Ph.D.* Edited by Boyd L. Daniels and M. Jack Suggs. Studies and Documents 29. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1967.
- Rabens, Volker. *The Holy Spirit & Ethics in Paul: Transformation & Empowering for Religious-Ethical Life*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 283. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
- Rabens, Volker. "Paul's Rhetoric of Demarcation: Separation from "Unbelievers" (2 Cor 6:14–7:1) in the Corinthian Conflict." Pages 229-53 in *Theologizing in the Corinthian Conflict: Studies in the Exegesis and Theology of 2 Corinthians*. Edited by Reimund Bieringer, Ma. Marilou S. Ibita, Dominika A. Kurek-Chomycz and Thomas A. Vollmer. Biblical Tools and Studies 16. Leuven: Peeters, 2013.
- Rabens, Volker. "Inclusion of and Demarcation from 'Outsiders': Mission and Ethics in Paul's Second Letter to the Corinthians." Pages 290-323 in *Sensitivity Towards Outsiders: Exploring the Dynamic Relationship between Mission and Ethics in the New Testament*

- and Early Christianity*. Edited by Jacobus Kok, Tobias Nicklas, Dieter T. Roth and Christopher M. Hays. *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe* 364. 2014.
- Radice, Roberto. "Philo's Theology and Theory of Creation." Pages 124-45 in *The Cambridge Companion to Philo*. Edited by Adam Kamesar. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Reesor, Margaret E. *The Nature of Man in Early Stoic Philosophy*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1989.
- Regev, Eyal. "Abominated Temple and a Holy Community: The Formation of the Notions of Purity and Impurity in Qumran." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 10.2 (2003): 243-78.
- Rensberger, D. "2 Corinthians 6:14 – 7:1 – A Fresh Examination." *Studia Biblica et Theologica* 8 (1978): 25-49.
- Renwick, David, A. *Paul, the Temple, and the Presence of God*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991.
- Reydams-Schils, Gretchen J. "Stoicized Readings of Timaeus in Philo of Alexandria." *Studia Philonica* 7 (1995): 85-102.
- Reydams-Schils, Gretchen J. *The Roman Stoics: Self, Responsibility, and Affection*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005.
- Richardson, Peter. "Judgment in Sexual Matters in 1 Corinthians 6:1-11." *Novum Testamentum* 25.1 (1983): 37-58.
- Richardson, Peter. "Temples, Altars and Living from the Gospel." Pages 89-110 in *Gospel in Paul: Studies on Corinthians, Galatians and Romans for Richard N. Longenecker*. Edited by L. Ann Jervis and Peter Richardson. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series* 108. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.
- Richardson, Philip. "What are the Spiritual Sacrifices of 1 Peter 2:5? Some light from Philo of Alexandria." *Evangelical Quarterly* 87.1 (2015): 3-17.
- Rist, J. M. *Stoic Philosophy*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1977.
- Rives, James B. *Religion in the Roman Empire*. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2007.
- Robertson, Paul. "Towards An Understanding of Philo's and Cicero's Treatment of Sacrifice." *Studia Philonica* 23 (2011): 41-67.
- Rosner, Brian J. "Temple and Holiness in 1 Corinthians 5." *Tyndale Bulletin* 42 (1991): 137-45.

- Rosner, Brian J. "Temple Prostitution in 1 Corinthians 6:12–20." *Novum Testamentum* 40 (1998): 336-51.
- Rosner, Brian S. *Paul, Scripture and Ethics: A Study of 1 Corinthians 5–7*. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 22. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- Rowe, Christopher. "Plato." Pages 98-124 in *The Cambridge Companion to Greek and Roman Philosophy*. Edited by David Sedley. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Rowland, C. C. "The Second Temple: Focus of Ideological Struggle?" Pages 175-98 in *Templum Amicitiae: Essays on the Second Temple presented to Ernst Bammel*. Edited by William Horbury. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 48. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.
- Rowland, Christopher. "The Temple in the New Testament." Pages 469-83 in *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel*. Edited by John Day. London: T&T Clark, 2005.
- Runia, David T. "Was Philo a Middle Platonist? A Difficult Question Revisited." *Studia Philonica* V (1993): 112-40.
- Runia, David T. "Response to Runia and Sterling." *Studia Philonica* V (1993): 141-46.
- Runia, David T. *Philo of Alexandria. On the Creation of the Cosmos According to Moses: Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*. Philo of Alexandria Commentary Series 1. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Russell, D. A. *Plutarch: Classical Life and Letters*. London: Duckworth, 1973.
- Rutherford, R. B. *The Meditations of Marcus Aurelius: A Study*. Oxford Classical Monographs. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Sampley, J. Paul., ed. *Paul in the Greco-Roman World: A Handbook*. Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 2003.
- Sandbach, F. H. "Phantasia Katalēptikē." Pages 9-21 in *Problems in Stoicism*. Edited by A. A. Long. London: Athlone Press, 1971.
- Sandbach, F. H. *The Stoics*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1975.
- Sandelin, Karl-Gustav. "Philo as a Jew." Pages 19-46 in *Reading Philo: A Handbook to Philo of Alexandria*. Edited by Torrey Seland. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014.
- Sandmel, Samuel. *Judaism and Christian Beginnings*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1978.

