

# Christian Body, Christian Self: Concepts of Early Christian Personhood

Edited by  
CLARE K. ROTHCHILD and  
TREVOR W. THOMPSON

*Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen  
zum Neuen Testament  
284*

---

**Mohr Siebeck**

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen  
zum Neuen Testament

Herausgeber / Editor  
Jörg Frey (Zürich)

Mitherausgeber / Associate Editors  
Friedrich Avemarie (Marburg)  
Markus Bockmuehl (Oxford)  
James A. Kelhoffer (Uppsala)  
Hans-Josef Klauck (Chicago, IL)

284





# Christian Body, Christian Self: Concepts of Early Christian Personhood

edited by

Clare K. Rothschild and  
Trevor W. Thompson

with the assistance of  
Robert S. Kinney

Mohr Siebeck

*Clare K. Rothschild*, born 1964; 1986 B.A. University of California, Berkeley; 1992 M.T.S. Harvard University; 2003 Ph.D. University of Chicago; currently Associate Professor of Theology at Lewis University, Romeoville, IL.

*Trevor W. Thompson*, born 1975; 1998 B.A. Oklahoma Christian University; 2002 M.A., M.Div. Harding University Graduate School of Theology; 2007 M.A. University of Chicago; 2009 Ph.D. (candidate) University of Chicago; currently Instructor of New Testament at Abilene Christian University.

e-ISBN PDF 978-3-16-151861-4

ISBN 978-3-16-150950-6

ISSN 0512-1604 (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament)

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data is available on the Internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

© 2011 by Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen, Germany.

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that permitted by copyright law) without the publisher's written permission. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage and processing in electronic systems.

The book was typeset by Martin Fischer in Tübingen, printed by Gulde-Druck in Tübingen on non-aging paper and bound by Buchbinderei Spinner in Ottersweier.

Printed in Germany.

To all leaders and participants of the  
Corpus Hellenisticum Novi Testamenti Section  
of The Society of Biblical Literature  
2005–present



## Acknowledgments

It has been so long since the *Corpus Hellenisticum Novi Testamenti* (hereafter: CHNT) SBL section's steering committee – consisting today of David Aune (Notre Dame), Rainer Hirsch-Luipold (Göttingen), Paul Holloway (Sewanee, The University of the South), Troy Martin (Xavier), Margaret M. Mitchell (Chicago), Christopher Mount (DePaul), George Parsenios (Princeton Theological Seminary), and Clare K. Rothschild (Lewis; hereafter: LU) – came up with the foundational idea for this book that precisely who it was – at which meeting, in which breakfast restaurant or cocktail bar, and in which city – is lost to history. No matter, at that time, the idea triggered the section's immediate conviction that the topic was complex, underexplored, and imperative for future research in the field of New Testament and Early Christian Literature and should be taken up as a theme for the foreseeable future. Today, more than five years since we made this commitment, CHNT presenters and participants have dedicated countless hours to papers and discussions on concepts of personhood among early Christians. This volume represents a mere sample of the fruit of this research.

The manuscript was collaboratively edited and prepared by Clare K. Rothschild and Trevor W. Thompson (Abilene Christian; hereafter: ACU) between November 2010 and May 2011. We received excellent direction and feedback on aspects of our work from all authors and others, including: Hans Dieter Betz (Chicago), James A. Kelhoffer (Uppsala), Hans-Josef Klauck (Chicago), and Margaret M. Mitchell (Chicago). J. Albert Harrill (Indiana) initially acted as co-editor with Rothschild until he was forced to withdraw to carry out other commitments. Bert, nevertheless, knows the topic like few others world wide and offered invaluable criticism of essays at an early stage in their collection.

Individual colleagues to whom we are also grateful include Johan Thom (Stellenbosch), L. Curt Niccum (ACU), and David Kneip (ACU). We also wish to thank Deans Bonnie Bondavalli (LU College of Arts & Sciences) and Jack R. Reese (ACU College of Biblical Studies) for generously permitting us (respectively) to take on (yet another!) time-consuming, but important publication project.

Finally, we wish to express utmost gratitude to Dr. Henning Ziebritzki at Mohr Siebeck for his interest in and special attention to the details of this manuscript and to Prof. Dr. Jörg Frey (Zürich) for its recommendation to the WUNT series. We also wish to thank Robert S. Kinney (assistant editor) who put in strenuous hours of copy-editing and to all at Mohr Siebeck who assisted in the production of this work. In the spirit of the international collaboration represented by Cor-



pus Hellenisticum Novi Testamenti and consistent with other WUNT volumes, the editors have permitted individual authors to adhere to their own stylistic and bibliographic conventions.

Of course, without the generous support of our spouses, Doug Rothschild and Alana Thompson, and the strength and flexibility of our children, Maxwell and Luke Rothschild and Atticus Thompson, no project of this magnitude comes to completion. For them, among other things, we hope to have modeled teamwork – a somewhat rare but valuable tool in academics today.

We dedicate this book to the leaders and participants of the CHNT SBL section who uphold the mission to read and discuss ancient Greek and Latin texts for their insight into the literary and religious worlds of early Christianity and to offer papers that analyze early Christian texts in dialogue with these texts and their representative contexts. Over the years, this SBL section has become a highlight of the annual meeting for us. We are grateful to all those who exert time and energy to offer excellent programs year after year.

Chicago/ Abilene, May 1, 2011

Clare K. Rothschild  
Trevor W. Thompson

## Table of Contents

Abbreviations and References .....	XI
------------------------------------	----

### I. Introduction

<i>Clare K. Rothschild and Trevor W. Thompson</i> <i>Status quaestionis: Christian Body, Christian Self</i> .....	3
--	---

### II. Jewish Literature

<i>Karina Martin Hogan</i> The Mortal Body and the Earth in Ben Sira and the Book of the Watchers .....	21
--	----

<i>Matthew Goff</i> Being Fleshly or Spiritual: Anthropological Reflection and Exegesis of Genesis 1–3 in 4QInstruction and First Corinthians .....	41
---	----

<i>Alec J. Lucas</i> Distinct Portraits and Parallel Development of the Knowledge of God in Romans 1:18–32 and Wisdom of Solomon 13–15 .....	61
--	----

### III. Pauline Literature

<i>Troels Engberg-Pedersen</i> A Stoic Concept of the Person in Paul? From Galatians 5:17 to Romans 7:14–25 .....	85
---	----

<i>Stefan Krauter</i> Is Romans 7:7–13 about akrasia? .....	113
--	-----

### IV. Canonical Gospels and Acts

<i>Martin Meiser</i> Anthropologie im Markusevangelium .....	125
---	-----

## V. Extra-canonical Gospels and Acts

*Manfred Lang*

The Christian and the Roman Self: The Lukan Paul and a Roman Reading . 151

*Troy W. Martin*Clarifying a Curiosity: The Plural *Bloods* (αἱμάτων) in John 1:13 . . . . . 175*Richard I. Pervo*

Identification Please: Aspects of Identity in Ancient Narrative . . . . . 187

*Janet E. Spittler*The Anthropology of the *Acts of Thomas* . . . . . 203*Romulus D. Stefanut*From *Logos* to *Mythos*: The *Apocalypse of Paul* and Plato's *Phaedo*  
in Dialogue . . . . . 217*Robert Matthew Calhoun*The Resurrection of the Flesh in *Third Corinthians* . . . . . 235

## VI. Later Witnesses

*Annette Bourland Huizenga*

"Epitomizing Virtue: Clothing the Christian Woman's Body" . . . . . 261

*David Konstan*

Torture and Identity: Paganism, Christianity, and Beyond . . . . . 283

*Fritz Graf*

Apollo, Possession, and Prophecy . . . . . 299

## VII. History of Interpretation

*John R. Levison*Assessing the Origins of Modern Pneumatology: The Life and Legacy  
of Hermann Gunkel . . . . . 313

Index of References . . . . . 333

Modern Authors . . . . . 358

## Abbreviations and References

The Greek New Testament is cited from *Novum Testamentum Graece*, the Nestle-Aland 27<sup>th</sup> Edition. Abbreviations correspond to *The SBL Handbook of Style* (72009); the *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, rev. ed. (32003); Liddell, Scott and Jones, McKenzie, *A Greek-English Lexicon*; and G. W. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, including the following:

AB	Anchor Bible
AB	Anchor Bible
ABD	Anchor Bible Dictionary
AGJU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums
AJEC	Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity
AnBib	Analecta biblica
ANRW	Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung.
b.	born
B. L. Add.	British Library Additional
BAGB	Bulletin de l'Association G. Budé
BBB	Bonner biblische Beiträge
BDAG	Bauer, Danker, Arndt, and Gingrich. <i>A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> . 3rd ed.
BECNT	Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament
BETL	Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium
BHT	Beiträge zur historischen Theologie
Bib	Biblica
BibInt	Biblical Interpretation
BICS	Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies
BN	Biblische Notizen
BThS	Biblisch-theologische Studien
BWANT	Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament
BZNW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
c.	century
ca.	circa
CahO	Cahiers d'orientalisme
CBET	Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology
CBQ	Catholic Biblical Quarterly
CBQMS	Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series
CBR	Currents in Biblical Research
CC SL	Corpus Christianorum Series Latina
CMG	Corpus Medicorum Graecorum
Cod. Vat. gr.	Codex Vaticanus graecus
DJD	Discoveries in the Judaean Desert
DSD	Dead Sea Discoveries

