PAUL, THE TEMPLE, AND BUILDING A METAPHOR

BY

DAVID ANTHONY BASHAM
SCHOOL OF RELIGIOUS STUDIES
MCGILL UNIVERSITY

DATE: 15 AUG 2022
INITIAL SUBMISSION

DATE: 30 SEPT 2022
ORAL DEFENCE

DATE: 15 DEC 2022
FINAL SUBMISSION

_____
GERBERN S. OEGEMA, SUPERVISOR

_____
HEIDI WENDT, CO-SUPERVISOR

_____
IAN H. HENDERSON, INTERNAL EXAMINER

_____
MATTHEW THIESSEN, EXTERNAL EXAMINER

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN THE SCHOOL OF RELIGIOUS STUDIES AT MCGILL UNIVERSITY

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

Paul's temple metaphor in 1 Corinthians speaks to a new cultic reality for gentiles-in-Christ that is linked to Israel's worship, though detached from its actual expression in Jerusalem. Against the cognitive trend in metaphor theory which argues that metaphors map in only one direction, an "interaction" theory better explains the bilateral effect of metaphor when there are cultic roadblocks to consider, such as those encountered by uncircumcised gentiles worshiping the God of Israel in Christ. Per Max Black's interaction theory, I argue that Paul and the Corinthians share a "system of associated commonplaces" about the Jerusalem temple. When Paul applies temple language to the Corinthians by calling them *naos theou* ("the temple of God"), he sparks a creative process of interaction between the temple and the Corinthian assembly, that is, a process of *selecting*, *emphasizing*, and *organizing* information from the source domain (temple) to see the target domain (the Corinthians) in a new light. The metaphor is also effectual in the other direction. At the same time that Paul creates a new kind of cultic access for them, he also negates actual temple devotion for gentiles attracted to Judaean religion.

RÉSUMÉ

La métaphore paulinienne du temple employée en 1 Corinthiens décrit une nouvelle réalité cultuelle pour les païens-en-Christ, liée au culte d'Israël, bien que détachée de son expression concrète à Jérusalem. Contrairement à l'approche cognitive des métaphores qui affirme que celles-ci n'opèrent que dans une seule direction, une théorie de « l'interaction » explique mieux

l'action bilatérale de la métaphore lorsque des obstacles cultuels doivent être pris en compte, tels que ceux rencontrés par les non-circoncis adorant le Dieu d'Israël en Christ. Suivant la théorie de l'interaction énoncée par Max Black, je soutiens que Paul et les Corinthiens partagent un « système de lieux communs associés » concernant le temple de Jérusalem. Lorsque Paul applique le langage du temple aux Corinthiens en les appelant *naos theou* (« le temple de Dieu »), il enclenche un processus créatif d'interaction entre le temple et l'assemblée de Corinthe, c'est-à-dire un processus de sélection, de mise en valeur et d'organisation des informations du domaine source (temple) permettant de voir le domaine cible (les Corinthiens) sous un nouveau jour. La métaphore opère aussi en direction opposée. Tandis que Paul leur présente un nouveau type d'accès au culte, il refuse aux non-Juifs qui seraient attirés par la religion de Judée l'accès aux pratiques cultuelles liées au temple.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Though the first in my family to complete high school, let alone a doctoral degree, it would be a mistake to assume brilliance on my part or lack thereof on that of my family's. My trajectory in life comes down to the people who sacrificed and invested much for my sake, even when conventional wisdom indicated otherwise.

I am eternally grateful for the love of my grandmother and late grandfather, who took me and my brother in and raised us as if we were their own sons. Without them, I quite literally do not know where I would be. Additionally, several church communities have been instrumental in raising me. As a teenager, those at Memorial Baptist Church in Beckley, West Virginia led me to faith in Jesus Christ. They were not only patient with me but exceedingly generous with their time and resources as well. Because of them, I was able to later fulfill my dream of attending seminary to study the Bible academically and train for ministry.

While at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Mark Seifrid demonstrated for me what it meant to be a New Testament scholar, walking us through the dense work of great scholars I had not encountered. This example only continued under the tutelage of world-class minds like Carl Holladay, Luke Johnson, and Carol Newsom at the Candler School of Theology, who became heroes and friends. It was here that the desire for a life in academia was solidified. These esteemed professors did much to prepare me to study in England, where the careful supervision of John Barclay and the dear friendship of so many at Durham University provided the most enjoyable environment for my continued development.

I was very fortunate to be offered a place in the School of Religious Studies at McGill University. Brilliant minds and a familial atmosphere made it a challenging and enjoyable place to pursue my doctoral studies. McGill truly has a global focus and afforded me many opportunities to develop as a teacher-scholar in the international community of biblical studies. Through the Travel Award for McGill PhD Students to the University of Glasgow, I was able to spend a summer in Scotland. Even near the end of my studies, McGill made it possible for me and my family to live in the Netherlands for my Dirk Smilde Scholarship that had been postponed in 2020 because of the pandemic. I am also thankful to the Smilde family for partially funding that time at the University of Groningen's Qumran Institute, which provided the perfect setting for me to complete my dissertation surrounded by the beauty of summer in Groningen and an international community of brilliant yet humble thinkers.

Furthermore, so many in Montréal played a part in our thriving as a family: St Jax Church, Emmaus Anglican Church, the Lee family, Ian Henderson, and especially the Richards family, whose financial support saw us through slim times. My colleagues and friends in the School of Religious Studies made my success in the program possible, especially Amanda Rosini and Matheus de Carvalho. I am incredibly fortunate to have had Heidi Wendt, Ian Henderson, and Matthew Thiessen as members of my doctoral committee. Most importantly, I cannot express the deep gratitude I have for my Doktorvater, Gerbern S. Oegema, for guiding me through highs and lows and working tirelessly for my growth and benefit.

I owe much to my colleague and friend, Peter Slade, who welcomed me into the guild here at Ashland University by giving me my first teaching post.

Much praise is due to my in-laws, Tom and Kathy, and grandmother-in-law, Mary Ellen, for raising the love of my life and exemplifying how to work hard. They have treated me as their own and moved us all over North America for me to pursue this calling.

Above all, my wife and children are the source from which I have drawn my strength during these years of study across numerous countries and US states. Mallonee, you are unfailingly sacrificial and a never-ending supply of joy. Thank you, my love, for all these years of devotion and trust. No honor or achievement means more to me than our children. Josephine and Lawrence, I want so badly to make you proud. I hope the words written in this meager offering work toward that end, and help lead you to the source of life abundant.

CONTRIBUTION TO ORIGINAL KNOWLEDGE

The following doctoral thesis is considered original scholarship and offers distinct contributions to knowledge in the field of New Testament studies.

INTRODUCTION

The Question

Paul employs several metaphors that span the range of cultic activity in the ancient Mediterranean world.[1] For example, Paul tells the Roman assembly that he is ministering his gospel like a priest, and that the nations are his offering to God (Rom 15.16). In Phil 2.17, Paul tells the Philippians that he is being poured out as a drink offering upon the sacrifice and service of their faith. Paul's language in these instances is cultic in that he refers to actual rituals of veneration. They are instances of metaphor in that they "speak about one thing in terms which are seen to be suggestive of another."[2] For example, concerning Rom 15.16, though Paul claims no actual priestly lineage, he conceives of his work in priestly terms (e.g., "…ministering like a priest the gospel of God, so that the offering of nations might be well-pleasing").[3] Furthermore, gentiles as an acceptable offering to God here does not involve actual sacrifice. Concerning Phil 2.17, though his physical

[1] See 1 Cor 3.16–17; 5.7; 6.19; 9.13; 10.16–21; 2 Cor 2.15–16; 6.16; 12.15; Rom 12.1; 15.16; Phil 2.17; 4.18; cf. also Eph 2.19–22; 5.2; Col 1.24; 1 Tim 3.15; 2 Tim 4.6.

[2] See definition in Janet M. Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), 15. Different terms have been used to capture the kinds of application Paul could have had in mind with his use of cultic language (e.g., *spiritualization*, *sublimation*, *Umdeutung*, *transference*). In the most recent phase of study on the topic, Paul's temple imagery has mainly been described as "metaphor". See Albert L. A. Hogeterp, "Paul and God's Temple: A Historical Interpretation of Cultic Imagery in the Corinthian Correspondence" (PhD diss., University of Groningen, 2004), 15. See also D. R. de Lacey, "οἵτινές ἐστε ὑμεῖς: The Function of a Metaphor in St Paul," in *Templum Amicitiae: Essays on the Second Temple presented to Ernst Bammel*, ed. William Horbury, JSNTSup 48 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), 391–409; and Christfried Böttrich, "'Ihr seid der Tempel Gottes': Tempelmetaphorik und Gemeinde bei Paulus," in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel. Community without Temple: Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*, eds. B. Ego, A. Lange und P. Pilhofer, WUNT 118 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), 411–25.

[3] Unless noted otherwise, all translations are my own.

suffering does not involve an actual libation ritual, Paul imagines his death as such since he is imprisoned for the sake of the message he proclaims.

Metaphor does not technically permit the collapsing of two things compared; paradoxically though, such rituals provide Paul with the only adequate language to express the significance of his work and possible death.[4] There seems to have been a mutual understanding of cultic acts between Paul and the audiences to whom he wrote, which was equally useful and troublesome for Paul. As Kathy Ehrensperger explains,

> Language related to cult and ritual would have been well understood by Jews and by people from the nations since it was an all-permeating aspect of life for all of them. It was all-pervasive in the public realm through the presence of temple buildings and sacred shrines, statues and festivals; Jews as much as people from the nations would have been familiar with this "world", although their stance toward it would have been different. For Jews the actual performance of rituals of sacrifice was limited to the Temple in Jerusalem. This meant that for Diaspora Jews participation in sacrifice rituals was rare and exceptional. Nevertheless, it was a dimension which even they would have taken for granted as a practice that was evidently part of their own tradition. Cult practice through ritual was a "common language" in the Roman Empire and beyond. The fact that Paul uses cultic language relatively frequently … should therefore not come as a surprise.[5]

Paul attests to the prevalence of these cultic categories by using such reference points to understand and explain his ministry among gentile Christ-devotees.[6]

---

[4] On this function of metaphor, see Carol A. Newsom, *The Self as Symbolic Space: Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran* (Leiden: Brill, 2018), 157.

[5] Kathy Ehrensperger, *Paul at the Crossroads of Cultures: Theologizing in the Space Between*, LNTS 456 (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2013), 176. See also Martin Vahrenhorst, *Kultische Sprache in den Paulusbriefen*, WUNT 230 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 8. Throughout, I will use "cult/ic" simply to designate the full range of communal rituals for a tradition, whether Judaean or otherwise.

[6] It is often the case in English, Paula Fredriksen explains, that "*Gentile* refers to ethnicity, but seems religiously neutral: the person so designated is not a Jew. *Pagan* refers specifically to religion: the person is neither a Jew nor a Christian" (*Paul: The Pagans' Apostle* [New Haven: Yale University Press, 2017], 34). However, Fredriksen continues, "this distinction between ethnicity and religion is not native to Mediterranean antiquity, where gods and humans formed family groups. In Paul's period, there was no such thing as a religiously 'neutral' ethnicity" (*Paul: The Pagans' Apostle*, 34). On the use and clarification of "pagan/ism," Christopher Jones traces the etymology and problems with the term but accepts that "The best course is to continue to use the vague term *pagan* but to keep constantly in mind that 'pagans' would never have thought of themselves as such [i.e., as "belonging to a village," from the Latin *paganus*, and therefore as "backwards" in their beliefs]: they would more likely have thought of themselves as observing *eusebeia* ('good reverence'; in Latin, *pietas*, English *piety*). When we talk of 'pagans,' we

On three occasions in his traditionally undisputed writings, Paul speaks of one Christ assembly in terms of being ναὸς θεοῦ, "God's temple" (1 Cor 3.16–17; 6.19; 2 Cor 6.16). The metaphor is expressed using a term which often refers to the inmost part of a temple, or the shrine containing the image of a deity.[7] In their correspondence, Paul applies *naos* to the corporate membership of the Corinthian assembly (1 Cor 3.16–17; 2 Cor 6.16), with an additional emphasis on the behavior of their individual bodies (1 Cor 6.19).[8]

In the first instance, Paul is concerned with how members of this assembly are treating one another per the reports he has received about them (1 Cor 1.11).[9] Frustrated, Paul writes, "Do you all not know that you are the temple of God and that the spirit of God dwells among you![10] If

should keep Roman senators like Symmachus and Macrobius far apart from peasants of Sardinia or Lusitania, and Athenian philosophers from Egyptian worshippers of theriomorphic gods such as Bastet" ("The Fuzziness of 'Paganism,'" *Common Knowledge* 18 [2012]: 254). See also discussion in Ken Dowden, *European Paganism: The Realities of Cult from Antiquity to the Middle Ages* (London; New York: Routledge, 2000), 3.

[7] See LSJ, "νᾱός," 1160. According to BDAG, ναός indicates "a place or structure specifically associated with or set apart for a deity, who is frequently perceived to be using it as a dwelling" (BDAG, "ναός," 665).

[8] The term occurs six times in total (1 Cor 3.16; 6.19; 2 Cor 6.16), and twice in letters largely considered to be authored by others in Paul's name (Eph 2.21; 2 Thess 2.4).

[9] As a translation of ἐκκλησία, I will use "assembly" throughout this study to be clear that the temple which Paul speaks of is not a physical building, but a group of people bound together in fellowship as the organic "body of Christ" (1 Cor 6.15; 12.27). As Louw and Nida explain, "The term ἐκκλησία was in common usage for several hundred years before the Christian era and was used to refer to an assembly of persons constituted by well-defined membership. In general Greek usage it was normally a socio-political entity based upon citizenship in a city-state…. For the NT, however, it is important to understand the meaning of ἐκκλησία as 'an assembly of God's people'" (L&N, "ἐκκλησία," 125). See also Anders Runesson, "The Question of Terminology: The Architecture of Contemporary Discussions on Paul," in *Paul within Judaism: Restoring the First-Century Context to the Apostle*, eds. Mark D. Nanos and Magnus Zetterholm (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2015), 71–72.

[10] Rather than being posed as a question seeking an answer, οὐκ οἴδατε, as a feature classical Greek diatribe, carries a rhetorical force of rebuke. For this reason, I have chosen to punctuate my translation with exclamation rather than a question mark. On the use of οὐκ οἴδατε in diatribe, see Rudolf Bultmann, *Der Stil der paulinischen Predigt und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe*, FRLANT 13 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1910); Stanley K. Stowers, *The Diatribe and Paul's Letter to the Romans*, SBLDS 57 (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981); Benjamin A. Edsall, "Paul's Rhetoric of Knowledge: The OYK OIΔATE Question in 1 Corinthians," *NovT* 55.3 (2013): 252–71.

anyone corrupts God's temple, God will destroy them;[11] for the temple of God is holy, which is what you all are" (1 Cor 3.16–17).[12]

In the second instance, Paul employs his temple imagery to address how they are acting with respect to their own bodies.[13] They do not realize the damage they are doing to themselves through *porneia*, nor the incompatibility of their bodies as members of Christ with the bodies of prostitutes: "Do you all not know that your [collective] body is the temple of the holy *pneuma* in you which you have from God, and that you are not your own!" (1 Cor 6.19). In both instances, the Corinthians have fallen short of the holiness Paul ascribes to them by virtue of the divine *pneuma* housed in and amongst them. The third instance concerns singular devotion to God as opposed to "idols": "What agreement does the temple of God have with idols? For we are the temple of the living God…" (2 Cor 6.16).

From the ways in which he qualifies *naos* in these instances, we can determine what their being so entails for Paul. From the immediate contexts of these passages, we can construct a five-part framework as to what Paul expects of the Corinthians. These are certainly not mutually exclusive but rather intimately interrelated. The Corinthian assembly are and are to act as: 1) a domain devoted to God (i.e., ναὸς θεοῦ [1 Cor 3.16–17; 6.19; 2 Cor 6.16]); 2) a domain where God's spirit resides (1 Cor 3.16; 6.19); 3) a "holy" domain that is not be "corrupted" (1 Cor 3.17); 4) a domain that God will avenge if "corrupted" (1 Cor 3.17); and 5) a domain that should be void of other gods, i.e., "idols" (2 Cor 6.16). This framework finds support throughout the Corinthian

[11] In Chapter Three, I will explain my decision to translate differently from one another the same verb (φθείρω) used twice here in 1 Cor 3.17.

[12] Elsewhere in the NT, we find ναὸς τοῦ θεοῦ in Matt 26.61 and Rev 11.19; 15.8. In those instances, the phrase occurs with the definite article prior to the designation.

[13] See August Strobel, *Der Erste Brief an die Korinther*, ZBK 6.1 (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1989), 114; Friedrich G. Lang, *Die Briefe an die Korinther*, NTD 7 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986), 84; Christian Wolff, *Der Erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther*, THKNT 7 (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1996), 130–31.

letters, as cited in the notes below. Per Max Black's "interaction" theory of metaphor, the above framework provides the "system of associated commonplaces" between *naos* and the Corinthian assembly.[14]

Indebted to the work of I. A. Richards, who described metaphor as "two thoughts of different things active together and supported by a single word, or phrase, whose meaning is a resultant of their interaction", philosopher Max Black further articulated this *interaction* understanding of metaphor.[15] Black argues that the creative dynamic of metaphorical expression is lost when metaphor is considered merely as "substitution" or "comparison". Black offers the example, "man is a wolf", arguing that substitution and comparison views result in a loss of "cognitive content".[16] In this metaphor, the reader does not need to know the standard dictionary meaning of "wolf" but rather those characteristics commonly held as true about wolves (e.g., as "fierce, carnivorous, treacherous").[17] The effect then of calling a man a "wolf" is

> to evoke the wolf-system of related commonplaces. If the man is a wolf, he preys upon other animals, is fierce, hungry, engaged in constant struggle, a scavenger, and so on. Each of these implied assertions has now to be made to fit the principal subject (the man)…. A suitable hearer will be led by the wolf-system of implications to construct a corresponding system of implications about the principal subject.…The wolf-metaphor suppresses some details, emphasizes others—in short, *organizes* our view of man.[18]

Ideally, a "suitable hearer" will share a similar system of commonplaces with the speaker so that the intention of the metaphor is intelligible. Nonetheless, "man *is* a wolf" sparks the creative

---

[14] Max Black, *Models and Metaphors: Studies in Language and Philosophy* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1962), 40. In a later publication, Black used the designation "parallel implication-complex". See also Max Black, "More about Metaphor," *Dialectica* 31.3/4 (1977): 442.

[15] I. A. Richards, *The Philosophy of Rhetoric* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1936), 93.

[16] Not to mention "sacrificing some of the charm, vivacity, or wit of the original" (Black, *Models and Metaphors*, 46).

[17] These commonplaces may vary in any given culture. From an expert's view, this system of commonplaces "may include half-truths or downright mistakes" (Black, *Models and Metaphors*, 40).

[18] Black, *Models and Metaphors*, 41.

process of selecting, emphasizing, and organizing information from the source domain (wolf) to see the target domain (man) in a new light. According to Black, some metaphors are not expendable as substitution and comparison understandings would have us think. I will argue that Paul's temple metaphor is an example of a *complex* metaphor that does not merely operate as rhetorical substitution or comparison.

Typically, a complex but short metaphor like Black's above would allow hearers to select, emphasize, and organize details like a filter in understanding the target domain. Ideally, Paul and the Corinthians would share a system of commonplaces regarding the source domain of Paul's metaphor, ναὸς θεοῦ—something I set out to show in Chapter Five. In furthering his particular approach to interaction theory, Black proposed an outline in a later publication of the process he initially described, using the label "parallel implication-complex" to mean the same as a system of associated commonplaces:

> (i) the presence of the primary subject incites the hearer to select some of the secondary subject's properties; and (ii) invites him to construct a parallel implication-complex [i.e., a system of associated commonplaces] that can fit the primary subject; and (iii) *reciprocally induces parallel changes* in the secondary subject.[19] (emphasis mine)

Herein lies the question of this study: If we can assume that Paul has the Judaean temple of Jerusalem in mind, then what parallel changes are induced in a Judaean ναὸς θεοῦ for his gentile audience in Corinth?

The "parallel changes" I am interested in concern the place of uncircumcised *ethnē* in relation to the Jerusalem temple. The Herodian temple complex was constructed on the basis that those of other nations (*allogenēs*—"other-born") were not permitted cultic access beyond the most

[19] Black, "More about Metaphor," 442.

outer court.[20] The reason for this has been debated. I am not primarily interested in why this was so, though various theories will be discussed, but rather in the overwhelming evidence that this indeed was the case. Paul's application of temple imagery to the Corinthians speaks to his view that these *ethnē*-in-Christ are imbued with the holiness of God's dwelling place on earth. The access that they would be denied in Jerusalem is rendered meaningless for them by the ways in which Paul builds his metaphor per the framework above. Figures of speech such as myth, symbol, and metaphor are necessary in this regard, as Luke Johnson writes, "for there is no other medium available for speaking of divine agency in the empirical realm."[21] Through the divine spirit observed in and amongst them, they gain access to the very presence of God in their assembly.

The Scope of the Study

It must be noted at the outset that the Jerusalem temple rarely features in Paul's letters. Temple pilgrimage does not preoccupy Paul at all, let alone in the way that Jewish rituals such as circumcision, food laws, table fellowship, and holy days do. In total, there are only two explicit references to cultic procedure in Jerusalem (1 Cor 10.18; Rom 9.4), with a third that could encompass priestly practice in general but likely refers to Jerusalem as well (1 Cor 9.13). In addition to these passages, accounts of Paul in the Acts of the Apostles will also be discussed. Acts

[20] Josephus describes the temple's inner courts as elevated by fourteen steps from this outer court with signs warning non-Judaeans not to progress further (*J.W.* 5.195; 6.125).

[21] Luke Timothy Johnson, *Constructing Paul: The Canonical Paul*, vol. 1 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2020), 246. Johnson observes a direct connection between Paul's convictions, myths, symbols, and metaphors and what he calls "the preeminent role of experience in stimulating and shaping each of Paul's letters." Johnson goes on: "Paul is far from a deductive or systematic thinker. He responds rather to what is happening in his own life and what he perceives as happening in the lives of believers. Specifically, his concern is always with what God is doing now in real human lives. If we miss this … we miss everything" (224). See also Carl Holladay, who characterizes Paul's writings as *situational theology* in that they show Paul developing theological positions in response to questions from within specific situations; and *dialogical theology*, reflecting an ongoing conversation between Paul and his assemblies. Paul not only brings theological conviction "to the conversation", but he also works out his positions "in the conversation" (*Introduction to the New Testament: Reference Edition* [Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2017], 393).

attests to the temple attendance of the first generation of Christ-followers, including that of Paul (Acts 21.26–27; cf. also 18.18). However, accounts of temple attendance in Acts concern Judaeans by birth and proselytes, not the uncircumcised who make up the majority if not the totality of Paul's Corinthian audience (though some may have included circumcised proselytes [cf. 1 Cor 7.18–20]).[22]

While I am sympathetic to reasons detailed by Caroline Johnson Hodge for retaining "Judaism" and "Jew/ish" as designations for the ancient context at hand, I will instead employ "Judaean" throughout.[23] Like Hodge, I will first try to use descriptors employed by the ancient writers discussed where relevant (e.g., "descendants of Abraham", "Israel"). Paul only uses *Ioudaïsmos* twice (Gal 1.13–14), in a moment when his back is against the wall, so to speak, defending his credentials against opponents wooing the Galatians away from Paul.[24] Though "Judaism" is often accepted as an unfortunate albeit necessary designation,[25] Steve Mason holds that

> This response misses the point … that historians do not otherwise feel the need to miniaturize complex cultures with capsule words. At least, I have never heard any historian speak of Romism, Athenism, Egyptism, or Syrism—or lament the lack of such terms. Those who feel this need for Judaeans alone might ask themselves why. Is it because the academic study of Judaea, its people, and literature skews toward the theological and trans-temporal? Are we unconsciously absorbing and preserving old Christian perspectives?[26]

---

[22] I engage with Acts' description of Pauline communities, particularly of the movement described in Corinth, because of the scarcity of sources in this regard. I do so in full awareness of these accounts' questionable historicity, to be addressed below.

[23] See Caroline Johnson Hodge, *If Sons, Then Heirs: A Study of Kinship and Ethnicity in the Letters of Paul* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 11–15.

[24] As Steve Mason notes, "The rare *Ioudaismos* ("Judaization") was usable only in the special context of movement toward or away from Judaean law and life, in contrast to some other cultural pull. That is why the term is hardly ever used" ("Jews, Judaeans, Judaizing, Judaism: Problems of Categorization in Ancient History," *JSJ* 38 (2007): 511).

[25] See, e.g., Seth Schwartz, "How Many Judaisms Were There? A Critique of Neusner and Smith on Definition and Mason and Boyarin on Categorization," *JAJ* 2 (2011): 203–38.

[26] Steve Mason, "Paul without Judaism: Historical Method over Perspective," in *Paul and Matthew among Jews and Gentiles: Essays in Honour of Terence L. Donaldson*, ed. Ronald Charles, LNTS (London: T&T Clark,

While the entirety of Mason's reasonings is too detailed to engage with here, I too find that theological sentiments in recent Pauline scholarship have colored the ways in which we understand Paul, especially his temple imagery.[27] In his 2019 retirement lecture at Duke Divinity School, Joel Marcus offered challenge to this recent trend:

> Unfortunately, and I do mean unfortunately, this Jewish Paul viewpoint is, in my view, hard to defend exegetically except perhaps around the edges, such as the end of Romans 11. The view that I'm speaking about extends Sanders' central insight that the pre-Christian Paul found nothing wrong with Judaism to the harder to justify assertion that the post-Christian Paul also found nothing wrong with Judaism.… According to this reading, Paul thinks the Torah is still the way of salvation for Jews. What Christ has done is open up a parallel pathway for gentiles. These interpreters end up ascribing to Paul a two-covenant position.… In my opinion, then, the two-covenant interpretation remains in the realm of things we wish Paul had said, but unfortunately, he didn't say. It does reflect important changes in our society, and those changes are to be applauded, but in my opinion, this sort of wishful exegesis will in the end convince only those who want to be convinced, not the intolerant Christian who are its ostensible targets.[28]

I offer here an example that will be engaged regularly throughout the project. While Paul's temple imagery is not compounded with explicit criticism of the temple establishment in Jerusalem, I cannot attribute to Paul the positive outlook that Paula Fredriksen does when she writes that "Paul praises the new community by likening it to something that he *values supremely*. If he valued the temple less, he would not use it as his touchstone" (emphasis mine).[29] As noted above, the temple

---

2020), 20. Furthermore, as Mason pointed out to me in personal conversation, the more we adopt "Judaism" as an unfortunate but necessary designation for this ancient context, the more it becomes a *thing* in ways it would not be until long after Paul (cf. Mason, "Paul without Judaism," 14–15).

[27] Consider a more measured assessment in Friedrich W. Horn, "Paulus und der Herodianische Tempel," *NTS* 53 (2007): 191.

[28] Joel Marcus, "Thoughts on the Parting of the Ways Between Judaism and Christianity" (paper presented at Duke Divinity School, Durham, NC, 30 April 2019).

[29] Paula Fredriksen, "Judaizing the Nations: The Ritual Demands of Paul's Gospel," *NTS* 56 (2010): 248. Cf. Jonathan Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple: Symbolism and Supersessionism in the Study of Ancient Judaism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 220.

is addressed so sparingly in Paul that this level of positivity seems unwarranted, though I agree with Fredriksen that Paul has the Jerusalem temple in mind.

Returning to Mason's contention, I nevertheless acknowledge Seth Schwartz's counterargument that Judaean custom in the Second Temple period was

> unusually tightly integrated and its administration was concentrated in the hands of an unusually unified clerisy. One God, one temple, one Torah, came by the later Second Temple Period to imply the unusual importance of religion for the Jews and also an unusual lack of differentiation among its priestly mediators. Furthermore, every extant ancient Jewish literary text in some way propounds, defends or comments on this body of material…"[30]

For this reason, I adopt Schwartz's God-Temple-Torah paradigm as a shorthand for "traditional" Judaean-*ness* as well as his approach to state something and then later clarify the varieties in a particular period.[31]

Though Paul's temple metaphor occurs in 2 Cor 6.16 as well, I limit discussion to 1 Corinthians primarily due to questions of authorship surrounding 2 Cor 6.14–7.1. Even in 1915, before the discovery of Qumran texts, Alfred Plummer wrote in his commentary on 2 Corinthians that "This strongly worded admonition to make no compromise with heathenism comes in so

[30] Schwartz, "How Many Judaisms Were There?" 235. See also discussion by James Rives, who observes that "religion" in the Roman Empire (with the exception of "Judaism" and "Christianity" to certain degrees) did not represent coherent or unified systems (*Religion in the Roman Empire*, Blackwell Ancient Religions [Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2007], 5). Rives shows that "Writers of the second century CE and later come increasingly to use *religio* to mean the worship of a particular deity, stressing belief and commitment to a way of life" (14).

[31] Schwartz begins his account of "Palestinian Jewish society and the impact of foreign rule on its integration by observing how the three pillars of ancient Judaism—the one God, the one Torah, and the one Temple—cohere in a single neat, ideological system." He promptly follows: "I will then disturb this coherence, first, by observing the messiness, diversity, and unpredictability of the *effects* of this system in Jewish Palestinian society in the first century…" (*Imperialism and Jewish Society: 200 B.C.E. to 640 C.E.* [Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009], 49). I agree with Stanley Stowers that "'Common Judaism' and most consensus models of 'Second Temple Judaism,' generalize the religion of literate experts" ("Why 'Common Judaism' Does Not Look like Mediterranean Religion," in *Strength to Strength: Essays in Honor of Shaye J. D. Cohen*, ed. Michael L. Satlow, BJS 363 [Providence, RI: Brown Judaic Studies, 2018], 254). Likewise, I do not deny extreme diversity within what has been dubbed common or Second Temple Judaism, but rather will attempt to let the texts addressed express their own views on God, Torah, and Temple, if at all. On this range of diversity, see especially John J. Collins, *The Invention of Judaism Torah and Jewish Identity from Deuteronomy to Paul*, Taubman Lectures in Jewish Studies (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2017).

abruptly here that a number of critics suppose that it is a fragment of another letter and some maintain that the fragment is not by St. Paul."[32] If from Paul himself, we would have the very scriptural passages from which he draws prophetic fulfillment for Christ assemblies as *naos theou*. If 2 Cor 6.14–7.1 is original to Paul either as author or by way of citation, then he understands this reality to be the prophetic fulfillment of several LXX texts, particularly Ezek 37.27 (cf. also Exod 29.45; Lev 26.11–12; 2 Sam 7.14; Isa 43.6; 52.11; Jer 31.1). It would show more concretely that these assemblies, built upon the "foundation" (θεμέλιος) of Jesus Christ (1 Cor 3.11), are the "holy mountain" to which the nations will stream per ancient prophetic hopes, not Jerusalem (cf. Isa 2.2–4; 66.20; Mic 4.1–5). However, the position of 2 Cor 6.14–7.1 in the conceptual flow of 2 Corinthians, in addition to the number of *hapax legomena*, have given many pause.[33] For these reasons, I set 2 Cor 6.16 aside in my consideration of Paul's temple imagery. Furthermore, doing so also allows me to focus on how the temple metaphor in 1 Corinthians, specifically, works toward that letter's occasion.[34]

---

[32] Alfred Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians*, ICC 34 (New York: Scribner, 1915), 204.

[33] For example: ἑτεροζυγέω, μετοχή, συμφώνησις, and συγκατάθεσις. In 1 Cor 5.9, however, Paul uses συναναμίγνυμι (cf. 2 Thess 3.14): when "I wrote to you in the letter not to *associate* with sexually immoral persons…" R. J. McKelvey suggests that 1 Cor 5.9–13 ("[When] I wrote to you in the letter not to associate with the sexually immoral…" [v. 9]) is Paul's clarification of what he meant in 2 Cor 6.14–7.1 (*The New Temple: The Church in the New Testament*, Oxford Theological Monographs [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969], 100). Yet, Paul's clarification seems to concern the sexually immoral primarily, which go unmentioned in 2 Cor 6.14–7.1. Joseph Fitzmyer concludes that the passage, which is an extreme digression at best, should be considered a non-Pauline interpolation ("Qumran and the Interpolated Fragment in 2 Cor 6:14–7:1," *CBQ* 23.3 [1961]: 271). See Victor Paul Furnish, *II Corinthians: Translated, with Introduction and Commentary*, AB32a (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1984), 371–83; and Thomas Schmeller, *Der Zweite Brief an die Korinther (2 Kor 1,1–7,4)*, EKKNT 8.1 (NeukirchenVluyn: Neukirchener Theologie, 2010), 366–82. For a focused treatment, see esp. J. Ayodeji Adewuya, *Holiness and Community in 2 Cor 6:14–7:1: Paul's View of Communal Holiness in the Corinthian Correspondence*, StBibLit 40 (New York: Peter Lang, 2001).