- Sandmel, Samuel. *Philo of Alexandria: An Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1979.
- Sandmel, Samuel. "Philo Judaeus: An Introduction to the Man, His Writings, and His Significance." *ANRW* 21:1:3-46. Part 2, *Principat*, 21:1. Edited by Hildegard Temporini and Wolfgang Haase. New York: de Gruyter, 1984.
- Sandnes, Karl Olav. *Belly and Body in the Pauline Epistles*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 120. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Savage, Timothy B. *Power through Weakness: Paul's Understanding of the Christian Ministry in 2 Corinthians*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 86. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Schenck, Kenneth. *A Brief Guide to Philo*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2005.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H. "Community Without Temple: The Qumran Community's Withdrawal from the Jerusalem Temple." Pages 267-84 in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel: Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*. Edited by Beate Ego, Armin Lange and Peter Pilhofer. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 118. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1999.
- Schmidt, Francis. *How the Temple Thinks. Identity and Social Cohesion in Ancient Judaism*. The Biblical Seminar 78. Translated by J. Edward Crowley. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- Schmithals, Walter. *Gnosticism in Corinth: An Investigation of the Letters to the Corinthians*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1971.
- Schnabel, Eckhard J. *Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther*. Wuppertal: R. Brockhaus, 2006.
- Schofield, Malcolm. "Stoic Ethics." Pages 233-56 in *The Cambridge Companion to the Stoics*. Edited by Brad Inwood. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Schofield, Malcolm. "Writing Philosophy." Pages 73-87 in *The Cambridge Companion to Cicero*. Edited by Catherine Steel. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Schowalter, Daniel N. and Steven J. Friesen. *Urban Religion in Roman Corinth: Interdisciplinary Approaches*. Harvard Theological Studies 53. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Divinity School, 2005.
- Schrage, Wolfgang. *Der erste Brief an die Korinther: 1 Kor 1,1-6,11*. Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 7.1. Zürich: Benziger, 1991.

- Schrage, Wolfgang. *Der erste Brief an die Korinther: 1 Kor 6,12-11,16*. Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 7.2. Zürich: Benziger, 1995.
- Schrage, Wolfgang. *Der erste Brief an die Korinther: 1 Kor 11,17-14,40*. Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 7.3. Zürich: Benziger, 1999.
- Schrage, Wolfgang. *Der erste Brief an die Korinther: 1 Kor 15,1-16,24*. Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 7.4. Zürich: Benziger, 2001.
- Schreiner, Thomas R. *Paul, Apostle of God's Glory in Christ: A Pauline Theology*. Downer's Grove, Ill.: IVP Academic, 2006.
- Schüssler Fiorenza, E. "Cultic Language in Qumran and in the New Testament." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 38 (1976): 159-77.
- Schüssler Fiorenza, Elizabeth. *Rhetoric and Ethic: The Politics of Biblical Studies*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999.
- Schwartz, Daniel R. "The Three Temples of 4Q Florilegium." *Revue de Qumran* 10 (1979): 83-91.
- Schwartz, Daniel R. "Philo, His Family, and His Times." Pages 9-31 in *The Cambridge Companion to Philo*. Edited by Adam Kamesar. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Scott, J. M. "The Triumph of God in 2 Cor 2.14: Additional Evidence of Merkabah Mysticism in Paul." *New Testament Studies* 42 (1996): 260-81.
- Scott, J. M. "The Use of Scripture in 2 Corinthians 6.16c – 18 and Paul's Restoration Theology." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 56 (1994): 73-99.
- Scott, James M. *Adoption as Sons of God: An Exegetical Investigation into the Background of υιοθεσία in the Pauline Corpus*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe 48. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1992.
- Sedley, David. *The Cambridge Companion to Greek and Roman Philosophy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Sedley, David. "The School, from Zeno to Arius Didymus." Pages 7-32 in *The Cambridge Companion to the Stoics*. Edited by Brad Inwood. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Seifrid, Mark A. *The Second Letter to the Corinthians*. Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014.