EABS	European Association of Biblical Studies
EBib	Etudes bibliques
EdF	Erträge der Forschung
EHS	Evangelische Hochschule Dresden
EKKNT	Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
ET	English translation
ETS	Erfurter theologische Studien
EWNT	Exegetisches Wörterbuch zum NT
FF	Forschungen und Fortschritte
FKDG	Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte, Göttingen
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
FS	Festschrift
FSRKA	Frankfurter Studien zur Religion und Kultur der Antike
GCS	Die griechische christliche Schriftsteller der ersten [drei] Jahrhunderte
GTB	Van Gorcum's theologische bibliothek
HBS	Henry Bradshaw Society
Heb.	Hebrew
HNT	Handbuch zum Neuen Testament
HNTC	Harper's New Testament Commentaries
HThK	Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
HTR	Harvard Theological Review
HUCA	Hebrew Union College Annual
HUT	Hermeneutische Untersuchungen zur Theologie
ICC	International Critical Commentary
IDB	The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible
IdF	Impulse der Forschung
ILS	Inscriptiones Latinae selectae
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature
JECS	Journal of Early Christian Studies
JJS	Journal of Jewish Studies
JR	Journal of Religion
JSJSup	Journal for the Study of Judaism Supplement Series
JSNT	Journal for the Study of the New Testament
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series
JSOT	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series
JSP	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha
JSPSup	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series
JSQ	Jewish Studies Quarterly
JTS	Journal of Theological Studies
KEK	Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament
KJV	King James Version
KuD	Kerygma und Dogma
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
LNTS	Library of New Testament Studies
LSJ	Liddell, Scott, and Jones. A Greek-English Lexicon
LXX	Septuagint

MBPS	Mellen Biblical Press Series
m. E.	„meines Erachtens (“in my opinion”)
MPL	Monumenta polyphoniae liturgicae sanctae ecclesiae Romane
MS(S)	manuscript(s)
MThA	Münsteraner theologische Abhandlungen
NA <sup>27</sup>	Novum Testamentum Graece. 27th ed.
NEB	New English Bible
NIB	The New Interpreter's Bible
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament
NIV	New International Version
NovT	Novum Testamentum
NovTSup	Novum Testamentum Supplements
NPNF	Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
NT	New Testament
NTAbh	Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen
NTOA	Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus
NTS	New Testament Studies
NW	Neuer Wettstein
OCT	Oxford Classical Texts
ÖTK	Ökumenischer Taschenbuch-Kommentar
OTL	Old Testament Library
PG	Patrologia graeca [= Patrologiae cursus completus: Series graeca]
PGL	Patristic Greek Lexicon
PGM	Papyri Graecae Magicae
PrJ	Preussische Jahrbücher
RAC	Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum
RevQ	Revue de Qumran
RGG	Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart
RHPR	Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses
RNT	Regensburger Neues Testament
RSV	Revised Standard Version
SBB	Stuttgarter biblische Beiträge
SBL	Society of Biblical Literature
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLEJL	Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and Its Literature
SBLMS	Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series
SBLRBS	Society of Biblical Literature Resources for Biblical Study
SBL SBS	Society of Biblical Literature Sources for Biblical Study
SBLSymS	Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series
SBLWGRW	Society of Biblical Literature Writings from the Graeco-Roman World
SBS	Stuttgarter Bibelstudien
SBT	Studies in Biblical Theology
SC	Sources chrétiennes
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
STDJ	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
SUNT	Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments

TAbR	Table Ronde
TB	Theologische Bücherei: Neudrucke und Berichte aus dem 20. Jahrhundert
TDNT	Theological Dictionary of the New Testament
TLZ	Theologische Literaturzeitung
TTZ	Trierer theologische Zeitschrift
TWAS	Twayne's World Author Series
TynBul	Tyndale Bulletin
UBS	United Bible Societies
UTB	Uni-Taschenbücher
VTSup	Supplements to Vetus Testamentum
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WKGLS	Wissenschaftliche Kommentare zu griechischen und lateinischen Schriftstellern
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
ZNT	Zeitschrift für Neues Testament
ZNW	Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche
ZTK	Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche

## I. Introduction





# *Status quaestionis: Christian Body, Christian Self*

Clare K. Rothschild and Trevor W. Thompson

γνώθι σε[ε]αυτόν.

## *I. Introduction*

In her 1917 University of Chicago dissertation (“‘Know Thyself’ in Greek and Latin Literature”), Eliza G. Wilkins identifies eight different interpretative trajectories for the famed maxim engraved in the forecourt of the Temple of Apollo at Delphi: ΓΝΩΘΙ ΣΑΥΤΟΝ: (1) Know Your Measure, (2) Know What You Can and Cannot Do, (3) Know Your Place, (4) Know the Limits of Your Wisdom, (5) Know Your Own Faults, (6) Know You are Human and Mortal, (7) Know Your Own Soul, and (8) ΓΝΩΘΙ ΣΑΥΤΟΝ is Difficult.<sup>1</sup> With regard to the eighth interpretative trajectory, Wilkins cites the famous exchange between Socrates and Alcibiades in the Platonic *Alcibiades*.<sup>2</sup>

*Socrates*: Is it, then, an easy thing to know oneself, and was it some simple person who inscribed this on the temple at Delphi; or is it something difficult and not for everyone? *Alcibiades*: It has often seemed to me, Socrates, that it is for everyone; but often, too, that it is very difficult.<sup>3</sup>

The evident challenge faced by Greeks and Romans attempting to interpret the concept of self in this brief saying has never abated. Today, different cultures and individuals within them define and interpret the self and what it signifies in different ways. It is common to ask: What is the self? How is the self related to

---

<sup>1</sup> Eliza G. Wilkins, “‘Know thyself’ in Greek and Latin literature” (Ph.D. diss., The University of Chicago, 1917). She includes one additional category in a concluding chapter, “ΓΝΩΘΙ ΣΑΥΤΟΝ in Early Ecclesiastical Literature.” Cf. Pierre P. Courcelle, *Connais-toi toi-même; de Socrate à saint Bernard* (3 vols.; Paris: Études augustiniennes, 1974–1975); Hans Dieter Betz, “The Delphic Maxim ΓΝΩΘΙ ΣΑΥΤΟΝ in Hermetic Interpretation,” *HTR* 63 (1970): 465–84; idem, “The Delphic Maxim ‘Know Yourself’ in the Greek Magical Papyri,” *HR* 21/2 (1981): 156–71 (both articles by Betz are reprinted in *Hellenismus und Urchristentum* [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1990]).

<sup>2</sup> On the date and authenticity of the *Alcibiades* see Nicholas Denyer, ed., Plato: *Alcibiades* (Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics; Cambridge University, 2001), 11–25.

<sup>3</sup> Translation ours. Plato/Ps-Plato, *Alcibiades* 1.129A. Socrates: Πότερον οὖν δὴ ῥάδιον τυγχάνει τὸ γνῶναι ἑαυτόν, καὶ τις ἦν φαῦλος ὁ τοῦτο ἀναθεὶς εἰς τὸν ἐν Πυθοὶ νεών, ἢ χαλεπὸν τι καὶ οὐχὶ παντός; Alcibiades: Ἐμοὶ μὲν, ὦ Σώκρατες, πολλάκις μὲν ἔδοξε παντός εἶναι, πολλάκις δὲ παγχάλεπον. John Burnet, ed., *Platonis opera* (6 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1901).

the body and the body to the self? Is the body synonymous with the self or is it a part of the self? How is the self related to the soul? Does the self exist after the demise of the body?

Likewise, within and across academic disciplines, definitions of both self and body range widely.<sup>4</sup> Different definitions are the result of two major factors. First, knowledge and understanding of the objects and ideas represented by the terms self and body are not static. Entire social and cultural evolutions, coupled with inconceivable technological and scientific advances, continually challenge understandings of humanity (e.g., human origins, chemical make-up) forcing redefinitions of key concepts. Second, as concepts, self and body are multivalent. Thinking only of self, Jerrold Seigel argues that the modern intellectual history of selfhood comprises three related but distinct modes of existence: material/bodily, relational/social, and reflexive/self-positing dimensions.<sup>5</sup> An abundance of synonyms pertaining to these three modes of self further obfuscates meaning. The self is related to, yet distinct from, a number of expressions and ideas: body, character, conscience, consciousness, human, human being, identity, mind, person, personality, psyche, reason, soul, and thought – to name a few.

Complicating matters even more, definitional questions are posed diachronically and cross-culturally. What is an *ancient* body or self? The ability to speak about such a concept is hindered when ancient contexts are merely implicit in ancient texts. What is more, “ancient concepts on ancient terms” – upheld as an ideal – admits compromise (e.g., anachronism) for concepts as intensely personal as self and body.

## II. Recent History of Research

Needless to say, early Christian texts are replete with the language of self and body. Clearly, such concepts were important to early Christians. Yet definitions rarely make sense across texts. Despite attempts to establish a single biblical or Christian vision of either self or body, the evidence demonstrates clear plurality

---

<sup>4</sup> For example, Jerrold Seigel (*The Idea of the Self: Thought and Experience in Western Europe Since the Seventeenth Century* [Cambridge University, 2005], 3) defines the self as, “The particular being any person is, whatever it is about each of us that distinguishes you or me from others, draws the parts of our existence with a slightly different emphasis, together, persists through changes, or opens the way to becoming who we might or should be.” Richard Sorabji defines the self, a person, as an “I” who owns psychological states, experiences, actions, a body, and bodily characteristics (*Self: Ancient and Modern Insights about Individuality, Life and Death* [University of Chicago, 2006], 21). Cf. Barry Dainton, *The Phenomenal Self* (Oxford University, 2009); Galen Strawson, *Selves: An Essay in Revisionary Metaphysics* (Oxford University, 2009); Shaun Gallagher, ed., *The Oxford Handbook of the Self* (Oxford Handbooks in Philosophy; Oxford University, 2011).