[34] Additionally, the use of ναός as a temple metaphor in Eph 2.19–22 will not be dealt with given the degree of debate surrounding the letter's authorship. Scholars remain divided on the issue. For measured discussion of authorship and canonicity, see Udo Schnelle, *The History and Theology of the New Testament Writings*, trans. M. Eugene Boring (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998); and Stephen E. Fowl, *Ephesians: A Commentary*, eds. C. Clifton Black, M. Eugene Boring, and John T. Carroll, NTL (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2012). For an in-depth treatment of textual details, see Andrew T. Lincoln, *Ephesians*, WBC 42 (Dallas: Word Books, 1990), lix–

We find similar temple imagery in the discovered writings of the Qumran community.[35] Unlike what we have received from Qumran, Paul does not direct explicit criticism at a priestly establishment in Jerusalem (cf. 1QpHab 11.4–6, 10–15; 12.2–6). The Serek ha-Yahad indicates that those at Qumran, at some point, took on an atoning function by means of their piety (cf. 1QS 8.1–10; 9.3–6; 4Q174 1.6–7). Perhaps perceived corruption in Jerusalem propelled those at Qumran to see cultic functions in this new light. Their self-understanding as a means of atonement through regulation and membership is unsurprising because we assume them to have been at odds with Jerusalem, though this has been challenged by some.[36] It is difficult to read Paul in the same manner since 1) he never speaks of his relationship with the Jerusalem cult,[37] and 2) because Acts offers accounts of his temple attendance (21.24–26; cf. 18.18).

lxxiii; and for the landscape of positions on authorship, Markus Barth, *Ephesians: Introduction, Translation, and Commentary on Chapters 1–3*, AB 34 (New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2008), 36–50.

[35] As Bertil Gärtner writes, the idea of a temple that is made up of a group of people is, as far as we know, limited to Qumran and the New Testament (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*, SNTSMS 1 [Cambridge: University Press, 1965], 56 n. 1). See also Wassén, "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," 55–86.

[36] For example, Martin Goodman takes up the question of whether the evidence from such texts "should be enough to encourage the view that sectarian Jews with such beliefs *would* cut themselves off from the Temple" ("Constructing Ancient Judaism from the Scrolls," in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, eds. Timothy H. Lim and John J. Collins [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010], 82–83). See also this position in Regev, *The Temple in Early Christianity*, 63–64. Even if Qumran did promote complete separation from Jerusalem, the temple still features heavily in their eschatological hopes. The Temple Scroll details the construction of a new temple complex that would have equaled the size of the entire city of Jerusalem as it then existed, requiring apocalyptic adjustments to the landscape. See discussion in Michael O. Wise, Martin G. Abegg Jr., and Edward M. Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation* (New York: HarperOne, 2005), 594.

[37] According to Paul's own travelogue in Galatians, surely it is significant that he himself did not feel the need to go up to Jerusalem for a fourteen-year period (Gal 2.1; cf. also 1.17–18). See Richard Bauckham, *The Jewish World Around the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010), 187 n. 36. In comparison, Philo mentions making pilgrimage to Jerusalem at least once (*Prov.* 2.64). Some have taken Philo's attestation to pilgrimage as evidence for its pervasiveness in the Second Temple period, while others have expressed suspicion at accounts of such widespread travel. See Joachim Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus*, trans. F. H. Cave and C. H. Cave (London: S.C.M. Press, 1969), 76–77; Lee I. Levine, *Jerusalem: Portrait of the City in the Second Temple Period (538 B.C.E.–70 C.E.)* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 2002), 249; and Shmuel Safrai, Yvonne Glikson and Semah Cecil Hyman, "Pilgrimage," in *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, eds. Fred Skolnik and Michael Berenbaum, vol. 16, 2nd ed. (Detroit: Macmillan; Keter Publishing House, 2007), 154.

Moving beyond Paul's personal devotion, this study seeks to demonstrate the role that metaphor as a device plays in bolstering Paul's message that the temple in Jerusalem is not an applicable form of devotion for gentiles-in-Christ. I echo Qumran scholar Jutta Jokiranta's sentiment that "to ask if the communities, by being compared to the temple, somehow replaced the temple is too *unspecific*; it must be asked which functions or properties of the temple they may have claimed (exclusively) for themselves" (emphasis mine).[38] For this reason, I am primarily concerned with gentile access and participation at the Jerusalem temple in the Second Temple period, and how these ritual circumstances should inform the way we read Paul's temple metaphor to a predominantly gentile audience.[39]

Though the term "ritual" is used throughout, the topic at hand is not pursued through the lens of theories derived from the field of ritual studies. Rather, my focus is on *how* Paul's metaphorical language works with regard to the realities of his non-Judaean audience and Jerusalem temple access.[40] Because cultic practice involves ritual, "ritual/s" will be used to

[38] Jutta Jokiranta, "Rule Scrolls: Introduction, 1QS, 1QSa, 1QSb" (Forthcoming).

[39] The Second Temple period, or "Early Judaism", refers roughly to the period stretching from the late sixth century BCE through the two Judaean revolts against Rome in 70 and 135 CE. While I will use "Second Temple" as a designation, the "Early" descriptor perhaps better captures the period after the exiles of Israel and Judah before the rise of the rabbinic class, since this period does not align exactly with the presence of the second temple in Jerusalem. We also know of other Judaean temples that existed during this period. More specifically, the period is bound by the conquests of Alexander the Great (330 BCE) and the Roman Emperor Hadrian (138 CE). In reality, the designation of time periods is never precise and involves a degree of superficiality. See comprehensive discussion of designations in Robert A. Kraft, and George W. E. Nickelsburg, eds., *Early Judaism and Its Modern Interpreters*, vol. 2 of *The Bible and Its Modern Interpreters*, gen. ed. Douglas A. Knight (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986).

[40] Nonetheless, I offer the following perimeters since the term will be used frequently. Catherine Bell notes the "surprising degree of consistency" in the descriptions of ritual she gathers: "ritual is a type of critical juncture wherein some pair of opposing social or cultural forces comes together. Examples include the ritual integration of belief and behavior, tradition and change, order and chaos, the individual and the group, subjectivity and objectivity, nature and culture, the real and the imaginative ideal. Whether it is defined in terms of features of 'enthusiasm' (fostering groupism) or 'formalism' (fostering the repetition of the traditional), ritual is consistently depicted as a mechanistically discrete and paradigmatic means of sociocultural integration, appropriation, or transformation. Given the variety of theoretical objectives and methods, such consistency is surprising and interesting" (*Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009], 16). Bell goes on to intimate, though, how slippery "ritual" can be when attempting to contrive a definition that captures every possible expression (69–70). The dominant position in the field of ritual studies is that rituals do not have inherent meaning in and of themselves (see Ehrensperger, *Paul at*

designate Jerusalem temple participation as a feature of the Second Temple period, per the God-Temple-Torah paradigm as articulated by Seth Schwartz.[41]

Uncircumcised gentile pilgrimage to Jerusalem was not unheard of, though involvement would have been limited given their status as *profane*, to be discussed. The ritual circumstances were dire, even if one had fully proselytized by means of circumcision, which may have been the case for some among Paul's Corinthian audience.[42] Evidence suggests that the inner court for lay Jewish men would never have been open to circumcised proselytes given their foreign genealogy as *allogenēs* ("other-born").[43] This would mean that, regardless of a male proselyte's circumcision, they would always be consigned to the outer court of the temple. This is where Paul's temple

the Crossroads of Cultures, 177). Rather, as Gerald Klingbeil emphasizes, "ritual constitutes a learned activity that is transmitted by processes of socialization in a particular cultural context" (*Bridging the Gap: Ritual and Ritual Texts in the Bible* [University Park, PA: Penn State University Press, 2007], 209). See also Risto Uro's work on *Ritual and Christian Beginnings: A Socio-Cognitive Analysis* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016).

[41] See Schwartz, *Imperialism and Jewish Society*, 49–100. In terms of defining "cult," I favor Sigmund Mowinckel's definition because it expresses the importance of *community* and *ritual*. Mowinckel defines cult as "the socially established and regulated holy acts and words in which the encounter and communion of the Deity with the congregation is established, developed, and brought to its ultimate goal. In other words: a relation in which a religion becomes a vitalizing function as a communion of God and congregation, and of the members of the congregation amongst themselves" (*The Psalms in Israel's Worship*, trans. Dafydd Rhys ap Thomas [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004], 1:15).

[42] As Paula Fredriksen explains, "The modern term for such a transition, 'conversion,' fits poorly in Paul's period, when one's kinship group, the *genos* or *ethnos*, anchored and articulated piety" (*Paul: The Pagans' Apostle*, 65).

[43] See Daniel R. Schwartz, "A Priestly View of Descent at Qumran," in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin*, eds. Lawrence H. Schiffman, Yigael Yadin, and Hagop Kevorkian Center for Near Eastern Studies, JSPSup 8 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), 165–66 n. 43. Apart from warning inscriptions, Shaye Cohen explains, it is unlikely that there were ever "gatekeepers" in the sense of those checking for one's circumcision upon entry (*The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties*, HCS 31 [Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999], 49 n. 96). "The priests will have been entrusted with the duty of protecting the temple from foreign contagion, but in the final analysis the priests did not keep gentiles out of the temple as much as well-intentioned and respectful gentiles kept themselves out of the temple (just as well-intentioned and respectful impure Jews kept themselves out of the temple until purified)" (65). See Josephus' account of an incident where some Samaritans took advantage of the confusion during Passover to enter the temple in *Ant*. 18.30. See also Matthew Thiessen, *Contesting Conversion: Genealogy, Circumcision, and Identity in Ancient Judaism and Christianity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 103–6; and E. P. Sanders, *Judaism: Practice and Belief, 63 BCE–66 CE* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2016), 111–18.

metaphor reveals its creative power by opening new cultic possibilities for his gentiles-in-Christ.[44] Once the ritual circumstances have been established regarding temple attendance for Judaeans and non-Judaeans in the Second Temple period, we can appreciate this effect of Paul's temple metaphor.[45]

Methodology

It is necessary to employ various methods as the texts at hand require.[46] Though Wayne Meeks refers to the use of social-scientific methodologies, specifically, I adopt his remark that "eclecticism seems the only honest and cautious way to proceed" as programmatic for my study.[47] What follows will largely be historical-critical and exegetical in method since the goal is to reconstruct from the pertinent texts the perceived realities for gentiles in relation to the Jerusalem temple. However, once this is established, then we can appreciate the effect of Paul's temple imagery as applied to the Corinthian assembly, which will require engagement with ancient and modern theories of metaphor.

Paul seeks to offer some explanation of his audience's experiences of God's *pneuma* through the message of Christ crucified in light of Israel's history and traditions. He indicates the value of Israel's system of worship, among other institutions, for positioning Judaeans to receive

[44] Horn stresses, "I do not mean that Paul wanted this to be understood as an attack on the Jerusalem temple and the temple cult. On the contrary, his strategy seems to be more *offensive*" [„Ich meine freilich nicht, dass Paulus dies als einen Angriff auf den Jerusalemer Tempel und den Tempelkult verstanden wissen wollte. Im Gegenteil, seine Strategie scheint offensiver zu sein"] (Horn, "Paulus und der Herodianische Tempel," 191). Nonetheless, the contrast between the status Paul ascribes his audience and the exclusionary layout of the Jerusalem temple could not be starker.

[45] In this study, it is not my goal to construct the details of a cultic world as deduced from Paul's cultic imagery. Instead, see Gupta, *Worship That Makes Sense to Paul*; or, for a more pessimistic view that a coherent system cannot be deduced, see Regev, *The Temple in Early Christianity*, 53–95.

[46] I borrow John Lanci's defense for a multi-methodological approach. Lanci embraces a range of analytical approaches such as word studies, ancient epistolary theory, social anthropology, archaeology, in addition to methods of historical criticism (*A New Temple for Corinth*, 4).

[47] Wayne A. Meeks, *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983), 6.

the Christ (cf. Rom 9.4). Paul does not encourage actual Judaean cultic devotion on the part of the gentiles though, but rather makes use of such rituals in new ways by means of metaphor. Metaphor allows Paul to describe the holiness with which his gentiles-in-Christ are now imbued (the target domain of the metaphor) as the holiness of God's presence in the Jerusalem temple (the source domain of the metaphor).

Metaphor is notoriously difficult to define, especially when different disciplines use the device to different ends. One scholar claims to have identified 125 definitions for metaphor, which Janet Soskice reckons is "surely only a small fraction of those which have been put forward."[48] Soskice concludes that, while it may not be satisfactory to everyone, some minimal definition is needed. Her definition—to "speak about one thing in terms which are seen to be suggestive of another"—is adopted here for my study of Paul's temple metaphor.[49]

It should be noted that Paul does not acknowledge or explain his employment of metaphor, which actually fits with the ancient understanding of the device's ambiguity. Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian are considered the ancient authorities on the use of metaphor in Graeco-Roman thought due to their extensive treatments.[50] Beyond the entertaining aspect of metaphor, as a device that "gives perspicuity, pleasure, and an air of unfamiliarity" (*Rhet*. 3.2.8 [Freese; Striker, LCL]), Aristotle explains that some things simply cannot be described without it. Furthermore, he holds that the use of metaphor is something that cannot be learned. In this way, it is a feature of language found even among the most common of peoples. Paul's writings represent this innate ability to

[48] See Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 15.

[49] Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 15.

[50] See, for example, Paul Ricœur, *The Rule of Metaphor: The Creation of Meaning in Language*, trans. Robert Czerny, Kathleen McLaughlin, and John Costello, SJ (London; New York: Routledge, 2003), 2; Umberto Eco, "The Scandal of Metaphor: Metaphorology and Semiotics," *Poetics Today* 4 (1983): 217–18; Raymond F. Collins, *The Power of Images in Paul* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2008), 1–10; Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 7–10.

employ metaphor. Similarly, Roman rhetorician Quintilian holds that metaphor is "both a gift which Nature herself confers on us, and which is therefore used even by uneducated persons and unconsciously, and at the same time so attractive and elegant that it shines by its own light however splendid its context" (*Inst*. 8.6.4 [Russell, LCL]). Regarding Paul's overwhelming use of metaphor, Raymond Collins clarifies that

> Paul did not read the writings of Quintilian, whose magnum opus was composed after Paul wrote his letters to the churches. Neither had he read Aristotle or Cicero. He was, nonetheless, a citizen of the Hellenistic world whose rhetorical contours were limned by that trio of rhetoricians. They wrote about metaphor as a technique to be employed by an orator or writer who wanted to persuade. Paul spoke and wrote in order to convince his audience of the truth of the gospel. Metaphor was one of the techniques that he employed.[51]

My assessment of metaphor, therefore, aligns with those studies ranging from ancient to modern that consider metaphor to be utterly pervasive in the ways we structure our realities.[52] As a field of study, metaphorology falls under the umbrella of Cognitive Linguistics. Among others, a fundamental characteristic of Cognitive Linguistics is that language "imposes a structure on the world rather than just mirroring objective reality. Specifically, language is a way of organizing knowledge that reflects the needs, interests, and experiences of individuals and cultures."[53] In this regard, the use of metaphor is seen not as superfluous but necessary and often unsubstitutable.[54] In this study, I favor philosophical rather literary metaphor theory. In particular, I will utilize

---

[51] Collins, *The Power of Images in Paul*, 10.

[52] See George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, who write that "most people think they can get along perfectly well without metaphor. We have found, on the contrary, that metaphor is pervasive in everyday life, not just in language but in thought and action. Our ordinary conceptual system, in terms of which we both think and act, is fundamentally metaphorical in nature" (Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By* [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003], 3).

[53] Dirk Geeraerts and Hubert Cuyckens, eds., "Introducing Cognitive linguistics," in *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 5.

[54] See McFague, *Sallie McFague*, 87. See also Jennifer McNeel, who emphasizes that Paul's metaphors "do not simply decorate the text, but are designed to affect the reader at a cognitive or emotional level, and thus are an integral part of Paul's rhetorical strategy" (*Paul as Infant and Nursing Mother: Metaphor, Rhetoric, and Identity in 1 Thessalonians 2:5–8* [Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2014], 1).

Black's "interaction" theory of metaphor, which challenges "substitution" and "comparison" understandings of metaphors. The instability introduced by Paul's temple imagery to the Corinthians is in applying concepts of God's temple (ναὸς θεοῦ) to a people fundamentally barred full access to that temple in Jerusalem. The subsequent creativity introduced concerns the way in which Paul has overcome that exclusion, that is, by means of metaphor.

History of Research

Scholarship on the subject has primarily been concerned with what this temple metaphor made by Paul—a Judaean living before the destruction of the temple in 70 CE—says about his relationship with the actual temple in Jerusalem (and, inevitably, with some form of normative "Judaism" in general). Recent scholarship on Paul's cultic metaphors, working to counter claims of supersessionism, has increasingly challenged the notion that Paul actively sought to undermine the legitimacy of the Jerusalem temple.

Protestant scholarship prior to the Holocaust operated from the presumption that Judaean cult represented a lesser, more primitive form of devotion.[55] For example, in his *Einleitung in die Psalmen*, Hermann Gunkel speaks of a communion with God that is liberated from external expressions of cultic worship.[56] In Hans Wenschkewitz's 1932 *Die Spiritualisierung der Kultusbegriffe: Tempel, Priester und Opfer im Neuen Testament*, Wenschkewitz held that the New

[55] Marcel Fraeyman challenges this notion, arguing that for Paul "the spiritual temple remains a real temple, to which belongs all that constituted the value of the ancient temple: true presence, true holiness and worship. What is more, the ancient worship and the ancient temple are only shadows compared to the present reality" [« le temple spirituel reste un temple réel, auquel revient tout ce qui constituait la valeur du temple ancien : vraie présence, véritable sainteté et culte. Ce qui plus est, l'ancien culte et l'ancien temple ne sont que des ombres en comparaison de la réalité présente »] ("La Spiritualisation de l'Idée du Temple dans les Epitres pauliniennes," *ETL* 33 [1947]: 411).

[56] "Such words show how little it seems necessary, in saying the lamentation, to perform the particular custom." [„Solche Worte zeigen, wie wenig es beim Sprechen des Klageliedes notwendig erscheint, den bestimmten Brauch zu vollziehen."] Hermann Gunkel and Joachim Begrich, *Einleitung in Die Psalmen: Die Gattungen Der Religiösen Lyrik Israels*, HKAT (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1933), 181–82.

Testament represented the climax of a progression towards a spiritualized conception of cult.[57] Citing the concept of "numinous awe," Wenschkewitz argued that temple and cult become meaningless for Paul in light of the Christ event.[58] Paul's use of ναός did not refer specifically to the temple in Jerusalem but was instead meant to inspire his audience to be generally *temple-like*.[59]

Decades later, interpreters began to read Paul's temple imagery in light of early Christianity's "thoroughgoing eschatology". Because of this eschatology, R. J. McKelvey argues that early Christ-followers believed themselves to be living in the time prophesied long ago—a time marked by the "new temple".[60] McKelvey also traces the philosophical development of Greek and Judaean tradition regarding a superior spiritual cult to the tangible and traditional.[61] In particular, he examines how Judaean conceptions and traditions of a heavenly temple were appropriated by New Testament writers. Like McKelvey, Georg Klinzing also emphasizes the movement's apocalyptic perspective.[62] Klinzing, however, became concerned that the term "spiritualization" was misleading. Looking at the habits of the Qumran community, Klinzing notes

[57] Hans Wenschkewitz, *Die Spiritualisierung der Kultusbegriffe: Tempel, Priester und Opfer im Neuen Testament* (Leipzig: Eduard Pfeiffer, 1932).

[58] The concept of "numinous awe" was drawn from Rudolf Otto's *Das Heilige: über das Irrationale in der Idee des Göttlichen und sein Verhältnis zum Rationalen*, which first appeared in 1917. Otto's work was foundational for many, like Mircea Eliade who built upon it in his *The Sacred and the Profane*. In this tradition of thought, transcendent experience is the defining factor of religion. From stones and trees to the incarnation of God in Jesus Christ, Eliade writes, "It could be said that the history of religions—from the most primitive to the most highly developed—is constituted by a great number of hierophanies, by manifestations of sacred realities." For Eliade, these hierophanies or symbols represent escapes into transcendence. See *The Sacred and the Profane: The Nature of Religion*, trans. Willard R. Trask (San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1987), 11.

[59] Likewise, Charles Moule describes Paul as taking "a certain delight also in 'sublimating' the Levitical term and Judaistic phrases, which had been his former boast, into purely spiritual senses, wholly on the level of personal relationships and volition…" ("Sanctuary and Sacrifice in the Church of the New Testament," *JTS* 1.1 [1950]: 36).

[60] McKelvey, *The New Temple*, 180. See also Johannes Weiss on "the new, glorious, perfect temple in which to dwell" (*Der Erste Korintherbrief*, KEK 5 [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1910], 84). Christian Wolff speaks of "replacing" the Jerusalem temple in *Der Erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther*, 74.

[61] See McKelvey, *The New Temple*, 42–57.

[62] Georg Klinzing, *Die Umdeutung des Kultus in der Qumrangemeinde und im Neuen Testament* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971), 221–24.

how deeply they cared about the proper prescription of their ritual practices, for example, how meals were to be eaten and how community membership was to be regulated. In comparison with the New Testament, Klinzing suggests the *Umdeutung* ("reinterpretation") of cultic (especially temple) language is due to an apocalyptic perspective which Christ-followers shared with Qumran.

The foundational study on the similarities in cultic language between Qumran and the New Testament is Bertil Gärtner's 1965 *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament*. According to Gärtner, Paul's temple metaphor in the Corinthian letters

> resemble the temple symbolism and overall ideology of the Qumran community. The resemblance does not stop with the assertion that the community is to be identified with the temple of God; it extends to the emphasis on the 'dwelling' of God in the community, the holiness which results, the exhortation to purity and finally the warning to beware of those who threaten the life of the community.[63]

Gärtner acknowledges that such symbolism may not have originated with Qumran and that Paul's dependence on Qumran, ultimately, cannot be proven.[64] Nevertheless, "the idea of a temple made up of a group of people is, as far as we know, limited to Qumran and the N.T."[65] While this suggests a link between the two groups of texts, it is also possible that this temple symbolism was reinterpreted by believers prior to Paul. Gärtner concludes that, for Qumran, their judgment of the Jerusalem temple precipitated the formation of a pure and faithful community; for Christ-followers, the likely adoption of Qumran's temple traditions was brought about by the resurrection of Christ and the giving of the divine spirit.[66]

---

[63] Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament*, 60.

[64] Others have likewise theorized that Paul took over the idea from Qumran, or even from the "Jewish-Christian church". See, for example, Friedrich G. Lang, *Die Briefe an die Korinther*, NTD 7 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986), 55; and Wolfgang Schrage, *Der Erste Brief an die Korinther: 1 Kor 1,1–6,11*, EKKNT 7.1 (Zürich/Braunschweig: Benziger; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1991), 305.

[65] Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament*, 56 n. 1.

[66] Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament*, 139.

Scholars have since questioned the eagerness to attribute to Paul a dependence on Qumranic tradition. While equally critical of spiritualization, Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza challenged the *religionsgeschichtlich* approach by Klinzing in assessing the cultic language of Qumran and earliest Christianity.[67] For example, "why did the NT communities not develop a similar hierarchical-priestly structure, if they shared with the Qumran writings the same apocalyptic-eschatological worldview and if this worldview caused the re-interpretation of the cultic institutions and terminology?" [68] Schüssler Fiorenza holds that the common self-understanding between Qumran and the Christ-followers as communities of the end-time does not explain why they re-interpret cultic language, nor why they differ so in their attitudes toward cultic notions. [69] Schüssler Fiorenza, therefore, opts for the term "transference" rather than "reinterpretation", for "This term indicates that Jewish and Hellenistic cultic concepts were *shifted* to designate a reality which was not cultic" (emphasis hers).[70]

More recently, Paul's cultic language has been catalogued and assessed so as to push back against what has been considered anti-sacrificial or anti-ritual bias in past scholarship. What these studies share is an emphasis on the ethical implications in Paul's use of cultic metaphors (much like Wenschkewitz, ironically). Wenschkewitz was not unaware of the intended ethical outcome of using such cultic imagery, for he saw in them Paul's desire to create a greater sense of

---

[67] More recently, Jonathan Klawans has contended that "To turn sacrificial metaphors into 'spiritualizations' *of* sacrifice is to misread them. These metaphors are, rather, *borrowings from* sacrifice. Sacrificial metaphors operate on the assumption of the efficacy and meaning of sacrificial rituals, and hope to appropriate some of that meaning and apply it to something else. Thus, Paul's metaphors can be compared to the efforts exerted by various groups of ancient Jews to infuse aspects of daily life with some of the holiness that pertained more directly to the temple" (*Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple: Symbolism and Supersessionism in the Study of Ancient Judaism* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006], 220).

[68] Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza," Cultic Language in Qumran and in the NT," *CBQ* 38 (1976): 164.

[69] See also Christian Wolff, *Der Erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther*, THKNT 7 (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1996), 74.

[70] Schüssler Fiorenza," Cultic Language in Qumran and in the NT," 161.

community among the Corinthians.[71] However, recent scholarship departs drastically by arguing that, in using cultic reference points, Paul shows that the Judaean cult is still important for him.

John Lanci's *A New Temple for Corinth* was the first among newer studies with an ethical emphasis that do not perceive judgement upon the Jerusalem temple in Paul's cultic metaphors. Lanci's work is also something of an outlier in that his concern is not with the Jerusalem temple but rather with those temples with which audiences like the Corinthians would have been familiar. Lanci argues that, when Paul speaks of the community in terms of a temple, "he has something very different than the Jerusalem Temple, and its replacement, in mind."[72] According to Lanci, Paul's building and temple imagery in 1 Corinthians encourages unity and discourages factionalism. Citing the conception of temples as spaces representative of civic unity, Lanci asserts that Paul and his audience would have thought first of the temples of Corinth: "rather than inviting the Corinthians to understand themselves as a new temple replacing the one in Jerusalem, Paul uses a metaphor, which both Gentile and Jew could understand, to present and then anchor the motif of community upbuilding which runs throughout the letter."[73] The specifics of Lanci's study will be assessed later, principally, the matter of Paul's temple referent.

Albert Hogeterp addresses the problem with what he considers anachronistic readings of Paul's temple metaphor. Spiritualization, he argues, "tends to take later theological developments and the historical situation of the parting of the way between Judaism and Christianity after 70 CE

---

[71] See Wenschkewitz, *Die Spiritualisierung der Kultusbegriffe*, 113.

[72] John R. Lanci, *A New Temple for Corinth: Rhetorical and Archaeological Approaches to Pauline Imagery*, StBibLit 1 (New York: P. Lang, 1997), 6. For a similar position, see Böttrich, "'Ihr seid der Tempel Gottes': Tempelmetaphorik und Gemeinde bei Paulus," 411–25; and Yulin Liu, *Temple Purity in 1–2 Corinthians*, WUNT 2/343 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013); and Lim, *Metaphors and Social Identity Formation in Paul's Letters to the Corinthians*.

[73] Lanci, *A New Temple for Corinth*, 5. See also Margaret Mitchell, who understands 1 Cor 3.17 as referring not to temple defilement but rather to the destruction of the community by factionalism, for which she cites Graeco-Roman examples in *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians* (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993), 99–111.

as a referential framework for the perspective of Paul."[74] Like Lanci, Hogeterp argues that Paul's cultic imagery cannot be understood to support the establishment of a new cult as a substitution for Jerusalem. Rather, he writes that "Paul's temple imagery should … be interpreted as a normative model which serves a paideutic purpose of teaching the Corinthians a holy way of life."[75] Hogeterp labors thoroughly through the variety of temple perspectives in the Second Temple period, especially rival temples like those at Leontopolis and Gerizim.[76] Additionally, Hogeterp examines Qumran's relation to the Jerusalem cult as well as that of the early Jesus movement.[77]

Friedrich Horn attempts to reconcile the account of Paul's temple devotion in Acts with the temple imagery of his letters. This is not a new endeavor either. Wenschkewitz, for example, had proposed that Paul's vow in Acts 21 was simply an expression of his approach to become "all things to all people" (1 Cor 9.22). Where Horn departs is in the suggestion that Paul sought to create a positive relationship („Möglichkeiten der Tempelfrömmigkeit wahrnimmt") between the temple and believing gentiles in their uncircumcised state.[78] Horn challenges Lanci's position that Paul refers to other temples as much as the Jerusalem temple based on the Corinthians' adoption of Judaean tradition.[79] While Horn considers the accusation from Acts 21 that Paul had attempted to bring Greeks into the temple to be unfounded (vv. 28–29), he nevertheless rejects the theory of substitution and entertains the possibility that Paul opens Jerusalem temple theology to gentiles

[74] Albert L. A. Hogeterp, *Paul and God's Temple: A Historical Interpretation of Cultic Imagery in the Corinthian Correspondence*, BTS 2 (Leuven: Peeters, 2006), 8.

[75] Hogeterp, *Paul and God's Temple*, 384.

[76] Hogeterp, *Paul and God's Temple*, 32–35.

[77] Like Hogeterp, I will focus primarily on Paul's Corinthian correspondence since these letters offer the only examples in undisputed Paul of temple language applied to his audience. See Hogeterp, *Paul and God's Temple*, 23.

[78] Horn, "Paulus und der Herodianische Tempel," 184–203.

[79] Horn, "Paulus und der Herodianische Tempel," 188.

like the Corinthians with a view to include them.[80] Horn acknowledges though that the temple still operates as a boundary marker in Paul's day; but through Paul's temple imagery it will, in time, become an "identity marker for Jews, Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians" alike.[81]

In *Worship That Makes Sense to Paul*, Nijay Gupta is not interested in making historical-critical claims about Paul's relation to the temple. In fact, he sidesteps the question of substitution altogether, expressing skepticism at the attempt to uncover what Paul was thinking when he wrote his metaphors. He argues that "Paul's cultic metaphors reveal much more about his thought than simply what he believed about the temple, priesthood, and sacrifices."[82] Gupta sees the question, "does Paul consider the Christian community to replace the Jewish second temple?" to be "wrong-headed" for several reasons. Like Fraeyman cited above (n. 70), what is considered "real" to ancient authors differs from modern conceptions. Gupta cites Philo, Josephus, and Hebrews to argue that, while the Jerusalem temple was acknowledged as legitimate, it only represents the reality of God's heavenly dwelling place (cf. Philo, *Mos.* 2.88; Josephus, *Ant.* 3.180; Heb 8.1–2). "In these terms, neither Paul's community-temple nor the Jerusalem temple was *the* real temple. The 'real' temple was not a building, structure, or 'thing' that could be found on earth."[83] The obvious objection to this position is that Gupta assumes the same philosophical persuasion of Paul as the other authors cited.

Gupta seeks to develop a coherent ethical framework of the cultic metaphors across Paul's undisputed letters. He does so by focusing on "the act of 'metaphorizing'—the comparison of

---

[80] Horn, "Paulus und der Herodianische Tempel," 191.

[81] „Er wächst … doch zugleich in die Rolle eines identity marker für Juden, Judenchristen und Heidenchristen" (Horn, "Paulus und der Herodianische Tempel," 203).

[82] Nijay K. Gupta, *Worship That Makes Sense to Paul: A New Approach to the Theology and Ethics of Paul's Cultic Metaphors*, 2nd ed. (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010), 1.

[83] Gupta, *Worship That Makes Sense to Paul*, 206.

something (like the people of God) to something else (like the temple) in order to communicate some 'truth' that can hardly be communicated another way."[84] Gupta's focus is to "not only ask what Paul is *saying* or *thinking* with this metaphor, but also what he is trying to *do* (from a socio-literary and rhetorical standpoint)."[85] There are areas of Paul's thought that could only be illuminated through his use of cultic metaphors.[86] In the end, Gupta is satisfied to leave Paul's temple imagery at more than "just a metaphor".[87]

Eyal Regev's 2019 study, *The Temple in Early Christianity*, represents the pendulum swung fully in the opposite direction from the spiritualization of Wenschkewitz, though again the ethical dimension remains. For Regev, Paul remains fully devoted to the Jerusalem temple's traditional status. Among the evidence offered for Paul's continued devotion are 1) a lack of explicit criticism of the Herodian temple; 2) a wide range of incoherent cultic metaphors that do not offer an alternative system of belief (related to this is the focus on ethics rather than atonement in many cases);[88] 3) and the very use of cultic metaphors themselves. This last argument Regev borrows from Paula Fredriksen, who posits that Paul's use of cultic metaphors actually reveals his deep commitment to the literal cult in Jerusalem.[89]

---

[84] Gupta, *Worship That Makes Sense to Paul*, 2.

[85] Gupta, *Worship That Makes Sense to Paul*, 206.

[86] Gupta, *Worship That Makes Sense to Paul*, 1.

[87] Gupta, *Worship That Makes Sense to Paul*, 206.

[88] Regev argues that "The Pauline cultic images are too multiple, diverse, and duplicated and do not cohere in a holistic, integral whole. Paul does not introduce a systematic web of Temple-priest-sacrifice. Rather, he uses a sporadic and somewhat incidental list of metaphorical imagery. When he draws on one Temple image, he seems to be unaware or uninterested in other cultic metaphors that he uses elsewhere even in the very same letter" (*The Temple in Early Christianity*, 85). It is not my task here to harmonize all these metaphors. Rather, Paul's seemingly sporadic use of various cultic metaphors speaks to an understanding of metaphor that will be applied here, namely, that metaphors are often made from "desperation, not decoration". See again McFague, *Sallie McFague*, 87. For a comprehensive treatment of Paul's cultic metaphors, see Gupta's *Worship That Makes Sense to Paul*. Nonetheless, in the three instances which we find ναός (1 Cor 3.16–17; 6.19; 2 Cor 6.16), it is consistently applied to the body/bodies of believers.