- Seland, Torrey. "The 'Common Priesthood' of Philo and 1 Peter: A Philonic Reading of 1 Peter 2.5, 9." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 57 (1995): 87-119.
- Seland, Torrey. "The Moderate Life of the Christian *paroikoi*: A Philonic Reading of 1 Pet 2:11." Pages 241-64 in *Philo und das Neue Testament: Wechselseitige Wahrnehmungen I. Internationales Symposium Zum Corpus Judaeo-Hellenisticum. 1.-4. Mai 2003, Eisenach/Jena*. Edited by Roland Deines and Karl-Wilhelm Niebuhr. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 172. Edited by 172. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 2004.
- Seland, Torrey, ed. *Reading Philo: A Handbook to Philo of Alexandria*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014.
- Sevenster, J. N. *Paul and Seneca*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 4. Leiden: Brill, 1961.
- Shanor, J. "Paul as Master-BUILDER: Construction Terms in First Corinthians." *New Testament Studies* 34 (1988): 461-71.
- Sharples, R. W. *Stoics, Epicureans and Sceptics: An Introduction to Hellenistic Philosophy*. London: Routledge, 1996.
- Shemesh, Aharon. "The Holiness According to the Temple Scroll." *Revue de Qumran* 19 (2000): 369-82.
- Shen, Michael Li-Tak. *Canaan to Corinth*. Studies in Biblical Literature 83. New York: Peter Lang, 2010.
- Skehan, Patrick W. and Alexander A. Di Lella. *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: A New Translation with Notes, Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 39. New York: Doubleday, 1987.
- Smit, Joop F. "About the Idol Offerings". *Rhetoric, Social Context and Theology of Paul's Discourse in First Corinthians 8:1-11:1*. Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 27. Leuven: Peeters, 2000.
- Smith, Jay E. "The Roots of a 'Libertine' Slogan in I Corinthians 6:18." *Journal of Theological Studies* 59.1 (2008): 63-95.
- Smith, Jay E. "Slogans in 1 Corinthians." *Bibliotheca sacra* 167 (2010): 68-88.
- Smith, Jay E. "A Slogan in 1 Corinthians 6:18b: Pressing the Case." Pages 74-98 in *Studies in the Pauline Epistles: Essays in Honor of Douglas J. Moo*. Edited by Matthew Harmon and Jay E. Smith. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2014.
- Snow, Robert S. Review of Timothy Wardle, *The Jerusalem Temple and Early Christian Identity*. *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 22.2 (2012): 304-5.

- Son, Kiwoong. *Zion Symbolism in Hebrews: Hebrews 12:18–24 as a Hermeneutical Key to the Epistle*. Waynesboro, Ga.: Paternoster, 2005.
- Son, S. Aaron. “Temple Purity in 1-2 Corinthians.” *Review of Biblical Literature* 11 (2013): Cited 28 July 2014. Online: http://www.bookreviews.org/pdf/9192_10133.pdf.
- Son, Sang-Won (Aaron). *Corporate Elements in Pauline Anthropology: A Study of Selected Terms, Idioms, and Concepts in the Light of Paul’s Usage and Background*. Analecta biblica. Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2001.
- Starling, David. “The ἄπιστοι of 2 Cor 6:14: Beyond the Impasse.” *Novum Testamentum* 55 (2013): 45-60.
- Starling, David I. *Not My People: Gentiles as Exiles in Pauline Hermeneutics*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 184. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011.
- Steel, Catherine, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Cicero*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Sterling, Gregory E. “Platonizing Moses: Philo and Middle Platonism.” *Studia Philonica* V (1993): 96-111.
- Sterling, Gregory E. “The Place of Philo of Alexandria in the Study of Christian Origins.” Pages 21-52 in *Philo und das Neue Testament: Wechselseitige Wahrnehmungen I. Internationales Symposium Zum Corpus Judaeo-Hellenisticum. 1.-4. Mai 2003, Eisenach/Jena*. Edited by Roland Deines and Karl-Wilhelm Niebuhr. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 172. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 2004.
- Sterling, Gregory E. ““The Jewish Philosophy”: Reading Moses via Hellenistic Philosophy according to Philo.” Pages 129-54 in *Reading Philo: A Handbook to Philo of Alexandria*. Edited by Torrey Seland. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014.
- Stevenson, Gregory. *Power and Place: Temple and Identity in the Book of Revelation*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 107. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2001.
- Stockhausen, Carol Kern. *Moses’ Veil and the Glory of the New Covenant: The Exegetical Substructure of II Cor 3, 1–4, 6*. Analecta biblica 116. Roma: Pontificio Istituto Biblica, 1989.
- Stowers, Stanley K. “Does Pauline Christianity Resemble a Hellenistic Philosophy?” Pages 81-102 in *Paul Beyond the Judaism-Hellenism Divide*. Edited by Troels Engberg-Pedersen. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001.
- Strack, Wolfram. *Kultische Terminologie in ekklesiologischen Kontexten in den Briefen des Paulus*. Bonner biblische Beiträge 92. Weinheim: Beltz Athenäum, 1994.