<sup>5</sup> Seigel, *Idea of the Self*, 3–44.

of opinion. Different early Christian writers, of texts both within and outside of the New Testament, offer distinct, often competing, visions of these concepts. Notable examples include:<sup>6</sup>

- “The spirit (πνεῦμα) is eager but the flesh (σάρξ) is weak.” (Mark 14:38)<sup>7</sup>
- “May the God of peace himself sanctify you completely, and may your spirit (πνεῦμα), *psyche* (ψυχή), and body (σῶμα) be kept blamelessly whole at the parousia of our Lord Jesus Christ.” (1 Thess 5:23)
- “If I pray in a tongue, my spirit (πνεῦμα) prays but my mind (νοῦς) is unproductive.” (1 Cor 14:14)
- “A physical body (σῶμα ψυχικόν) is sown; a spiritual body (σῶμα πνευματικόν) is raised. If there is a physical body (σῶμα ψυχικόν), there is also a spiritual body (πνευματικόν).” (1 Cor 15:44)
- “For I delight in the law of God in my inner human being (κατὰ τὸν ἔσω ἄνθρωπον). But I see another law in my members that is at war with the law of my mind (νοῦς) taking me captive to the law of sin present in my members ... So then, on the one hand, I myself am a slave in mind (νοῦς) to the law of God, but, on the other hand, I am slave in flesh (σάρξ) to the law of sin.” (Rom 7:22–23...25b)
- “A double-minded human being (ἀνήρ διψυχος), unstable in every way.” (Jas 1:8)
- “Beloved, I urge you, as foreigners and exiles, to abstain from fleshly desires (σαρκικαὶ ἐπιθυμίαι) that wage war against the *psyche* (ψυχή).” (1 Pet 2:11)
- “For who would not marvel at their nobility, endurance, and love of the Master? Those who, although having been torn to shreds by whips to the point that the structure of the flesh (ἡ τῆς σαρκὸς οἰκονομία) was visible as deep as the inner veins and arteries, endured.” (Mart. Pol. 2.2)
- “They happen to be in the flesh (ἐν σαρκί) but they do not live according to the flesh (κατὰ σάρκα).”... “The *psyche* (ψυχή) is sown throughout all the members of the body (σῶμα); and Christians [are sown] throughout the cities of the world. On the one hand, the *psyche* (ψυχή) dwells in the body (σῶμα), but, on the other hand, it is not from the body (σῶμα); and Christians dwell in the world, but they are not from the world.” (Diogn. 5.8, 6.2–3)

What is more, reception history multiplies interpretations. Depending upon the particular anthropological-philosophical paradigm of the interpreter (e.g., Platonic, Cartesian), Christian texts reflect any of a great number of pictures of the self and body – often combining qualities – deliberately or accidentally – for new, unique formulations.

A comprehensive history of scholarship on treatments of the self and body in Early Christian texts is beyond the scope of this introduction.<sup>8</sup> Thus, recogniz-

<sup>6</sup> Cf. also Matt 27:50; 2 Cor 4:16; 1 Pet 3:18–20; 4:6; Heb 12:23.

<sup>7</sup> Translations ours.

<sup>8</sup> For more detailed treatments see Robert Jewett, *Paul's Anthropological Terms: A Study of their Use in Conflict Settings* (AGJU 10; Leiden: Brill, 1971). For each of Paul's anthropological terms, Jewett begins the discussion with a “History of Research.” Cf. Robert H. Gundry, *Sōma in Biblical Theology with Emphasis on Pauline Anthropology* (SNTSMS 29; Cambridge University, 1976), 3–8; Udo Schnelle, “Neutestamentliche Anthropologie: Ein Forschungsbericht,” *ANRW* 26.3:2658–714.

ing the broader interest in the self<sup>9</sup> and the body<sup>10</sup> among classicists, scholars of ancient Judaism, and scholars of late antiquity, the following summary merely highlights a few recent and significant developments on the topic in New Testament Studies during the second-half of the twentieth and beginning of the twenty-first centuries.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>9</sup> Among other important works, see: Christopher Gill, ed., *The Person and the Human Mind: Issues in Ancient and Modern Philosophy* (Oxford University, 1990); idem, *Personality in Greek Epic, Tragedy, and Philosophy: The Self in Dialogue* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1995); idem, *The Structured Self in Hellenistic and Roman Thought* (Oxford University, 2006); Phillip Cary, *Augustine's Invention of the Inner Self: The Legacy of a Christian Platonist* (New York: Oxford University, 2000); Carol A. Newsom, *The Self as Symbolic Space: Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran* (STDJ 52; Leiden: Brill, 2004); Gretchen J. Reydam-Schils, *The Roman Stoics: Self, Responsibility, and Affection* (University of Chicago, 2005); Shadi Bartsch, *The Mirror of the Self: Sexuality, Self-knowledge, and the Gaze in the Early Roman Empire* (University of Chicago, 2006); Shadi Bartsch and David Wray, eds., *Seneca and the Self* (Cambridge University, 2009); Vincent Farenaga, *Citizen and Self in Ancient Greece: Individuals Performing Justice and the Law* (Cambridge University, 2006); Pauliina Remes, *Plotinus on Self: The Philosophy of the 'We'* (Cambridge University, 2007); Chiara Thumiger, *Hidden Paths: Self and Characterization in Greek Tragedy: Euripides' Bacchae* (BICS Supplement 99; London: Institute of Classical Studies, 2007); Pauliina Remes and Juha Sihvola, eds., *Ancient Philosophy of the Self* (The New Synthese Historical Library; Dordrecht: Springer, 2008); Maha Elkaissy-Friemuth and John M. Dillon, eds., *The Afterlife of the Platonic Soul: Reflections of Platonic Psychology in the Monotheistic Religions* (Studies in Platonism, Neoplatonism, and the Platonic Tradition 9; Leiden: Brill, 2009).

<sup>10</sup> Notable works include: Aline Rousselle, *Porneia: On Desire and the Body in Antiquity* (trans. Felicia Pheasant; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1988); John J. Winkler, *The Constraints of Desire: The Anthropology of Sex and Gender in Ancient Greece* (New York: Routledge, 1990); Maria Wyke, *Gender and the Body in the Ancient Mediterranean* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1998); Dominic Montserrat, ed., *Changing Bodies, Changing Meanings: Studies on the Human Body in Antiquity* (London: Routledge, 1998); John P. Wright and Paul Potter, eds., *Psyche and Soma: Physicians and Metaphysicians on the Mind-Body Problem from Antiquity to Enlightenment* (Oxford University, 2000); David Fredrick, ed., *The Roman Gaze: Vision, Power, and the Body* (Arethusa Books; Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, 2002); Mark W. Hamilton, *The Body Royal: The Social Poetics of Kingship in Ancient Israel* (Biblical Interpretation Series 78; Leiden: Brill, 2005); Mladen Popović, *Reading the Human Body: Physiognomics and Astrology in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Hellenistic-Early Roman Period Judaism* (STDJ 67; Leiden: Brill, 2007); Thorsten Fögen and Mireille M. Lee, eds., *Bodies and Boundaries in Graeco-Roman Antiquity* (Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2009); Benjamin D. Sommer, *The Bodies of God and the World of Ancient Israel* (Cambridge University, 2009); Brooke Holmes, *The Symptom and the Subject: The Emergence of the Physical Body in Ancient Greece* (Princeton University, 2010).

<sup>11</sup> Other important works include: Udo Schnelle, *Neutestamentliche Anthropologie: Jesus, Paulus, Johannes* (BThS 18; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1991); idem, *The Human Condition: Anthropology in the Teachings of Jesus, Paul, and John* (trans. O.C. Dean, Jr.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996); Graham J. Warne, *Hebrew Perspectives on the Human Person in the Hellenistic Era: Philo and Paul* (MBPS 35; Lewiston, N.Y.: Mellen, 1995); 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); Lorenzo Scornaiench, *Sarx und Soma bei Paulus: Der Mensch zwischen Destruktivität und Konstruktivität* (NTOA/SUNT 67; Göttingen, Niedersachs: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008); Michael Labahn and Outi Lehtipuu, eds., *Anthropology in the New Testament and its Ancient Context Papers from the EABS-Meeting in Piliscsaba* (CBET 54; Leuven: Peeters, 2010);

We begin with *Rudolf Bultmann* (1948–53), whose legacy signals the end of the dominance of bipartite (body-soul) or tripartite anthropologies (body-soul-spirit) in interpreting early Christian anthropology.<sup>12</sup> Influenced by Søren Kierkegaard and Martin Heidegger, Bultmann argues for a unified concept of the human being. With a particular emphasis on the importance of σῶμα in Pauline anthropology, Bultmann famously observes: “It is clear that the *soma* is not a something that outwardly clings to a man’s real *self* (to his soul, for instance), but belongs to its very essence, so that we can say man does not *have* a *soma*; he *is soma*, for in not a few cases *soma* can be translated simply ‘I.’”<sup>13</sup> According to Bultmann, the human being is not a composite entity, but a unified whole.