[89] See again Fredriksen, "Judaizing the Nations," 248: "Paul praises the new community by likening it to something that he values supremely. If he valued the temple less, he would not use it as his touchstone."

Outline

In Chapter One, I engage with conceptions of metaphor as put forth by ancient Graeco-Roman authors to better understand the necessity of Paul identifying the Corinthian assembly as ναὸς θεοῦ. Studies of metaphor going all the way back to these authors have observed that metaphors are not merely useful for rhetorical flourish but are often irreplaceable in basic speech. In this sense, metaphors are actually essential to the way we conceive of, and even construct, our realities. Eventually, they become entrenched in how we perceive certain activities. In certain cases where ritual is involved, metaphor can lead to something much more consequential. The *is like* of simile falls short because of the real holiness bestowed on the Corinthians, which, if transgressed, leads to physical consequences. The only expression that accurately captures how Paul conceives of this group is that they *are* the dwelling place of God.

In Chapter Two, I propose that an "interaction" theory of metaphor best captures the effect of Paul's temple language applied to the Corinthians. Interaction theory purports that shifts in meaning can occur for both subjects in metaphorical relation. Some within the cognitive trend of metaphor theory argue for an understanding of metaphor as merely unilateral in that no effect is perceived upon the "primary subject" or "source domain", only upon the "secondary subject" or "target domain". However, where there are ritual realities to consider, these shifts in meaning can help to enact and explain ritual change. Since the Corinthians are discouraged from other cults in Corinth, yet are never directed toward Jerusalem, Paul's temple metaphor has the effect of creating a new cultic reality consistent with, though detached from, actual Judaean cult.

In Chapter Three I begin to treat Paul's temple language in earnest to determine whether Paul's attitude toward the Jerusalem temple can be ascertained. Using Steve Mason's four principles for building an historically responsible reading, I start with Paul's explicit references to

the cult in Jerusalem.[90] Though few, they show that the Jerusalem temple was useful for Paul in understanding and explaining his gospel service among the nations. The more figurative ways in which he employs temple language further shows the usefulness of the temple for explaining the status he affords the Corinthians as the holy dwelling place of God's spirit. This understanding not only reflects Second Temple developments in Judaean pneumatology, but also the flexibility to think of the temple beyond a means of atonement. The ways in which Paul speaks of the temple regarding his work and the status of the Corinthians shows that he considers literal cultic ritual in Jerusalem to be irrelevant for believing gentiles.

In Chapter Four, I address Luke's eagerness in Acts to quell anxieties over Paul's commitment to Judaean custom. Luke does so through affirmation from James, Paul's submission to James' authority, and Paul's participation in temple ritual. Furthermore, Luke seeks to acquit Paul of claims that he sought entry at the temple for the uncircumcised. I offer here a history of gentile temple attendance in Jerusalem from ancient Israel through the Second Temple period to understand the reasoning behind their lack of access according to Acts. I address how gentile temple access was understood in terms of Israelite/Judaean conceptions of purity and holiness. Access for gentiles was restricted not merely because of purity regulations but because of their *profane* (i.e., unholy) status. If Paul's gentile audience had adopted Judaean traditions to some degree,[91] but remained uncircumcised, what relationship could they hope to have with the cult in Jerusalem?

---

[90] "[B]egin at the beginning, distinguish rhetoric from true beliefs, do not multiply entities unnecessarily, and work from the known to the unknown. These principles together recommend that we begin with 1 Thess, try to understand *it* (not Paul's psychology or formative influences) as his first audiences might have done, and work from what is clearest to what becomes foggier in his later letters" (Mason, "Paul without Judaism: Historical Method over Perspective," 26).

[91] Paula Fredriksen uses the term "judaize" (ἰουδαΐζω) in this regard. The verb is found only once in the NT in Gal 2.14, where Paul uses it negatively in his account of the confrontation with Cephas (Peter). In Galatia, gentiles

In Chapter Five, a description of the Corinthian assembly is given to show that this audience would have fallen between two worlds of cultic participation: one "pagan" in its variety and multiplicity, and the other Judaean. Though a mostly gentile audience, Paul assumes of them detailed awareness as concerns Judaean tradition and practice. While we cannot know the extent of their affiliation prior to Paul (though Acts offers something in this regard), we can be certain of an intimate familiarity with Judaean religion due to indications in 1 Corinthians. If this can be reasonably assumed, then Paul does not have to be appealing to Corinthian temples in his temple imagery, as has been suggested by some. If Paul wants the Corinthians to retain his Judaean monotheism, it does not serve his purpose to have them think of themselves in terms of temples devoted to other deities. Because of the proposed familiarity, and perhaps even prior proselytization in the case of some, I argue that the Corinthian gentiles would have been able to grasp the great import of being identified as the place of God's presence, an honor historically associated with the Jerusalem cult.[92]

In an Appendix, having established the ritual importance of Paul's temple metaphor, I address the question of whether Paul's temple metaphor was a regular feature of his teaching. Paul prefaces his metaphor with οὐκ οἴδατε ("Do you not know?"), which would seem to indicate that

---

were being compelled to live according to Judaean custom. To do so, according to Paul, threatens the "truth of the gospel," i.e., how gentiles lay claim to righteousness. Nevertheless, gentile converts to the movement had adopted some form of Judaean religion, for Paul understands his mission in terms of Israel's prophetic promises. It is therefore quite likely that the earliest gentile converts already had an initial attraction to Judaean religion. As Fredriksen imagines, "The god-fearers, those Judaizing pagan adherents of urban synagogues, had presented a wonderful target of opportunity for the early Jesus movement. Because they were already in some sense familiar with Jewish scriptural traditions through their contact with the synagogue, they could understand the significance of terms like 'messiah' or 'David' or 'Jerusalem' or 'Kingdom' that articulated the gospel message. Their synagogue context enabled them to listen, to understand, and to respond. And because of its own apocalyptic principles, this Jewish movement saw the incorporation of gentiles as a natural—indeed, as a prophesied and promised—extension of its mission to Israel. In the End, the nations, too, would stream to Jerusalem" (*When Christians Were Jews: The First Generation* [New Haven: Yale University Press, 2018], 153).

[92] The history of extra/biblical thought regarding Yahweh's presence as "cloud", "glory", and "spirit" will be addressed below, in addition to the question of God's presence in the second temple.

he is presuming past knowledge on the part of the audience. Did the Corinthians already think of themselves as ναὸς θεοῦ, though they were living in a manner inconsistent with that status; or was it news to them that such a status had been bestowed upon them? Recent comparison of the question's use in ancient diatribe has challenged the assumption that Paul must be drawing upon instruction which he imparted at an earlier date. Using categories of grammatical structure to differentiate between occurrences of the question in 1 Corinthians, I determine that Paul is likely drawing upon past instruction to confront behavior inconsistent with the identity previously pronounced upon them as the dwelling place of God's spirit.

CHAPTER ONE

METAPHOR AS DESPERATION

Introduction

The line between what is metaphor and what is literal can be blurred, with metaphors being vital to the way we perceive and express reality, especially in religious language and thought. As noted, recent scholarship surveyed understands Paul's temple language as metaphor. We must ask though, is Paul using metaphor when he refers to the Corinthians as ναὸς θεοῦ if he means that the community features identified above are *literally* so?[93] In the strictest sense, yes. Paul applies ναός—a term usually referring to physical shrines of inorganic material—to an assembly of organic beings. In this chapter, I am interested in the use of metaphor and the understanding of its boundaries in and around Paul's time. For manageability, I limit the scope of this chapter to those ancient authors with whom Paul shared a common Graeco-Roman milieu.[94] The scholarship on metaphor theory is vast. Modern insights into the nature of metaphor, especially that of Cognitive Linguistics, will be included as they pertain to the ancient authors discussed.

[93] Consider Jürgen Roloff's contention that "This is not figurative-metaphorical, but actual speech," in *Die Kirche im Neuen Testament*, GNT 10 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993), 113.

[94] By doing so, I do not mean to cleanly delineate between identities and cultures, as if Paul can only resemble Greek thinkers because he writes in Greek. Rather, those thinkers discussed below offer actual manuals on the use of metaphor as a device of literature and speech and therefore provide a helpful comparison for Paul's language. On metaphor from a Hebrew Bible perspective, see the volume edited by Pierre van Hecke, *Metaphor in the Hebrew Bible*, BETL 187 (Leuven: University Press, 2005).

The Necessity of Metaphor

Literary theorists have increasingly challenged a mere rhetorical understanding of metaphor. Metaphors have often been seen as nice but unnecessary, that is, that whatever is being expressed by metaphor could be said more directly.[95] This is due in part to misreadings of ancient authors such as Aristotle and Quintilian. Indeed, Aristotle does indicate that metaphor can be a matter of simple substitution: "Likewise with loan words, metaphors, and the other classes, one could observe the truth of my argument by substituting the standard terms" (*Poet.* 22 [Halliwell et al., LCL]).[96] In her work, Janet Soskice seeks to clear Aristotle and Quintilian of the charge that their view of metaphor can be reduced to mere substitution. Soskice writes of Quintilian that, "despite his interest in entertainment and in style, Quintilian does not regard the tropes simply as figurative versions of what may be formulated literally. He notes, as did Aristotle, that we may use a trope because there is no other term available for that of which we wish to give account."[97]

Beginning in the twentieth century, studies of metaphor increasingly observed that metaphors are not merely useful for rhetorical flourish but are actually essential to how we conceive of and even construct our realities. As Sallie McFague puts it, metaphor is a strategy of "desperation, not decoration:"

> [W]hat a metaphor expresses cannot be said directly or apart from it, for if it could be, one would have said it directly. Here, metaphor is a strategy of desperation, not decoration; it is an attempt to say something about the unfamiliar in terms of the familiar, an attempt to speak about what we do not know in terms of what we do know.[98]

---

[95] See Sallie McFague, *Sallie McFague: Collected Readings*, ed. David B. Lott (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2013), 87. See Danilo Verde, "Metaphor as Knowledge: A Hermeneutical Framework for Biblical Exegesis with a Sample Reading from the Song of Songs (Song 8:10)," BibAn 6 (2016): 45–72. See also Janet Soskice's discussion on metaphor's place in one of the earliest known controversies regarding the nature of language: "whether language is grounded in nature or in convention" (*Metaphor and Religious Language* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985], 1).

[96] Relatedly, Cicero can refer to them as sources of entertainment (*De or.* 3.155).

[97] Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 10.

[98] McFague, *Sallie McFague: Collected Readings*, 87.

Scholars of metaphor, George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, also explain,

> [M]ost people think they can get along perfectly well without metaphor. We have found, on the contrary, that metaphor is pervasive in everyday life, not just in language but in thought and action. Our ordinary conceptual system, in terms of which we both think and act, is fundamentally metaphorical in nature.[99]

This turn in understanding is due in large part to the field of Cognitive Linguistics, which sees metaphor as understanding of one conceptual domain in terms of another conceptual domain (e.g., "An argument is war;" "Love is a journey;" "Theories are buildings;" "Ideas are food").[100] Lakoff and Johnson point out that many of our daily activities (e.g., arguing, solving problems, "budgeting" time) are actually metaphorical in nature. In turn, the metaphors that characterize those activities start to structure our realities. Eventually, they become inseparable from how we perceive those activities. As they write, "Much of cultural change arises from the introduction of new metaphorical concepts and the loss of old ones."[101]

Ancient Conceptions of Metaphor

Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian are seen as the Graeco-Roman authorities on the perimeters of a worthy metaphor.[102] Though its use can be merely "ornamental" at times, they all acknowledge that metaphor is sometimes all that one can employ when seeking not only the best description, but description at a very basic level.[103] In this way, they collectively observe that metaphors are not learned but used across all classes of society as a device necessary to basic communication.

---

[99] George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003), 3.

[100] Zoltan Kovecses, *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 4–5.

[101] Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, 145.

[102] See Raymond F. Collins, *The Power of Images in Paul* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2008), 1–10. See also Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 1, 3.

[103] Especially Quintilian, who indicates that some languages may need to use metaphor more than others, as in the case of Latin versus Greek.

Paul's use of temple language reflects this observation. His ease of use speaks to the pervasive nature of metaphor as a common occurrence fundamental to description. In this way, his temple metaphor is not merely ornamental. Rather, it is the only way in which he can get the Corinthians to understand the consequences of factionalism and sexual immorality in 1 Corinthians.

Aristotle

According to Paul Ricœur, it was Aristotle who defined metaphor for the entire subsequent history of Western thought.[104] Umberto Eco states definitively that "of the thousands and thousands of pages written about metaphor, few add anything of substance to the first two or three fundamental concepts stated by Aristotle."[105] Aristotle (384–322 BCE) explains that "bare speech", or prose, depends upon metaphor (*metaphora*). This is because prose, as opposed to poetry, has fewer resources at its command (*Rhet*. 3.2.8).[106] Therefore, out of necessity, one will be intimately familiar with metaphor for plain communication. In this regard, the use of metaphor is a kind of innate skill in that it cannot be learned from anyone else (*Rhet*. 3.2.10). For this reason, whereas Paul indicates to audiences when using other kinds of figurative speech,[107] he could be forgiven for not explicitly indicating his use of metaphor.

Aristotle tells us that metaphor is useful where there is no name or designation for a particular action. Nevertheless, "we must use a metaphor from what is akin and of the same kind,

---

[104] Paul Ricœur, *The Rule of Metaphor: The Creation of Meaning in Language*, trans. Robert Czerny, Kathleen McLaughlin, and John Costello, SJ (London; New York: Routledge, 2003), 2.

[105] Umberto Eco, "The Scandal of Metaphor: Metaphorology and Semiotics," *Poetics Today* 4 (1983): 217–18. In her assessment of Aristotle and Quintilian, Soskice writes that "we shall taste the freshness of their insights only if we free them from the obligation to answer questions that were never theirs to ask." See Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 7–10.

[106] Aristotle advises that metaphors in basic speech, if too "far-fetched", will start to become too much like poetry (*Rhet*. 3.3.4; cf. also 3.6.3).

[107] Cf. 1 Cor 10.6, 11, where Paul explicitly employs τύπος as warning; and Gal 4.24, where he explains his allegorical (ἀλληγορέω) reading strategy. See Steven DiMattei, "Paul's Allegory of the Two Covenants (Gal 4.21–31) in Light of First-Century Hellenistic Rhetoric and Jewish Hermeneutics," *NTS* 52 (2006): 102–122.

so that, as soon as it is uttered, it is clearly seen to be akin…" (*Rhet*. 3.2.12 [Freese; Striker, LCL]). We could say the same about Paul's application of temple language to the Corinthian believers. If Paul believed the above features to be fundamentally so, then what else could he have called them besides ναὸς θεοῦ? "Words signify something," Aristotle writes. Metaphor reaches for what is familiar for the sake of learning, something that is "naturally pleasant to all". Metaphor, above all, produces this effect (*Rhet*. 3.10.2–3), and the best are "understood the moment they are stated, though they had not been known before…" (*Rhet*. 3.10.3–4) because they "set things before the eyes" (*Rhet*. 3.10.6–7).[108] The very best do so by speaking of "inanimate things as if they were animate". Aristotle offers the following examples from Homer: "the shameless stone was rolling"; "The arrow flew…eager to fly toward them"; "[The spears were] stuck in the ground and longing to feast on the flesh [of the heroes]" (*Rhet*. 3.11.3).

Aristotle describes a metaphor as "the application of a word that belongs to another thing", and offers four examples: "either from genus to species, species to genus, species to species, or by analogy" (*Poet*. 21 [Halliwell et al., LCL]). The first example has come to be understood as synecdoche, in which a part represents the whole, or vice versa, as in "Atlanta won by six runs" (meaning Atlanta's baseball team).[109] The second example has come to be understood as metonymy, where a word or phrase denotes a property or something associated, for example, when referring to the monarchy as "the crown".[110] In the third instance, Aristotle considers proverbs to be examples of metaphors from species to species (*Rhet*. 3.11.14). In the fourth, he describes

[108] "…for when he calls old age stubble, he teaches and informs us through the genus; for both have lost their bloom" (*Rhet*. 3.10.2–3 [1410b]).

[109] *OED* Online, "synecdoche, n." (Oxford University Press: March 2022), https://www-oed-com.proxy3.library.mcgill.ca/view/Entry/196458?redirectedFrom=synecdoche (accessed April 16, 2022).

[110] Cicero already observed this development in his time (*De or*. 93–94). See also Quintilian (*Inst*. 9.1.5). *OED* Online, "metonymy, n." (Oxford University Press: March 2022), https://www-oed-com.proxy3.library.mcgill.ca/view/Entry/117628?redirectedFrom=metonymy (accessed April 16, 2022).

metaphor as analogy: cases where "*b* is to *a* as *d* is to *c*". This enables one to speak of "*d* instead of *b*, or *b* instead of *d*", as in: "old age is to life as evening to day: so one will call evening 'the day's old age,' or … call old age 'the evening of life' or 'life's sunset'" (*Poet*. 21).

Finally, Aristotle saw little difference between simile and metaphor. He describes similes as merely metaphors *explained*:

> When the poet says he rushed on like a lion, it is a simile; if he says, "a lion, he rushed on," it is a metaphor; for because both are courageous, he transfers the word and calls Achilles a lion. A simile can also be used in a speech, but only rarely, for there is something poetical about it. Similes must be used like metaphors, for they are metaphors that differ only in the manner stated. (*Rhet*. 3.4.1–3)

For my purposes here, we can distinguish between this kind of metaphor, which clearly indicates that Achilles is only lion-like rather than a literal lion, and what Paul employs regarding the Corinthian assembly. Aristotle refers to the "participants" or subjects of a metaphor as nouns (or "names" from ὄνομα). As discussed below, the metaphorical copula (i.e., the verb) distinguishes metaphor. Paul Cho explains: "The metaphorical copula transfers or transposes the meaning of one word to another.… what it means to transpose the meaning of one word to another is not obvious—it is itself a metaphor—and certainly cannot be reduced to a theory of substitution."[111]

Cicero

Cicero defines metaphor (Lat: *translatio*) as "the figurative use of a single word" (*De or*. 2.261). A metaphor is fundamentally based on the resemblance between two subjects, since everything in the world has some connection with other things, even if it lacks name or designation (*De or*. 3.159–61). If so, "we are compelled to invent a new term or to use a metaphor" (*Or*. *Brut*. 211 [62] [Hendrickson; Hubbell, LCL]).

[111] Paul K.-K. Cho, *Myth, History, and Metaphor in the Hebrew Bible* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019), 20.

> [S]ince we are wont to use words figuratively either to add charm or because of the poverty of the language, it happens in all arts that when we have to name something which had had no name because the thing itself was unknown, we are compelled to invent a new term or to use a metaphor" (*Or*. *Brut*. 211 [62] [Hendrickson; Hubbell, LCL]).

As we saw in Aristotle, Cicero considers metaphor to be utterly necessary. It is a device that "sprang from necessity due to the pressure of poverty and deficiency" of prose (*De or*. 3.155 [Rackham, LCL]). In time, metaphor's "agreeable and entertaining quality" made it unavoidably popular: "For just as clothes were first invented to protect us against cold and afterwards began to be used for the sake of adornment and dignity as well, so the metaphorical employment of words was begun because of poverty, but was brought into common use for the sake of entertainment" (*De or*. 3.155). Sometimes, metaphor is not needed out of desperation but rather for flourish, that is, to "convey some degree of brilliance to the style" (*De or*. 3.155–56). Though Cicero will emphasize metaphor's entertaining quality throughout his description, he never loses sight of its necessity in certain cases of basic speech.

Like Aristotle, Cicero speaks of metaphor as something innately learned. Its use can be found across all classes of society regardless of education. Even "country people" (*rustici*), he writes, "speak of 'jewelled vines,' 'luxurious herbage,' 'joyful harvests'" (*De or*. 3.155–56). It is frequently employed by all "because it is of the commonest occurrence in the language of townsman and rustic alike" (*Or*. *Brut*. 81–82 [24–25]). Every metaphor, Cicero asserts, "provided it be a good one", directly appeals to the senses, especially that of sight as the keenest sense: "for while the rest of the senses supply such metaphors as 'the fragrance of good manners,' 'the softness of a humane spirit,' 'the roar of the waves,' 'a sweet style of speaking,' the metaphors drawn from the sense of sight are much more vivid, virtually placing within the range of our mental vision objects not actually visible to our sight" (*De or*. 3.159–61).

Metaphor has several useful functions, according to Cicero. He likewise understands metaphor to be a condensed simile, that is, a simile "contracted into one word". If possible, metaphor is to be favored over simile (*De or*. 3.159–61). He advises that it should only be used when it can bring about greater clarity, for metaphor may "better convey the whole meaning of the matter" (3.158). When something "can scarcely be conveyed by the proper term is expressed metaphorically, the meaning we desire to convey is made clear by the resemblance of the thing that we have expressed by the word that does not belong" (*De or*. 3.155–56). Occasionally, it can help to achieve brevity in speech, for instance, "'If the weapon slipped from his hand': it was not possible to express the unintentional nature of the discharge of the missile more briefly by employing the proper words than it is conveyed by a single word used metaphorically" (*De or*. 3.158). Like Aristotle, Cicero also warns against producing "far-fetched" metaphors. A good metaphor should not be on a scale bigger than required (e.g., "a hurricane of revelry"), or smaller than required (e.g., "the revelling of the hurricane"). The metaphorical term brought in for clarity and/or effect should never be "narrower in scope than the literal and proper word would have been…" (*De or*. 3.164). A good metaphor does not lead the hearer's thoughts astray. Rather, it enhances significance without introducing distraction: "the hearer's thoughts are led to something else and yet without going astray, which is a very great pleasure; or because a single word in each case suggests the thing and a picture of the whole" (*De or*. 3.159–61). In this way, metaphor should always appeal to the senses.[112]

[112] Suppose, Max Black writes, "we try to state the cognitive content of an interaction-metaphor in 'plain language.' Up to a point, we may succeed in stating a number of the relevant relations between the two subjects…. But the set of literal statements so obtained will not have the same power to inform and enlighten as the original. For one thing, the implications, previously left for a suitable reader to educe for himself, with a nice feeling for their relative priorities and degrees of importance, are now presented explicitly as though having equal weight. The literal paraphrase inevitably says too much—and with the wrong emphasis. One of the points I most wish to stress is that the loss in such cases is a loss in cognitive content; the relevant weakness of the literal paraphrase is not that it may be tiresomely prolix or boringly explicit (or deficient in qualities of style); it fails to be a translation because it fails to

Quite like the observations of Cognitive Linguistics, Cicero describes metaphor as a sort of borrowing. One takes words from elsewhere when the proper name for a thing or phenomenon is lacking. "Consequently the metaphors in which you take what you have not got from somewhere else are a sort of borrowing; but there is another somewhat bolder kind that do not indicate poverty but convey some degree of brilliance to the style" (*De or*. 3.155–56). If something does not have a proper name or designation of its own, for example,

> a "sheet" in a ship, a "bond" in the sense of a contract made with a pair of scales, a "separation" in the case of a wife, necessity compels one to borrow what one has not got from somewhere else; but even in cases where there are plenty of specific words available, metaphorical terms give people much more pleasure, if the metaphor is a good one." (*De or*. 3.159–61)

Nevertheless, if a thing has no proper term, "the borrowing seems to be done in order to make the meaning clear, and not for entertainment" (*Or*. *Brut*. 81–82 [24–25]).

Quintilian

Quintilian refers to metaphor as "the commonest and [by] far the most beautiful of Tropes, namely *translatio*, which is called *metaphora* in Greek" (*Inst*. 8.6.4–7). It is "the greatest ornament of oratory" (*Inst*. 8.2.6). It is both a gift "which Nature herself confers on us, and which is therefore used even by uneducated persons and unconsciously, and at the same time so attractive and elegant that it shines by its own light however splendid its context" (*Inst*. 8.6.4–7). Metaphor "fits words to things which do not belong to them" (*Inst*. 8.2.6), and it does so by borrowing words which "belong elsewhere" (*Inst*. 12.10.41).

There are four classes of metaphor according to Quintilian: 1) The substitution of one animate thing for another; 2) The substitution of inanimate things for other inanimate things; 3)

---

give the insight that the metaphor did" (*Models and Metaphors: Studies in Language and Philosophy* [Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1962], 46).

Inanimate for animate; and 4) Animate for inanimate (*Inst*. 8.6.9–11). Quintilian, too, describes metaphor as a shortened form of simile. The difference being that simile introduces a term so that we can compare the thing we wish to describe; with metaphor, we substitute one thing for another: "It is a comparison when I say that a man acted 'like a lion,' a Metaphor when I say of a man 'he is a lion'" (*Inst*. 8.6.9).

Quintilian argues that individual words have no value on their own. Context is everything. A metaphor, therefore, can only be justified by reference to its context (*Inst*. 8.3.38). In this way, a good metaphor ought to either "occupy a vacant space" or, if it replaces something, "be more effective than the word it banishes" (*Inst*. 8.6.18). When one uses metaphor, a noun or a verb is "transferred" from its "proper" place where there is either no "proper" word, or the "transferred" term is better than the "proper" one (*Inst*. 8.6.4–7). Correctly employed, metaphor "adds to the resources of language by exchanges or borrowings to supply its deficiencies." Furthermore, and the "hardest task of all," it ensures that nothing goes without a name (*Inst*. 8.6.4–7). Again, this is done out of necessity:

> (1) Necessity makes countrymen call a vinebud *gemma* (what else could they say?), or speak of the crops as "thirsty" or the harvest as "in trouble"; necessity makes us speak of a man as "hard" or "rough," because there is no pre-existing proper term which we could apply to these characteristics. (2) A second stage is shown in "inflamed with anger," "on fire with greed," and "fallen into error"; these are meant to convey a meaning, because none of these things can be described more appropriately by its own natural words than by these imported ones. (*Inst*. 8.6.4–7)

For Quintilian, metaphor either expresses meaning better, or it is more decorative in a communicatively effective sense. When the proposed transference has none of these effects, it is considered "improper".

Metaphor in 1 Corinthians

Because metaphors can become so intertwined with the ways in which we perceive, they can be difficult to identify. Nietzsche, for example, posited that all conceptions of truth begin with figures of speech:

> What is truth? a mobile army of metaphors, metonyms, anthropomorphisms, in short, a sum of human relations which were poetically and rhetorically heightened, transferred, and adorned, and after long use seem solid, canonical, and binding to a nation. Truths are illusions about which it has been forgotten that they *are* illusions, worn-out metaphors without sensory impact, coins which have lost their image and now can be used only as metal, and no longer as coins."[113]

Nietzsche captures how, over time, metaphors become inseparable from the ways in which we structure our worlds. Consider the following examples of how fluid the bounds of metaphor are when attempting to identify its use over the course of 1 Corinthians:

- The community as God's "cultivated field" (γεώργιον [3.6–9])
- The community as God's "building" (οἰκοδομή [3.9])
- Built upon Jesus Christ as the "foundation" (θεμέλιος [3.11])
- For whom Paul considers himself a "master builder" (ἀρχιτέκτων [3.10])
- The community as God's "temple" (ναός [3.16])
- The assembly as a "new batch of dough" (νέον φύραμα) and as "unleavened" (ἄζυμοι [5.7])
- Christ as their "paschal lamb" (πάσχα [5.7]), which they are to celebrate *as if* celebrating the actual feast of Passover, "not with old leaven nor with the leaven of malice and evil but with the unleavened [bread] of sincerity and truth" (5.8)
- Individuals' bodies as "body parts of Christ" (μέλη Χριστοῦ [6.15])
- Bodies as "the temple of the holy *pneuma* in you all" (ναὸς τοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν ἁγίου πνεύματός [6.19])
- The Corinthians as Paul's "work" (ἔργον) in the Lord (9.1)

[113] Friedrich Nietzsche, "On Truth and Lying in an Extra-Moral Sense," in *Friedrich Nietzsche on Rhetoric and Language*, eds. Sander L. Gilman, Carole Blair, and David J. Parent (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), 250.

- Christ as the "rock" at Horeb from which Israel drank (πνευματικῆς ἀκολουθούσης πέτρας, ἡ πέτρα δὲ ἦν ὁ Χριστός) [10.4; cf. Exod 17.6; Num 20.11; Ps 78.15])

- The shared cup of blessing as "the blood of Christ" (τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ), and the shared bread as "the body of Christ" (τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ [10.16; 11.24–25])

- Christ as "the head of every man" (παντὸς ἀνδρὸς ἡ κεφαλὴ [11.3])

- And, again, the assembly as Christ's "body" corporately and individually (σῶμα Χριστοῦ καὶ μέλη ἐκ μέρους [12.27])

There is no doubt that more could be identified. For example, the assembly as ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ("*in* Christ Jesus") is technically a metaphor since the people of Corinth are not *literally* inside of Jesus—or are they (1 Cor 1.30)? Timothy is not Paul's *literal* child as though Paul sired him, but Timothy *is* his child "in the Lord" and, for Paul, that requires a faithfulness of Timothy as if he really were Paul's progeny (4.17). The same logic follows regarding whether one was called to faith while a slave or called while free (7.22). The former is the Lord's freedman and the latter Christ's slave. They are slaves, but they are not; they are free, but they are not. Stanley Stowers, echoing Albert Schweitzer's landmark study of Paul's apocalypticism, takes issues with Richard Hays' claim that all language is ultimately metaphorical.[114] Stowers later concedes,

[114] Stanley K. Stowers, "What is 'Pauline Participation in Christ'?" in *Redefining First-Century Jewish and Christian Identities: Essays in Honor of Ed Parish Sanders*, eds. Fabian E. Udoh et al. (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2008), 355. See also Stanley K. Stowers, "Kinds of Myth, Meals, and Power: Paul and the Corinthians," in *Redescribing Paul and the Corinthians*, eds. Ron Cameron and Merrill P. Miller, ECL 5 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011), 134–35. Cf. Richard B. Hays, "What is 'Pauline Participation in Christ'?" in *Redefining First-Century Jewish and Christian Identities: Essays in Honor of Ed Parish Sanders*, eds. Fabian E. Udoh et al. (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2008), 336–51. In general, I find Stowers and Hays to be speaking past one another. Consider Stowers elsewhere: "Schweitzer was not claiming that there might not be metaphor involved in the language of participation, but that the language was not *only* metaphorical or figurative with no central reference to substances and objects. This misleading criticism of Schweitzer is clear also in Hays's discussion of him…" ("What is 'Pauline Participation in Christ'?" 355 n. 14). Cf. Hays, who writes of Schweitzer that, "First of all, [his] epistemology falsely dichotomizes metaphor and reality. In common with many thinkers of his generation, Schweitzer understood metaphor as a purely decorative or illustrative mode of expression rather than as a means of articulating realities which are inaccessible except through a particular, unique metaphor. Consequently, when Schweitzer correctly sees that 'dying and rising with Christ' occupies in Paul's thought a place of central and irreplaceable significance, he wrongly concludes that this dying and rising must be nonmetaphorical, i.e., literal." See Richard B. Hays, *The Faith of Jesus Christ: The Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1–4:11* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 44–45.

however, that "Paul's language here is not metaphorical, *or at least it is not only metaphorical* in the sense of not involving a realistic meaning and reference" (emphasis mine).[115] This is my point exactly. I do not mean to demean Paul's view of the world through a "modernist" lens of spiritual versus physical.[116] Yet, we can only assess Paul's language for what it is—terms that find literal/physical/actual expression elsewhere but which Paul employs to designate something else, hence my dependance on Luke Johnson's claim that figures of speech such as myth, symbol, and metaphor are necessary in this regard, "for there is no other medium available for speaking of divine agency in the empirical realm."[117] In this way, Paul borrows from one conceptual domain to explain another. While Paul really means these as straightforward pronouncements of reality, they nevertheless "speak about one thing in terms which are seen to be suggestive of another."[118] Herein lies the power and mystery of metaphor.[119]

---

[115] Stowers, "What is 'Pauline Participation in Christ'?" 356.

[116] See Stowers, "What is 'Pauline Participation in Christ'?" 355.

[117] Luke Timothy Johnson, *Constructing Paul: The Canonical Paul*, vol. 1 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2020), 246.

[118] Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 15. Some metaphors have become so familiar to certain readers so as to be considered "dead": "Both ordinary and technical languages is littered with usages which we take to have been originally metaphorical, like 'stem of a glass', 'leaf of a book', 'flow of electricity', but which now have no figurative connections for the native speaker" (71).

[119] In certain cases where ritual is involved (such as temple pilgrimage), metaphor can lead to something quite consequential. McFague explains this process by charting out the evolution of metaphor into *model* and then *concept*: "A model is a metaphor that has gained sufficient stability and scope so as to present a pattern for relatively comprehensive and coherent explanation. The metaphor of God the father is an excellent example of this. In becoming a model, it has permitted an understanding of many things. If God is seen as father, human beings become children, sin can be understood as rebellious behavior, and redemption can be thought of as a restoration to the status of favored offspring. As the creeds of the church amply illustrate, models approach the status of concepts: Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are models of the divine life that inform the tradition's most central concept, the trinity" (*Sallie McFague: Collected Readings*, 87–88). In this example, McFague shows just how consequential a metaphor can become, even if it is not always perceived in the moment to be so impactful. Northrop Frye argues that the central doctrines of the Bible at large and in subsequent Christianity "can be grammatically expressed only in the form of metaphor. In the doctrine of the Trinity, for example, one equals three. Or, one is three and three are one. The doctrine of the real presence is that the body and blood are the bread and the wine. Jesus, in Christian doctrine, is man and God. All of these are metaphorical in grammatical expression, and they are all statements that completely transcend, or whatever they do, the world of logic. In logic, A can only be A. It can never be B" (*Biblical and Classical Myths: The Mythological Framework of Western Culture* [Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004], 28).