- Sweet, J. P. M. "A House Not made with Hands." Pages 368-90 in *Templum Amicitiae: Essays on the Second Temple presented to Ernst Bammel*. Edited by William Horbury. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 48. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.
- Tempest, Kathryn. *Cicero: Politics and Persuasion in Ancient Rome*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2011.
- Termini, Cristina. "Philo's Thought within the Context of Middle Judaism." Pages 95-123 in *The Cambridge Companion to Philo*. Edited by Adam Kamesar. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Theissen, Gerd. *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity: Essays on Corinth*. Translated by John H. Schütz. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982.
- Thiselton, Anthony C. "Realized eschatology at Corinth." *New Testament Studies* 24.4 (1978): 510-26.
- Thiselton, Anthony C. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Thompson, James W. "Paul's Argument from *Pathos* in 2 Corinthians." Pages 127-45 in *Paul and Pathos*. Edited by Thomas H. Olbricht and Jerry L. Sumney. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 16. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001.
- Thorsteinsson, Runar M. *Roman Christianity and Roman Stoicism: A Comparative Study of Ancient Morality*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Thrall, Margaret E. "2 Corinthians 1:12: ἀγιότητα or ἀπλότητα?" Pages 366-72 in *Studies in New Testament Language and Text: Essays in Honour of George D. Kilpatrick on the Occasion on his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*. Edited by J. K. Elliott. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 44. Leiden: Brill, 1976.
- Thrall, Margaret E. "The Problem of 2 Cor vi. 14–vii. 1 in Some Recent Discussion." *New Testament Studies* 24 (1977): 132-48.
- Thrall, Margaret E. *2 Corinthians 1-7: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians*. International Critical Commentary. London: T&T Clark, 1994.
- Thrall, Margaret E. *2 Corinthians 8-13: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians*. International Critical Commentary. T&T Clark, 2000.
- Tieleman, Teun. Review of Troels Engberg-Pedersen, *The Stoic Theory of Oikeiosis: Moral Development and Social Interaction in Early Stoic Philosophy*. *Mnemosyne* 48 (1995): 226-32.

- Tobin, Thomas H. "Was Philo a Middle Platonist? Some suggestions." *Studia Philonica* V (1993): 147-50.
- Tomlin, Graham. "Christians and Epicureans in 1 Corinthians." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 68 (1997): 51-72.
- Tomson, Peter J. *Paul and the Jewish Law: Halakha in the Letters of the Apostle to the Gentiles*. Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum 3.1. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.
- Tomson, Peter J. "Christ, Belial, and Women: 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 Compared with Ancient Judaism and with the Pauline Corpus." Pages 79-131 in *Second Corinthians in the Perspective of Late Second Temple Judaism*. Edited by Reimund Bieringer, Emmanuel Nathan, Didier Pollefeyt and Peter J. Tomson. Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum 14. Leiden: Brill, 2014.
- Trapp, Michael. "The Role of Philosophy and Philosophers in the Imperial Period." Pages 43-57 in *A Companion to Plutarch*. Edited by Mark Beck. Malden, Mass: Wiley-Blackwell, 2014.
- Tucker, Brian J. "The Role of Civic Identity on the Pauline Corinth." *Didaskalia* 72.8 (2008): 71-91.
- Tucker, Paavo. "Reconsidering Βελίαρ: 2 Corinthians 6:15 in Its Anti-Imperial Jewish Apocalyptic Context." *Journal for the Study of Paul and his Letters* 4.2 (2014): 169-85.
- Vahrenhorst, Martin. *Kultische Sprache in den Paulusbriefen*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 230. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 2008.
- van Kooten, George H. *Paul's Anthropology in Context: The Image of God, Assimilation to God, and Tripartite Man in Ancient Judaism, Ancient Philosophy and Early Christianity*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 232. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 2008.
- van Ruiten, J. T. A. G. M. "Visions of the Temple in the Book of Jubilees." Pages 215-27 in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel: Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*. Edited by Beate Ego, Armin Lange and Peter Pilhofer. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 118. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1999.
- van Unnik, W. C. "'With Unveiled Face,' an Exegesis of 2 Corinthians iii 12–18." *Novum Testamentum* (1963): 153-69.