*Krister Stendahl* (1963) challenges Bultmann’s existentialist view of Pauline anthropology,<sup>14</sup> in particular his view of Paul’s letters “as documents of human consciousness.”<sup>15</sup> Specifically, Stendahl questions the imposition of “introspection” and a “troubled conscience” on to Paul.<sup>16</sup> In contrast to what he regards as the Augustinian and/or the Lutheran reading of a weakened or feeble conscience, Stendahl apprehends a “robust conscience” in Paul’s letters, particularly at Gal 1:13–14<sup>17</sup> and Phil 3:4–11.<sup>18</sup> Following Bultmann, Stendahl’s interpretation reopens thinking about early Christian anthropology.

---

Benjamin H. Dunning, *Aliens and Sojourners: Self as Other in Early Christianity* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 2009).

<sup>12</sup> Rudolf Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament* (trans. by K. Grobel; 2 vols.; New York: Scribner, 1951–55), 2:190–259. Although Bultmann does not explicitly engage the dominant *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule* in his treatment of New Testament anthropology, a tacit critique is clear in his opposition to ancient Greek models of the human being. Cf. John A. T. Robinson, *The Body: A Study in Pauline Theology* (SBT 5; London: SCM 1952), and David W. Stacey, *The Pauline View of Man: In Relation to Its Judaic and Hellenistic Background* (London: Macmillan, 1956). For criticism of Bultmann, see Ernst Käsemann, “On Paul’s Anthropology” in *Perspective on Paul* (trans. by M. Kohl; London: SCM, 1971), 1–31.

<sup>13</sup> Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, 2:194. “Aber an einer Reihe dieser Stellen ist deutlich, daß das σῶμα nicht etwas dem eigentlichen Ich des Menschen (etwa seiner Seele) äußerlich Anhaftendes ist, sondern wesentlich zu diesem gehört, so daß man sagen kann: der Mensch hat nicht ein σῶμα, sondern er ist σῶμα. Denn nicht selten kann man σῶμα einfach durch ‘ich’ (bzw. Ein dem Zusammenhang entsprechendes Personalpronomen) übersetzen.” [*Theologie des neuen Testaments* (9th edition; edited and updated by Otto Merk; Tübingen: Mohr, 1984) 2:195].

<sup>14</sup> Krister Stendahl, “The Apostle Paul and the Introspective Conscience of the West,” *HTR* 56/3 (1963): 199–215, here: 207–8.

<sup>15</sup> Stendahl, “Apostle Paul and the Introspective Conscience of the West,” 199.

<sup>16</sup> Stendahl, “Apostle Paul and the Introspective Conscience of the West,” 200. In a note, Stendahl rightly recognizes, “The actual meaning of the Greek word *syneidesis*, usually translated ‘conscience,’ is a complex linguistic problem,” (200 n. 2).

<sup>17</sup> Gal 1:14 καὶ προέκοπτον ἐν τῷ Ἰουδαϊσμῷ ὑπὲρ πολλοὺς συνηλικιώτας ἐν τῷ γένει μου, περισσότερως ἢ τῶν πατρικῶν μου παραδόσεων.

<sup>18</sup> Stendahl, “Apostle Paul and the Introspective Conscience of the West,” 200, 210. Phil 3:4 καίπερ ἐγὼ ἔχων πεποιθῆσιν καὶ ἐν σαρκί. Εἴ τις δοκεῖ ἄλλος πεποιθῆναι ἐν σαρκί, ἐγὼ μᾶλλον. Phil 3:6 κατὰ ζήλος διώκων τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, κατὰ δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐν νόμῳ γενόμενος ἀμεμπτος.

Likewise, Robert Jewett (1971) rejects Bultmann's existentialist reading of Pauline anthropology, rather favoring the explanation that Paul's anthropological teaching emerged from and was shaped by exchanges with opponents. Jewett's research, drawing heavily upon parallels in the Septuagint and Second Temple Jewish writings, focuses on eight specific anthropological terms in Paul: σάρξ, πνεῦμα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, σῶμα, καρδιά, ψυχή, νοῦς, ἔξω/ἔσω ἄνθρωπος, and συνείδησις.<sup>19</sup> Important for subsequent interpretation of Pauline anthropology, Jewett argues that Paul: (1) never uses ψυχή in the sense of "soul"; (2) views "the human spirit simply as the apportioned divine spirit";<sup>20</sup> (3) does not use πνεῦμα and ψυχή interchangeably; and (4) develops his concept of σῶμα with the specific intent of countering "gnostic dualism."<sup>21</sup> The details of Jewett's construction, in particular those tied to theories of Gnosticism, are no longer persuasive. His larger argument in favor of contextualized anthropology, however, remains an important insight.

Equally important, Dale B. Martin's (1995) interpretation of the Corinthian correspondence calls into question simplistic notions of body and self in Paul's letters by situating expressions like body among the competing anthropologies of Paul's day. Martin draws upon contemporary philosophical and medical literature to distinguish two competing models of the body in the Corinthian correspondence.<sup>22</sup> One model, shared broadly by philosophers and medical writers, regards a healthy body as a state of balance, the diseased body suffering from a distortion of balance. The second model, a more popular view, understands the body as a dangerously permeable entity constantly threatened by outside malevolent forces.<sup>23</sup> Martin's work has inspired a number of subsequent monographs and shorter essays comparing self and body in early Christian texts with other philosophical and medical evidence.

At roughly the same time as Martin's work on the Christian body in First Corinthians, Stanley K. Stowers (1995) appeals to ancient rhetoric to wager something new and important about the Christian self in Romans. Stowers argues that Paul's use of the first person singular in Rom 7:7–25 represents προσωποποιᾶ,

<sup>19</sup> For a "Summary of Results," see Jewett, *Paul's Anthropological Terms*, 447–60. Jewett explicitly rejects the assumed Jewish *versus* Hellenistic divide evident in many earlier works on Pauline anthropology. For more on the end of the divide, see Egon Brandenburger, *Fleisch und Geist; Paulus und die dualistische Weisheit* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag des Erziehungsvereins, 1968); Martin Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus; Studien zu ihrer Begegnung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung Palästinas bis zur Mitte des 2. Jh. v. Chr.* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1969); idem, *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine During the Early Hellenistic Period* (trans. John Bowden; 2 vols.; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974); John J. Collins, *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora* (New York: Crossroad, 1983 [2d ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000]).

<sup>20</sup> Jewett, *Paul's Anthropological Terms*, 451.

<sup>21</sup> Jewett, *Paul's Anthropological Terms*, 458.

<sup>22</sup> Dale B. Martin, *The Corinthian Body* (New Haven: Yale University, 1995).

<sup>23</sup> Martin, *Corinthian Body*, 3–37.



the rhetorical technique also known as speech-in-character.<sup>24</sup> Speech-in-character, a conventional component of the ancient educational curricula, entails that a speaker or writer plausibly constructs what a particular character (πρόσωπον), real or fictitious, would say or write in a given situation. Although interpreters continue to debate the *precise* identity of “I” in Rom 7:7–25, Stowers established that Paul creates a new persona to meet specific rhetorical exigencies of his letter. And, as Stowers notes, the strategy can be seen elsewhere in Paul’s letters and in other early Christian texts.

Only a few years after Martin and Stowers and in contrast to their Greek-based comparative analyses, Jörg Frey (1999) seeks to understand and explicate early Christian anthropological concepts on Jewish terms. Specifically, building upon the early comparative analyses of Karl G. Kuhn<sup>25</sup> and William D. Davies,<sup>26</sup> Frey attempts to move beyond explanations of Paul’s use of σάρξ on the basis of purely Hellenistic or Gnostic usage, rather emphasizing the relevance of texts from Qumran for its understanding.<sup>27</sup> According to Frey, in Paul, “σάρξ is strongly associated with the notion of evil and iniquity. It even seems to denote a sphere or power opposed to God and his will.”<sup>28</sup> With others, Frey acknowledges that Paul’s use of σάρξ certainly transcends the meaning and semantic domain of the Hebrew נֶפֶשׁ. Yet, recognizing differences between Paul and the Jewish tradi-

<sup>24</sup> Stanley K. Stowers, “Romans 7:7–25 as a Speech-in-Character (προσωποποιία),” in *Paul in his Hellenistic Context* (ed. T. Engberg-Pedersen; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995), 180–202; idem, “Apostrophe, Προσωποποιία, and Paul’s Rhetorical Education,” in *Early Christianity and Classical Culture: Comparative Studies in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe* (ed. J. T. Fitzgerald, T. H. Olbricht, and L. M. White; NovTSup 110; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 351–69. On the use of προσωποποιία in pseudepigraphic texts see Karl Matthias Schmidt, *Mahnung und Erinnerung im Maskenspiel: Epistolographie, Rhetorik und Narrativik der pseudepigraphen Petrusbriefe* (HBS 38; Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 2003).

<sup>25</sup> Karl G. Kuhn, “New Light on Temptation, Sin, and Flesh in the New Testament,” in *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (ed. K. Stendahl; New York: Harper, 1957), 94–113, here: 101–8.

<sup>26</sup> William D. Davies, “Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Flesh and Spirit,” in *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (ed. K. Stendahl; New York: Harper, 1957), 157–82.

<sup>27</sup> Jörg Frey, “Die paulinische Antithese von ‘Fleisch’ und ‘Geist’ und die palästinisch-jüdische Weisheitstradition,” *ZNT* 90 (1999): 45–77. Cf. idem, “Different Patterns of Dualistic Thought in the Qumran Library: Reflections on Their Background and History,” in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies Cambridge 1995* (ed. M. Bernstein, F. García Martínez, and J. Kampen; STDJ 23; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 275–335; idem, “Flesh and Spirit in the Palestinian Jewish Sapiential Tradition and in the Qumran Texts: An Inquiry into the Background of Pauline Usage,” in *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought* (ed. C. Hempel, A. Lange, and H. Lichtenberger; BETL 159; Leuven University, 2002), 367–404. Also compare Eibert Tigchelaar, “‘Spiritual People,’ ‘Fleshly Spirit,’ and ‘Vision of Meditation’: Reflections on 4QInstruction and 1 Corinthians,” in *Echoes from the Caves: Qumran and the New Testament* (ed. F. García Martínez; STDJ 85; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 103–18.