The Metaphorical Copula

In the passages cited above, I have limited myself to those instances in 1 Corinthians where the "metaphorical copula" is used. The metaphorical copula consists of putting two subjects in relation to one another by means of a *to be* verb (e.g., "am," "is," "are").[120] Consider Aristotle's definition: "A metaphor is the application of a word that belongs to another thing: either from genus to species, species to genus, species to species, or by analogy" (*Poet.* 21 [Halliwell et al., LCL]).[121] In this regard, the grammatical form of a metaphor has two categories—A and B—put into relation with one another via "to be" (i.e., A *is* B).

The relationship between two subjects in a metaphor is fundamentally paradoxical, to say the least. By speaking about one thing in terms suggestive of another, a metaphor is seen to have an "irreducibly paradoxical quality".[122] Ricœur describes this as the *is* and *is not* quality of metaphor.[123] In this way, they are "intentional category mistakes", as Kevin Vanhoozer details:

> [T]hings that do not normally belong together are brought together, and from the resulting tension a new connection is discovered that our previous ways of classifying the world hid from us. In mediating this logical opposition, metaphor makes sense of what would otherwise be nonsense.[124]

Northrup Frye puts it even more bluntly: "They are said to be the same thing, although they remain two different things. Therefore, the metaphor is illogical; or, more accurately, it is insane."[125] Paul

---

[120] See Cho, *Myth, History, and Metaphor in the Hebrew Bible*, 19–20.

[121] Technically, these four are better categorized as examples of synecdoche (categories 1 and 2), hyperbole (category 3), and a broader conception of metaphor as applying to every transposition of terms (category 4). See Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 5. See also Ricœur, *The Rule of Metaphor*, 17.

[122] Carol Newsom, *The Self as Symbolic Space: Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran* (Leiden: Brill, 2018), 157.

[123] Ricouer, *The Rule of Metaphor*, 255–56.

[124] Kevin J. Vanhoozer, *Biblical Narrative in the Philosophy of Paul Ricœur: A Study in Hermeneutics and Theology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 64.

[125] Frye and Macpherson, *Biblical and Classical Myths*, 27–28.

Cho goes further, stating that anyone who employs metaphor (i.e., that A *is* B) is actually lying, since they are in fact making something up.[126]

In bringing together unlike subjects, metaphors have the power to produce new realities. Cho explains this power by making the distinction between a metaphor and the mere likeness of subjects which, though a necessary precursor to metaphor, does not go far enough in capturing the device's essence:

> We must first dismiss the tempting solution of the simile to the enigma of the metaphor. Aristotle said that "making good metaphors depends on perceiving the likeness in things." The initial attraction that leads to the birth of a metaphor is the perception of a likeness or a resemblance between two unlike things. Similarity is thus a necessary (but not sufficient) precondition for metaphor and is the reason that many metaphors can be said otherwise as a simile, the "to be like" of similitude replacing the "to be" of identity, with little to no loss of meaning: "[O]ld age is like the evening of life."[127]

There is, however, a disjunction between reality and those metaphors which concern unlike subjects. This is why simile falls short of the profundity of metaphor:

> A metaphor refuses to settle for the "is like" of simile and insists, despite the apparent inequality of A and B, that A "is" B. If the "is not" of the metaphorical copula is the degree zero of metaphor, the "is like" of similitude the precondition, then the metaphorical "is" is the *raison d'être* of metaphor. That is, the "is" marks the crucial difference between a metaphor and a simile and justifies the existence of metaphor as a distinct semiotic function. There is a hidden drama within the metaphorical copula that moves from the "is not" of literal falsehood, through the "is like" of similitude, finally to the "is" of metaphor. And when we arrive at the "is" of metaphor, it is important to keep in mind that we encounter something new, something that did not exist before the invention of the metaphor.[128]

To trace Paul's temple metaphor in 1 Corinthians through Cho's "hidden drama", the Corinthian assembly *is not* a literal building (since the use of ναός usually designates inorganic structures), but an organic group of humans united around common belief and practice. The *is like* of simile

---

[126] Cho, *Myth, History, and Metaphor in the Hebrew Bible*, 26. See also Ricœur, *The Rule of Metaphor*, 255–56; and Vanhoozer, *Biblical Narrative in the Philosophy of Paul Ricœur*, 64.

[127] Cho, *Myth, History, and Metaphor in the Hebrew Bible*, 27.

[128] Cho, *Myth, History, and Metaphor in the Hebrew Bible*, 27–28.

falls short because of the *real* holiness bestowed on this group of people which, if transgressed, leads to *real* consequences.[129] The only expression that accurately captures how Paul conceives of this group is that they *are* the dwelling place of God.

Conclusion

While metaphors can be difficult to identify, it has been increasingly argued by modern metaphorology that it is a necessary feature of everyday understanding and communication. In this chapter, it was shown that metaphor, in the words of McFague, is often a strategy of *desperation* not *decoration*, a point made by the first known commentators on the use of metaphor as a device necessary for description.[130] Metaphors are often employed where direct speech will not suffice. In this way, by bringing together unlike subjects, metaphors have the power to produce new realities.

The mere likeness of subjects as expressed with simile does not go far enough in capturing metaphor's essence. Some metaphors cannot be reduced to mere instances of substituted language without loss of meaning. The *is like* of simile falls short because of the real holiness bestowed on this group of people which, if transgressed, leads to real consequences. The only expression that accurately captures how Paul conceives of this group is that they *are* the dwelling place of God. Paul builds his temple metaphor for uncircumcised gentiles worshipping the God of Israel in light of their ritual circumstances. In the next chapter, I submit that an "interaction" theory of metaphor

[129] Consider, for example, the consequence of partaking of the eucharist unworthily: "For the one eating and drinking eats and drinks judgment on themself if they do not carefully judge the body. For this very reason many among you are weak and sick, and a number of you have died" (1 Cor 11.29–30). Clearly, Paul associates the very real presence of God in the body of believers and in the elements of bread and cup. Such physical consequences hearken back to those incidents in ancient Israel where the holiness of God was breached (e.g., Uzzah and the ark in 2 Sam 6.3–8 // 1 Chron 13.7–11).

[130] McFague, *Sallie McFague: Collected Readings*, 87.

best captures the extent of Paul's temple metaphor and shows how he builds a cultic identity for them through it.

CHAPTER TWO

METAPHOR AS INTERACTION

Introduction

When two subjects are put into metaphorical relation with one another, new vistas emerge that affect the way subjects A and B are both perceived. Certain studies of metaphor favor an understanding of the device as merely unilateral in that no effect is perceived upon the "primary subject" or "source domain", only upon the "secondary subject" or "target domain". As argued in the previous chapter, metaphors have the power to shape new realities out of necessity for basic description. In this chapter, I will address how new realities can destabilize others via metaphor. Per the way Paul has built his metaphor, shifts in meaning, consequently, speak to a new kind cultic expression for the Corinthians over against traditional Judaean cult.

Since the idea of a temple made up of a group of people appears limited to Qumran and the New Testament, comparison with Qumran's temple imagery will be addressed here.[131] While there seems to be no exact parallel from the extant literature for the ways in which Paul applies his temple imagery to the Corinthians, evidence from Qumran offers useful comparison, even if Qumran differs from Paul contextually in a number of significant ways as a priestly community at odds with the Jerusalem establishment. Speaking of their community in terms of God's temple is not merely rhetorical for Qumran but, rather, formative. The community appears to have taken

[131] See 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*, SNTSMS 1 (Cambridge: University Press, 1965), 56 n. 1.

over the function of atonement from the temple in Jerusalem, if only temporarily, due to their predicament as dissenters from the Hasmonean-controlled cult. Because they still value cultic notions, they must employ what we call metaphor to explain the atoning function of the community apart from Jerusalem. Relatedly, I am interested in how Paul redirects a cultic understanding of relation to the God of Israel for his assemblies in light of his conviction that all should remain "as they are" (1 Cor 7.18).

Building a Metaphor

Paul appears uninterested, at least primarily, in saying something about literal temples, whether Judaean or otherwise, when he applies his temple imagery to the Corinthians. As noted, this should not be surprising since metaphors are typically constructed to communicate something about the target domain rather than the source domain. Nevertheless, from the ways in which he qualifies *naos* in these instances, we can determine what being ναὸς θεοῦ entails for Paul. From the immediate contexts of these passages, we can construct a five-part framework as to what Paul expects of the Corinthians. These are certainly not mutually exclusive but rather intimately interrelated. The Corinthian assembly are/are to be: 1) a domain devoted to God (i.e., ναὸς θεοῦ [1 Cor 3.16–17; 6.19; 2 Cor 6.16]);[132] 2) a domain where God's spirit resides (1 Cor 3.16; 6.19);[133] 3) a "holy" domain that is not be "corrupted" (1 Cor 3.17);[134] 4) a domain that God will avenge if "corrupted" (1 Cor 3.17);[135] and 5) a domain that should be void of other gods, "idols" (2 Cor

[132] Cf. 1 Cor 1.2; 3.9, 16–17; 6.19; 7.22–23; 10.32; 11.16, 22; 15.9; 2 Cor 1.1; 6.16; 11.2.

[133] Cf. 1 Cor 2.4, 12–14; 3.16; 6.11, 17, 19; 7.40; 12.3–4, 7–11, 13; 2 Cor 1.22; 3.3, 6, 8, 17–18; 5.5; 6.6; 11.4; 13.14.

[134] Cf. 1 Cor 1.2; 3.17; 6.1–2; 11; 7.14, 34; 12.3; 14.33; 16.1, 15, 20; 2 Cor 1.1, 12; 6.6; 7.1; 8.4; 9.1, 12; 13.12–14.

[135] Cf. 1 Cor 3.13–17; 5.4–5, 12–13; 6.9–10, 13; 7.9; 8.11–12; 10.5–12, 20–22; 11.22, 27–34; 2 Cor 11.15; 13.1–10.

6.16).[136] This framework finds support throughout the Corinthian letters, as cited in the notes below. Per Max Black's theory of metaphor, the above framework provides the "system of associated commonplaces" between ναὸς θεοῦ and the Corinthian assembly.[137]

Black argues that the creative dynamic of metaphorical expression is lost when metaphor is considered merely as "substitution" or "comparison". For example, a substitution understanding holds that "Richard is a lion" is simply used "in place of some equivalent *literal* expression".[138] According to this view, metaphor is simply "decoration".[139] According to a comparison view of metaphor, which Black understands as merely a type of substitution, "Richard is *like* a lion" means the same thing as "Richard is a lion".[140] While such views may suffice for *simple* metaphors, Black holds that *complex* metaphors are better understood as based upon a "system of associated commonplaces" between both domains (subjects A and B) of a metaphor.

A complex but short metaphor allows hearers to select, emphasize, and organize details like a filter in understanding the target domain. I will argue that Paul and the Corinthians share a system of commonplaces regarding the source domain of Paul's metaphor, ναὸς θεοῦ. Even if the Corinthians did differ in their own conception of ναὸς θεοῦ, Paul nevertheless provides the qualifications of *naos* for them per the framework detailed above. While these features were not foreign to other cults, especially those found in ancient Corinth, and it is impossible to insist that

---

[136] Cf. 1 Cor 8.7, 10; 10.20–21, 28; 12.2; 2 Cor 6.16. Though the Pauline authorship of 2 Cor 6.14–7.1 is debated, I retain this fifth feature since it coheres with Paul's values as expressed elsewhere in the Corinthian letters. The issue of authorship will be addressed below.

[137] Max Black, *Models and Metaphors: Studies in Language and Philosophy* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1962), 40. In a later publication, Black used the designation "parallel implication-complex." See Max Black, "More about Metaphor," *Dialectica* 31.3/4 (1977): 442.

[138] Black, *Models and Metaphors*, 31.

[139] Black, *Models and Metaphors*, 34. See also Sallie McFague, who refers to metaphor as a strategy of "desperation, not decoration" in *Sallie McFague: Collected Readings*, ed. David B. Lott (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2013), 87.

[140] Black, *Models and Metaphors*, 36.

the Corinthians would *not* have thought of these cults upon hearing, I maintain from the several Judaean details of his correspondence that Paul has prepared them to at least think also of the Jerusalem temple. If that is the case, what comparisons might be made whilst thinking of the assembly as the shrine where the God of Israel's spirit dwells? The prominence of Judaean details that pervade the letters, in addition to the scriptural background of *naos*, *hagios*, and *pneuma* from the Septuagint, make it difficult to maintain that Paul has any *naos* in mind, regardless of whether the Corinthians had ever been to Jerusalem (though he obviously assumes some familiarity in 1 Cor 10.18).

The Directionality of Metaphor

When two subjects are put into metaphorical relation with one another, new vistas emerge that affect the way subjects A and B are both perceived. It causes us to think deeply about B, the secondary subject (the temple), so that we might draw from its attributes for the sake of seeing subject A (the Corinthian believers) in a new light. In so doing, we come to see the secondary subject in a new light as well. An interaction theory of metaphor best explains this reciprocity between subjects.

What has exercised so many studies on Paul's temple language is whether identifying the Corinthians as God's temple carries with it a judgment of the referent, that is, whether the Jerusalem temple is rendered void as the place of God's dwelling and therefore the means of cultic relation to God. Consider Nijay Gupta's criticism:

> It is a mistake—one that many scholars have repeated in the past—to presume that when Paul uses cultic metaphors, he is attempting to critique or dismiss cultic practices. Or that he is devising a new theology of cult. To make this assumption is like presuming that when he uses the language of sowing and watering plants (as in 1 Corinthians 3.6–9) we can extrapolate Paul's theology of agriculture. Sure enough, cultic worship was a major aspect of life for many Jews in the first century, but the Christ event enacted for Paul a destabilization of many of the values and categories of thought that he had previously taken

> for granted. Part of the advantage of using metaphors is that one can affirm continuity and stability while at the same time introducing tension and instability.[141]

Throughout his study, Gupta does not take a clear stance on this question. Here, he appears to be saying two different things at once, that is, that metaphors are not significant and yet they are. As Gupta himself admits, comparison of Paul's temple metaphor with metaphors of agriculture ignores the difference in theological weight between these subjects. Furthermore, it takes for granted that Paul's use of agriculture is banal. Perhaps it is no coincidence that Paul would speak of this temple community as a "cultivated field" since concepts of temple and garden feature in the second creation account of Genesis and Israelite temple architecture.[142]

As another example of ritually consequential imagery, consider the rhetoric employed by ancient Israel's prophets when expressing the problem of sin. The concept of the "uncircumcised heart" (cf. Deut 10.16; Jer 4.4; 9.26; Ezek 44.7–9; Lev 26.41) is an image, Carol Newsom writes, that "may have been employed initially simply as an emphatic rhetorical gesture rather than as a claim about anthropology per se, but tropes, once introduced, have a potential that may *exceed the intent* of their original crafters" (emphasis mine).[143] Whatever the intent of the original crafters, it is an image that allows Paul to formulate his understanding of gentile inclusion in Rom 2.25–29, where he maintains that real circumcision is a matter of the heart.

---

[141] Nijay K. Gupta, *Worship That Makes Sense to Paul: A New Approach to the Theology and Ethics of Paul's Cultic Metaphors*, 2nd ed. (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010), 214.

[142] See Gregory K. Beale, *The Temple and the Church's Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God* (Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 2004); and Cecilia Wassén, "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 *Holiness, and Identity in Judaism: Essays in Memory of Susan Haber*, eds. Carl S. Ehrlich, et al., WUNT 305 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 55–86.

[143] Carol A. Newsom, "When the Problem is Who You Are, Not What You've Done: Spiritual Transformation as Alternative to Atonement" (paper presented at the St Andrews Symposium for Biblical and Early Christian Studies, St Andrews, UK, 6 June 2018), 5.

Gupta's contention stems from an understanding of metaphor known as conceptual metaphor theory, which was espoused by George Lakoff, Mark Turner, and Mark Johnson in several studies. They criticize a bilateral understanding of metaphor according to interaction theory, which was first defined by I. A. Richards. Richards stated that "when we use a metaphor we have two thoughts of different things active together and supported by a single word, or phrase, whose meaning is a resultant of their interaction."[144] Lakoff and Turner offer the conventional metaphor, "Life is a journey", as an example of their criticism:

> When we understand that life is a journey we structure life in terms of a journey, and map onto the domain of life the inferential structure associated with journeys. But we do not map onto journeys the inferential structure associated with the domain of life.… we do not understand thereby that journeys have waking and sleeping parts, as lives do. We do not infer that, just as we can lead only one life, so a traveler can take only one journey. We map one way only, from the source domain of journey onto the target domain of life.[145]

In terms offered by Lakoff and Turner, metaphors cause us to map properties of the *source domain* onto the *target domain*. While some metaphors may cause us to "map" or "associate implications" primarily in one direction, putting two subjects in metaphorical relation nevertheless brings about a fluidity between the subjects where we are brought to think more deeply about both, especially, I argue, in ritual circumstances.

An Interaction Theory Defended

Conceptual metaphor theory has since given way to conceptual integration theory or blending theory as developed by Gilles Fauconnier and Mark Turner, a critic of interaction theory.[146]

---

[144] I. A. Richards, *The Philosophy of Rhetoric* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1936), 93.

[145] George Lakoff and Mark Turner, *More Than Cool Reason: A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989), 131–32.

[146] See Gilles Fauconnier and Mark Turner, *The Way We Think: Conceptual Blending and the Mind's Hidden Complexities* (New York: Basic Books, 2002).

However, in his review of Fauconnier and Turner, Charles Forceville challenges the novelty of blending theory:

> [O]ne of the alleged assets of blending theory that is repeatedly emphasized by Fauconnier and Turner is that it can explain emergent structure. Inasmuch as the blended space generates aspects of meaning that inheres in neither of the input spaces, conceptual integration yields something more than the sum of the component parts and hence clearly has a creative dimension. That is correct but, again, the notion of novel, emergent features has its roots in metaphor theory—not so much in the book on literary metaphor Turner himself coauthored with George Lakoff, *More than Cool Reason* (1989), but rather in Max Black's "More about Metaphor" (1977/1979).[147]

Others have since noted how indebted blending theory is to interaction theory, praising the original insights of Max Black and his predecessors.[148]

Black's "More about Metaphor" was already a response to critics of his first publication on the subject.[149] Black clarifies that

> Although I speak figuratively here of the *subjects* interacting, such an outcome is of course produced in the minds of the speaker and hearer: it is they who are led to engage in selecting, organising and "projecting." I think of a metaphorical statement (even a weak one) as a verbal action essentially demanding "uptake," a creative response from a competent reader.… In *Metaphor*, I said—to the scandal of some of my subsequent critics—that the imputed interaction involves "shifts in meaning of words belonging to the same family or system as the metaphorical expression" (45). I meant, of course, a shift in the *speaker's* meaning—and the corresponding *hearer's* meaning—what both of them understand by the words, as used on the particular occasion.[150] (italics his; underline mine)

Richards refers to this as the "interinanimation of words".[151] Employing metaphor sparks a dynamic and creative endeavor on the part of both speaker and hearer. Once introduced, a fluidity

---

[147] Charles Forceville, review of *The Way We Think: Conceptual Blending and the Mind's Hidden Complexities*, by Gilles Fauconnier and Mark Turner, *Metaphor and Symbol* 19.1 (2004): 83–89.

[148] See Scarlet Marquette, "Metaphors We Lie by: Cognitive Blending in the Poetry of Elena Shvarts," *Slavic and East European Journal* 51.4 (2007): 693–715; and Chanita Goodblatt and Joseph Glicksohn, "Bidirectionality and Metaphor: An Introduction," *Poetics Today* 38:1 (2017): 1–14.

[149] See Max Black, "Metaphor," in *Models and Metaphors: Studies in Language and Philosophy* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1962), 25–47.

[150] Black, "More about Metaphor," 442–3.

[151] See Richards, *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*, 47–66.

between the subjects put into metaphorical relation with another can occur because it demands the activity of constructing a "parallel implication-complex" to understand the relation between the subjects (on which the speaker and hearer may, respectively, intend and derive differently).

Black did envision an effect upon the source domain, albeit in the realm of the speaker and hearer's minds. Black describes an interaction theory of metaphor in three parts. In the context of a metaphorical statement, two subjects *interact* thusly:

> (i) the presence of the primary subject incites the hearer to select some of the secondary subject's properties; and (ii) invites him to construct a parallel implication-complex that can fit the primary subject; and (iii) reciprocally induces parallel changes in the secondary subject.[152]

To explain "implication-complex," Black offers the metaphor, "Marriage [M] is a zero-sum game [G]:"

> (*G*1) A "game" is a contest;
> (*G*2) between two opponents;
> (*G*3) in which one player can win only at the expense of the other.

These implications could then be projected onto marriage as such:

> (*M*l) A marriage is a sustained struggle;
> (*M*2) between two contestants;
> (*M*3) in which the rewards (power? money? satisfaction?) of one contestant are gained only at the other's expense.[153]

"Parallel changes in the secondary subject" occur when one begins to think on the nature of a zero-sum game.

Returning to Gupta's criticism, Black's theory challenges the assumption that, since we do not infer something profound about agriculture, we should not about the temple. Let us insert into

[152] Max Black, "More about Metaphor," *Dialectica* 31.3/4 (1977): 442.

[153] Black, "More about Metaphor," 443.

this framework the agricultural metaphor referenced above from 1 Corinthians 3, "you [Corinthian believers] are God's cultivated field" (v. 9):

> (i) the presence of the primary subject (Corinthian believers) incites the hearer to select some of the secondary subject's (a cultivated field) properties; and (ii) invites him to construct a parallel implication-complex (i.e., "associated implications") that can fit the primary subject (Corinthian believers); and (iii) reciprocally induces parallel changes in the secondary subject (a cultivated field).

Let us also insert into Black's framework Paul's temple metaphor from the same chapter, "Don't you [Corinthian believers] know that you are the temple of God" (1 Cor 3.16):

> (i) the presence of the primary subject (Corinthian believers) incites the hearer to select some of the secondary subject's (the temple of God) properties; and (ii) invites him to construct a parallel implication-complex (i.e., "associated implications") that can fit the primary subject (Corinthian believers); and (iii) reciprocally induces parallel changes in the secondary subject (the temple of God).

Equating the two subjects of agriculture and temple in metaphor is an unfortunate oversimplification because of the significant ritual realities of the temple in Jerusalem. "Shifts in meaning" for the temple are inevitably more consequential.

Returning to the question of this study: If we can assume that Paul has the Judaean temple of Jerusalem in mind, then what parallel changes are induced in a Judaean *naos theou* for his gentile audience in Corinth? The "parallel changes" I am interested in concern the place of uncircumcised *ethnē* in relation to the Jerusalem temple.[154] The Herodian temple complex was constructed on the basis that the nations were not permitted cultic access beyond the most outer court.[155] Paul's application of temple imagery to the Corinthians speaks to his radical view that these *ethnē*-in-Christ are imbued with the holiness of God's dwelling place on earth. The access that they would be denied in Jerusalem is rendered meaningless by the ways in which Paul builds

[154] See again Soskice's basic definition of metaphor as cited above.

[155] Cf. again Josephus on the temple's inner courts as elevated by fourteen steps from this outer court with signs warning non-Judaeans not to progress further (*J.W.* 5.195; 6.125–26).

his metaphor per the framework above. Through the divine spirit observed amongst them, though certainly *real* for Paul, they gain a kind of virtual access to the very presence of God in their community—one that had not previously been possible.[156]

The source image of the temple as the dwelling place of God used in the metaphor is transformed by Paul into the target image of the Corinthian community as a new (though some may say *additional*) dwelling place of God. In so doing, both the target image as the new or additional dwelling place and the source image of the temple as dwelling place are transformed—the latter no longer being the only and exclusive dwelling place of Israel's God. This is the interaction in both directions of the metaphor and underlines how Paul forms a new community with language borrowed from the Judaean temple.

Qumran's Temple Imagery Compared

From the extant literature, there appears to be no exact comparison to Paul's application of ναός to the community of believers where God's spirit is thought to dwell. Gupta cites Platonic notions in Philo, Josephus, and Hebrews, but Paul provides no evidence of this notion in his writings.[157] Much has been made of seemingly similar concepts in the writings of Qumran, particularly in

[156] Cf. again Luke Timothy Johnson on figures of speech such as myth, symbol, and metaphor are necessary in this regard (*Constructing Paul: The Canonical Paul*, vol. 1 [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2020], 246). See also Soskice in her chapter on "theological realism", who contends that "criticisms of metaphor in religious language often conceal a more radical critique of the possibility of any talk of God, of any traditional theologizing at all. This is so because the traditional empiricist criticisms of 'non-literal' speech are, as the quotations above demonstrate, in the end, attacks on the possibility of any metaphysics. The plan of our counter-argument has been to show that models and metaphorical theory terms may, in both the scientific and religious cases, be reality depicting without pretending to be directly descriptive, and by doing so to support the Christian's right to make metaphysical claims" (*Metaphor and Religious Language*, 144–45).

[157] See Gupta, *Worship That Makes Sense to Paul*, 206.

Serek ha-Yahad (1QS 8.1–10; 9.3–6; cf. 4Q174 1.6–7), but the priestly background of this community in addition to their hopes for a renewed and restructured temple lack parallel in Paul.[158]

At some point, the community at Qumran appear to have taken on the function of atonement from the temple in Jerusalem, if only temporarily, due to their predicament as dissenters from the Hasmonean-controlled cult. Because they still valued cultic notions, they employed metaphor to explain the atoning function of the community apart from Jerusalem. The paradox of metaphor, Carol Newsom writes, does not "permit the collapsing of the two things compared. Paradoxically, however, the only adequate language for the truth of what the community is, *is* the language of temple."[159] The architectural images invoked by Qumran—"foundation" (סוד יסודות), "wall" (חומה), "corner" (פנה), "house" (בית), "dwelling" (מעון), "planting" (מעטת)—suggest (much like the Corinthians) a community in its infancy in need of stability and security.[160] These metaphors are not merely rhetorical but, rather, formative. Similarities between Paul's temple metaphors in 1 Corinthians with those at Qumran do not have to insinuate dependence.[161] Rather, as Jörg Frey concludes, Paul "takes up concepts that are widespread in the Jewish tradition and that are already connected with each other—even when he is writing to a primarily Gentile

[158] See analysis in Eyal Regev, "Community as Temple: Revisiting Cultic Metaphors in Qumran and the New Testament," *BBR* 28.4 (2018): 604–31.

[159] Carol A. Newsom, *The Self as Symbolic Space: Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran* (Leiden: Brill, 2018), 157.

[160] See discussion in Newsom, *The Self as Symbolic Space*, 156.

[161] Bertil Gärtner acknowledges that such symbolism may not have originated with Qumran and that Paul's dependence on Qumran, ultimately, cannot be proven. Nevertheless, "the idea of a temple made up of a group of people is, as far as we know, limited to Qumran and the N.T." (*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*, SNTSMS 1 [Cambridge: University Press, 1965], 56 n. 1). See also Friedrich G. Lang, *Die Briefe an die Korinther*, NTD 7 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986), 55; and Wolfgang Schrage, *Der Erste Brief an die Korinther: 1 Kor 1,1–6,11*, EKKNT 7.1 (Zürich/Braunschweig: Benziger; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1991), 305.

Christian audience."[162] Any parallels between Paul and Qumran, as Frey states, "prove that Paul's formulations rely on Jewish linguistic forms" which pervaded Second Temple thought.[163]

As the pertinent passages in 1QS show, the primary function of the community as temple is to "atone" for sin by "working justice and suffering affliction" (see 1QS 8.1–10; 9. 3–6; cf. 4Q174 1.6–7).[164] As Regev observes in his comparison of Qumran and Paul, temple imagery in Paul does not indicate a cultic function on the part of the community.[165] Rather, Regev argues that Paul merely intends to create a link between community and temple so as to inspire holy conduct. Unlike Qumran, "Paul and the author of Ephesians do not specify how the community is characterized as a Temple and what Temple functions it replaces or copies" (cf. 1 Pet 2.4–6).[166] This, however, should not detract from the significance of the Corinthians as ναὸς θεοῦ. The temple had other functions and, as shown above, could be employed to emphasize concepts besides atonement.

Another difference concerns how Qumran will achieve its holiness. The Serek ha-Yahad indicates what is necessary for the community to reach and maintain the holiness that will ensure the efficacy of the atonement necessary:

> In the Community council (there shall be) twelve men and three priests, perfect in everything that has been revealed from all the law to implement truth, justice, judgment, compassionate love and unassuming behaviour of one to another, to preserve faithfulness in the land with firm purpose and repentant spirit in order to atone for sin by doing justice and undergoing trials, and to walk with everyone in the measure of the truth and the

[162] Jörg Frey, *Qumran, Early Judaism, and New Testament Interpretation: Kleine Schriften III*, ed. Jacob N. Cerone, WUNT 424 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019), 39.

[163] Frey, *Qumran, Early Judaism, and New Testament Interpretation*, 38–43. See also Albert L. A. Hogeterp, *Paul and God's Temple: A Historical Interpretation of Cultic Imagery in the Corinthian Correspondence*, BTS 2 (Leuven: Peeters, 2006), 382.

[164] Translations quoted from Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, vol. 1 (Leiden: Brill; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000).

[165] Regev, *The Temple in Early Christianity*, 64. See also Eyal Regev, "Community as Temple: Revisiting Cultic Metaphors in Qumran and the New Testament," *BBR* 28.4 (2018): 604–31.

[166] Regev, *The Temple in Early Christianity*, 64.

> regulation of the time. When these things exist in Israel the Community council shall be founded on truth, *Blank* to be an everlasting plantation, a holy house for Israel and the foundation of the holy of holies for Aaron, true witnesses for the judgment and chosen by the will (of God) to atone for the land and to render the wicked their retribution. (1QS 8.1–7)

Paul, rather, implores the Corinthians to live in such a way as is consistent with their current status: "Do you all not know that you are the temple of God and that the spirit of God is housed among you! If anyone destroys the temple of God by corruption, God will destroy them; for the temple of God is holy, which is what you all are" (1 Cor 3.16–17). As Conzelmann captures, "The imperative is grounded on the indicative; holiness is not the goal of conduct, but its presupposition."[167]

As observed in the Qumran community taking on the atoning work of the cult, such metaphors operate as vehicles for new belief and ritual. This runs counter to Regev's thesis that "Beliefs can hardly replace public rituals at the Jerusalem Temple."[168] Newsom acknowledges as much of the Qumran community:

> At the same time that the temple metaphor structures an identity for the sectarian community, it also restructures thought about the temple. The cognitive force of metaphor *flows in both directions*. Because the community appropriates the metaphor of the temple for its identity, what it further says about its own identity reorganizes discourse about the function of the temple."[169] (emphasis mine)

Paul's temple language likewise has the power to effect ritual change given the social and religious realities of his audience. While we have no evidence of polemic aimed at the temple in Paul, the circumstances of his audience as those he considers formerly *ethnē* (1 Cor 12.2) yet still uncircumcised non-Judaeans barred from full participation at the temple in Jerusalem put Paul's temple imagery in a category somewhat parallel to the situation at Qumran. That is, the ritual

[167] Hans Conzelmann and James Warren Dunkly, *1 Corinthians: A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, ed. George W. MacRae, trans. James W. Leitch, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975), 98.

[168] Regev, *The Temple in Early Christianity*, 90.

[169] Newsom, *The Self as Symbolic Space*, 158.

realities demand that we take these metaphors more seriously than mere rhetoric to inspire holy conduct. Somewhat out-of-step with the logic of his arguments, Regev acknowledges as much, writing,

> In calling for his Gentile readers to think of their religious life as Christians along the lines of Temple and sacrifice, Paul actually transforms the basic and unique trait of the Jewish cult—its being exclusively Jewish and unavailable to non-Jews. Through his use of metaphors Paul has made the virtual Temple and sacrifice accessible to non-Jewish-Christians.… Virtual as it may seem, the metaphoric sense of Temple and sacrifice was essential to the religious life of his addressees.[170]

The barrier separating gentile observers from Judaean devotees at the temple in Jerusalem continues to exist in Paul's time. Regev asserts that metaphors can hardly replace beliefs and yet admits as much above. As Friedrich Horn puts it, "the Gentile Christians in their holiness fulfill the prerequisites for further temple access and can thus, like Israel, be assigned to God."[171]

For Paul, retaining gentiles-in-Christ as non-Judaean meant that they needed to relate to God *cultically*, but without the Jerusalem temple. I do not dispute that Paul is still cultic in sentiment. I agree in part with Paula Fredriksen when she writes that "Paul praises the new community by likening it to something that he values supremely. If he valued the temple less, he would not use it as his touchstone."[172] Jonathan Klawans makes a similar argument:

> [W]hen we look a little deeper into Paul's descriptions of sacrificial worship, we find that Paul affirms many of the fundamental theological tenets upon which ancient Jewish sacrificial worship is based.… In his letters, Paul affirms and even praises these notions, all without articulating any explicit critique of the cult, or even alluding to any such critique ostensibly offered by Jesus.[173]

In his defense of "spiritualization", Stephen Finlan maintains that

---

[170] Regev, *The Temple in Early Christianity*, 90.