- Vegge, Ivar. *2 Corinthians – a Letter about Reconciliation: A Psychagogical, Epistolographical and Rhetorical Analysis*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe 239. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 2008.
- Vermes, G. “The Symbolical Interpretation of Lebanon in the Targums.” *Journal of Theological Studies* IX (1958): 1-12.
- Veyne, Paul. *Seneca: The Life of a Stoic*. Translated by David Sullivan. New York: Routledge, 2003.
- Vogel, Manuel. “Tempel and Tempelkult in Pseudo-Philos *Lieber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*.” Pages 251-63 in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel: Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*. Edited by Beate Ego, Armin Lange and Peter Pilhofer. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 118. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1999.
- Wagner, J. Ross. “Working Out Salvation: Holiness and Community in Philippians.” in *Holiness and Ecclesiology in the New Testament*. Edited by Kent E. Brower and Andy Johnson. 257–74. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- Walker Jr, W. O. “The Burden of Proof in Identifying Interpolations in the Pauline Letters.” *New Testament Studies* 33 (1987): 610-18.
- Walker Jr, W. O. “2 Cor 6.14–7.1 and the Chiastic Structure of 6.11–13; 7.2–3.” *New Testament Studies* 48.1 (2002): 142 -144.
- Wardle, Timothy. *The Jerusalem Temple and Early Christian Identity*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe 291. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 2010.
- Wardle, Timothy. “Who is Sacrificing? Assessing the Early Christian Reticence to Transfer the Idea of the Priesthood to the Community.” Pages 99-114 in *Ritual and Metaphor: Sacrifice in the Bible*. Edited by Christian A. Eberhart. Society of Biblical Literature Resources for Biblical Study 68. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011.
- Ware, James. “Moral Progress and Divine Power in Seneca and Paul.” Pages 267-83 in *Passions and Moral Progress in Greco-Roman Thought*. Edited by John T. Fitzgerald. New York: Routledge, 2008.
- Warren, James, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Epicureanism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Wassen, Cecilia. “Do You Have to Be Pure in a Metaphorical Temple? Sanctuary Metaphors and Construction of Sacred Space in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Paul’s Letters.” Pages 55-86 in *Purity, Holiness, and Identity in Judaism and Christianity: Essays in Memory of Susan Haber*. Edited by Carl S. Ehrlich, Anders Runesson and Eileen Schuller.

- Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 305. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 2013.
- Webb, William J. “Unequally Yoked with Unbelievers, Part 1: Who are the Unbelievers (ἄπιστοι) in 2 Corinthians 6:14?” *Bibliotheca sacra* 149 (1992): 27-44.
- Webb, William J. “Unequally Yoked with Unbelievers, Part 2: What is the Unequal Yoke (ἕτεροζυγοῦντες) in 2 Corinthians 6:14?” *Bibliotheca sacra* 149 (1992): 162-79.
- Webb, William J. *Returning Home: New Covenant and Second Exodus as the Context for 2 Corinthians 6:14–7:1*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 85. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.
- Weiss, Johannes. *Der erste Korintherbrief*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1910.
- Wenschkewitz, Hans. *Die Spiritualisierung der Kultusbegriffe: Tempel, Priester und Opfer im Neuen Testament*. Angelos Beihefte 4. Leipzig: Eduard Pfeiffer, 1932.
- Wenthe, Dean O. “An Exegetical study of 1 Corinthians 5:7b.” *The Springfielder* 38.2 (1974): 134-40.
- Werman, Carl. “God’s House: Temple or Universe.” Pages 309-22 in *Philo und das Neue Testament: Wechselseitige Wahrnehmungen, I. Interationales Symposium zum Corpus Judaeo-Hellenisticum, 1.-4. Mai 2003, Eisenach /Jena*. Edited by Roland Deines and Karl-Wilhelm Niebuhr. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 172. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 2004.
- White, Michael J. “Stoic Natural Philosophy (Physics and Cosmology).” Pages 124-52 in *The Cambridge Companion to the Stoics*. Edited by Brad Inwood. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Wilken, Robert L. “Toward a Social Interpretation of Early Christian Apologetics.” *Church History* 39.4 (1970): 437-58.
- Williamson, Ronald. *Jews in the Hellenistic World: Philo*. Cambridge Commentaries on Writings of the Jewish and Christian World 200 BC to AD 200 Volume 1, Part 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Willis, Wendell L. *Idol Meat in Corinth: The Pauline Argument in 1 Corinthians 8 and 10*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 68. Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1985.
- Wilson, Walter T. *Philo of Alexandria. On Virtues: Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*. Philo of Alexandria Commentary Series 3. Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- Windisch, Hans. *Der Zweite Korintherbrief*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1924.