<sup>28</sup> Jörg Frey, “The Notion of ‘Flesh’ in 4QInstruction and the Background of Pauline Usage,” in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Oslo, 1998* (ed. D. K. Falk, F. García Martínez, E. M. Schuller; STDJ 35; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 197–226; here: 197.



tion on the topic of the law, Frey demonstrates strong parallels between Paul's understanding of σάρξ and the broader use of כָּשָׁר in Jewish wisdom traditions at Qumran (e.g., 1Q/4QInstruction and 1Q/4Q Mysteries). As Matthew Goff (see: Chapter 2) and others recognize, anthropologies evident in the texts from Qumran offer promising new venues for the exploration of Early Christian anthropological concepts.

Within only a few years of Martin, Stowers, and Frey, *Troels Engberg-Pedersen* (2000) launches a visionary campaign of viewing Paul's anthropology as closely aligned with Hellenistic moral philosophy, in particular, Stoicism.<sup>29</sup> Engberg-Pedersen (see: Chapter 3) maintains that Paul's anthropological terms should not be understood as metaphors. Rather, for Paul, anthropological language is concrete and physical as in certain Stoic anthropological concepts (e.g., πνεῦμα is a real, physical, and cognitive entity). Like Martin, Engberg-Pedersen's interpretation of Pauline anthropology highlights options available in the ancient world for thinking about concepts of personhood and challenges traditional approaches to thinking about Paul and the various anthropologies represented by his letters.

At about this same time, yet in contrast to programs such as Engberg-Pedersen's, *Hans Dieter Betz* (2000) explores Paul's use of the "inner human being" (ὁ ἔσω ἄνθρωπος) in Rom 7:22 and 2 Cor 4:16.<sup>30</sup> Betz argues that, shaped by the theological debate in Corinth, Paul rejects the soul-body dualism of Middle Platonism while recognizing the human experience of internal and external antagonisms. With Bultmann, Betz argues that Paul maintains the fundamental unity of the human being, a feat accomplished by conceptually reconfiguring the terms ἔσω and ἔξω ἄνθρωπος to avoid dualism. Paul integrates these terms into his non-materialistic "mythico-historical doctrine of creation of the primordial Adam-ἄνθρωπος" as well as his "eschatological redemption through the Christ-ἄνθρωπος"<sup>31</sup> with the result of, according to Betz, "an alternative to a Platonist anthropological dualism" that makes "a decisive contribution to ancient anthropology."<sup>32</sup>

<sup>29</sup> Troels Engberg-Pedersen, *Paul and the Stoics* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2000); idem, *Cosmology and Self in the Apostle Paul: The Material Spirit* (Oxford University, 2010). The recently published dissertation of Emma Wasserman engages Engberg-Pedersen extensively: *The Death of the Soul in Romans 7: Sin, Death, and the Law in Light of Hellenistic Moral Psychology* (WUNT 2.256; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008). Cf. Volker Rabens, *The Holy Spirit and Ethics in Paul: Transformation and Empowering for Religious-Ethical Life* (WUNT 2.283; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010).

<sup>30</sup> Cf. Eph 3:16. Hans Dieter Betz, "The Concept of the 'Inner Human Being' (ὁ ἔσω ἄνθρωπος) in the Anthropology of Paul," *NTS* 46 (2000): 315–41. Among others, Betz specifically engages Theo K. Heckel (*Der innere Mensch: Die Paulinische Verarbeitung eines Platonischen Motivs* (WUNT 2.53; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1993) and Walter Burkert, "Towards Plato and Paul: The 'Inner' Human Being," in *Ancient and Modern Perspectives on the Bible and Culture: Essays in Honor of Hans Dieter Betz* (ed. A. Y. Collins; Atlanta: Scholars, 1998), 59–82.

<sup>31</sup> Betz, "Concept of the 'Inner Human Being,'" 340.

<sup>32</sup> Betz, "Concept of the 'Inner Human Being,'" 340.

Drawing upon the work of Martin, Stowers, and Betz, J. Albert Harrill (2005) calls attention to Paul's selection of an *enslaved* persona in Rom 7:7–25 as model human being “containing both an ‘outer’ and ‘innermost self.’”<sup>33</sup> According to Harrill, the Romans recognized an internal faculty of assent in slaves, preferring slaves who could recognize their master's wishes and take initiative (e.g., the comedic exchanges between master and slave in the *Vita Aesopi*), an expression of slave authority (*auctoritas*). The persona in Romans is a “captured slave”<sup>34</sup> whose external members are under the control of Sin, but the inner parts delight in God's law. The enslaved persona is, according to Harrill, a “religious self” that “though captured, retains its subjective agency.”<sup>35</sup> The slave of Rom 7:7–25 provides an important frame for Pauline and later Christian self-understandings and self-definitions.

Finally, sharing a comparative approach with Betz, Harrill, and others but to a different end, Christopher N. Mount (2005) categorizes Pauline Christianity as a form of “spirit-possession cult”<sup>36</sup> in which “individuals within the community had come under the control of an alien spirit that subordinated the ‘I’ of the individual to that of the occupying spirit.”<sup>37</sup> According to Mount, the physical bodies of early Christ-believers are thought to be: “possessed by a crucified and resurrected deity.”<sup>38</sup> Such possession results in the exhibition of various phenomena, including *glossolalia* (cf. 1 Corinthians 12, 14). With an entirely new formulation of the early Christian concept of self, Mount's work emphasizes how the early Christian body and self together (“I”) house a foreign and divine spirit (i.e., the spirit of the Lord) creating of the believer's “I” a primary, new, and alternate identity (2 Cor 5:17).

Today scholarship on the concepts of self and body in early Christian texts advances in a number of different directions. In addition to the approaches mentioned above, scholars interpret the texts in conversation with contemporary phi-

<sup>33</sup> J. Albert Harrill, “Paul and the Slave Self,” in *Religion and the Self in Antiquity* (ed. D. Brakke, M. L. Satlow, and S. Weitzman; Bloomington: Indiana University, 2005), 51–69, here: 53. Cf. idem, “Investive against Paul (2 Cor 10:10), the Physiognomics of the Ancient Slave Body, and the Greco-Roman Rhetoric of Manhood,” in *Antiquity and Humanity: Essays on Ancient Religion and Philosophy Presented to Hans Dieter Betz on His 70th Birthday* (ed. A. Y. Collins and M. M. Mitchell; WUNT 2.164; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 189–213 (both articles are reprinted with slight revision in *Slaves in the New Testament: Literary, Social and Moral Dimensions* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006]).

<sup>34</sup> Harrill, “Paul and the Slave Self,” 63.

<sup>35</sup> Harrill, “Paul and the Slave Self,” 63.

<sup>36</sup> Christopher N. Mount, “1 Corinthians 11:3–16: Spirit Possession and Authority in a Non-Pauline Interpolation,” *JBL* 124/2 (2005): 313–40, here: 316.

<sup>37</sup> Mount, “1 Corinthians 11:3–16: Spirit Possession and Authority in a Non-Pauline Interpolation,” 317.

<sup>38</sup> Mount, “Religious Experience, the Religion of Paul, and Women in Pauline Churches,” in *Women and Gender in Ancient Religions: Interdisciplinary Approaches* (ed. S. Ahearne-Kroll, P. A. Holloway, and J. A. Kelhoffer; WUNT 263; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 323–48, here: 342.

losophy, psychology,<sup>39</sup> political science, and advances in the hard sciences, in particular the neurosciences, all but doing away with the notion of self.<sup>40</sup> Recent studies and monographs focus on the suffering self,<sup>41</sup> the asexual self/body,<sup>42</sup> embodied knowledge,<sup>43</sup> religion and the self,<sup>44</sup> the disabled body,<sup>45</sup> the gendered body,<sup>46</sup> the slave body,<sup>47</sup> the martyr's body,<sup>48</sup> and the relevance of ancient scientific and medical treatises for understanding the body.<sup>49</sup> The essays in this volume individually and collectively participate in these ongoing discussions about the

<sup>39</sup> Gerd Theissen, *Psychologische Aspekte paulinischer Theologie* (FRLANT 131; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983); idem, *Psychological Aspects of Pauline Theology* (trans. J. P. Galvin; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987); Klaus Berger, *Historische Psychologie des Neuen Testaments* (SBS 146–47; Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1991); idem, *Identity and Experience in the New Testament* (trans. by C. Muenchow; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003).

<sup>40</sup> Joel B. Green, *Body, Soul, and Human Life: The Nature of Humanity in the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008).

<sup>41</sup> Judith Perkins, *The Suffering Self: Pain and Narrative Representation in the Early Christian Era* (London and New York: Routledge, 1995).

<sup>42</sup> Peter Brown, *The Body and Society: Men, Women, and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity* (New York: Columbia University, 1988; Second-Anniversary Edition 2008); Elizabeth A. Clark, *Reading Renunciation: Asceticism and Scripture in Early Christianity* (Princeton University, 1999); Richard Valantasis, *The Making of the Self: Ancient and Modern Asceticism* (Cambridge: James Clarke & Co., 2008).