[171] „Wohl aber erfüllen die Heidenchristen in ihrer Heiligkeit die Voraussetzungen des weitergehenden Tempelzugangs und können so, Israel gleich, Gott zugeordnet werden" (Friedrich W. Horn, "Paulus und der Herodianische Tempel," *NTS* 53.2 [2007]: 201).

[172] Paula Fredriksen, "Judaizing the Nations: The Ritual Demands of Paul's Gospel," *NTS* 56 (2010): 248.

[173] Jonathan Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple: Symbolism and Supersessionism in the Study of Ancient Judaism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 220.

> This involves a confusion of the literal and the metaphorical. Sacrificial metaphors do not necessarily entail affirmation of the sacrificial cult, any more than the remark "as a peacemaker, Senator Mitchell works magic" affirms a literal belief in magic. It is overly literal to claim that *metaphorizing* is the same as doctrinal *affirming*.[174] (emphasis his)

While I think Paul's temple metaphor is more consequential than Finlan indicates here, I nevertheless echo his conclusion that "To assume that Paul is affirming all the tenets of cultic ideology is to ignore the difference between *literal* and *metaphorical* usage" (emphasis his).[175] More specifically, Qumran offers at least one example of some Judaeans who could value cultic notions of relation to God whilst deriding a particular expression of cult. In what I argue can be seen as a somewhat parallel instance, Paul redirects a cultic understanding of relation to the God of Israel in light of his conviction that all should remain as they are (1 Cor 7.18–19).[176]

Paul's language leads his groups away from the Jerusalem temple, not toward it. Such is the conclusion of Regev, who admits that,

> [F]rom the perspective of his readers, when the believers are holy and God's spirit resides within them and especially when their faith is like a sacrifice, and even more so when Christ's death atones like a sin offering or the kaporet (on the Day of Atonement), the religious role of the Jerusalem Temple diminishes. Although the community and Jesus are only *like* a Temple or sacrifice (because they are only metaphors), the number of metaphors and the continuous thinking of Christian worship in terms of the Temple cult divert attention from the Temple to Christian life."[177] (emphasis his)

---

[174] Stephen Finlan, "Spiritualization of Sacrifice in Paul and Hebrews," in *Ritual and Metaphor: Sacrifice in the Bible*, ed. Christian Eberhart, SBL 68 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2011), 89.

[175] Finlan, "Spiritualization of Sacrifice in Paul and Hebrews," 90.

[176] By tracing the effective history of Paul's temple imagery, Read Marlatte's Oxford dissertation shows that it is entirely reasonable that later Christians could use temple language in meaningful ways, even whilst speaking quite negatively about Israel's cult (e.g., Eph 2.11–22, 1 Pet 2.4–10, Hebrews, and the *Epistle of Barnabas*). "[T]his conceptual structure provides no constraints and allows for the possibility of extensions and applications that could address different issues. Therefore, Paul, while not addressing the question of the status of the Temple himself, provides the conceptual and linguistic tools for those in different historical circumstances and those addressing different questions to construct an answer" ("The Setting and Early Effective-History of Paul's Temple Metaphors" [PhD diss., University of Oxford, 2017], 332).

[177] Eyal Regev, *The Temple in Early Christianity: Experiencing the Sacred* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2019), 88–89.

According to Regev though, Paul only did so "unwittingly" in that he could not have foreseen that consequences of his metaphor:

> [W]hen the Temple is not the sole place of God's dwelling place and the animal sacrifices are not the only way to achieve cultic atonement, they are no longer the same. Ultimately, the Pauline use of the Temple realm as a model for sanctity and atonement does indeed create a certain competition with the Temple cult, but it does so somewhat *unwittingly* and in a relatively delicate manner."[178] (emphasis mine)

Regev's conclusion that Paul only "unwittingly" uses temple imagery, that is, without perceiving the effect of doing so for the ritual of temple attendance in Jerusalem falls short of what we can confidently assume about Paul and his audience. It is hard to imagine that a Judaean of Paul's pedigree (cf. Gal 1.13–14; Phil 3.4–6) would be unwitting on such a matter of importance per the God-Temple-Torah paradigm offered by Schwartz.[179] Furthermore, it is Paul that seeks to keep these gentiles in their uncircumcised state, thereby ensuring their permanent barring from full participation in Jerusalem.[180] For these reasons, it is difficult to maintain that Paul did not know that he was leading his gentiles-in-Christ away from the temple, not toward it. For those dotted along the proselyte spectrum, Paul's temple metaphor provides an answer to questions concerning pilgrimage in the same way that identifying Christ as their Passover Lamb actually leads the

[178] Regev, *The Temple in Early Christianity*, 89.

[179] See again Seth Schwartz, *Imperialism and Jewish Society: 200 B.C.E. to 640 C.E.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009), 49.

[180] Fredriksen contends that Paul does so because of his interpretation of prophetic expectations for gentile inclusion at the "End of the Age" as distinct from other Judaeans in his time: "The synagogue's *prosēlytoi* were no longer pagans: they were Jews 'of a peculiar sort.' The synagogue's god-fearers or Judaizers or sympathizers, however, seem to have been *active* pagans: they added the god of Israel to their native pantheons while continuing to worship their own gods as well. *But the Kingdom's pagans were a special and a purely theoretical category:* they were ex-pagan pagans, or (to use the wiggle-room afforded by our two English words) ex-pagan gentiles. *Like* god-fearers, these eschatological pagans would retain their native ethnicities; *unlike* god-fearers, these pagans would no longer worship their native gods. *Like* proselytes, these pagans would worship exclusively the god of Israel; *unlike* proselytes, these pagans would preserve their own ethnicities and—another way of saying the same thing—they would not assume the bulk of Jewish ancestral custom (such as, for males, circumcision)." See discussion in Fredriksen, *Paul: The Pagans' Apostle* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2017), 73–77.

Corinthians away from celebrating Passover, not to it. This is an example of an interaction theory of metaphor with mutual consequence upon both subjects in the metaphorical copula.

Conclusion

An interaction theory of metaphor best captures the shifts in meaning that occur for both the primary (e.g., the temple) and secondary (e.g., the Corinthian believers) subjects as opposed to a unilateral understanding of metaphor which "maps" in only one direction from the source domain (temple) to the target domain (Corinthian believers). Given the ritual history concerning gentile status and temple access, as well as the degree of Judaean affiliation among the Corinthian assembly, I maintain that Paul would have anticipated the impact of identifying the Corinthian gentiles as God's dwelling place. An interaction theory of metaphor better explains the bilateral effect of metaphor when there are cultic roadblocks to consider, such as those encountered by uncircumcised gentiles worshiping the God of Israel.

Such is the case with the Qumran community, who employed temple metaphors for its community as an expression of the ritual predicament in which they found themselves. Because they were still cultic in their understanding of relation to God, they appropriated the temple's function of atonement for themselves. Not only does this dictate new meaning and ritual, it also simultaneously pronounces judgement of the expression of cult in Jerusalem from which they have separated. Likewise, Paul's temple metaphors in light of the ritual realities for uncircumcised Corinthians work in both directions as creating new cultic access for them whilst pronouncing judgement on the cult in Jerusalem for them. In his use of the temple metaphor, Paul has created something new—a new understanding and self-understanding of the Corinthian community as a legitimate dwelling place of God by using the image of the Jerusalem temple.

CHAPTER THREE

THE TEMPLE IN PAUL

Introduction

I offer here an understanding of Paul's relationship with the Jerusalem temple derived from his letters as well as what relationship he may have imagined for the Corinthian believers. Using Steve Mason's four principles for building an historically responsible reading, I start with Paul's explicit references to the cult in Jerusalem. Though few, they show that the temple was useful for Paul in understanding and explaining his gospel service among the nations. While he praises Israel's *latreia* ("worship" or even "temple service") in Rom 9.4, as a letter Romans (especially chs. 9–11) is so rhetorically nuanced that we should be careful picking out one passage to determine what Paul definitively thought on a given matter. While these do not necessitate the conclusion that Paul *rejected* the temple establishment in Jerusalem altogether, neither does it permit Paula Fredriksen's overly positive evaluation that Paul "values supremely" the Jerusalem temple.[181]

Moving to the figurative ways in which he employs temple language, these show further the usefulness of the temple for explaining the status he affords the Corinthians, that is, as the holy dwelling place of God's spirit. This understanding not only reflects Second Temple developments in Judaean pneumatology, but also the flexibility to think of the temple beyond a means of atonement. Combined, the ways in which Paul speaks of the temple regarding his work and the

[181] Paula Fredriksen, "Judaizing the Nations: The Ritual Demands of Paul's Gospel," *NTS* 56 (2010): 248.

status of the Corinthians shows that he considers literal cultic ritual in Jerusalem to be irrelevant for believing gentiles.

The Temple in Paul's Letters

Steve Mason begins his reading of the historical Paul by asking how Paul presented himself to his groups.[182] In doing so, Mason offers four basic principles of historical research to follow:

> [B]egin at the beginning, distinguish rhetoric from true beliefs, do not multiply entities unnecessarily, and work from the known to the unknown. These principles together recommend that we begin with 1 Thess, try to understand *it* (not Paul's psychology or formative influences) as his first audiences might have done, and work from what is clearest to what becomes foggier in his later letters.[183] (emphasis his)

To conduct such a reading for Paul's relationship with the Jerusalem temple, in addition to what relationship he imagined for the groups to which he wrote, we must acknowledge firstly that the temple rarely features in Paul's letters. Temple pilgrimage does not preoccupy Paul at all,[184] let alone in the way that Judaean rituals such as circumcision,[185] food laws (including table fellowship: 1 Cor 5.11; Gal 2.12),[186] or holy days (Gal 4.10; Rom 14.5–6) do.[187] In total, there are

[182] Mason admits to being something of an outsider to the topic but implies that perhaps that's what needed for a lightning-rod figure like Paul: "…I do not mean to suggest that while everyone has been searching for Paul, I have found him: 'Relax everyone: He is over here!' Rather, I propose that the normal sense of what it means to study a figure *historically* seems almost impossible with Paul because the theological stakes are so deeply internalized" (Steve Mason, "Paul without Judaism: Historical Method over Perspective," in *Paul and Matthew among Jews and Gentiles: Essays in Honour of Terence L. Donaldson*, ed. Ronald Charles, LNTS [London: T&T Clark, 2020], 10).

[183] Mason, "Paul without Judaism: Historical Method over Perspective," 26. See also Steve Mason, "What is History? Using Josephus for the Judaean-Roman War," in *The Jewish Revolt against Rome: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, ed. Mladen Popović, Supplements to *JSJ* 154 (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 158–207.

[184] According to Paul's own travelogue in Galatians, he did not feel the need to go up to Jerusalem for a fourteen-year period (Gal 2.1; cf. also 1.17–18). See Richard Bauckham, *The Jewish World Around the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010), 187 n. 36.

[185] See 1 Cor 7.18–19; Gal 2.3, 7–9, 12; 5.2–3, 6, 11; 6.12–13, 15; Rom 2.25–3.1, 30; 4.9–12; 15.8; Phil 3.3, 5.

[186] See 1 Cor 6.13; 8.4, 7–8, 10, 13; 10.25, 27–28, 10.31; Rom 14.2–3, 6, 15, 17, 20–21, 23.

[187] See Jonathan Klawans, *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 151 n. 105; and E. P. Sanders, *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985), 93–105.

only two explicit references to the cult in Jerusalem, with a third that could encompass priestly procedure in general but likely refers to Jerusalem as well (1 Cor 10.18; Rom 9.4; cf. 1 Cor 9.13).

First Corinthians 10.18

In 1 Cor 10.18, Paul refers to the consumption of sacrifices by Israel κατὰ σάρκα ("according to the flesh"), whether by a priest or layperson (cf. Lev 7.6ff.; Deut 14.22–26).[188] While there are neutral references to "the flesh" in Paul (e.g., concerning the descent of Jesus from David in Rom 1.3), the majority represent the flesh in a negative light or, at the very least, as inferior to a spiritual opposite.[189] From what follows in vv. 19–20, some have concluded that Paul likens Israel's cult to idolatry on par with the sacrifices of gentile cults: "What then am I saying? That a thing sacrificed to idols is anything, or that an idol is anything?"[190] This seems unwarranted upon close reading. Paul is merely making the point that, alongside the example of gentile cults (v. 20) as well as the Lord's Supper (vv. 16–17), consuming portions of what is offered binds one to the deity of whatever altar, including Israel present.[191] Nevertheless, it seems unnecessary to include the

[188] If, as John Lanci and others maintain, that references to the Jerusalem temple would have been unintelligible to the Corinthians, it is curious that Paul would explicitly cite the cult of Israel here. See John R. Lanci, *A New Temple for Corinth: Rhetorical and Archaeological Approaches to Pauline Imagery*, StBibLit 1 (New York: P. Lang, 1997); and and Kar Yong Lim, Metaphors and Social Identity Formation in Paul's Letters to the Corinthians (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2017).

[189] Neutral references using κατὰ σάρκα include Abraham as forefather (Rom 4.1), and Paul and the Christ's Judaean kinsmen (Rom 9.3, 5). For negative references, see Rom 8.4–5, 12–13; 1 Cor 1.26; 2 Cor 1.17; 5.16; 10.2–3; 11.18; Gal 4.23, 29.

[190] If taken negatively, debate has concerned whether Paul has in mind Israel present, as if the entire cultic system in Paul's day constitutes idolatry, or ancient Israel during times of explicit idolatry. See overview in Anthony C. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 771–72.

[191] As Emma Wasserman observes, "Though Paul's imagined Christ-followers lack a communal sacrificial meal in honor of the deity, he evokes their meatless meal in honor of Christ and God (10:16–17) and then compares it to the Israelite practices of sacrifice and meat distribution" (*Apocalypse as Holy War: Divine Politics and Polemics in the Letters of Paul* [New Haven: Yale University Press, 2018], 157).

qualification Israel κατὰ σάρκα unless there is another Israel *kata pneuma*.[192] While *kata pneuma* does not occur explicitly, Paul does make qualitative contrasts with those he considers fleshly throughout his letters (e.g., Rom 2.28–29; 9.8; Gal 4.23).

First Corinthians 9.14

In what may be a more general reference to priestly practice, Paul likens his gospel service to those employed in temple service (τὰ ἱερὰ ἐργαζόμενοι), and his message to that which priests offer (1 Cor 9.13; cf. Rom 15.16). Paul asserts that those who earn their living by such gospel service have the same claim to basic provisions from the congregations they serve as priests do the food sacrificed upon the altars they attend (1 Cor 9.13–14; cf. Lev 6.16, 26; 7.6, 31–36; Num 5.9–10; 18.8–20, 31; Deut 18.1). Though there were similar regulations for non-Judaean temple priests, Paul's polemic against other temple rites (cf. 1 Cor 10.20) suggests that he has the Jerusalem cult in mind.[193] Furthermore, the strict use of θυσιαστήριον for the altar of the God of Israel in the Septuagint and New Testament has led some to conclude that Paul has only the cult of Israel in mind here.[194] In which case, while not explicitly supplanting the service of Judaean priests in Jerusalem, Paul at least understands his work in the same light. What Paul does for the Corinthians is as good as what the priests do in Jerusalem.

---

[192] Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, rev. ed., NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014), 454 n. 581. See also Roy E. Ciampa and Brian S. Rosner, *The First Letter to the Corinthians*, PNTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 477–78.

[193] See Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 32 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), 365.

[194] See Albert L. A. Hogeterp, "Paul and God's Temple: A Historical Interpretation of Cultic Imagery in the Corinthian Correspondence" (PhD diss., University of Groningen, 2004), 287; Nijay K. Gupta, *Worship That Makes Sense to Paul: A New Approach to the Theology and Ethics of Paul's Cultic Metaphors*, 2nd ed. (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010), 77–78; Eyal Regev, *The Temple in Early Christianity: Experiencing the Sacred* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2019), 67.

Romans 9.4

In recounting the many benefits bestowed on Israel in his letter to the Roman assembly, Paul includes their λατρεία, which can be rendered as "worship" or, more specifically, "temple service".[195] These are his kinsmen κατὰ σάρκα (9.3), to whom belong the adoption as children, the glory of the Lord's presence, the covenants, the giving of the law, the temple service, the promises, the patriarchs, and from whom the Christ is descended, again, κατὰ σάρκα (vv. 4–5). Though Rom 9.4 reflects Paul's appreciation for these traditions of Israel, Mason captures the ways in which Paul "bobs and weaves" throughout the Roman letter:

> [U]ncharacteristically falling over himself to be polite with a group he did not establish (1:11–12), Paul bobs and weaves to defend The Announcement from specifically *Judaean* criticisms. Circumcision and Judaean identity have *enormous* value, he stresses (3:1–2)—although none with respect to salvation in Christ (3:30). Is the law finished with, or is it sin? Perish the thought! (3:31; 7:12)—although it points to Christ and otherwise is irrelevant (3:21; 4:14; 10:4). Has God abandoned Israel? Absolutely not! (9:2–6a)—but then again, not all "Israel" are *really* Israel, are they? (9:6b). God's choice of Israel is irrevocable, and so *all* Israel will be saved—at least when they cease to oppose The Announcement (11:25–32).[196] (emphasis his)

Going back to Mason's four principles, it is perhaps too strong to say that we must "distinguish rhetoric from true beliefs" here.[197] Nevertheless, though Paul praises Israel's λατρεία, we should be cautious about pinning Paul down so easily given the bobbing and weaving Mason describes. Consider further his positive outlook on circumcision in Rom 3.1–2 as compared with Galatians (e.g., 5.6; 6.15). John Gager has argued that Paul's apparent animosity toward Judaean ritual is due to his role as "apostle to the gentiles" (Rom 11.13), but others find it likely that Paul did

[195] Cf. Heb 9.1. See LSJ, "λατρεία," 1032: "*service to* the gods, divine *worship*;" and BDAG, "λατρεία," 587: "*regulations for worship*."

[196] Mason, "Paul without Judaism," 35.

[197] See again Mason, "Paul without Judaism," 26

discourage Judaean rituals in mixed Christ assemblies.[198] Ultimately, Paul is perplexed that the above gifts have not led Israel κατὰ σάρκα to the same messianic confession regarding Jesus (Rom 9.5).[199] Paul does not invalidate temple attendance for ethnic Judaeans in the assemblies to which he wrote, though he may have considered it a concession for "the weak" (cf. Rom 14.1–4).

In general, Paul perceives and clarifies misunderstandings about his teaching in the Roman letter, perhaps stemming from his fiery letter to the Galatians. Gager explains:

> The relationship between the two letters is revealing—and decisive—for understanding Romans. It is difficult to escape the impression that much of Romans is designed to correct misreadings of Paul's position on certain basic problems—the law of Moses and Israel, the law and Gentiles, Christ and Israel—misreadings stemming in part from the letter to the Galatians itself.[200]

Perhaps we can include Israel's λατρεία ("temple service") in this regard, clarifying that his priest-like ministry among the nations does not detract from the institution of Israel's cult. But can we attribute to Paul the degree of value Paula Fredriksen does? Fredriksen posits that Paul's use of cultic imagery actually reveals his deep commitment to the actual cult in Jerusalem. Fredriksen writes that "Paul praises the new community by likening it to something that he values supremely. If he valued the temple less, he would not use it as his touchstone."[201] In comparison, the Qumran

---

[198] John G. Gager, *Reinventing Paul* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 102–3. Richard Pervo writes that, "When pressed (Gal 5:3), Paul treats Torah as absolute. Jewish-gentile unity was difficult to preserve in mixed communities. Although Paul made no objections to completely Jewish communities of believers in Jesus, he may well have recommended that those of Jewish background in mixed churches not circumcise their children. Those who did so would be numbered among 'the weak'" (*Acts: A Commentary*, ed. Harold W. Attridge, Hermeneia [Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2009], 544 n. 28). See also Stephen G. Wilson, *Luke and the Law*, SNTSMS 50 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 101–2. Cf. Paul's mention of "the weak" in 1 Cor 8.9ff.; 9.22; Rom 14.1ff.; 15.1.

[199] Paul, however, heads off any "incipient anti-Jewish sentiment" on the part of gentile believers later in Rom 11.17–21. See discussion in N. T. Wright, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2013), 2:501.

[200] Gager, *Reinventing Paul*, 102–3.

[201] Paula Fredriksen, "Judaizing the Nations: The Ritual Demands of Paul's Gospel," *NTS* 56 (2010): 248.

community could use the idea of temple ritual whilst being critical of the temple.[202] Given Paul's praise of Israel's λατρεία, we can conclude that Paul retained a high view of Israel's institutions for Israel κατὰ σάρκα, at least historically,[203] whilst also aware of gentile devotees' predicament in relation to these institutions. After all, if Paul can separate circumcision from "the keeping the commands of God" (1 Cor 7.19), why should temple devotion be treated differently?[204]

Romans 2.22

In this consideration, Paul's use of ἱεροσυλέω (to "rob temple[s]", or "commit sacrilege") in Rom 2.22 should also be mentioned.[205] Extreme detestation of other deities was warned against by some Judaeans, including Paul. Philo and Josephus acknowledge the sanctity of temples devoted to other deities in the fear that disrespect towards them might somehow offend the God of Israel.[206] Philo warns that proselytes, those who have "denounced the vain imaginings of their fathers and ancestors," must not even

> deal in idle talk or revile with an unbridled tongue the gods whom others acknowledge, lest they on their part be moved to utter profane words against Him Who truly is. For they know not the difference, and since the falsehood has been taught to them as truth from childhood and has grown up with them, they will go astray. (*Spec*. 1.9.53 [Colson, LCL])

---

[202] See Martin Goodman for the range of views regarding Qumran and the temple in "Constructing Ancient Judaism from the Scrolls," in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, eds. Timothy H. Lim and John J. Collins (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 81–91.

[203] Fitzmyer points out though in Rom 9.4 that "Paul does not say that 'they were Israelites,' but 'who are Israelites.' The tense is significant. Jews still have, then, the right to boast of such an ancestral heritage associated with a God-given name." But, as he acknowledges, "it is questionable whether Paul understands 'Israelites' to designate merely 'a particular category within the people' of Israel…" (cf. Rom 9.6–7). Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Romans: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 33 (New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2008), 545.

[204] See John J. Collins, *The Invention of Judaism Torah and Jewish Identity from Deuteronomy to Paul*, Taubman Lectures in Jewish Studies (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2017, 165.

[205] "[T]o take objects from a temple by force or stealth … to commit irreverent acts" (BDAG, "ἱεροσυλέω," 471).

[206] See discussion in J. B. Lightfoot, *Notes on Epistles of St. Paul from Unpublished Commentaries* (London: Macmillan, 1895), 262–63; Gerhard Delling, "Josephus und die heidnischen Religionen," *Klio* 43 (1965): 263–69; Edgar Krentz," The Name of God in Disrepute: Romans 2:17–29 [22–23]," *CurTM* 17.6 (1990): 436.

Philo probably derives this warning from Exod 22.27 LXX, which retains a plural form in its translation: θεοὺς οὐ κακολογήσεις—"You shall not revile *gods*."[207] Philo offers the same interpretation of Lev 24.15 LXX, even though the singular θεὸς is used:

> clearly by "god," he is not here alluding to the Primal God, the Begetter of the Universe, but to the gods of the different cities who are falsely so called, being fashioned by the skill of painters and sculptors. For the world as we know it is full of idols of wood and stone, and suchlike images. We must refrain from speaking insultingly of these, lest any of Moses' disciples get into the habit of treating lightly the name "god" in general, for it is a title worthy of the highest respect and love. (*Mos*. 2.38.205 [Colson, LCL])

Josephus likewise cites Exod 22.27 in *Ant*. 4.207 (cf. *Ag. Ap.* 2.237). In a departure from Deut 7.25, Josephus also reinterprets Moses as commanding: "Let none blaspheme the gods which other cities revere, nor rob foreign temples, nor take treasure that has been dedicated in the name of any god" (Thackeray and Marcus, LCL). However, Deut 7.25 LXX reads: "The carved objects of their gods you shall utterly burn with fire. You shall not desire silver or gold from them and you shall not take any for yourself, lest you stumble on account of it, because it is an abomination to the Lord your God." While Deuteronomy exhorts the Israelites to destroy the carved objects of their gods, Josephus leans on the latter part of the verse as the reason why one should not blaspheme foreign deities. The *Letter of Aristeas* can be cited in this regard, which is sensitive towards the gods of others since the one true God is ultimately behind the conception of them: "For they worship the overseer and founder god of all things, whom all do, but we, king [Ptolemy], do too, calling Zeus by a different name" (15–16).[208]

Paul seems to share this same sensitivity towards foreign cults. Like Philo and Josephus, Paul's "monotheism" does not mean that he denies the existence of other deities, but rather that he

[207] See Philo, *On the Decalogue*, *On the Special Laws, Books 1–3*, trans. F. H. Colson, LCL 320 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1937), 129 n. c.

[208] See Krentz, "The Name of God in Disrepute," 437.

views them as inferior to the God of Israel (cf. 1 Cor 2.8; 8.5–6; 10.20–21; 2 Cor 4.4; Gal 4.8–9; Phil 2.10; cf. 1 Cor 15.24–27).[209] Paul's rhetorical questions in Rom 2.22–23 imply that sacrilege of temples devoted to other gods transgresses Torah. In this diatribe, Paul rhetorically asks those who detest idols, "do you not rob temple[s] [ἱεροσυλέω]?" (v. 22).[210] Long ago, J. B. Lightfoot cited Acts 19.37 as a possibility that some made gains "out of the very things which they professed to abominate. Doubtless some instance had occurred, in which Jews, under pretence of detestation of idolatry, had plundered some heathen temples and gained booty thereby."[211] In Paul, it is cited as one of the reasons why "the name of God is blasphemed among the nations" (Rom 2.24), since temple defilement was considered a heinous act across the ancient world regardless of the temple's deity. Robbery of a temple was one of the worst offenses committable, seen in the same light as treason and murder. References to the act appear in numerous ancient vice-lists from Plato to Diogenes Laertius. Theft and adultery frequently occur in these lists as well, as seen in Rom 2.20–22. The Judaean interlocutor here is probably hyperbolic though, as Craig Keener concludes, "perhaps even reduced to the absurd" in order to contrast the righteous gentile with the hypocritical Judaean.[212]

[209] On Paul's taxonomy for these beings, see Emma Wasserman, *Apocalypse as Holy War: Divine Politics and Polemics in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2018), 141–72. Nevertheless, the scriptural triangulation of ναός, πνεῦμα, and ἅγιος in 1 Cor 3.16–17 counters the possibility that Paul wants the Corinthians to think of themselves as any temple with which they might be familiar in Corinth. See Nijay K. Gupta, *Worship That Makes Sense to Paul: A New Approach to the Theology and Ethics of Paul's Cultic Metaphors*, 2nd ed. (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010), 19; See also M. Fraeyman, "La Spiritualisation de l'Idée du Temple dans les Epitres pauliniennes," *ETL* 33 (1947): 391.

[210] The verb ἱεροσυλέω and related terms are rare in biblical writings (cf. 2 Macc 4.39; 9.2; 13.6; esp. Acts 19.37).

[211] Lightfoot, *Notes on Epistles of St. Paul from Unpublished Commentaries*, 262.

[212] See Craig S. Keener, *Romans: A New Covenant Commentary*, NCCS 6 (Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2009), 46–48.

Temple Imagery in Paul

On three occasions in his traditionally undisputed writings, Paul speaks of one Christ assembly in terms of being ναὸς θεοῦ, "God's temple" (1 Cor 3.16–17; 6.19; 2 Cor 6.16; cf. also Eph 2.21; 2 Thess 2.4). This metaphor is expressed using a term which, according to the extant literature, only ever refers to inorganic structures built for the worship of a deity who, as BDAG notes, is "frequently perceived to be using it as a dwelling".[213] At times, it can refer to the inmost part of a temple or the shrine containing the image of a deity.[214]

Terminology

Like ἱερόν and ἅγιον (or τὰ ἅγια), ναός in the New Testament almost always refers to the actual Jerusalem temple.[215] Ἱερόν is typically used to represent the entire temple complex, with all of its areas, while ναός designates the inmost part of a temple where God is said to dwell.[216] The Gospels of Mark (15.38), Matthew (27.51), and Luke (23.45) use ναός to indicate the area of the temple complex where the curtain separating the Holy Place from the Most Holy Place hangs (cf. Exod 26.31–35). While this is generally the case in the Septuagint, and the New Testament in places (e.g., Luke 1.9; 2 Thess 2.4), usage more broadly does not always make a stark distinction with the terms between the outer and inner sanctums.[217] For example, Judas surely did not cast down

[213] BDAG, "ναός," 665.

[214] As in Herodotus, *Hist*. 1.183, and Xenophon, *Apol*. 15; but also, a portable shrine in Herodotus, *Hist*. 2.63. See LSJ, "νᾱός," 1160.

[215] In Revelation, the author speaks of ὁ ναὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ. Cf. also use in John 2.21, which speaks of the temple of Jesus' body, and Acts 19.24, which refers to silver shrines of Artemis made in Ephesus.

[216] See 1 Kgdms 1.9; 3.3 2 Kgdms 22.7; 3 Kgdms 6.7, 10, 18, 34; 7.7, 36; 4 Kgdms 18.16; 23.4; 24.13; 1 Chr 28.11, 20; 2 Chr 3.17; 4.7–8, 22; 8.12; 15.8; 26.16, 19; 27.2; 29.7, 17; 36.7; 1 Esd 1.39; 2.17–18; 4.45; 5.52, 55–56, 64; 6.17–18; 2 Esd 5.14; Pss 5.8; 10.4; 17.7; 26.4; 27.2; 28.9; 44.16; 64.5; 67.30; 78.1; 137.2; 143.12; Isa 66.6; Jer 7.4; 24.1; Ezek 8.16; 41.1, 4, 15, 21–22, 25; Joel 3.5; Amos 8.3; Jonah 2.5, 8; Hab 2.20; Hag 2.9, 15, 18; Zech 8.9; Mal 3.1; Tob 1.4; Jdt 4.2, 11, 18; Wis 3.14; 9:8; Sir 45.9; 50.1, 7, 14; Bar 1.8; Dan 3.53; Bel 11, 14; 1 Macc 1.22; 2:8; 4.49–50, 57; 7.36; 2 Macc 8.2; 10.5; 14.35; 15.18, 33; 3 Macc 1.10; 3.17; 5.43.

[217] See conclusion in Otto Michel, "ναός," *TDNT* 4:882.

his silver pieces in the Most Holy Place of the temple (Matt 27.5).[218] We find so few occurrences of ναός in Paul that it is difficult to discern these architectural divisions. Yet, in Paul, the distinction appears warranted. Paul only employs ἱερόν once in his reference to the priestly practice of those who eat from the altars at which they minister (1 Cor 9.13). When combined with the clarification that God's spirit abides there, there is good reason to conclude that Paul envisions the innermost sanctum of the temple. In which case, ναός would indeed designate the most sacred part of the temple where God was believed to be present.[219]

Instances

In their correspondence, Paul applies ναός to the corporate membership of the Corinthian assembly (1 Cor 3.16–17; 2 Cor 6.16), with an additional emphasis on the behavior of their individual bodies (1 Cor 6.19).[220] In the first instance, he is concerned with how members of this assembly are treating one another per the reports he has received about them (1 Cor 1.11). Frustrated, Paul writes, "Do you all not know that you are the temple of God and that the spirit of God dwells amongst you![221] If anyone corrupts God's temple, God will destroy them; for the temple of God is holy, which is what you all are" (1 Cor 3.16–17).

---

[218] See Michel, "ναός," *TDNT* 4.884; and Gupta, *Worship That Makes Sense to Paul*, 65.

[219] See position in Michael Newton, *The Concept of Purity at Qumran and in the Letters of Paul*, SNTSMS 53 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 54. See also Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 146.

[220] The term occurs six times in total (1 Cor 3.16; 6.19; 2 Cor 6.16), and twice in writings largely considered disputed (Eph 2.21; 2 Thess 2.4).

[221] Rather than being posed as a question seeking an answer, οὐκ οἴδατε, as a feature classical Greek diatribe, carries a rhetorical force of rebuke. For this reason, I have chosen to punctuate my translation with an exclamation mark rather than a question mark. On the use of οὐκ οἴδατε in diatribe, see Rudolf Bultmann, *Der Stil der paulinischen Predigt und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe*, FRLANT 13 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1910); Stanley K. Stowers, *The Diatribe and Paul's Letter to the Romans*, SBLDS 57 (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981); Benjamin A. Edsall, "Paul's Rhetoric of Knowledge: The OYK OIΔATE Question in 1 Corinthians," *NovT* 55.3 (2013): 252–71.