- Winston, David. "Response to Runia and Sterling." *Studia Philonica* V (1993): 141-46.
- Winston, David. "Philo and the Hellenistic Jewish Encounter." *Studia Philonica* 7 (1995): 124-42.
- Winter, Bruce W. "Gluttony and Immorality at Élitist Banquets: The Background to 1 Corinthians 6:12–20." *Jian Dao* 7 (1997): 77-90.
- Winter, Bruce W. *After Paul Left Corinth: The Influence of Secular Ethics and Social Change*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001.
- Winter, Bruce W. *Philo and Paul Among the Sophists: Alexandrian and Corinthian Responses to a Julio-Claudian Movement*. 2d ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.
- Winter, Bruce W. "Carnal Conduct and Sanctification in 1 Corinthians: *Simul sanctus et peccator?*" Pages 184-200 in *Holiness and Ecclesiology in the New Testament*. Edited by Kent E. Brower and Andy Johnson. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- Winter, Bruce W. "Identifying the Offering, the Cup and the Table of the 'Demons' in 1 Cor 10:20-21." Pages 847-68 in *Saint Paul and Corinth: International Scientific Conference Proceedings, Corinth, 23-25 September, 2007*. Edited by C. Belezos, S. Despotis and C. Karakolis. Athens: Psychogios, 2009.
- Wise, M. O. "4QFlorilegium and the Temple of Adam." *Revue de Qumran* 15 (1991): 103-32.
- Witherington III, Ben. "Not So Idle Thoughts about Eidolothuton." *Tyndale Bulletin* 44.2 (1993): 237-54.
- Witherington III, Ben. *Conflict and Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
- Witherington III, Ben. *Paul's Narrative Thought World: The Tapestry of Tragedy and Triumph*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994.
- Wolff, Christian. *Der zweite Brief des Paulus an die Korinther*. Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament 8. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1989.
- Wright III, Benjamin G. "Ben Sira and the *Book of the Watchers* on the Legitimate Priesthood." Pages 241-54 in *Intertextual Studies in Ben Sira and Tobit*. Edited by Jeremy Corley and Vincent Skemp. Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 38. Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2005.
- Wright III, Benjamin G. *Praise Israel for Wisdom and Instruction: Essays on Ben Sira and Wisdom, the Letter of Aristeeas and the Septuagint*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 131. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

- Wright, M. R. "Cicero on Self-Love and Love of Humanity in *De Finibus* 3." Pages 171-95 in *Cicero the Philosopher: Twelve Papers*. Edited by J. G. F. Powell. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.
- Wright, N. T. *The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991.
- Wright, N. T. "Monotheism, Christology and Ethics: 1 Corinthians 8." Pages 120-36 in *The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology*. Edited by N. T. Wright. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991.
- Wright, N. T. *The Resurrection of the Son of God*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003.
- Wright, N. T. *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2013.
- Yadin, Y. "A Midrash on II Sam. vii and Ps. i-ii (4QFlorilegium)." *Israel Exploration Journal* IX (1959): 95-98.
- Yeo, Khiok-Khng. *Rhetorical Interaction in 1 Corinthians 8 and 10: A Formal Analysis with Preliminary Suggestions for a Chinese, Cross-Cultural Hermeneutic*. Biblical Interpretation 9. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Yinger, Kent L. *Paul, Judaism, and Judgment According to Deeds*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 105. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Young, Frances and David F. Ford. *Meaning and Truth in 2 Corinthians*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987.
- Zeilinger, Franz. "Die Echtheit von 2 Cor 6:14-7:1." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 112 (1993): 71-80.
- Zeller, Dieter. *Die erste Brief an die Korinther*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010.