<sup>43</sup> Jennifer A. Glancy, *Corporal Knowledge: Early Christian Bodies* (Oxford University, 2010).

<sup>44</sup> David Shulman and Guy G. Stroumsa, eds., *Self and Self-Transformation in the History of Religions* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University, 2002); David Brakke, Michael L. Satlow, and Steven Weitzman, eds., *Religion and the Self in Antiquity* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University, 2005).

<sup>45</sup> Hector Avalos, Sarah J. Melcher, and Jeremy Schipper, eds., *This Abled Body: Rethinking Disabilities in Biblical Studies* (SemeiaSt 55; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007); Jeremy Schipper and Candida Moss, eds., *Disability Studies and Biblical Literature* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011).

<sup>46</sup> Jorunn Økland, *Women in Their Place: Paul and The Corinthian Discourse of Gender and Sanctuary Space* (JSNTSup 269; London: T & T Clark International, 2004); David G. Horrell, "Disciplining Performance and 'Placing' the Church: Widows, Elders and Slaves in the Household of God (1 Tim 5,1–6,2)," in *1 Timothy Reconsidered* (Colloquium Oecumenicum Paulinum 18; Leuven: Peeters, 2008), 109–34; Caroline Vander Stichele and Todd Penner, *Contextualizing Gender in Early Christian Discourse: Thinking Beyond Thecla* (London: T & T Clark, 2009); Adela Yarbro Collins, "The Female Body as Social Space in 1 Timothy," *NTS* 57/2 (2011): 155–75.

<sup>47</sup> Carolyn Osiek, "Female Slaves, *Porneia*, and the Limits of Obedience," in *Early Christian Families in Context* (ed. D. L. Balch and C. Osiek; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 255–76. Compare also the discussion of Harrill's work above.

<sup>48</sup> Brent D. Shaw, "Body/Power/Identity: Passions of the Martyrs," *JECS* 4/3 (1996): 269–312; David Frankfurter, "Martyrology and the Prurient Gaze," *JECS* 17/2 (2009): 215–45; Candida R. Moss, *The Other Christs: Imitating Jesus in Ancient Christian Ideologies of Martyrdom* (New York: Oxford University, 2010).

<sup>49</sup> Annette Weissenrieder, *Images of Illness in the Gospel of Luke: Insights of Ancient Medical Texts* (WUNT 2.164; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003); Troy W. Martin, "Paul's Pneumatological Statements and Ancient Medical Texts," in *The New Testament and Early Christian Literature in Greco-Roman Context: Studies in Honor of David E. Aune* (ed. John Fotopoulos; NovTSup 122; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 105–26; idem, "Ancient Medical Texts, Newly Re-Discovered: The Medical Background of Biblical Breathing," *Early Christianity* 1/4 (2010): 513–38.

early Christian self and body. They do not proceed with a uniform notion of either concept. Rather, recognizing competition on the topic ably captured in Wilkin's dissertation on the Delphic maxim and in the wide variety of different approaches today, these essays offer nuanced analyses of texts and/or passages exhibiting particular ancient perceptions of these highly crucial and enigmatic concepts.

### III. Essays

This volume offers seventeen new essays picking up on the latest developments in examinations of early Christian concepts of personhood. The volume is organized in six sections: (1) Jewish Literature; (2) Paul; (3) Canonical Gospels and Acts; (4) Extra-canonical Gospels and Acts; (5) Later Witnesses; and (6) History of Interpretation.

The collection opens with a piece by *Karina Martin Hogan (Fordham)*, entitled "The Mortal Body and the Earth in Ben Sira and the Book of the Watchers." Picking up on Leo G. Perdue's (*Wisdom and Creation*) argument that cosmology and anthropology are two prominent, tightly intertwined strands of the theology of wisdom literature, such that what the wisdom tradition has to say about the human person can only be understood properly within the context of what it says about creation as a whole, Hogan makes the case that this insight can be extended to Second Temple Jewish texts that address creation. Her essay first focuses on the place of the earth in the cosmology of the Wisdom of Ben Sira and the Book of the Watchers, before turning to the relationship of the human body to the earth in these two works.

The second piece in this section is *Matthew Goff's (Florida State)* "Being Fleshly or Spiritual: Anthropological Reflection and Exegesis of Genesis 1–3 in 4QInstruction and First Corinthians." Motivated by the assumption that the Dead Sea Scrolls provide a context for assessing the extent to which early Christian authors were influenced by post-biblical traditions attested in Palestine, Goff explores conceptions of humankind and interpretations of Genesis 1–3 in Paul in relation to 4QInstruction (1Q26, 4Q415–18, 423). He focuses on First Corinthians 3 and 15 insofar as these texts demarcate individuals along anthropological lines (e.g., flesh, spirit). Debate over the background of these issues in Paul's writings often focuses on Hellenistic Jewish texts such as the Wisdom of Solomon and the writings of Philo. Goff suggests that Paul draws from and reformulates a wider scope of early Jewish sapiential traditions attested in Palestine for the view he puts forward in this letter.

In "Distinct Portraits and Parallel Development of the Knowledge of God in Romans 1:18–32 and Wisdom of Solomon 13–15," *Alec Lucas (Loyola Chicago)* defends the value of a close comparative analysis of Romans and Wisdom of Solomon on the point of epistemology. In the long history of scholars relating the

Pauline corpus, especially Romans, to the Wisdom of Solomon, the topic of anthropology sometimes arises. For example, Otto Pfleiderer and Hermann Gunkel debated the role of Wisdom 7–9 (esp. Wis 7:22 ff.; 9:6–17) in shaping Paul's doctrine of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. Following a review of the history of scholarship including these two positions, Lucas takes up his own comparative analysis of the relationship between Rom 1:18–32 and Wisdom 13–15. Lucas argues that, although these two texts have frequently been related to one another, such comparisons have obscured an important difference between the texts concerning the “knowledge of God.” Namely, Rom 1:18–32 presents humanity as having initially possessed the knowledge of God, but as having suppressed that knowledge in the descent into idolatry and immorality whereas Wisdom 13–15 depicts the knowledge of God as something not even Graeco-Roman nature worshippers achieved, much less idolaters and/or theriolatrous Egyptians.

Essays dedicated exclusively to concepts of personhood in the letters of Paul open with a new piece by *Troels Engberg-Pedersen (Copenhagen)*, “A Stoic Concept of the Person in Paul? From Galatians 5:17 to Romans 7:14–25.” Following on previously published arguments in which he argues that one need not choose between Paul as Platonic or Stoic in Romans 7, Engberg-Pedersen argues that in Rom 8:1–13 Paul presupposes a Stoic cognitive understanding. According to Engberg-Pedersen, it is important to make a strict case for Stoicism in this case because of the passage's implications for Paul's notion of person. To this end, Engberg-Pedersen examines a few verses in Galatians 5:16–18. He concludes by summarizing all three ideas in Paul: Christian body, Christian self, and Christian person.

*Stefan Krauter's (München)* “Is Romans 7:7–13 about ἀκρασία?” also picks up on the theme of ancient Stoicism in Paul's letters in a careful treatment of ἀκρασία in Romans 7. Krauter begins with the “weakness of will” philosophical *topos*, discussed in ancient philosophy under the title of ἀκρασία. The various philosophical schools developed different models of explaining ἀκρασία, including paradoxical behaviours. According to Krauter, in the wake of Rudolf Bultmann's and Werner Georg Kümmel's work on Romans 7, it became fashionable to deny any connection between Paul's text and the ancient philosophical debates. Today, however, exegetical research focuses on interpreting Rom 7:14–24 in the context of these debates. Therefore, in dialogue with recent monographs and articles on this topic, Krauter analyzes the structure of Rom 7:7–24 and the relationship between Rom 7:7–13 to Genesis 3 in order to propose that Rom 7:7–13 does not deal with the effects of law on a person who is *already* in the state of ἀκρασία, but rather with the problem of how law contributes to the process in which a person *becomes akratic*. Krauter concludes that Rom 7:7–13 fits nicely in the ancient philosophical *topos* of the paradoxical effect of prohibitions.

With regard to the canonical gospels and Acts, *Martin Meiser's (Saarland)* “Anthropologie im Markusevangelium” makes a case for the suffering self as an

anthropological concept in the Gospel of Mark adapted from ancient Judaism. Meiser argues that faith functions as an exemption to act establishing a type of critical social advantage by economic and social non-elites.

Moreover, in "The Christian and the Roman Self: The Lukan Paul and a Roman Reading" *Manfred Lang* (Halle) explores the Christian vis-à-vis a Roman self in terms of Luke-Acts and against a background of Greek contemporary texts. His contribution focuses less on modern concerns (e.g., Kantian discourse) than recent conclusions of, for example, Christopher Gill where the (ancient) self reflects a non-Cartesian model of selfhood.

Concluding this section is a piece entitled, "Clarifying a Curiosity: The Plural *Bloods* (αἱμάτων) in John 1:13" by *Troy Martin* (Xavier) on the value of ancient medical texts for understanding "bloods" in John 1:13. According to Martin, the plural may refer exclusively to the flows of blood from the mother that provides the material for a fetus. By using the plural, however, John may express contributions to the procreative process by both the mother and the father. If the phrase "the will of the flesh" relates to the woman's role in conception (and the phrase "the will of a husband" certainly relates to a man's role), then these two phrases together elaborate on the plural use of *bloods* in John 1:13 to refer contributions by both father and mother in conception and formation of the fetus. This natural process is precisely what John wants to exclude as a characteristic of the children of God, born again from water, Spirit (John 3:5), and God (1:13).