I have applied the definite article in my translation for two reasons: 1) From a grammatical standpoint, the word-order of 1 Cor 3.16 and 6.19 coheres with "Colwell's Rule" that the definite article is often used when the designation (i.e., ναὸς θεοῦ) follows the verb, though absent when preceding the verb.[222] 2) From a scriptural perspective, the number of occurrences of *naos*, *hagios*, and *pneuma* in the Septuagint (many times together), in addition to warnings against damaging God's dwelling place, show that Paul does not need to go outside of Israel's scriptures for his conception of *naos*.[223] For these reasons, in addition to Paul's persistent opposition to idolatry in the letters (cf. 1 Cor 8.1, 4, 7, 10; 10.14, 19, 28; 12.2; 2 Cor 6.16), I conclude that he would not have meant any *naos* when employing this metaphor, regardless of how the Corinthians would have received such language. In fact, I will maintain the opposite, that is, that they would have been conditioned by Paul and/or other itinerant Judaeans (cf. 1 Cor 1.12) to think of the Jerusalem temple.[224]

In the second instance, Paul employs his temple imagery to address how they are conducting themselves with respect to their own bodies. They do not realize the damage they are doing to themselves through πορνεία, nor the incompatibility of their bodies as members of Christ with the bodies of prostitutes: "Do you all not know that your collective body is the temple of the holy spirit in you which you have from God, and that you are not your own!" (1 Cor 6.19). Paul emphatically denies the possibility that Christ's body and that of a prostitute's can be blended. The

[222] See E. C. Colwell, "A Definite Rule for the Use of the Article in the Greek New Testament," *JBL* 52.1 (1933): 13. See also Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 5–6.

[223] See extensive treatment in H. H. Drake Williams, *The Wisdom of the Wise: The Presence and Function of Scripture Within 1 Cor. 1:18–3:23*, AGJU 49 (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 265–68.

[224] For the opposing view that Paul's temple metaphor plays primarily on the variety of cults in Corinth, see John R. Lanci, *A New Temple for Corinth: Rhetorical and Archaeological Approaches to Pauline Imagery*, StBibLit 1 (New York: P. Lang, 1997); and Kar Yong Lim, *Metaphors and Social Identity Formation in Paul's Letters to the Corinthians* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2017).

man, Dale Martin writes, "by penetrating the prostitute, is himself penetrated by the sinful cosmos."[225] Pneumatic union between the believing man's body and Christ's implicates Christ in πορνεία by extension, to put it more mildly than Martin.[226]

In both instances, the Corinthians have fallen short of the holiness Paul ascribes to them by virtue of the divine *pneuma* housed in and amongst them. The third instance concerns singular devotion to God as opposed to idols: "What agreement does the temple of God have with idols? For we are the temple of the living God…" (2 Cor 6.16). His labeling the Corinthians as such derives from what he observes. They have been gifted with divine *pneuma*, as manifested in their faith and spiritual gifts (1 Cor 12.4ff.). Second, and connectedly, this leads Paul to find utterly contradictory the ways in which they are treating one another as well as themselves.

Where is the Spirit?

Paul assumes a close correspondence between God's spirit and this temple (1 Cor 3.16–17; 6.19; cf. Eph 2.21–22). However, no Hebrew Bible text *explicitly* refers to the spirit in-dwelling the temple in Jerusalem, leading Eyal Regev to credit the idea as Paul's innovation.[227] Instead, the spirit is often described as present with the people of God (cf. Ps 51.11; Isa 63.9–10). However, the outpouring of God's spirit was anticipated in the post-exilic prophecies of Israel's restoration (cf. Isa 32.15; 44.3; Ezek 36.27; 37.14; 39.29; Joel 2.28–29), a hope which the Pauline or deutero-

[225] Dale B. Martin, *The Corinthian Body* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 178.

[226] See further discussion in Martin, *The Corinthian Body*, 174–79. See also Robert H. von Thaden Jr., "Pauline Rhetorical Invention: Seeing 1 Corinthians 6:12—7:7 through Conceptual Integration Theory," in *Cognitive Linguistic Explorations in Biblical Studies*, eds. Bonnie Howe and Joel B. Green (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2014), 112. Here occurs the only use of μὴ γένοιτο in 1 Corinthians, a regular feature of diatribe in Epictetus, for example. See Abraham J. Malherbe, "Mh Γenoito in the Diatribe and Paul," *HTR* 73.1–2 (1980): 232 n. 8.

[227] Regev, *The Temple in Early Christianity*, 58.

Pauline 2 Cor 6.16 considers fulfilled.[228] Joseph Greene has shown, however, that the idea of God's spirit in God's temple was not unique to Paul but rather a result of "overlap and intersection" between Yahweh's presence (as "cloud" or "glory") in the temple and Yahweh's spirit among the people outside the temple, especially in the exilic and post-exilic periods after the first temple's destruction.[229] As Greene cites, Hebrew Bible and Second Temple literature imply a correlation between the glory cloud/presence in the temple and the spirit.[230]

Josephus, however, makes the link explicit in his description of Solomon's dedication of the first temple. After the priests place the ark of the covenant in the temple,

> there suddenly appeared a thick cloud, not threatening nor like a swollen rain-cloud in the winter season, but diffused and temperate, which streamed into the temple and so darkened the sight of the priests that they could not see one another; and it produced in the minds of all of them an impression and belief that God had descended into the temple and had gladly made His abode there. (*Ant*. 8.106–7 [Marcus, LCL]).

As part of Solomon's recounted prayer, he entreats the God of his father, David, "to send some portion of *Thy spirit* to dwell in the temple, that Thou mayest seem to us to be on earth as well. For to Thee even the whole vault of heaven and all its host is but a small habitation—how much less this poor temple!" (emphasis mine; *Ant*. 8.114 [Marcus, LCL]). However, God's spirit is never mentioned in the biblical accounts of this dedication in 1 Kings 8 or 2 Chronicles 6. Rather, Josephus has likened God's spirit to the glory cloud mentioned earlier as the divine presence in the first temple. The author of Isaiah 63 already equates the glory cloud and God's spirit in

---

[228] See R. J. McKelvey, *The New Temple: The Church in the New Testament*, Oxford Theological Monographs (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969), 105–6.

[229] Joseph R. Greene, "The Spirit in the Temple: Bridging the Gap between Old Testament Absence and New Testament Assumption," *JETS* 55 (2012): 717–42. See also Joseph R. Greene, "Did God Dwell in the Second Temple? Clarifying the Relationship Between Theophany and Temple Dwelling," *JETS* 61.4 (2018): 767–84. Benjamin Sommer highlights evidence that Ancient Near Eastern gods were thought to have multiple bodies at the same time and that ancient Israel reflects such a belief in *The Bodies of God and the World of Ancient Israel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009). Proposing a similar belief in the early Jesus movement, see Matthew Thiessen, "'The Rock Was Christ': The Fluidity of Christ's Body in 1 Corinthians 10.4," *JSNT* 36.2 (2013): 103–126.

[230] Greene, "The Spirit in the Temple," 730.

remembering the exodus event, but Josephus (and Paul, I argue) represent this view with regard to the temple explicitly.[231]

Additionally, in retelling of Solomon's temple dedication, Josephus departs from the biblical accounts by excluding references to enemies and war in the passage. Instead of Solomon ending his prayer with "that all the peoples of the earth may know that the LORD is God; there is no other" (1 Kgs 8.60), Josephus has Solomon conclude with the hope that all people would realize that Jews "are not inhumane by nature nor unfriendly to those who are not of our country, but wish that all people equally should receive aid from Thee and enjoy Thy blessings" (*Ant*. 8.117 [Marcus, LCL]).[232] According to John Levison, such an alteration reflects Josephus' attempt to "dispel the libel of Jewish misanthropy".[233] This sentiment is especially evident in *Against Apion*, where Josephus explains that the purpose of the Judaean law is "to promote piety, friendly relations with each other, and humanity towards the world at large, besides justice, hardihood, and contempt of death" (2.146 [Thackeray, LCL]). Levison surmises that

> Josephus' penchant for promoting the philanthropic nature of the Jews suggests what a difficulty he confronted when he was compelled to interpret in a milieu defined in part by anti-Jewish sentiment the biblical version of Solomon's dedication of the temple, in which the chosenness of Israel, the centrality of the temple, and the conviction that "the LORD is God; there is no other" feature so prominently.[234]

Levison explains that Josephus' terminology in his alteration of Solomon's prayer is Stoic in nature since the Stoic conception of πνεῦμα speaks to this sentiment of cosmic unity: "A request for a portion of the spirit was fulfilled when fire leapt from air [2 Chronicles 7], when the two constituent

[231] See Greene, "The Spirit in the Temple," 730–31.

[232] See discussion in Hogeterp, *Paul and God's Temple*, 328–30.

[233] John R. Levison, *The Spirit in First Century Judaism*, AGJU 29 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 226.

[234] Levison, *The Spirit in First Century Judaism*, 226.

components of πνεῦμα, understood from a Stoic perspective, appeared."[235] Levison goes so far as to say that the application of Stoicism to Solomon's dedicatory prayer actually undermines the notion that God would permanently dwell in the Jerusalem temple alone, countering the idea of Judaean exclusivism.[236] Instead, as in Stoic thought, God is said to move through all creation.[237] While Levison may be right that Josephus revises Solomon's prayer to make the account more suitable for audiences of a Stoic persuasion, this motivation, as Greene counters, "does not exclude Josephus from also following existing Jewish depictions. Even if Levison is correct about Josephus' motivation, the passage still attests to at least one Hellenistic Jew's comfort with equating the glory cloud with Yahweh's Spirit."[238]

The Temple as a Unifying Image

Paul speaks of the Corinthians believers with tender (infants, cultivated land) yet also stalwart descriptors (building, temple). Paul not only cares about how others treat them, but how they treat one another as well. Their preciousness to Paul ultimately stems from their holy status as the dwelling place of God's spirit. Paul understands what he has asked of them, i.e., to abandon their former cultic devotion—which bound family and society in ancient Corinth—for his Judaean

[235] Levison, *The Spirit in First Century Judaism*, 227. See also Ernest Best, "The Use and Non-use of Pneuma by Josephus," *NovT* 3 (1959): 223.

[236] Josephus later admits that the presence of God had flown from the temple due to the neglect of proper cult by the rebels prior to its destruction by Roman forces in 70 CE (*Ant*. 20.166).

[237] See Levison, *The Spirit in First Century Judaism*, 227. In comparison, see esp. Paul's Areopagus sermon in Acts 17: "The God who made the world and everything in it, being Lord of heaven and earth, does not dwell in temples crafted by human hands" (v. 24). For Paul, the immanence of God in the manifestation of τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ among the Corinthians, where that divine spirit is said to be "housed," is evidence of their status as ναὸς θεοῦ. On Stoicism in Paul's understanding of the indwelling spirit, see Friedrich G. Lang, *Die Briefe an die Korinther*, NTD 7 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986), 56. See also Christian Wolff, *Der Erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther*, THKNT 7 (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1996), 130. See though John Barclay's challenge to a Stoic Paul in "Stoic Physics and the Christ-event: A Review of Troels Engberg-Pedersen, *Cosmology and Self in the Apostle Paul: The Material Spirit* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010)," *JSNT* 33.4 (2011): 406–414.

[238] Greene, "The Spirit in the Temple," 731 n. 55.

monotheism.[239] But he is not offering traditional Judaean religion as a substitute. The experience of God's spirit among them does not necessitate their circumcision or temple pilgrimage. Paul describes them in the only way he knows how—the very shrine of God, the place where God comes to meet his people. They have found cultic access to the God of Israel by means of the divine spirit's activity in their community built upon the foundation of belief in Jesus Christ.

In his reading of Paul's temple imagery, Regev splits hairs over the functions of the temple, writing, "But here and elsewhere in the Corinthian correspondence, the Temple is where God dwells and not necessarily where sacrifices are offered. For all these reasons, it seems that Paul's metaphor is mainly a rhetorical tool for arguing for general sanctity within the community."[240] However, Philo and Josephus both put great emphasis on the oneness fostered among the multitudes making pilgrimage to Jerusalem. Ian Rutherford has noted the uniqueness of this sentiment in descriptions of Greek temple attendance:

> First, no Greek source, as far as I am aware, argues that pilgrimage is valuable because it creates an opportunity to create relationships with other people. Greek writers occasionally report that significant relationships begin at festivals at sanctuaries (this is a common theme in the fictionalized world of the Greek Romance, for example), but this is never identified as a reason to go. Secondly … Greek writers do not seem to present arguments in favor of pilgrimage at all, even though it was a significant part of their culture."[241]

---

[239] Religious ceremonies in the ancient world would have included all citizens, not merely those of a religious order. For example, at the rededication of an area where a major temple was to be rebuilt, the Roman historian Tacitus' description of the occasion shows the inseparability of civic and religious life. Diviners, magistrates, priests, senators, knights, a praetor, even the emperor, become involved in the clearing and rebuilding, as well as the sacrificing that accompanied the event (*Hist*. 4.53). See discussion in Robert Louis Wilken, *The Christians as the Romans Saw Them*, 2nd ed. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003), 55–56. Corinthian believers may have risked ostracization and even persecution for abandoning certain cultic involvement. From Britain to Syria, Robin Lane Fox explains, "pagan cults aimed to honour the gods and avert the misfortunes which might result from the gods' own anger at their neglect. Like an electric current, the power of the gods had great potential for helping and harming; unlike electricity, it was unpredictable and mortals could do no more than attempt to channel its force in advance. Any account of pagan worship which minimizes the gods' uncertain anger and mortals' fear of it is an empty account" (*Pagans and Christians* [New York: Knopf, 1987], 38). See also Paula Fredriksen, *When Christians Were Jews: The First Generation* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2018), 151.

[240] Regev, *The Temple in Early Christianity*, 58.

[241] Ian Rutherford, "Concord and *Communitas*: Greek Elements in Philo's Account of Jewish Pilgrimage," in *Journeys in the Roman East: Imagined and Real*, ed. Maren Niehoff (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017), 266–67.

This value correlates with what we see in Paul, namely, the effectiveness of the image of the Jerusalem temple, specifically, to inspire a sense of unity.

Building on reports of quarrelling between various groups in the congregation (1 Cor 1.11ff.), Paul begins ch. 3 with a rebuke regarding how little they have grown: "And I, brothers, have not been able to speak to you as those who are spiritual but as those who are fleshly—as infants in Christ" (3.1). The factitiousness rampant among them shows that they have not grasped the superiority of Christ, otherwise they would not attach themselves to one of the apostles as they should only Christ. Paul knew that when he first began his ministry among them that he had to carefully select what teaching they were able to receive, the summary of which is "Jesus Christ, and him crucified" (2.2). "I gave you milk to drink, not food, since you were not ready for food. In fact, you are still not ready" (3.2). Their behavior shows that they still are not ready for more advanced instruction (cf. Heb 5.12–13):

> For you are still fleshly. When there is jealously and strife among you, are you not still fleshly and walking according to man? For when someone say: "I am of Paul", but another: "I am of Apollos", are you not mere men? Who is Apollos? Who is Paul? Mere servants through whom you believed, and to each as the Lord appointed. I planted; Apollos watered; but God alone gave the growth. So then, the one planting nor the one watering are anything, but God alone, the one who enables growth. (3.3–7)

Paul likens their efforts among the Corinthians and others around the Mediterranean to that of plant cultivation. Paul plants assemblies knowing that someone else must come along to tend. Quite literally, he is hesitant to deal with water at all (cf. his resistance to baptize in 1.14–17)! It is speculative but interesting to think that Paul's giftedness in this regard may have derived from his tentmaking trade, which coincidentally is only mentioned during his time in Corinth (cf. Acts 18.3). The Corinthians' unhealthy allegiance to these various ministers is nonsense since they all actually work together: "To be sure, the one planting and the one watering are one team…" (3.8).

This, however, does not negate the fact that each will be accountable for the part they play in ministering to believers: "but each will receive his own reward according to his own labor" (3.8).

Division as Sacrilege

A new metaphor is introduced—not only are they a cultivated field, but a structure. Paul understands his work among the nations in architectural terms. He and others contribute to these assemblies as if to a great structure, a structure built on the foundation of the confession of Jesus Christ crucified (1 Cor 3.11; cf. 2.2). It is a building that should stand with structural integrity: "We are God's fellow workers; you are God's cultivated field; you are God's building. According to the grace of God given me as a master architect I laid a foundation, but another is building upon it. Let each one take care how he builds upon it" (3.9–10). The building is certainly doomed for collapse if the proper foundation is not laid first: "For no foundation can be laid apart from the one which is laid, which is Jesus Christ" (3.11). This has been Paul's part to play in the great team of ministers, God's co-workers (cf. again 2.2). The structures that are these assemblies, however, are still "under construction", so to speak. While the foundation will remain, the materials used upon that foundation may not withstand: "If anyone builds upon that foundation with gold, silver, precious stones, wood, grass, straw, the quality of each builder's work will be clear, for the Day will make it clear, since it will be revealed by fire; and the fire will test the quality of each builder's work" (3.12–13). Some of these materials obviously will not withstand the coming "Day" of judgement.[242] Though they *are* the temple, they are still being constructed with an array of materials, some more enduring than others.

[242] Cf. Rom 2.5, 16; 13.12; 1 Cor 1.8; 5.5; 2 Cor 1.14; Eph 4.30; Phil 1.6, 10; 2.16; 1 Thess 5.2, 4; 2 Thess 1.7–10; 2.2; 2 Tim 1.12, 18; 4.8.

Words such as οἰκοδομή ("building") and its verbal form οἰκοδομέω ("to build up") occur overwhelmingly in Paul,[243] not to mention the only use of ἀρχιτέκτων ("master builder") in the New Testament.[244] Paul assures the shoddy builder that even though their ministry may not stand the test coming, their person will not be destroyed with their poor construction: "If their work, built upon that foundation, endures, they will receive a reward. If their work is reduced to ashes, they will indeed suffer great loss, but will saved nonetheless—but only as through fire" (3.14–15). However, this is not the case for those who do more than construct a shanty upon the firm foundation of Christ, but actually do harm to God's field, God's building, God's temple (3.16–17). These gentiles no longer stand at a distance from God's holiness in Herod's Outer Court, where all manner of people and animals were permitted; they themselves are now that sacred place which God inhabits, hence the grave danger of doing it harm. Paul goes to indicate the harm to which he refers (cf. 3.18–23). In particular, those who consider themselves wise or knowledgeable inflict damage upon the consciences of weaker members in the body by their engagement in the eating of idol meat (cf. chs. 8 and 10).[245]

[243] See Rom 14.19; 15.2, 20; 1 Cor 3.9; 8.1, 10; 10.23; 14.3–5, 12, 17, 26; 2 Cor 5.1; 10.8; 12.19; 13.10; Gal 2.18; 1 Thess 5.11; cf. also Eph 2.21; 4.12, 16, 29.

[244] The culmination of these metaphors is found in Ephesians, where the unity of humanity regardless of ethnicity and the holiness of the church as temple meet (2.19–22).

[245] Those "with knowledge" are likely higher-status Christians while the weak may have been lower-class believers who would not have been so accustomed to social gatherings where meat (most often sacrificed) was readily available. See Martin, *The Corinthian Body*, 75–76. See also discussion in Lanci, *A New Temple for Corinth*, 104–7. These have "sinned" against weaker members by leading them to do something for which their consciences were not ready. Those who are strong know that a thing sacrificed to idols is actually nothing (1 Cor 8:4; 10:19), and that "the earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof" (1 Cor 10:26; 8:6; cf. 1 Tim 4:4). Those without this confidence, though, experience defilement (8:7) and woundedness (8:12) when they eat. Defilement, in this regard, is not polemic used by Paul but rather a sympathetic statement about personal guilt. See Peter D. Gooch, *Dangerous Food: 1 Corinthians 8–10 in Its Context* (Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1993), 78. See also Richard A. Horsley, "Consciousness and Freedom among the Corinthians: 1 Corinthians 8–10," *CBQ* 40.4 (1978): 581–86; and Wendell L. Willis, *Idol Meat in Corinth: The Pauline Argument in 1 Corinthians 8 and 10*, SBLDS 68 (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1985), 89–92.

Important to this structural theme is the twice-used φθείρω in 1 Cor 3.17, both translated as "destroy" in all modern English translations. The AV/KJV, however, captures best the likely distinction between each use in v. 17, translating the first instance as "defile" and the second as "destroy:" "If any man defile [φθείρω] the temple of God, him shall God destroy [φθείρω]; for the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are."[246] The term can also be translated as "ruin", "corrupt", or "spoil", which other instances in Paul illustrate.[247] The term is found in the popular Greek proverb that Paul quotes in 1 Cor 15.33: "Bad company *corrupts* [φθείρω] good morals." In 2 Cor 7.2, Paul asserts that he and Timothy "*corrupted* [φθείρω] no one", nor "exploited anyone". Similarly, Paul expresses concern in 2 Cor 11.3 that, just as the serpent deceived Eve, the minds of the Corinthians "will be *corrupted* [φθείρω] from sincerity [and purity] to Christ."[248] Finally, in Ephesians—a letter written in Paul's name but likely by another—the author writes of the audience's former manner of life (the "old man") that must be laid aside, for it is "being *corrupted* [φθείρω] according to the lusts of deceit" (4.22). According to 1 Corinthians 3, God will be the one to destroy this temple in the same way that God is responsible for burning poor building materials in the coming fire (3.15). The threat is a play on the word since, if the temple of God is corrupted (indicating a *moral* ruin) by someone, then God will *ruin* that one in a very real sense.[249]

---

[246] On the other hand, Robertson and Plummer denigrate the AV/KJV translation for obscuring the working of *lex talionis* in the passage. See discussion in Archibald Robertson and Alfred Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians*, 2nd ed., ICC 33 (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1911), 67.

[247] See BDAG, "φθείρω," 1054.

[248] On differing traditions, see text-critical apparatus in NA28: 572.

[249] Ernst Käsemann observes here the law of *jus talionis*: the "destruction of the destroyer" (*New Testament Questions of Today* [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969], 67. Anthony Thiselton likewise writes that the "destruction of the destroyer is tied to the destroyer's act *by internal logical grammar.* So to damage the church that the work of the Spirit becomes impeded is *thereby* to cut oneself off from the Spirit as one's own source of life" (*The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000], 318). See also Wolfgang Schrage, *Der Erste Brief an die Korinther: 1 Kor 1,1–6,11*, EKKNT 7.1 (Zürich/Braunschweig: Benziger; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1991), 306

The logic of the transition to 1 Cor 3.16–17 from Paul's discourse on building materials, and the ensuing reward or punishment for how one builds, is not immediately obvious.[250] However, the structural theme from building materials to temple seems to provide the common thread. There is a shift to "sacred" character of building.[251] The ruin imagined in the temple metaphor is taken a step further than the destruction of one's inadequate building materials (3.15), since Paul is now speaking of those who *morally* corrupt the community of Christ. Admittedly, the line between the actions is, as Richard Hays puts it, "perilously thin. One is saved, though with singed eyebrows, while the other is destroyed."[252] Nevertheless, as Schrage suspects, Paul seems to have a third group in mind: 1) those rewarded in judgement (v. 14); 2) those narrowly escaped (v. 15); and 3) teachers who "instead of continuing to build, destroy the foundation and thus the temple of God."[253]

Paul does not explicitly describe the actions of those who would destroy the temple community, though contextually it appears to stem from their factitiousness. David Garland maintains that "it undoubtedly relates in some way to their boastful arrogance, their eagerness to appraise others, and their competitive partisanship—all the things that divide Christ."[254] Worse

---

[250] As C. K. Barrett admits in *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, HNTC (New York: Harper & Row, 1968), 90.

[251] See Schrage, *Der Erste Brief an die Korinther*, 304.

[252] Richard B. Hays, *First Corinthians*, IBC (Louisville, KY: John Knox Press, 1997), 58. Weiss writes that "a renewed sharpening of the tone exists cannot be denied. There the salvation of the bad worker is still assumed, but here the desecration of the temple is threatened! It is clear that [Paul] is not talking purely academically here but has certain dangers and certain people in mind." ["…eine erneute Derschärfung des Tons vorliegt, ist nicht zu leugnen. Dort wird immer noch die Rettung des schlechten Ar beiters angenommen, hier aber dem Tempelschänder der Untergang gedroht! Daß P. hier nicht rein akademisch redet, sondern bestimmte Gefahren, bestimmte Personen im Auge hat, ist klar"]. See Johannes Weiss, *Der Erste Korintherbrief*, KEK 5 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1910), 86.

[253] „Werden nun nach den im Gericht Belohnten (V 14) und den mit knapper Not Entkommenen (V 15) noch die Verlorenen angeführt, konkret christliche Lehrer, die, statt weiterzubauen, das Fundament und eben damit den Tempel Gottes zerstören." See Schrage, *Der Erste Brief an die Korinther*, 304.

[254] David E. Garland, *1 Corinthians*, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003), 294.

than those, Jerome Murphy-O'Connor writes, "who build with defective materials are those who would attempt to destroy the community (v. 17) by introducing elements incompatible with its basic character, viz. anything that smacks of egocentricity (see on 8:11–12)."[255] If the matter concerns their divisions, then it is the inherent pride in such disunity that is understood to be on the level of sacrilege. While the use of inferior materials does indeed endanger the growth and development of God's temple community, corruption of this moral nature threatens the very existence of the community.[256]

According to Paul, the breaching of the holiness ascribed to the Corinthians—a holiness not simply *like* the temple, but *of* the temple—has real, physical implications. As Joseph Fitzmyer asserts,

> What was true of the sanctity of the Jerusalem Temple must be true also of the Corinthian community. Whoever violates the community, violates what pertains to God, which is sacrilege. The Corinthian community is also "sacred," because the Spirit of God dwells within it (3:16). As "the temple of God," its sacred character must be respected.[257]

Such a view is only possible because Paul deems the Corinthian gentiles to be "holy" and, therefore, no longer *profane* (cf. 1 Cor 1.2, 30; 3.17; 6.1–2, 11, 19; 7.14, 34; 12.3; 14.33; 16.1; 15,

---

[255] Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, *1 Corinthians*, NTM 10 (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, Inc., 1982), 27.

[256] In reference to Matt 16.18, even though the gates of hell cannot prevail against the church at large, Barrett writes, "Paul is thinking of a local manifestation of God's temple, a local church: and it is a matter of fact that local churches have, under various pressures, including that of heresy, gone out of existence…" (*A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 91). However, assessing parallel usage regarding a pagan temple in Arcadian Tegea, Jay Shanor argues that the use of φθείρω need not indicate permanent destruction: "a contractor found guilty of damaging a part of the completed temple was subject to a fine. It seems more consistent, in the context, to number this latter worker *among* the builders, yet one who has been found guilty of damaging the temple upon which he has been employed to labour. This is certainly the understanding conveyed by equivalent statements in the secular contracts. In that realm, the fine for damaging existing parts of the temple was set in advance by the men issuing the contracts. In the spiritual realm, Paul simply states that if any man does harm to God's temple, God will do harm to him" ("Paul as Master Builder Construction Terms in First Corinthians," *NTS* 34.3 [1988]: 471). I favor Barrett's understanding that Paul has in mind transgression of "primitive conceptions of holiness." See Barrett, *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 92.

[257] Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 32 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), 203.

20).[258] The same consequences for breaching standards of holiness in these fledging, predominantly gentile communities are the same as those for breaching the holiness of the physical temple.[259] The Corinthians, whose factitiousness later occasions the post-apostolic letter of 1 Clement (95–97 CE),[260] are arguably among Paul's more troubled churches. N. T. Wright notes the absurdity of referring to this community as ναὸς θεοῦ given their moral failings. This designation Paul gives

> not to the Philippians he loved so much, not to the Thessalonians in the midst of their suffering and danger, but precisely to the recalcitrant, muddled, problem-ridden Corinthians. This is not, in other words, a sober judgment based on the noticeable holiness, gospel-inspired love or joy, of this or that *ekklēsia*. It is simply, for Paul, a fact: the living God, who had said he would put his name in the great house in Jerusalem, has put that name upon and within these little, surprised communities, dotted about the world of the north-eastern Mediterranean."[261]

Conclusion

Using Mason's framework for a reading of Paul as he presented himself in his letters, I set out to establish Paul's thoughts pertaining to the temple in Jerusalem from the few explicit references as well as his temple imagery. It is clear that Paul felt it a useful reference to make to the Corinthians

[258] Margaret Mitchell's position that 1 Cor 3.17 does not speak to temple defilement, but rather a secular, political breakdown by factionalism, is therefore unsatisfactory. See Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians* (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993), 103. As Erich Fascher states, the real threat of destruction leaves "no confusion" (*Der Erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther: Einführung und Auslegung der Kapitel 1–7*, THKNT 7.1 [Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1975], 139).

[259] With regard to NT usage, Otto Procksch and Karl Georg Kuhn argue that holiness is to be thought of "not as צֶדֶק== δικαιοσύνη, but as טָהֳרָה== purity (Lv. 13:7; 14:23; Ez. 44:23), so that the cultic element is not lost." The opposite of this moral state, they write, is ἀκαθαρσία, which is revealed particularly in the sexual behavior of the gentile world: "These passages show us again that, whether under Hellenistic influence or not, the reference of holiness is always to the static morality of innocence rather than to ethical action. But this static morality is closely linked with cultic qualification. For this reason we should never translate ἁγιότης or ἅγιος as morality or moral, since this is to lose the element of the *religiosum*" (Procksch and Kuhn, "ἁγιος," *TDNT* 1:108–9).

[260] See Michael W. Holmes, *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1999), 23.

[261] N. T. Wright, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2013), 1:355.

for an understanding of his work among the nations, likening his gospel service and their participation in the Lord's supper to cultic activity in Jerusalem. From Rom 9.4, we saw that Paul values the historic gift of ancient Israel "worship" or "temple service" (λατρεία). Yet, in following Mason's directive to "distinguish rhetoric from true beliefs", we should be careful to take this praise as unequivocal support for the Jerusalem cult in Paul's time given the rhetorical moves Paul makes throughout Romans, let alone in chs. 9–11. Working from the known to the unknown, though Paul nowhere expresses explicit rejection of the Jerusalem cult, the combination of likening his ministry to the temple service and the ways in which he speaks of the Corinthians as ναὸς θεοῦ lead to the conclusion that Paul believed Jerusalem temple ritual to be inapplicable and unnecessary for his gentiles-in-Christ beyond a source for his imagery.

CHAPTER FOUR

PAUL IN THE TEMPLE:

QUESTIONS OF ATTENDANCE, ACCESS & INCLUSION

Introduction

When the author of Acts addresses the controversy of Paul's teaching, he definitively rejects the notion that Paul preaches "against the people, the law, and this place [i.e., the temple]" (Acts 21.28), including the claim that Paul wanted to bring non-Judaeans beyond their designated area in the temple complex. Though we surveyed no explicit criticism of the temple in the previous chapter, surely the exclusionary layout of the temple complex would have been bothersome to Paul, not to mention his total subservience to the request of James (Acts 21.23–24; cf. Gal 2.6). Acts' account of the allegations of heresy against Paul, his temple attendance, and arrest may have been construed in such a way as to dampen the controversy of Paul's view on Judaean custom, apparent even in his own writings.

In this chapter, I trace different views regarding the status of gentiles throughout ancient Israel and the Second Temple period in relation to the Jerusalem temple, focusing particularly on the place of the *gēr* ("resident alien"). Access for gentiles would be restricted not because of purity regulations but because of a profane (i.e., unholy) status. However, some gentiles were known to have worshipped at the temple and to have sent money to it. After all, the outer court or "Court of the Gentiles" was one of several courts added to the temple complex. Even for those who did not convert fully, voluntary oblations to the God of Israel were still possible. In this chapter, I consider

the background to gentile temple attendance in Jerusalem, and how these circumstances might inform Paul's expectations for the Corinthian believers.

The Jerusalem Temple

Pilgrimage

Accounts of widespread temple attendance come to us primarily from Philo, Josephus, and the author of Luke-Acts. In particular, Jerusalem pilgrimage plays a constitutive role in Luke's biographies of Jesus and the early movement, as Maren Niehoff observes: "Its narrative function is rather similar to that of the pilgrimage Philo imagines in the *Exposition*, where the Jerusalem Temple is a central aspect of Jewish identity."[262] For Philo, discussion of Jerusalem temple devotion picks up following his embassy to Gaius in 40 CE whilst before he was predominantly concerned with notions of a cosmic temple.[263] Philo is the first author in post-biblical times not just to describe pilgrimage to Jerusalem, but to make it central to his understanding of Judaean tradition. In this way, as Niehoff writes, Philo "plays an active role in shaping the discursive reality of the Temple."[264] Philo's emphasis on pilgrimage fits with the biblical mandate for males to go

[262] Maren R. Niehoff, *Philo of Alexandria: An Intellectual Biography* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2018), 168.

[263] Per the timeline of his works suggested by Niehoff in *Philo of Alexandria*, 245–46. In his earlier writings, Philo interprets the Jerusalem temple in a largely philosophical manner. However, following his involvement in the Judaean embassy from Alexandria to the emperor Gaius in Rome, there is an observable shift in Philo's writings from the transcendental Platonism of his earlier years to Roman Stoicism (Niehoff, *Philo of Alexandria*, 165). Prior to Niehoff, Stoicism in Philo had been observed to varying degrees. See, e.g., Audrey N. M. Rich, "The Platonic Ideas as the Thought of God," *Mnemosyne* 7 (1954): 123–33; and Christopher Gill, "The School in the Roman Imperial Period," in *The Cambridge Companion to the Stoics*, ed. Brad Inwood (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 55). This shift influences the way in which Philo treats the temple in Jerusalem, as Niehoff explains: "On Platonist views, god is too transcendent to be involved in the specifics of the world and humanity. The Stoics, by contrast, adopted a more immanent notion of the deity and identified a divine presence in their very lives and surroundings" (*Philo of Alexandria*, 74). In this regard, Philo couples Stoic sentiment with the exclusivity Judaean religion.