The section on non-canonical writings opens with a reflection entitled, "Identification Please: Aspects of Identity in Ancient Narrative" by *Richard I. Pervo* (Minneapolis) on personhood and identity in the non-canonical Acts. The thesis of this essay is that identity is a fundamental concern of ancient popular narrative, working at both the center and fringe of such texts. Identity, according to Pervo, is always both an individual and a corporate matter. Implicit answers to such basic questions as: what is and/or makes a genuine person, what prevents me/us from becoming what I/we ought and wish to be, underlie most, if not all, of these disparate texts and permit broad comparisons with other ancient writings.

*Janet Spittler* (Texas Christian) in "The Anthropology of the *Acts of Thomas*" provides an exposition of the Christian self in the *Acts of Thomas* against the background of contemporary Platonism. In two relatively recent articles on the *Acts of Andrew*, L. R. Lanzillotta takes a narrow view of the anthropology of the text offering insights on how the text fits into the theological and philosophical landscape of the second century. Building on Lanzillotta's work, Spittler presents a comparison of the anthropology of the *Acts of Andrew* and the *Acts of Thomas* demonstrating that they have fundamentally different understandings of what comprises the human being.

Also on the apocryphal Acts, *Romulus Stefanut* (Chicago) in his essay, "From Logos to Mythos: The Apocalypse of Paul and Plato's *Phaedo* in Dialogue" ex-



amines the *Acts of John*. As the classical historian Jean-Pierre Vernant points out in his work *Les origines de la pensée grecque* (*Origins of Greek Thought*), the beginnings of Greek philosophy are associated with the paradigm shift from μῦθος (*mythos*) to λόγος (*logos*). Beginning with Thales of Miletus, philosophy – defined as a rational discourse about the universe – departed from the mythical language of Homer and the other poets by offering a rational comprehensive principle (ἀρχή) accounting for the whole of existence. Stefanut suggests that this ‘history of philosophy’ trajectory can be found in Judaism and Christianity: the pattern beginning with μῦθος in Genesis and carried out in the New Testament emphasis on λόγος. Stefanut, however, asks what happens when rational discourse (i.e., λόγος) becomes insufficient? Narrative gaps left by revelatory discourse may be filled (or amplified), as in the *Apocalypse of Paul*, by mythical discourse.

This section concludes with a Greek text and translation of *Third Corinthians* by Robert Matthew Calhoun (*Chicago*). The essay, entitled “The Resurrection of the Flesh in Third Corinthians,” argues that, unlike Irenaeus and Tertullian who perform “exegetical acrobatics” in their debates with heretics, the author of *Third Corinthians* adopts Paul’s persona in order to prove his endorsement of the concept of the resurrection of the flesh, and to usher Paul into line with the Gospels and the emerging “orthodox” consensus. Calhoun further argues that the author of Third Corinthians does not compose his pseudepigraphon to refute specific Gnostic movements or doctrines (as much of the secondary literature on the text supposes), but to resolve an internal controversy regarding the resurrected body. Since Paul’s remarks grind against the secure establishment of a coherent doctrine, the author designs *Third Corinthians* not to *clarify* the argument of 1 Corinthians 15, but to *replace* it.

The section on later witnesses opens with a piece entitled “Epitomizing Virtue: Clothing the Christian Woman’s Body.” In this essay, Annette Bourland-Huizenga (*Dubuque Seminary*) takes up the problem of ancient moralizing advice on proper feminine adornment. According to Bourland-Huizenga, like several other Greek philosophical sources, *On the Harmony* constructs a conceptual link between a woman’s external appearance and her internal uprightness. The truly “harmonious” woman is recognized by simplicity of adornment. The author of First Timothy formulates some of the same ideas. Thus, this essay compares advice in 1 Timothy 2 to that of other moral-philosophical texts, including the letter *Melissa to Kleareta*, the treatises by Periktione, *On the Harmony of a Woman*, and by Phintys, *On the Moderation of a Woman*, Plutarch’s *Advice to the Bride and Groom*, and Xenophon’s *Oeconomicus*. First Peter is also taken into account. The essay covers the following questions: (1) which elements of female adornment these sources address, and what they represent; (2) what perceptions of gender-differentiation, of femininity and masculinity, lie beneath the philosophical judgments expressed in this literature; (3) when First Timothy promotes such cultural

assessments, what distinctive concepts its theological justifications introduce. The investigation shows that two concerns stand behind the references to specific items of adornment: (A) a concern over the display of wealth, and (B) a gender perspective viewing women as weaker and more likely to act out sexual desires, than men.

Also treating later witnesses, in "Torture and Identity: Paganism, Christianity, and Beyond," *David Konstan (Brown)* challenges traditional thinking about victims of persecution. Konstan argues that the idea of the soul's separability from the body lent itself to the idea that torture need not effect intellectual conviction and may be symptomatic, not so much of early Christian texts, as contemporary novels and martyr stories.

In "Apollo, Possession, and Prophecy," *Fritz Graf (Ohio State)* explores the contentious topic of how the Pythia, the medium of Apollo in Delphi, communicated with her god and with her clients. According to most modern scholarship, she was in a state of possession and frenzy, even if the ritual means for achieving this state of mind were unclear in antiquity and continues to be debated by modern scholars. Graf offers the various possibilities, including a related discussion of the theories of the oracle's origin, concluding that in Delphi, and perhaps other Apolline oracles, there was a tension between the ritual of the oracles and the stories told about them, between practice and ideology. Modern scholars, under the influence of Christian readings of spirit possession, reduce to a single theory what in reality were various, even contradictory, perspectives of the phenomena.

The volume concludes with a piece by *John R. Levison (Seattle Pacific)* entitled "Assessing the Origins of Modern Pneumatology: The Life and Legacy of Hermann Gunkel." This essay reflects on Gunkel's *Die Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes nach der populären Anschauung der apostolischen Zeit und der Lehre des Apostels Paulus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1888), a landmark work on the spirit in early Christian texts, dominating biblical and theological perspectives on early Christian pneumatology throughout the twentieth century. Identifying the three ways in which Gunkel defined pneumatology, Levison then evaluates Gunkel's association of the spirit with the spectacular and the spontaneous. Calling for reparation of this legacy, Levison argues that Gunkel's life helps us appreciate the cost that challenges to contemporary assumptions about pneumatology entail. The essay concludes with a theme we see as emblematic of the volume overall; namely, an exhortation to the guild to keep all avenues of inquiry open as we move forward in the study of early Christian concepts of personhood.





## II. Jewish Literature



## The Mortal Body and the Earth in Ben Sira and the Book of the Watchers

Karina Martin Hogan

In *Wisdom and Creation*, Leo G. Perdue argues that cosmology and anthropology are the two most prominent strands of the theology of the wisdom literature, and that they are tightly intertwined.<sup>1</sup> What the wisdom tradition has to say about the human person can only be properly understood within the context of what it says about creation as a whole. More recently, scholars applying an ecological hermeneutic to the Bible have made a similar point “from the perspective of Earth.”<sup>2</sup> Although the Bible (especially Gen 1:28) has been used to justify the exploitation of nature by human beings,<sup>3</sup> it is a rich resource for ecological theology in that it presents numerous opportunities for reflection on the place of human beings in the intricate web of life that is understood to be God’s creation. This insight can certainly be extended beyond the Hebrew Bible to many Jewish texts of the Second Temple period that address the theme of creation. This essay will first

---

<sup>1</sup> Leo G. Perdue, *Wisdom and Creation: The Theology of Wisdom Literature* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1994), 48 *et passim*.

<sup>2</sup> Among the many contributions to ecological hermeneutics in recent years, some of the most influential have been the five volumes of essays by the Earth Bible team: *Readings from the Perspective of Earth*, *The Earth Story in Genesis*, *The Earth Story in Wisdom Traditions*, *The Earth Story in Psalms and Prophets*, and *The Earth Story in the New Testament* (ed. Norman C. Habel *et al.*; Sheffield Academic and Pilgrim Press, 2000–2002); the work of the SBL Ecological Hermeneutics group, represented by the volume *Exploring Ecological Hermeneutics* (ed. Norman C. Habel and Peter L. Trudinger; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008); and the work of Terence E. Fretheim, especially *God and the World in the Old Testament: A Relational Theology of Creation* (Nashville: Abingdon, 2005). For a more complete bibliography, see Gene M. Tucker, “Ecological Approaches: The Bible and the Land,” in *Method Matters: Essays on the Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Honor of David L. Petersen* (ed. Joel M. LeMon and Kent H. Richards; SBLRBS 56; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009), 349–68.

<sup>3</sup> The pernicious influence of Gen 1:28 on the development of Western culture was certainly exaggerated by Lynn White, Jr. in his influential article “The Historical Roots of our Ecological Crisis,” *Science* 155 (1967): 1203–7. Jeremy Cohen (“*Be Fertile and Increase, Fill the Earth and Master It*”: *The Ancient and Medieval Career of a Biblical Text* [Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1989]) has shown that pre-modern interpretation of this verse focused almost entirely on the divine command to procreate, and that it was not understood to give license to exploit the environment. Nevertheless, White’s article sparked a widespread interest in environmental ethics and drew biblical scholars into the discussion; for a review of the debate and an alternative to the “mastery” and “stewardship” interpretations of Gen 1:28, see J. Baird Callicott, “Genesis and John Muir,” in *Covenant for a New Creation: Ethics, Religion and Public Policy* (ed. Carol S. Robb and Carl J. Casebolt; Maryknoll, N. Y.: Orbis, 1991), 107–40.

examine the place of the earth in the cosmology of two early Jewish works, the Wisdom of Ben Sira and the Book of the Watchers, and will then narrow its focus to the relationship of the human body to the earth in the two works. This investigation sheds light on an important resource for understanding early Christian concepts of personhood, insofar as early Christianity was informed by both the wisdom and apocalyptic traditions in early Judaism.