[264] Niehoff, *Philo of Alexandria*, 167. To be sure, lofty conceptions of a greater temple still linger in Philo's writings. For example, Philo writes that "The highest, and in the truest sense the holy, temple of God is, as we must believe, the whole universe, having for its sanctuary the most sacred part of all existence, even heaven, for its votive ornaments the stars, for its priests the angels who are servitors to His powers, unbodied souls, not compounds of

up to Jerusalem three times a year for the major feasts (Exod 23.14, 17; 34.23; Deut 16.16; cf. Tob 1.6). Only once though does Philo mention making pilgrimage to Jerusalem himself (*Prov.* 2.64).[265] The idealistic expectation of going up to Jerusalem three times a year, therefore, may not have been realistic, especially for Judaeans less capable than Philo. Furthermore, as an Egyptian Judaean, Philo would have written whilst aware of the standing temple of Onias at Leontopolis, run by the priestly family ousted under Seleucid rule.[266]

In the first century CE, the temple in Jerusalem operated like other temples of the Graeco-Roman world as an economic hub. Animals would have been in high demand during the festivals in Jerusalem if Josephus' estimation of the number of lambs (256,500) slaughtered at Passover is even somewhat accurate (*J.W.* 6.424).[267] The sale of animals alone, not to mention the ancillary commerce from travelers, would have been quite lucrative for the regional economy.[268] It has been

---

rational and irrational nature, as ours are, but with the irrational eliminated, all mind through and through, pure intelligences, in the likeness of the monad" (*Spec*. 1.66–67 [Colson, LCL]). Philo is quick to mention, however, "the temple made by hands," and that there is only one: "But he provided that there should not be temples built either in many places or many in the same place, for he judged that since God is one, there should be also only one temple. Further, he does not consent to those who wish to perform the rites in their houses, but bids them rise up from the ends of the earth and come to this temple" (*Spec*. 1.67–68 [Colson, LCL]).

[265] Some have taken Philo's attestation to pilgrimage as evidence for its pervasiveness during the Second Temple period, while others have expressed suspicion at accounts of such widespread travel. See Joachim Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus*, trans. F. H. Cave and C. H. Cave (London: S.C.M. Press, 1969), 76–77; Lee I. Levine, *Jerusalem: Portrait of the City in the Second Temple Period (538 B.C.E.–70 C.E.)* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 2002), 249; and Shmuel Safrai, Yvonne Glikson and Semah Cecil Hyman, "Pilgrimage," in *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, eds. Fred Skolnik and Michael Berenbaum, vol. 16, 2nd ed. (Detroit: Macmillan; Keter Publishing House, 2007), 154.

[266] We know of other temples at Elephantine and Leontopolis in Egypt where cultic practices were carried out in the Second Temple period. See full discussion in Albert L. A. Hogeterp, *Paul and God's Temple: A Historical Interpretation of Cultic Imagery in the Corinthian Correspondence*, BTS 2 (Leuven: Peeters, 2006), 32–35. See also Seth Schwartz, *Imperialism and Jewish Society: 200 B.C.E. to 640 C.E.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009), 216–17. Furthermore, Elias Bickerman offers evidence of sacrifices offered by gentiles outside of Jerusalem with the help of Judaeans. See Bickerman, "The Altars of Gentiles: A Note on the Jewish 'Ius Sacrum'," in *Studies in Jewish and Christian History* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 596–617.

[267] See Neill Hamilton, who discusses the use of temples as bank, especially during the Hellenistic period in "Temple Cleansing and Temple Bank," *JBL* 83.4 (1964): 365–72. See also Beate Dignas, who discusses this phenomenon for the cults of Asia Minor in *Economy of the Sacred in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor*, Oxford Classical Monographs (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).

[268] See discussion in Joachim Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus*, trans. F. H. Cave and C. H. Cave (London: S.C.M. Press, 1969), 56.

estimated that Herod's temple complex could hold approximately 75,000 people.[269] Though there is possible evidence of various temple courts prior to Herod (cf. Neh 8.1; 12.44; 13.4–5, 7), and that he did not tamper with the dimensions of the temple proper, his expansion seems to have resulted in the accommodation of many non-Judaeans who attended as admirers in an outer court.[270]

However, there is no evidence of mass pilgrimage prior to Herod. Perhaps merely from silence, but no Greek or Latin author seems to write about Judaean pilgrimage before the mid-first century BCE. For example, the *Letter of Aristeas*, a mid-second century BCE writing, speaks glowingly about Jerusalem and the temple but never mentions pilgrimage.[271] This is curious since mass movements across international borders would have been noticeable in the late Hellenistic period, especially if Judaeans were coming from Alexandria (in Ptolemaic territory until 31 BCE) or Babylonia (in Parthian territory).[272] Martin Goodman cites Herod's architectural expansions as the beginning of significant international pilgrimage, writing,

> It seems likely that the pilgrimage feasts before Herod's time involved essentially only local Jews from the land of Israel; the vastly expanded Temple court which Herod was to build would eventually be filled to overflowing, but no source suggests a problem with lack of space in the Temple before then.[273]

---

[269] See Eric M. Meyers and James F. Strange, *Archaeology, the Rabbis, and Early Christianity: The Social and Historical Setting of Palestinian Judaism and Christianity* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1981), 52.

[270] See discussion in Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus*, 77. See description in Carol Meyers, "Temple, Jerusalem," *AYBD* 6:365.

[271] Martin Goodman, *Judaism in the Roman World: Collected Essays*, AGJU 66 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 62. See also Niehoff, *Philo of Alexandria*, 167.

[272] See Goodman, *Judaism in the Roman World*, 62.

[273] Goodman, *Judaism in the Roman World*, 62. An indication of significant pilgrimage in the period from Judaea's surrounding regions, at least, is apparent in the fears of Roman authorities concerning Judaean patriotism. There was at least some concern on the part of the Romans regarding the number of people who might rise up to defend Jerusalem and the temple. As James Rives explains, "the greatest physical embodiment of the people who revolted against Rome would have been the great crowds that filled Jerusalem during the major festivals, crowds that came not only from Judaea but also from Galilee, Peraea, and Idumaea. For someone like Vespasian, it was precisely through their participation in the Temple cult that the inhabitants of these various regions became, in a very physical sense, a single people. Consequently, it was only the abolition of the Temple cult that could unravel these strong

It appears then that steps were taken by Herod's administration to encourage pilgrimage to Jerusalem, and that his expansion of the temple complex was at least partly meant to generate commerce for those who could be convinced to make the journey to Jerusalem, whether Judaean or not.

Temple Tax

Emphasis on the one temple in Jerusalem would have been useful for the collection of a tax from homeland as well as diaspora Judaeans. It seems that this tax was reinstituted at the start of the Second Temple period to support services at the temple (Neh 10.32–33; cf. Exod 20.11–16). In *Ant.* 16.166–68, Josephus describes "sacred money" sent to the temple in Jerusalem as an "ancient custom". In 1 Baruch, Babylonian Judaeans are said to have sent money to Jerusalem for offerings, incense, and prayers on feast days on their behalf, as well as for King Nebuchadnezzar and his son Belshazzar (1.10–14). Though travel was difficult and rare, if not impossible for many, Richard Bauckham imagines the significance of the temple tax for diaspora Judaeans:

> Whether or not they could offer their own sacrifices by attending the temple, all Jews everywhere offered, in a sense, the daily burnt offerings every morning and evening, because these were paid for by the temple tax which all Jews paid and offered on behalf of Israel by the priests. The assiduity and enthusiasm with which Diaspora Jews paid their temple tax were not just because the temple tax was a symbolic expression of their allegiance to the religious centre of their nation; it was also actually the means by which the sacrifices offered in the temple enabled their own access to God. Also, of course, the ritual of the day of atonement effected atonement for all Jews without their having to be present. We should not underestimate the importance of the temple for Diaspora Jews even apart from pilgrimage to Jerusalem.[274]

---

physical connections and remove the basis for future revolts" ("Flavian Religious Policy and the Destruction of the Jerusalem Temple," in *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome*, eds. Jonathan Edmondson, Steve Mason, and James B. Rives [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005], 162). Regardless of the temple's destruction in 70 CE, Judaeans would continue to cause strife for the Romans in the Kitos War (115–117 CE) and the Bar Kokhba Revolt (132–136 CE), the latter of which gave rise to the hope of a rebuilt temple. See discussion in Naftali S. Cohn, *The Memory of the Temple and the Making of the Rabbis* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012), 95–103.

[274] Richard Bauckham, *The Jewish World around the New Testament: Collected Essays I*, ed. Jörg Frey, WUNT 233 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 183–84.

Whether or not this is an accurate sentiment to ascribe to all Judaeans everywhere in this period, Bauckham highlights that at least some, particularly those in diaspora contexts, were able to substitute other practices for actual temple attendance given their circumstances.

The Synagogue

Several studies speak to the use of temple symbolism in ancient synagogues as a possible substitution for temple attendance in diaspora contexts. The origin of the synagogue, however, is simply unknown, though a sixth-century BCE provenance during the Babylonian exile after the destruction of the first temple seems likely.[275] Shaye Cohen has criticized this theory as "plausible and attractive" but nevertheless "unsubstantiated and overly simplistic".[276] However, we must reckon with the lackluster response to Cyrus' edict in 538 BCE, which permitted exiles to return to the land. Whatever the reasons, many chose to remain in the Persian diaspora, for example, perhaps indicating that their religious needs were already being met without the temple.[277]

Nevertheless, the symbolic power of the temple did not die out, even in diaspora contexts at large. Steven Fine's study, *This Holy Place*, likens the appropriation of the temple ("templization") in synagogues to what we observe at Qumran, in the New Testament, and in the Tannaim.[278] Whereas the pilgrim to Jerusalem would have merely been a participant-observer at the temple, which necessarily involved only priests and Levites, the synagogue's architecture and

[275] See discussion in Eric M. Meyers, "Synagogue: Introductory Survey," *ABD* 6:252.

[276] Shaye J. D. Cohen, "The Temple and the Synagogue," in *The Cambridge History of Judaism*, eds. W. Horbury, W. Davies, and J. Sturdy (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 298.

[277] See Meyers, "Synagogue: Introductory Survey," *ABD* 6:252.

[278] Steven Fine, *This Holy Place: On the Sanctity of the Synagogue During the Greco-Roman Period* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 1997), 32, 55.

liturgy of reading and prayer would have been far more communal.[279] Though architectural styles differed (e.g., basilica, broadhouse, apsidal), common between them is the prominent place of the Torah shrine where scrolls for reading were kept.[280] Thomas Kraabel concludes from the archaeology of diaspora synagogues that, by the first century CE, "Diaspora Jews under Rome had learned to separate the symbols of Temple and Jerusalem from the physical building and the geographical location—thus they do not aid in the revolts—and that this spiritualization is a concomitant of their sense of being at home in the Diaspora."[281] Even if one maintains that the Corinthians were too far away from Jerusalem for temple attendance to be an issue, these predominantly gentile Christ assemblies still did not operate as diaspora expressions of Jerusalem worship in the same ways that synagogues did, and certainly could never be pilgrims in the fullest sense.[282]

The Temple in Luke-Acts

One of the ways in which the author of Luke-Acts seeks to promote *Christianoi* (Acts 11.26; 26.28) with his narratives is by means of his portrayal of earliest devotees' involvement in Jerusalem

[279] See also Steven Fine," Did the Synagogue Replace the Temple?" *BRev* 12.2 (1996). http://cojs.org/steven-fine-synagogue-replace-temple-bible-review-12-2-1996/.

[280] For example, see depictions of the temple and its worship surrounding the Torah shrine of the Dura Europos Synagogue in Cohn, *The Memory of the Temple and the Making of the Rabbis*, 97–101.

[281] A. Thomas Kraabel, "Social Systems of Six Diaspora Synagogues," in *Diaspora Jews and Judaism: Essays in Honor of, and in Dialogue with, A. Thomas Kraabel*, eds. A. Thomas Kraabel, J. Andrew Overman, and Robert S. MacLennan, SFSHJ 41 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 265.

[282] On the distance between Corinth and Jerusalem, see Eyal Regev, *The Temple in Early Christianity: Experiencing the Sacred* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2019), 89–90. See also Fredriksen, who writes that, "to a Gentile in the Diaspora, rejecting all sacrifice but the Jerusalem cult is little different from rejecting all sacrifice whatsoever" (*Paul: The Pagans' Apostle* [New Haven: Yale University Press, 2017], 154 n. 50). Elsewhere, Fredriksen imagines that "by assuming that single most socially obvious of Jewish behaviors—refusal to engage in public cult—these gentiles were acting as if they had 'become' Jews, when in fact they had not. Allegiance to the Jesus-assembly for the pagan god-fearer, in other words, required a much more radical form of Judaizing than the synagogue had ever requested, much less required" (*When Christians Were Jews: The First Generation* [New Haven: Yale University Press, 2018], 151).

temple life. The significance of the temple in Luke-Acts is apparent early on in Luke's Gospel. Jesus is seen engaging with teachers in the temple after his family's pilgrimage for Passover (Luke 2.41–49). The temple features in numerous scenes prior to Jesus' ministry, including Zacharias' exchange with an angelic messenger (1.8–23); Jesus' presentation in the temple and his encounters with Simon and Anna (2.22–38); and Jesus' temptation at the pinnacle of the temple which, inverted from Matthew, is the climax of the temptation scene (4.9). In Luke 18, it is in the temple that the prayers of the Pharisee and the tax collector are contrasted (vv. 9–14). Perhaps it is significant that Matthew mentions ostentatious prayer in the synagogue (6.2), while Luke addresses it as occurring in the temple (18.10).[283] After Jesus' temple-cleansing scene, Luke indicates that he continued teaching in the temple on a daily basis (19.45–20.1; 21.37–38; 22.53). Most conspicuously, the claim by (cf. John 2.19) or about (cf. Matt 26.61; 27.40; Mark 14.58; 15.29) Jesus that his body is the temple to be destroyed and rebuilt in three days is altogether absent in Luke.[284]

The end of Luke's Gospel sets the scene for how the Jesus movement will be portrayed in Acts. After Jesus' ascension, the disciples "returned to Jerusalem with great joy and were continually in the temple blessing God" (Luke 24.53). The temple serves as the first meeting place for the church according to Acts 2.46. It has even been suggested that the disciples were able to make use of a chamber in the temple for meetings (cf. Luke 24.53; Acts 1.13; 2.2).[285] The apostles

[283] See C. F. D. Moule, *The Birth of the New Testament*, BNTC (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1962), 13. Steve Mason suggests that "Luke's sources tell him that Jesus spent most of his career away from Jerusalem, in the villages of Galilee, and came down to the great city only in the final days of his life (cf. Mark 11:1; Matt 21:1). But Luke gets around this problem by regularly introducing Jerusalem into the narrative before its time" (*Josephus and the New Testament* [Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1992], 199).

[284] As we see at Jesus' trial in Matthew and Mark, false witnesses during Stephen's trial similarly testify that "we have heard him say that this Nazarene, Jesus, will destroy this place…" (Acts 6.14).

[285] See discussion in C. K. Barrett, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2004), 87.

go up to the temple at the designated hour of prayer (Acts 3.1), and in the temple complex they preach everyday (5.21, 42). Later, James encourages Paul to prove his allegiance to Mosaic law by joining four men under a vow in purification. In so doing, "all will know that there is nothing to the things reported about you, but that you yourself also are in observance, guarding the law" (21.24, 26; 24.18). Paul is earlier described as being under this vow of his own accord (18.18). Luke is quick to clear Paul of the charge brought against him by diaspora Judaeans from Asia Minor who allege that Paul has defiled the temple by bringing Greeks beyond their designated area (21.28–29; cf. 24.6, 12; 25.8).[286] In defense of his mission, Paul recounts a time of prayer in the temple when his calling to the gentiles was confirmed in a vision, presumably by Jesus himself (22.17).

It is important for Luke to establish the heritage of the Christian movement firmly within the traditions of Israel, and the temple is a narrative device that allows him to do so. Perhaps this is because Luke's Roman affinities shape his writing in ways than cannot be said for the other Gospels.[287] Luke must, as Steve Mason writes, "plant Jesus' life and Christian origins deeply

[286] In his reading of Paul's cultic metaphors in light of the Acts narrative, Friedrich Horn finds it doubtful that Paul actually sought temple access for gentiles beyond the outer court. Nonetheless, he concludes that Paul sought to position gentiles *positively* toward the temple in Jerusalem: "Jewish temple theology thrives on the exclusivity of the temple, which is expressed in the real exclusion of pagans and which, at the same time, exists in polemical antithesis to pagan temples under the accusation of εἰδωλολάτρια. This sheer exclusivity is broken by Paul by assigning Gentile Christians to the temple of God. The temple is probably still a Jewish boundary marker with respect to Gentiles, but at the same time it is growing into the role of an identity marker for Jews, Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians." [„Jüdische Tempeltheologie lebt von der Exklusivität des Tempels, die in der faktischen Ausgrenzung der Heiden zum Ausdruck kommt und die gleichzeitig in der polemischen Antithese zu heidnischen Tempeln unter dem Vorwurf der εἰδωλολάτρια besteht. Diese glatte Exklusivität wird von Paulus durchbrochen, indem er Heidenchristen dem Tempel Gottes zuordnet. Damit ist der Tempel wohl noch jüdischer boundary marker gegenüber den Heiden, er wächst aber doch zugleich in die Rolle eines identity marker für Juden, Judenchristen und Heidenchriste."] See Horn, "Paulus und der Herodianische Tempel," *NTS* 53 (2007): 203.

[287] On Luke's view toward a Roman audience, see discussion in Udo Schnelle, *The History and Theology of the New Testament Writings*, trans. M. Eugene Boring (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998), 247. See also François Bovon, *Luke 1: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1–9:50*, ed. Helmut Koester, trans. Christine M. Thomas, Donald S. Deer, and James E. Crouch, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002), 9; F. F. Bruce, *The Acts of the Apostles: The Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary*, 3rd rev. ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990), 24–25. See in-depth consideration in Craig S. Keener, *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary. Introduction and 1:1–2:47*, vol. 1

within the soil of Judaism. In his portrayal, Christianity is not in fact new but is the true descendant of the Jewish heritage."[288] This entails presenting the movement as borne from Israel's scriptures and institutions. As Naftali Cohn has observed in how the temple is remembered in early rabbinic discourse, so also for Christians up through the third century CE, "discourse about the Temple functioned to establish group identity, to maintain a link with tradition, and to confer authority on particular individuals, perspectives, and ritual practices. Among early Christians, Temple discourse was widespread and meaningful."[289] By the time of Luke's writing, the Christian movement seems distinct enough (at least from Luke's perspective) for him to isolate the trajectory of Jesus-followers in his retelling of history whilst also nestling their history within the context of Israel's traditions.[290]

(Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012), 423–34. Regarding the unity of the two works, see Henry J. Cadbury, *The Making of Luke-Acts* (London: S.P.C.K., 1958). For a *rethinking* of this unity, see the collection of essays in Andrew F. Gregory and C. Kavin Rowe, *Rethinking the Unity and Reception of Luke and Acts* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2010).

[288] Mason, *Josephus and the New Testament*, 199.

[289] Outside of the NT (Acts, Revelation, Hebrews, and the Gospels), Cohn also cites the *Protoevangelium of James*, the *Infancy Gospel of Thomas*, and the *Acts of Thomas*; traditions centering on the figure of James like *Apocryphon of James*, the *First Apocalypse of James*, the *Second Apocalypse of James*, and the section of the Pseudo-Clementine *Recognitions* often called the *Ascent of James*; as well as Barnabas, Justin Martyr, Hippolytus, Origen, and Irenaeus. To this list should be added Melito of Sardis as well. These authors "denigrated the Temple and saw no value in its actual practice. Yet even this negative discourse about the Temple was central to the construction of their own identity as 'Israel,' against the competing constructions espoused by those with whom they claim to have disputed." See Cohn, *The Memory of the Temple and the Making of the Rabbis*, 102–9.

[290] John A. T. Robinson in/famously favored much earlier dates for the NT in general and held that if Acts (and other NT writings) was a post-destruction writing then events in 70 CE would have been mentioned. See Robinson, *Redating the New Testament* (London: SCM Press LTD, 1976), 8–10. Using Jerusalem's destruction as well, Joseph Tyson advocates for a second-century CE date for Acts. The lack of reference to such destruction, Tyson holds, does not necessarily indicate that it was composed beforehand. Acts could equally have been composed long enough afterwards for a degree of calmness on the matter to set in, making the mention of it superfluous as a well-known historical event: "One might grant that if Acts had been written within a decade after the fall of Jerusalem and in conversation with Palestinian or diaspora Jews, lack of explicit reference would be surprising. If, however, a second-century date or a non-Palestinian provenance for Acts is plausible, this lack is much less surprising" (*Marcion and Luke-Acts: A Defining Struggle* [Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2006], 13). See also John Knox, *Marcion and the New Testament: An Essay in the Early History of the Canon* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press), 1942.

The author of Luke-Acts, however, seems to tread a delicate path between antiquity and compliance.[291] On one hand, he fixes the Christian movement within the heritage of Israel and, on the other, convinces outsiders that the movement poses no threat to Roman rule. François Bovon explains:

> Luke wants to attest to the truth of Christian faith and to quell Roman fears about the Christian mission. Luke is convinced that the gospel is politically innocuous; on the contrary, the ethical attitude of the Christians can only work to the advantage of their pagan neighbors. By emphasizing, with a mixture of naïveté and self-confidence, the interest of the authorities and upper classes for the message of Peter and, even more, of Paul, Luke advocates the social acceptance of the Christian church.[292]

Josephus is comparable in this regard. Mason writes of Josephus and Luke that they

> stand out from all other Hellenistic historians because they are both aliens, pleading with selected insiders for recognition of their causes. For this purpose, the points that they need to make are similar: they must show that their groups are worthy of respect because, contrary to first impressions, they are well established in remotest antiquity, possess enviable moral codes, and pose no threat to Roman order. In the event, both writers will lay claim to the great heritage of Judaism.[293]

Nevertheless, a closer reading shows that controversy surrounding the temple lurks beneath the surface of Luke's narratives.

For Josephus, he obviously has a Roman audience in mind given his location and patronage. Not only can he not afford to offend the imperial powers that be, but he also wants to

---

[291] For example, Rives shows that the Jerusalem temple could be as much a cause for worry as assurance, at least in Flavian Rome. Vespasian was not simply taking a precaution against further revolts in Judaea, "but hoping to eliminate the anomalous cult organization that made the Jews throughout the Roman world into a people with an alternative focus of loyalty and national identity ("Flavian Religious Policy and the Destruction of the Jerusalem Temple," 164). Without the temple in Jerusalem, Judaeans might better assimilate. They could have their own national customs, ancestral philosophy, and local ethnic associations, but there would no longer be a centralizing institution that competed for their allegiance. By destroying their temple, the hope was that Judaeans would pose less of a problem for Roman authorities.

[292] Bovon, *Luke 1*, 9.

[293] Mason, *Josephus and the New Testament*, 204. On the question of dependance between Josephus and Luke-Acts, see Mason, *Josephus and the New Testament*, 251–94. See also John Barclay on the deftness with which Josephus actually criticizes the Flavians in "The Empire Writes Back: Josephan Rhetoric in Flavian Rome," in *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome*, eds. Jonathan Edmondson, Steve Mason, and James Rives (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 315–32.

present Judaean traditions in the best possible light in spite of the revolt. Like Josephus, Luke likely wants to impress a Roman audience by showcasing not only the unity and orderliness of *Christianoi* but also that the movement is thoroughly steeped in antiquity as the rightful inheritors of Israel's traditions. Additionally, a presentation of earliest Christianity as participants in the Jerusalem cult would have helped to normalize the movement. These efforts to normalize their respective communities speak to the strength of traditional cultic value in Graeco-Roman society at large.

With his writings, Josephus sought to promote the reputation of the Judaeans to a predominantly Roman audience. Considering this intention, we must note where he accentuates aspects of Judaean history and tradition. Josephus artfully remains loyal to his new patrons whilst retaining pride as a Judaean in his retelling of the war with Rome. There is no doubt that Josephus highly regards the priesthood and temple service (cf. *Ag. Ap.* 2.22). He himself is supposedly of priestly descent (*Life* 1; *J.W.* 3.3). However, to accentuate such traits also endears Judaeans to his Roman audience. Josephus not only highlights those aspects which show the tradition to be a *national* religion, but also those which show it to be philosophical as well, as Steve Mason has noted:

> Most other known religions had an ethnic and geographical base.… As these traditions became known throughout the empire they attracted members from other nations, but they were still largely identified with their ethnic base. Each had its own temples and sacrificial rituals, which could be traced back to time immemorial. The philosophical schools, by contrast, originated with historical founders of the relatively recent past. Without temples or ethnic bases, they did not usually engage in sacrifice and worship but rather devoted themselves to study, teaching, and moral exhortation. Within this context, on the one hand, Judaism satisfied the normal criteria for a national religion: it had an ethnic and geographical center, with temple, priesthood, and sacrificial system. On the other hand, the earliest Greek observers of Judaism had noted its "philosophical" quality.[294]

[294] Mason, *Josephus and the New Testament*, 68–69. See also Craig Keener, who explains that "Because Christian meetings lacked sacrifices and emphasized moral instruction, outsiders might view them more as a combination of a philosophic school, patronal banquets and (less acceptably) a religious association than a religious

Though derided for their anti-social behavior, Judaeans' antiquity and cult were at least intelligible to onlookers. However, Christianity was put under even greater scrutiny for seeming to lack these qualities. In their rejection of traditional cultic participation, Christians were understood to be revolting against age-old institutions of the broader Graeco-Roman world.[295]

Though Luke presents the movement as temple observant, he also hints at challenges to its status. He does so at key points in the Acts narrative, principally through the speeches of Stephen and Paul (7.48; 17.24). Stephen, for example, is put on trial for "saying things against this holy place and the law" (6.13), of which Paul is likewise accused (21.28; 25.8). The very climax of Stephen's speech, before he turns to rebuking his audience, concerns the inadequacy of an earthly dwelling for the Most High God (7.44–50). Steve Walton explains this apparent oscillation between using the temple and challenging it in terms of the movement's evolution from a sect to a group with its own established practices:

> [I]n Acts we are seeing the process of change going on before our eyes. The stories in Acts represent, as it were, the cusp of the change from a localized view of God dwelling in the Temple to what we might call a universalized view, in which God is available, and reveals himself, anywhere and everywhere. Luke says implicitly what Paul or Hebrews or 1 Peter or John or Revelation say explicitly, but does not express their view outright because he is concerned to describe faithfully the historical process of development. Luke is not

cult. (Gentile religion emphasized ritual and sacrifice, not moral instruction.) But, given their aniconic monotheism, basis in Scripture, and teachings on sexual matters, they would view them most closely in relation to Jewish associations, that is, synagogues (cf. Acts 18:4–8; sometimes to the embarrassment of local synagogue communities, Acts 18:12–13)" (*1–2 Corinthians*, NCBC [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005], 5).

[295] The customs that set Judaeans apart regularly drew ire, as Tacitus details: "Whatever their origin, these rites are maintained by their antiquity: the other customs of the Jews are base and abominable, and owe their persistence to their depravity" (*Hist*. 5.5 [Moore; Jackson, LCL]). Christianity was put under even greater scrutiny for seeming to lack these qualities. In their rejection of traditional cultic participation, Christians were understood to be revolting against age-old institutions of the broader Graeco-Roman world. By the time of Celsus, the second-century CE philosopher and opponent of Christianity, Christians were widely known to "avoid setting up altars and images and temples". This fueled suspicion of them as an obscure and secretive society (*Cels*. 8.17). See Origen, *Origen: Contra Celsum*, trans. Henry Chadwick (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), 464. In this regard, Judaism garnered more respect from Celsus because of their cultic tradition (*Cels*. 5.44). Origen's rebuttal to Celsus reflects an even further developed spiritualization of cultic devotion similar to that of Hebrews. Origen writes that "He [Celsus] does not notice that our altars are the mind of each righteous man, from which true and intelligible incense with a sweet savour is sent up, prayers from a pure conscience" (*Cels*. 8.17 [Chadwick]).

> imposing his own, later, view on the material, but is presenting the period as carefully as he can in order to enable his readers to see where the Christian faith has come from (Luke 1:1–4) and how a Jew-plus-Gentile church has come into being from the followers of a Jewish Messiah.[296]

Luke straddles the line between writing an historical account of Christianity—with an emphasis on its firm grounding in the history and institutions of Israel—and perhaps what he believes to be the growing sentiment of the movement in his own time, that is, that judgment has been pronounced on *Ioudaioi* and their institutions and that a sacrificial cult is no longer warranted.

Paul in the Temple

According to Acts, Paul has no qualms about attending the temple and taking part in sacrificial ritual there, though in general the historicity of Acts in general has long been challenged.[297] Upon Paul's return to Jerusalem in Acts 21, he and his party are gladly received by James and the elders of the Jerusalem believers. There is mutual rejoicing at Paul's ministry "among the gentiles". It seems accepted, from the perspective of James and those in Jerusalem, that what was established at the council in Acts 15 is the extent of what Judaean believers will impose upon gentile believers (21.25; 15.29), though Galatians may challenge this (cf. Gal 2.12).[298] If, on the other hand, Judaean believers were pushing for greater conformity to Judaean custom among gentile believers than Acts lets on, perhaps pilgrimage was on the cards, so to speak, once they had assimilated by

[296] Steve Walton, "A Tale of Two Perspectives? The Place of the Temple in Acts," in *Heaven on Earth*, eds. T. Desmond Alexander and Simon Gathercole (Carlisle, UK: Paternoster Press, 2004), 149. R. J. McKelvey suggests that the devotion of the first Christians to the temple in Jerusalem was a "transitional phenomenon" (McKelvey, *The New Temple: The Church in the New Testament*, OTM [London: Oxford University Press, 1969], 85).

[297] To be discussed below.

[298] While Jürgen Roloff accepts this („Nichts deutet darauf hin, daß Jakobus sein früheres grundsätzliches Ja zur gesetzesfreien Heidenmission (15,19; Gal 2,9) und zur Kirchengemeinschaft mit den Heidenchristen zurückgenommen hätte"), C. K. Barrett points out the discrepancy with the influence otherwise from Judaean believers as recorded by Paul in Galatians. See Roloff *Die Apostelgeschichte*, NTD 5 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1981), 312; and C. K. Barrett, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2004), 1001.

circumcision (cf. Acts 15.1). The prophetic expectation of the nations streaming to Jerusalem, specifically, may actually have been the hope among Judaean Jesus-devotees advocating gentile conformity (cf. Isa 2.2–4; 66.20; Mic 4.1–5).[299]

It is Paul's message to fellow Judaeans, however, that gives cause for concern, particularly, among Christ-followers in Jerusalem who are described as "zealous for the law" (v. 20). It was reported to these that Paul had been actively attempting to turn diaspora Judaeans (i.e., those living "among the *ethnē*") from Moses' laws, which includes convincing them not to circumcise their sons, specifically, but in general to not walk in the traditional customs of Judaean religion at all.[300] Gerd Lüdemann finds it likely that,

> In any case, the accusation v. 21 had a basis in what was at least partly going on in Pauline communities. It is true that nowhere in Paul's surviving letters is there a statement corresponding to the accusation in Acts 21.21. However, the facts presented in v. 21 were possible consequences for Jews living in the Pauline communities. If the Torah was at best provisional to the new creation in Christ (1 Cor 7.19; Gal 6.15), it was inevitable that as a result of such a practice, born Jews would be alienated from the law and their children would no longer be circumcised… V. 21 therefore gives historically reliable information about the possible consequences of Paul's preaching and practice among Jews and about the reservations of the Jerusalem community towards Paul.[301]

---

[299] On the identity of Paul's opponents in Galatia, see discussion in Matthew Thiessen, *Paul and the Gentile Problem* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 76 and 76 n. 12. See also Fredriksen, with whom I agree against arguments that, to our knowledge, "ancient Jews embarked on missions to turn pagans into Jews. The only firm evidence we have for such a mission is that of Paul's apostolic opponents, mid-first century, in Galatia. In that singular instance, the motives for that mission stemmed from dynamics internal to the Jesus movement itself: the mission does not reflect a standard and widespread Jewish behavior" (*Paul: The Pagans' Apostle*, 76).

[300] Pervo cautions that "Extremes are best avoided," concluding that "It is probably safest to say that Paul did not generally encourage Jewish believers to have their sons circumcised." See Richard I. Pervo, *Acts: A Commentary*, ed. Harold W. Attridge, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2009), 544 n. 28. See also discussion in Stephen G. Wilson, *Luke and the Law*, SNTSMS 50 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 101–2.

[301] „Jedenfalls hatte der Vorwurf V. 21 einen Anhalt in dem, was in paulinischen Gemeinden zumindest teilweise vor sich ging. Zwar findet sich nirgendwo in den erhaltenen Briefen des Paulus eine dem Vorwurf von Apg 21,21 entsprechende Aussage. Doch waren die V. 21 dargelegten Sachverhalte mögliche Folgen für Juden, die in den paulinischen Gemeinden lebten. Wenn die Tora gegenüber der neuen Schöpfung in Christus bestenfalls vorläufig war (1Kor 7,19; Gal 6,15), konnte es nicht ausbleiben, daß geborene Juden in der Folge einer solchen Praxis vom Gesetz entfremdet wurden und ihre Kinder nicht mehr beschnitten (vgl. m. R. Hengel 1985: 97). V. 21 gibt daher eine historisch zuverlässige Information über die möglichen Folgen der paulinischen Predigt sowie Praxis unter Juden und über die Vorbehalte der Jerusalemer Gemeinde gegenüber Paulus wieder" (Gerd Lüdemann, *Das Frühe Christentum Nach Den Traditionen Der Apostelgeschichte: Ein Kommentar* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987], 244–45).