It has become popular in recent years to compare the Wisdom of Ben Sira with the early apocalypses contained in *1 Enoch*.<sup>4</sup> This trend reflects a growing recognition that the wisdom and apocalyptic genres are not as discrete as they were once assumed to be, and they probably emerged out of similar social contexts. That is, both wisdom and apocalyptic literature have been recognized as productions of scribal elites, and in Second Temple period Judea there would have been a limited number of institutions that supported scribal activity.<sup>5</sup> Thus the likelihood that Ben Sira and the authors of the early Enochic apocalypses were aware of one another's existence is quite high, and certainly the concerns of the texts overlap.

The Book of the Watchers (BW) is an especially fertile field for comparison with Ben Sira. Completed about a half-century earlier than Ben Sira's book (which can be dated fairly securely to the early second century BCE), the BW shares with Ben Sira an exegetical interest in the primeval narratives in Genesis, although Ben Sira refers most often to Genesis 1–3, while the BW concentrates on Genesis 6–9.<sup>6</sup> Perhaps more to the point, the two texts share an interest in questions of theodicy and of theological anthropology raised by the primeval narratives. While the earth has a much more prominent place in the cosmology of the BW than in that of Ben Sira, they share certain cosmological assumptions that inform their respective anthropologies.

---

<sup>4</sup> The first monograph comparing them was Randal A. Argall, *1 Enoch and Sirach: A Comparative Literary and Conceptual Analysis of the Themes of Revelation, Creation and Judgment* (SBLJL 8; Atlanta: Scholars, 1995). Since then a number of scholars have brought Ben Sira into dialogue with the Enochic apocalypses on various themes, including Benjamin G. Wright III, Gabriele Boccaccini, Richard Horsley, John J. Collins, George W.E. Nickelsburg and Patrick Tiller.

<sup>5</sup> Benjamin G. Wright III, "Wisdom, Instruction and Social Location in Ben Sira and *1 Enoch*," in *Praise Israel for Wisdom and Instruction: Essays on Ben Sira and Wisdom, the Letter of Aristeas and the Septuagint* (JSJSup 131; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 147–63, esp. 161. Originally published in *Things Revealed: Studies in Early Jewish and Christian Literature in Honor of Michael E. Stone* (ed. Esther Chazon, David Satran and Ruth Clements; JSJSup 89; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 105–21.

<sup>6</sup> There are exceptions: Ben Sira emphasizes the human *yetzer* in his discussion of responsibility for sin, a concept that he probably derived from Gen 6:5 and 8:21; he also (probably) mentions the giants (16:7), and Enoch and Noah are the first two ancestors he praises (44:16–18). As for the BW, there are numerous possible allusions to the Eden myth in the second journey narrative (*1 Enoch* 20–36), and one definite one (32:6).

### The Earth in the Cosmology of Ben Sira

The book of Sirach contains four poems treating the observable works of creation (16:24–17:14; 33:7–15; 39:12–35; and 42:15–43:33).<sup>7</sup> There are also two Wisdom hymns in the book (1:1–10 and chapter 24) that allude to aspects of creation that are beyond human observation.<sup>8</sup> One might expect the earth to have a prominent place among the observable works of creation, but in fact Ben Sira rarely discusses the earth as a creation in its own right. Instead, his meditations on creation tend to focus on phenomena of the heavens and on humankind, while the earth and the rest of its creatures remain in the background.

Only in the context of the “hidden” aspects of creation does Ben Sira express wonder at the earth itself: “The height of heaven, the breadth of the earth, the abyss, and wisdom – who can search them out?” (1:3).<sup>9</sup> An answer to this question comes later in the book: apart from God, only Wisdom herself can claim to have “searched out” heaven, earth and the abyss (24:5–6). Significantly, however, Wisdom seeks a “resting place” on earth in the central wisdom hymn, and in fact “takes root” in the land of Israel, in Jerusalem (24:7–12). Wisdom’s connection with the earth is reinforced in this hymn by comparing her to earthly phenomena, especially trees (24:13–17) and rivers (24:25–27). The lack of attention to the earth in Ben Sira’s poems about the observable creation is not an indication of disregard or disdain for the earth, therefore, since he does not hesitate to associate transcendent Wisdom closely with the earth and its creatures. Rather, it seems to be related to the standpoint of the observer, whether divine or human.

In the first poem about the observable works of creation, after introducing the theme of order in creation “from the beginning” (16:26–28), Ben Sira envisions the original state of the earth as that of an empty receptacle, or a *tabula rasa*: “Then the Lord looked upon the earth, and filled it with his good things. With all kinds of living beings he covered its surface, and into it they must return” (16:29–30). Here the divine perspective on the earth from above, as a blank sur-

<sup>7</sup> It is not clear where the first of these poems ends: Patrick W. Skehan and Alexander A. DiLella (*The Wisdom of Ben Sira* [AB 39; New York: Doubleday, 1987] 276–86) treat 16:24–18:14 as a single unit, while John J. Collins (*Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age* [OTL; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997] 58–61) sees 17:20 as the conclusion of the instruction beginning in 16:24. A number of scholars break the poem off at 17:14, however. See especially Luis Alonso Schökel, “The Vision of Man in Sirach 16:24–17:14,” in *Israelite Wisdom: Theological and Literary Essays in Honor of Samuel Terrien* (ed. J. G. Gammie et al.; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press for Union Theological Seminary, 1978) 235–45.

<sup>8</sup> The distinction between observable and “hidden” aspects of creation, according to which Argall organizes his chapter on creation in *1 Enoch and Sirach*, might seem more relevant to the BW than to Sirach, since Enoch is shown many aspects of the creation that are hidden from ordinary human beings, while Ben Sira cautions his disciple, “what is hidden is not your concern” (3:22). Nevertheless, Ben Sira ends his longest poem on creation with the statement, “Many things greater than these lie hidden, for I have seen but few of his works” (43:32).

<sup>9</sup> Unless otherwise noted, translations of Ben Sira are from the NRSV.

face waiting to be filled, is in tension with the perspective from below at the end of the 16:30, which is narrowly focused on the earth as a container for the dead. The point about all living things returning into the earth, which is repeated with respect to human beings in particular in 17:1, will be discussed in the section on Ben Sira's anthropology. The important point for Ben Sira's cosmology is the subtle contrast between the orderly but unspecified "works" of creation that Ben Sira describes in 16:26–28, which "neither hunger nor grow weary, and they do not abandon their tasks" (16:27), on the one hand, and the creatures of earth on the other, which are not described at all. Although most scholars infer that the "works" Ben Sira is describing in 16:26–28 are the heavenly luminaries, he does not identify them clearly.<sup>10</sup> The result is that the message about the goodness of creation as a whole comes across more strongly than the contrast between the heavens and the earth.

The next poem on "the works of the Most High" (33:7–15) follows a similar pattern. It begins by discussing the days of the year: some of them God creates to be ordinary, others to be exalted and holy, yet the same sun illumines all of them (33:7–9). The order of the heavenly luminaries is once again implied, since it is through the movements of the sun and especially the moon that God "appointed the different seasons and festivals" (33:8; cf. 43:6–7; Gen 1:14; Ps 104:19).<sup>11</sup> Ben Sira then draws a clear, but not exact, analogy between different types of days and different types of people: "Some [people] he blessed and exalted, and some he made holy and brought near to himself; but some he cursed and brought low, and turned them out of their place" (33:12). This problematic analogy will be analyzed further in the section on Ben Sira's anthropology. From the point of view of cosmology, scholars have tended to read the whole passage through the lens of the "doctrine of opposites" with which it concludes: "Look at all the works of the Most High; they come in pairs, one the opposite of the other" (33:15).<sup>12</sup> Yet that is only half of the cosmological/anthropological paradox Ben Sira is

<sup>10</sup> Maurice Gilbert, "Ben Sira, Reader of Genesis 1–11," in *Intertextual Studies in Ben Sira and Tobit* (ed. Jeremy Corley and Vincent Skemp; CBQMS 38; Washington, DC: The Catholic Biblical Association, 2005), 89–99 (here 93); Skehan and DiLella, *Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 281; Argall, *1 Enoch and Sirach*, 136; Alonso Schökel, "Vision of Man," 235–36. For Alonso Schökel, the implicit distinction between celestial beings and creatures of earth is essential background to Ben Sira's "vision of man" as sharing characteristics of both groups.

<sup>11</sup> Argall, *1 Enoch and Sirach*, 138–39.

<sup>12</sup> On the "doctrine of opposites" as Ben Sira's main innovation in theodicy, see O. S. Rankin, *Israel's Wisdom Literature: Its Bearing on Theology and the History of Religion* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1936), 34–35; Skehan and DiLella, *Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 401; Collins, *Jewish Wisdom*, 85, 95. Greg Schmidt Goering considers that the importance of the "doctrine of opposites" within Ben Sira's thought has been exaggerated. See his *Wisdom's Root Revealed: Ben Sira and the Election of Israel* (JSJSup 139; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 26–27. Even in 33:7–15, which is the *locus classicus* for Ben Sira's doctrine of opposites, Goering thinks the dynamic of election, rather than binary opposition, is meant to be transferred by analogy from the days to the people (ibid., 49–61). This argument will be treated below, in the context of Ben Sira's anthropology.