Without giving Paul the agency to respond though, James implies that he knows these reports to be false.

James' plan to convince these zealous, Christ-following Judaeans otherwise goes a step further than his own attendance, showing not just that Paul himself has not abandoned these customs (cf. Acts 18.18), but that he supports fellow Judaeans in the ancestral ways. Paul is instructed to undergo a rite of purification with four men who are "under a vow". Additionally, Paul is to give the amount necessary for the sacrifices required to end their vow and shave their heads.[302] The vow described here is a "nazirite" vow, as detailed in Num 6.1–21.[303] Paul is described as under the same vow of his own accord in Acts 18.18. In this instance, Paul subjects himself to the vow for seven days (21.27), though for the other men it has been longer. According to Numbers 6, the vow (for men and women[304]) involved abstention from any grape- and vinegar-based drink;[305] letting the hair of one's head grow without cutting it; and keeping distance from any human corpse. Following the completion of one's vow, certain animals and food goods are to be offered, which include a one-year-old male lamb and a one-year-old ewe, both unblemished, for purification; a ram unblemished for an offering of well-being; and accompanying grain and

[302] Barrett speculates that this is how Paul's collection for the Jerusalem believers (Rom 15.31; 2 Cor 8.4; 9.1, 12–13) was spent: "James, having received the money, announced, perhaps with excellent intention, perhaps to Paul's dismay, 'We shall use part of this gift to pay the expenses of our four poor Nazirite brothers, and will do so in your name, so as to still the rumours that you no longer care for the ancestral religion and observe the Law.' If this happened Paul could hardly complain; the gift was presumably given with no strings attached to it, and it was true that he understood the Gospel as the fulfilment of God's promise to his people and was prepared on occasion to act 'as if he were a Jew' (1 Cor. 9:20)" (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*, 1001).

[303] See also Judg 13.4–18; 1 Sam 1.10–23; Amos 2.11–12; 1 Macc 3.49; Josephus, *Ant*. 4.72; 19.293–94; and *m. Naz*. 4.7.

[304] See Josephus, *War* 2.313.

[305] From נָזִיר, to "separate oneself." See G. Mayer, "נָזִיר," *TDOT* 9:307–11.

drink offerings (Num 6.15; cf. 15.1–10; Lev 2.4–13).[306] After the priestly presentation of these items for offering, the nazirite shaves/cuts their hair and places it on the altar under the ram offered. The nazirite continues in the ceremony by having part of the boiled ram and some of the grain offerings placed in their hands by the priest, but then the priest is said to elevate them as a wave offering before consuming as part of his priestly due. For Paul, this would have been an involved and expensive ritual to undertake, especially if he covered the costs for four others.[307] In this way, Paul is seen in total support of the temple establishment, not decrying it.[308]

The author of Acts has carefully crafted this encounter to clarify several controversies surrounding Paul's ministry by emphasizing that: 1) Paul's ministry concerns the gentiles, not Judaeans; 2) Paul does not teach Judaean, Palestinian or diaspora, to abandon Moses, circumcision, or any traditional custom; and 3) Paul himself "observes and guards the law". When confronted with the question of his allegiance to Judaean custom, Paul is directed to disprove such allegations by partaking in temple ritual. This indicates, at least from Luke's perspective, that devotion at the temple would be the ultimate means by which questions of allegiance would be appeased, that is, of one's Judaean-*ness*.

In the end, their efforts to persuade the zealous believers in Jerusalem backfires. Two important details should be noted. First, Paul is apprehended not by these zealous believers, but by *Ioudaioi* from Asia Minor (cf. Acts 16.6), like those in the diaspora he is accused of misleading.

---

[306] That is, "a basket of unleavened bread, cakes of choice flour mixed with oil and unleavened wafers spread with oil, with their grain offering and their drink offerings" (Num 6.15 NRSV).

[307] Cf. *m. Naz*. 4.7.

[308] It is unlikely that Luke would have Paul engage in temple ritual in a disingenuous fashion. As Kavin Rowe observes, "Hermeneutically, it is crucial to understand that, for Luke, Paul is a 'reliable' character; indeed, he is the human protagonist of much of Acts" (*World Upside Down: Reading Acts in the Graeco-Roman Age* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009], 80).

Second, he is apprehended not because of his reputation for misleading diaspora Judaeans, but for allegedly trying to bring Greeks beyond their designated area in the temple complex (Acts 21.28).

Gentiles and the Temple

As noted, the outer court or "Court of the Gentiles" was one of several courts attached to the Herodian temple and functioned as the area where sacrificial animals were sold and bought.[309] Josephus describes a partition between this court and the inner sanctuary (*J.W.* 5.193).[310] Altogether, he describes four courts that make up the temple complex:

> All who ever saw our temple are aware of the general design of the building, and the inviolable barriers which preserved its sanctity. It had four surrounding courts, each with its special statutory restrictions. The outer court was open to all, foreigners included; women during their impurity were alone refused admission. To the second court all Jews were admitted and, when uncontaminated by any defilement, their wives; to the third male Jews, if clean and purified; to the fourth the priests robed in their priestly vestments. (*Ag. Ap.* 2.104 [Thackeray, LCL])

Those of foreign birth (*allogenēs*) were forbidden to enter the temple beyond the outer court. The inner courts were elevated by fourteen steps from this outer court with signs warning non-Judaeans not to progress further (*J.W.* 5.193–95; 6.125; *Ant.* 12:145; 15:417).[311] Two of these have been discovered.[312] Elias Bickerman offers the following translation: "No alien may enter within the balustrade around the sanctuary and the enclosure. Whoever is caught, on himself shall he put blame for the death which will ensue."[313] We also know from Josephus that the Romans permitted

---

[309] It was the site of Jesus' temple cleansing (Matt 21.12–17; Mark 11.15–19; Luke 19.45–48; John 2.13–22).

[310] The "Court of the Gentiles" as a designation is not found in Josephus, the New Testament, or m. Middoth. See Clyde Weber Votaw," The Temple at Jerusalem in Jesus' Day," *BW* 23.3 (1904): 176. Revelation, however, does refer to "the court outside the temple … given to the gentiles" (11.2).

[311] See also Philo, *Legat.* 212; m. Mid. 2.3; m. Kelim 1.8; cf. Eph 2.14.

[312] Μηθένα ἀλλογενῆ εἰσπορεύεσθαι ἐντὸς τοῦ περὶ τὸ ἱερὸν τρυφάκτου καὶ περιβόλου. Ὃς δ᾽ἂν ληφθῇ, ἑαυτῶι αἴτιος ἔσται διὰ τὸ ἐξακολουθεῖν θάνατον. Originally published in Charles Clermont-Ganneau, "Une stèle du temple de Jérusalem," *RAr* 23 (1872): 214–34. See also Dittenberger, *OGIS* 2:598.

[313] Elias J. Bickerman, "The Warning Inscriptions of Herod's Temple," *JQR* 37.4 (1947): 388.

Judaeans to execute anyone who entered the inner sanctuary, even a Roman citizen (*J.W.* 6.126). While the use of dividers was common in ancient cults, to protect the holy from the profane in temple areas, Bickerman notes that exclusion on the grounds of being an "alien" or "stranger" would have been unusual elsewhere during the Augustan age.[314]

It seems though that the impurity of non-Judaeans was not the issue, as such impurity was generally not considered contagious. Paula Fredriksen has argued that pagans, according to at least some Judaeans, were not considered *intrinsically* impure but rather *functionally* impure, "made such by their enduring attachment to idols (not to mention their habitual indulgence in the various forms of πορνεία that invariably accompany idolatry in Jewish anti-pagan rhetoric, e.g., Rom 1.18–32)."[315] Rather, standards of ritual impurity were thought to be inapplicable to the unconverted gentile because of their status as *profane*. Klawans maintains, though, that non-Judaeans were indeed thought to be inherently profane, as opposed to the inherent holiness of Israel,[316] and that it was for this reason gentiles were excluded from the temple in Jerusalem. As Bickerman puts it, "The pagan visitor of the Temple … was shut out not because his hands or heart were unclean but because he was an alien."[317] Gentiles, though technically not ritually impure, could still threaten the purity of the sanctuary by their being profane. For example,

> [W]omen, whether ritually impure or not, are excluded from entry beyond the court reserved for them. Women and Gentiles, as well as impaired priests, are excluded not because they are impure, but because they are of a lower, and more profane, status. If Gentiles were considered ritually impure, we would expect them to defile in and out of the Temple, because there is no category of ritual impurity that results only in an exclusion from the Temple. In addition, we would expect there to be some purification ritual they

[314] Bickerman, "The Warning Inscriptions of Herod's Temple," 390–94.

[315] Paula Fredriksen, "Judaizing the Nations: The Ritual Demands of Paul's Gospel," *NTS* 56 (2010): 246.

[316] Jonathan Klawans, "Notions of Gentile Impurity in Ancient Judaism," *AJSR* 20.2 (1995): 292.

[317] Bickerman, "The Warning Inscriptions of Herod's Temple," 390. See E. P. Sanders, who considers ritual impurity to be the reason for gentile exclusion from the temple (Sanders, *Judaism: Practice and Belief, 63 BCE–66 CE* [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2016], 111–18). Cf. discussion in Alon, who contends that gentiles were largely exempt from matters of ritual purity. See Alon, *Jews, Judaism, and the Classical World*, 146–89.

> could perform, in order to rid themselves of ritual impurity. Gentiles were excluded from the Temple not because they were impure, but because they were profane.[318]

In this sense, profaneness runs deeper than impurity. Therefore, measures were taken to clearly demarcate the boundaries which were not to be crossed.[319]

Nonetheless, gentiles were known to have worshipped at the Jerusalem temple and sent money to it, though the level of devotion of these individuals can be difficult to classify. They might be an enlightened and benevolent monarch, general, or dignitary, or simply a private citizen, as Shaye Cohen explains.[320] Josephus mentions gentiles who would come from beyond the Euphrates for veneration at the temple but could not fully partake because "Moses had forbidden this to any of those not governed by our laws nor affiliated through the customs of their fathers to ourselves" (*Ant*. 3.15.3 [Thackeray, LCL]). While the uncircumcised could not enter the holy courts of the temple, this did not stop some gentiles from travelling to or patronizing the temple in the Second Temple period.

Even for those who did not convert, voluntary oblations to the God of Israel were still possible, at least according to the Mishnah. Two kinds of sacrifices could be offered by gentiles: the holocaust (*'olah*) and peace-offerings (*shelamim*), which were eaten before the Lord.[321]

> Anything which is vowed or given as a freewill offering do they accept from them. Anything which is not vowed or given as a freewill offering do they not accept from them.

---

[318] Klawans, "Notions of Gentile Impurity in Ancient Judaism," 298. On the disqualification of priests, see Lev 22.4–7. Consider also the profanation of tools used for constructing the altar (Exod 20.24) as well as the eating of the peace offering (Lev 19.5–8) (Klawans, "Notions of Gentile Impurity in Ancient Judaism," 292). In *11QTemple*, Qumran forbade, at the very least, first-generation proselytes temple access and perhaps even to the third generation. See discussion in Joseph M. Baumgarten, "Exclusions from the Temple: Proselytes and Agrippa I," *JJS* 33.1–2 (1982): 215–25.

[319] On the "dividing wall of the barrier" in Eph 2.14, which Christ breaks down between Judaean and gentile, see discussion Andrew T. Lincoln, *Ephesians*, WBC 42 (Dallas: Word, Inc., 1990), 141.

[320] See classifications in Shaye Cohen, "Crossing the Boundary and Becoming a Jew," *HTR* 82 (1989): 13–33.

[321] See Elias Bickerman, "The Altars of Gentiles: A Note on the Jewish 'Ius Sacrum'," in *Studies in Jewish and Christian History*, vol. 2 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 596.

> And so is the matter explained by Ezra, since it is said, *You have nothing to do with us to build a house unto our God* [Ezra 4.3]. (m. Šeqal. 1.5e–g [Neusner])

The obligatory offerings, however, were accepted only by Judaeans and presumably proselytes at the designated times. This mishnaic prescription corresponds to what is known about the place of the *gēr* in the cultic practice of ancient Israel as more than a mere observer at the temple.

Resident Aliens in Ancient Israel

A *gēr* ("resident alien") was someone who had taken up permanent residence in Israel, physically and ritually. In contrast to foreigners who might simply be passing through or temporarily dwelling in Israel, these were peoples who had joined themselves to Israel in a religious sense.[322] Upon circumcision, the *gēr* in ancient Israel could offer the sacrifices reserved for Israel if the proper prescriptions were followed (cf. Num 9.14; 15.14–16; cf. Lev 22.18). However, participation was not mandatory as it was for the native Israelite (Num 9.13).

By means of their circumcision, the *gēr* seems to have occupied an intermediate position between a native (*'ezrach*) and a foreigner (*nokhrî*).[323] Jacob Milgrom has argued that the injunction, "there shall be one law for you and the *gēr*" (Exod 12.48–49; Lev 7.7; 24.22; Num 9.14; 15.15, 29–30), is not a generalization, and that it applied only in specific cases.[324] Though joined to Israel, it seems that distinction still lingered between the *gēr* and the native in many contexts. At times, different Hebrew Bible sources have divergent views on the same issue.[325]

---

[322] The Septuagint translates the Hebrew *gēr* (גֵּר) with the Greek *prosēlytos* (προσήλυτος) in those instances (77 times) where there was a religious connotation (as opposed to ξένος and πάροικος elsewhere). See Paul F. Stuehrenberg, "Proselyte," *ABD* 5:503.

[323] See Diether Kellermann, "גּוּר," *TDOT* 2.443.

[324] Jacob Milgrom, "Religious Conversion and the Revolt Model for the Formation of Israel," *JBL* 101.2 (1982): 170.

[325] For example, the eating of *nebelah* (cf. Deut 14.21; Lev 17.15). Also, different from what we read in D (Deut 16.14), the *gēr* is not explicitly invited to participate in the Feast of Booths in Leviticus 23.

In a positive sense, native Israel was commanded to be just toward *gērîm* since they were often associated with those in need (Lev 19.10; 23.22). Such an ethic was derived from Israel's past in Egypt as strangers themselves (Exod 22.20; 23.9; Lev 19.34; Deut 10.18–19; 23.7; 24.17–22). The *gēr* is routinely associated with defenseless widows and orphans as well as Levites (Deut 26.11–13),[326] in addition to little ones, wives, and servants as opposed to chiefs, tribes, elders, officers and, in general, "all the men of Israel" (Deut 29.10–11; cf. Josh 8.35; 2 Chron 2.17–18). Conversely, how the *gēr* was to be treated even served as a model for how the destitute native should be treated (Lev 25.35).

According to the Deuteronomistic source (D), the *gēr* was understood as inferior to the native by nature. Economic ascendancy of the *gēr* over the native was seen as consequence for disobedience on the part of the native Israelite (Deut 28.43). The Deuteronomic notion of holiness has more of a national aspect since Israel alone belongs to God and is holy by virtue of God's election (Deut 14.2). Holiness then is bestowed on every Israelite at the outset. This rationale in Deuteronomy is contrasted with the practices of foreign peoples, which Israel must avoid (Deut 7.6; 14.2, 21).

In the Priestly view (P), however, only by constant physical purification and sanctification could holiness be achieved. Physical proximity to the divine presence as represented in the cult is crucial. This holiness is contingent upon the preservation of that proximity through ritual means. Priests, especially, must observe certain regulations because of their physical proximity to the presence of God.[327] We see the different applications of these ideas when the *gēr* comes into view.

[326] This grouping is seen in prophetic literature as well (cf. Jer 7.6; 22.3; Ezek 22.7, 29; Zech 7.10; Mal 3.5).

[327] See discussion in Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972), 226–27.

For P, because the western side of the Jordan is the land of God's tabernacle (Josh 22.19), all the inhabitants of the land regardless of status or ethnic affiliation are subject to the sacral code. Moshe Weinfeld explains that

> Residence in the land is deemed to be an automatic recognition of the god of the country on the part of the resident and thus also entails the obligation to worship him (cf. 2 Kgs. 17); conversely an Israelite who resides outside the land of Yahweh is deemed to dwell in an unclean land and be the worshipper of foreign gods (1 Sam. 26:19; and cf. Josh. 22:16–19 = P). The resident alien and the native Israelite, therefore, both draw their sustenance from a common sacral source and both are consequently required to observe the code of holiness that it entails.[328]

This is not the case according to D. Although able to enjoy protection, as well as political and economic rights as natives, the *gēr* is never considered a true Israelite by blood and race. For this reason, the *gēr* is not required to observe the sacral obligations which are required of the holy people.[329]

It is increasingly held, however, that a distinct stratum exists within P composed by a "Holiness School" (HS or H). This school made steps to include aliens among Israel in response to an influx of immigrants as well as prophetic criticism.[330] There, the *gēr* becomes a more integrated proselyte as opposed to the *gēr* in P elsewhere (i.e., "Priestly Torah" or PT).[331] The

---

[328] Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, 229.

[329] Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, 229–30.

[330] At the time of HS's origin, there was perhaps a massive influx of foreign cults into Judaea and Israel. In addition to the incursion of idolatrous practices into Israel (especially Molech worship, soothsaying, and conjuring of spirits), social injustices would have been rampant. In light of these phenomena, it is argued, there was a disregard for morality on the part of the cult. See Israel Knohl, *The Sanctuary of Silence: The Priestly Torah and the Holiness School* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995), 222–23. Knohl cites other social factors such as wars with the Arameans and the resulting social and economic polarization; the rise of the Assyrian empire and the incursion of Aramaic-Assyrian culture; the destruction of the northern kingdom of Samaria; the exile of Israel to Assyria; and Sennacherib's war against Judah were geopolitical factors (205). Additionally, many of inhabitants of the northern kingdom migrated to Jerusalem after its destruction in 722 BCE, bringing their spiritual heritage along with them. These experiences, Knohl proposes, "drew the Jerusalem priesthood out of the shelter of the Temple and stimulated forces of renewal and creativity to resolve the immediate crises" (223).

[331] Prior to Knohl's research, it was assumed that the *gēr* was a proselyte and therefore a full Israelite in P, though with some exceptions, in major works such as A. Bertholet, *Die Stellung der Israeliten und der Juden zu den Fremden* (Freiburg: J. C. B. Mohr, 1896); and Morton Smith, *Palestinian Parties and Politics That Shaped the Old Testament* (New York: Columbia University, 1971), 178–82.

primary innovation of HS was the infusion of holiness with moral content, and the application of holiness to the entire community of Israel as well as to the land.[332]

Regarding the place of foreigners in prophetic writings, their precise status is unclear.[333] Terence Donaldson suggests that, while full adherence to the Mosaic covenant may not have been a part of the original intention of these texts, such an interpretation could easily have been made by later readers. The status of those who gather to Zion is indeed ambiguous in some texts (cf. Zech 8.21; Jer 3.17; Zeph 3.9), while others could easily indicate to a later reader that Torah observance and full covenant participation on the part of gentiles was to be expected.

> [I]n Isa. 56.6–8, every Gentile who 'holds fast to my covenant' is a full participant in the worship at YHWH's holy mountain; in Isa. 66.21, it is probably from the gathered nations who have come to see his glory (vv. 18–20) that YHWH chooses priests and Levites; in Zech. 2.11, the nations who 'join themselves to YHWH in that day' shall be considered '[YHWH's] people'; and in Zech. 14.16–19, they are enjoined to keep the Feast of Booths annually.[334]

In Isa 2.2–4 and Mic 4.1–3, "all the nations" gather to the mountain of the Lord to learn "the ways of the God of Jacob". These "ways" appear to be the content of Torah that shall go forth from Zion into all the world. In deutero-Isaiah, the servant of the Lord is to bring "his Torah" to the coastlands (42.4), a role fulfilled by the Lord in 51.4.[335]

---

[332] In HS, the land is personified as a pure, living body, which vomits in reaction to impurity: "so that the land will not vomit you out of it for defiling it, as it vomited out the nation which was before you" (Lev 18.28; cf. 20.22).

[333] See R. N. Whybray, who notes that "Most commentators see here a commission to convert the nations to the worship of Yahweh. But in 51:4, where the similar phrase 'a light to the peoples' occurs, it is associated with God's expressed will (*tôrah*) and universal rule (*mišpāṭ*). The two lines therefore probably mean that the nations of the world will be obliged to accept Yahweh's sovereignty, of which they will now become aware for the first time (hence a light), and will thus be forced to accept the obligation (*berît*) which he imposes upon them" (Whybray, *Isaiah 40–66*, NCB [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981], 75).

[334] Terence L. Donaldson," Proselytes or 'Righteous Gentiles'? The Status of Gentiles in Eschatological Pilgrimage Patterns of Thought," *JSP* 4.7 (1990): 11–12.

[335] Donaldson, "Proselytes or 'Righteous Gentiles'?" 11.

Though the barrier between morality and the cult is challenged by prophetic voices, the holy status of the temple, the sacrifices, and the priesthood is nonetheless retained. With fiery rhetoric, the prophet Amos had denigrated the elevation of ritual over social justice, even mocking the conception of that cultic framework in the desert: "Did you draw near to me with sacrifices and gifts to me those forty years in the wilderness, O house of Israel?" (Amos 5.25).[336] In the end, though, both morality and cult are brought under a broadened rubric for holiness in response to the prophetic critique.[337] While not obligatory, the prophetic expectation ultimately was that *gērîm* would want to attach themselves to the house of Jacob as a result of Israel's restoration in the land (Isa 14.1). The *gēr* is even said to have a share with the tribes of Israel in the promised inheritance (Ezek 47.22–23). In this sense, at least, they would be as the native-born. They are also held to the same standard of undivided fidelity to the God of Israel (Ezek 14.7).[338]

Upon the return of exiles at the beginning of the Second Temple period, the only remedy for the intermarriage with non-natives that Ezra uncovers is divorce (Ezra 9.11–14), not

[336] See Knohl, *The Sanctuary of Silence*, 214–15. To be clear, such critique does not necessarily indicate abandonment of the priestly processes for ritual purity. Stephen Finlan insightfully points out as much in his categorization of varying expressions of spiritualization. In the category of *moralizing* or *rationalizing*, there is an attempt to link morality with purification. In this sense, the critique is still *pro-cultic* ("Spiritualization of sacrifice in Paul and Hebrews," in *Ritual and Metaphor: Sacrifice in the Bible*, ed. Christian Eberhart, SBL 68 [Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011], 84).

[337] Though abandoning the entire temple framework was not an option, Knohl imagines a dynamic situation where the priestly establishment "could not ignore the truth in the prophetic criticism of the nation's spiritual state and its reverberations among the people. No longer could they take refuge behind the Temple walls; they had to provide an answer for the questions of the day" (*The Sanctuary of Silence*, 215). Based on these criticisms and new social realities, some priests felt the urgent need to reformulate a theological and legal framework of the priesthood in a way that would preserve the core principles of the cultic tradition (215–16).

[338] As noted in the Introduction, if 2 Cor 6.14–7.1 were original to Paul either as author or by way of citation, then it would that he understands the immanence of God's *pneuma* as the prophetic fulfillment of several LXX texts, particularly Ezek 37.27 (cf. also Exod 29.45; Lev 26.11–12; 2 Sam 7.14; Isa 43.6; 52.11; Jer 31.1). It would show more concretely that the assemblies he founded and ministered among, built upon the "foundation" (θεμέλιος) of Jesus Christ (1 Cor 3.11), are the "holy mountain" to which the nations will stream per ancient prophetic hopes, not Jerusalem (cf. again Isa 2.2–4; 66.20; Mic 4.1–5).

conversion.[339] For Ezra, such a response is fitting given the possible consequences: send the women away lest they, the people, be sent away again. Terms of defilement are used with reference to this dilemma (cf. Ezra 6.21; 9.1, 11–14). The proposed solution of divorce is thus understood as purification (Neh 13.30).[340] Jonathan Klawans argues that the passages in Ezra and Nehemiah "echo not the priestly traditions relating to ritual impurity, but the Holiness Code traditions related to moral impurity."[341] At the end of his study on the H strata within P, Israel Knohl proposes that the *haburot* of the Pharisees mostly inherited the popular Priestly sentiment of the HS. Pharisaism is seen to be broadening the conception of holiness, which had previously been restricted to the temple alone.[342] On the other hand, Knohl asserts, the *halakah* of Qumran and the Sadducees preserve the cultic conception prevalent in Priestly Torah, most evident in the former's separation from the temple due to perceived priestly corruption and the disallowance of proselytes to enter the same sacred areas that were accessible to Israelites.[343]

---

[339] Milgrom maintains that religious conversion is neither attested nor possible in ancient Israel before the Second Temple period. Though a *gēr* might fully accept and practice Israelite custom, complete assimilation would only be achieved generations later through intermarriage. See Milgrom, "Religious Conversion and the Revolt Model for the Formation of Israel," 169, 175. On conversion through intermarriage, see also Cohen, "Crossing the Boundary and Becoming a Jew," 25–26.

[340] Jonathan Klawans, *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 43.

[341] Klawans, *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism*, 44.

[342] As Hillel Newman and Ruth Ludlam state in their study on early Judaean sectarian groups though, historical description of the Pharisees and Sadducees is one of the most difficult tasks in the history of the period given the nature of the sources. Concerning Pharisees, the sources constitute Qumran, Christian literature, Josephus, and rabbinic literature. There are significant differences between each in their descriptions and in their attitudes. See Newman and Ludlam, *Proximity to Power and Jewish Sectarian Groups of the Ancient Period: A Review of Lifestyle, Values, and Halakhah in the Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes, and Qumran*, BRLA 25 (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 53–54. See also, Martin Hengel and Roland Deines, *The Pre-Christian Paul* (London: SCM Press, 1991), 30. However, Anthony Saldarini likewise sees the regulations of Ezra and Nehemiah as a forerunner to that adopted by the Pharisees in the Graeco-Roman period ("Pharisees," *ABD* 5:300).

[343] Knohl, *The Sanctuary of Silence: The Priestly Torah and the Holiness School*, 224. On the relationship of Sadducee *halakah* to the *halakah* of the Qumran writings, see J. M. Baumgarten, "The Pharisaic-Sadducean Controversies about Purity and the Qumran Text," JJS 31 (1980): 157–70; and Y. Susman, "The Study of the History of *Halakha* and the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Tarbiz* 59 (1990): 11–76. Gedalia Alon argues that these traditions have their origin in a duality already present in Torah itself (cf. Lev 7.19–21; 11.8, 33; 12.4; 15; 21.4; 22.4–8; Num 29.20). He plots these traditions among Second Temple sects: "The expansionist tendency entrenched itself among the Essenes, whereas the inclination towards restriction was most powerful among the Sadducees. But in the Pharisaic teaching

Paul's View According to Acts

As Judaeans, the earliest Jesus-devotees were obviously not exempt from these tensions, especially with regard to the status of gentiles. Paul was not actively seen bringing Greeks beyond their designated area, according to Luke, but was presumed by onlookers since Paul had earlier been seen with one Trophimus of Ephesus, apparently a non-Judaean. But how would these onlookers know for sure? There was no clear temple protocol for confirming the status of Trophimus, whether by checking his genealogy or circumcision.[344] Either way, it seems that Luke suppresses the matter. Furthermore, Paul never answers any of the allegations against him, neither what James reports nor the accusation from diaspora Judaeans. (cf. Acts 24.6, 19). Shaye Cohen outlines possible reasons why:

> Perhaps Acts suppresses Paul's defense because the defense did not accord well with Acts' picture of a Jewishly pious and non-antinomian Paul. Perhaps Paul said, "I brought Trophimus, a gentile, into the temple, but the distinction between Jew and gentile no longer exists in God's eyes, and gentiles may worship freely in the house of God just as Jews

neither was able to oust the other entirely, although the tendency towards limitation was the stronger. When we seek the reason for this Halakhic struggle among the Pharisees, we must regard it as the result of the clash between two general fundaments on which Rabbinic doctrine rested: one was the adaptation of the Halakha to the needs of life; the other was the extension of sanctity to all Jews (even those who were not priests) and to all places (apart from the Temple) and at all times. This second principle compelled the Sages to instruct all Israel in levitical purity and to enjoin complete abstention (from uncleanness)." See Gedalia Alon, *Jews, Judaism, and the Classical World: Studies in Jewish History in the Times of the Second Temple and Talmud* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1977), 230–34. See also Jacob Neusner, *From Politics to Piety: The Emergence of Pharisaic Judaism*, 2nd ed. (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2003), 90.

[344] See discussion in Shaye J. D. Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties*, HCS 31 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 46 n. 96.

> do."[345] … He might have said, "Yes, I brought Trophimus into the temple, but Trophimus is really a Jew, not a gentile."[346]

Regardless of how Paul may have labelled Trophimus, Luke wants readers to know that Trophimus was *not* Judaean, meaning, he could not have accessed the inner court for lay Judaean men, and that Paul would never have advocated for his entry. To be fair, we get no indication from Paul's letters that he sought such a thing. As noted, he seems almost entirely uninterested in saying anything about the temple in Jerusalem explicitly. For Luke, it is an unfounded allegation, but one he feels he must address. Given the obvious need to defend Paul,[347] it is curious that Luke includes these allegations at all, unless of course they were so well-known that to not mention them would bring into question Luke's bias toward Paul as an historian attempting a definitive account of Christian origins (cf. Luke 1.1–4). In the end, Paul is not only entirely submissive to the exclusionary layout of the Jerusalem temple, but he also has no agency in responding to these allegations specifically, whether that assumed by zealous Judaean believers or that made by diaspora Judaeans from Asia Minor. Perhaps we should understand these allegations as mere

---

[345] Gerd Theißen understands this particular sentiment as credible and in line with the "Hellenistic school" around Stephen. See Theißen, *Die Religion Der Ersten Christen: Eine Theorie Des Urchristentums* (Gütersloh: Chr. Kaiser/Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2000), 161–62. See also Alexander J. M. Wedderburn, *A History of the First Christians* (London: T&T Clark, 2005), 55. A constructed dichotomy going back to F. C. Baur, Anders Gerdmar observes the influence that Baur's philosophical and political views had on his perception of the supposed conflict between these two "schools" in earliest Christianity as loaded with the ideology of a German liberal in the nineteenth century. See Gerdmar, "Baur and the Creation of the Judaism-Hellenism Dichotomy," in *Ferdinand Christian Baur und die Geschichte des frühen Christentums*, eds. Martin Bauspiess, Christof Landmesser, and David Lincicum, WUNT 333 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 107–28. Ultimately, the oversimplification of "Jewish" versus "Hellenistic" ignores the interpenetration between Judaism and Hellenism in the early development of Christianity. Scholarly endeavors of the twentieth century accelerated the accuracy with which these terms are used, but as Wayne Meeks determines, "Jewish" and "Hellenistic" are essentially no help at all in unravelling the numerous combinations of religious/cultural varieties in the ancient Mediterranean world ("Judaism, Hellenism, and the Birth of Christianity," in *Paul Beyond the Judaism/Hellenism Divide*, ed. Troels Engberg-Pedersen [Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001], 26). Grand schemes like that of Baur's, he writes, "tempt us to gloss over contrary evidence and lull us sometimes into thinking we have understood when we have only classified" (25). Likewise, Dale Martin warns against using such labels as carriers of our own slanted baggage, as alleged of Baur. See Martin, "Paul and the Judaism/Hellenism Dichotomy: Toward a Social History of the Question," in *Paul Beyond the Judaism/Hellenism Divide*, ed. Troels Engberg-Pedersen (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001), 58–59.

[346] Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness*, 361.

[347] See again Rowe, *World Upside Down*, 80.

misunderstandings of Paul, which the author of Acts would have us believe, but, as Cohen states, "anyone who has read the Pauline epistles, especially Galatians, will have to concede that the first accusation, at least, has merit."[348]

Paul in His Own Words

Morton Enslin highlighted numerous traces of detailed knowledge from Paul's letters in Acts. The issue, he writes, is "not so much that 'Luke' omits much material which modern writers assume he would have used had he known it, but that he not infrequently contradicts what is said or implied in the letters."[349] If the author was a close associate of Paul's (the physician and traveling companion Luke mentioned in Col 4.14; 2 Tim 4.11; and Phlm 24), as tradition maintains (cf. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 3.14.1), it is difficult to explain the contrast, for example, between Paul's letter to the Galatians and Acts. This is an observation going back to F. C. Baur, who wrote that history in Acts is "manifestly governed by the writer's desire to give a new version of what had occurred."[350] John Knox's proposal offers a plausible way forward:

> This impasse should lead us to examine the hidden major premise on both sides, namely: If Luke knew the letters of Paul, he must have used them. I believe we are forced by the literary evidence (or, rather, by the lack of it), on the one hand, and by the a priori probabilities, on the other, to question this premise and to consider seriously the possibility that Luke knew, or at least knew of, letters of Paul—even the (collected) letters of Paul—and quite consciously and deliberately made little or no use of them.[351]

If Paul was opposed to temple worship in principle, perhaps he was not so principled as to reject James' request to attend the temple in Acts 21.24 given his practice to become "all things to

---

[348] Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness*, 360.

[349] Morton S. Enslin, "'Luke' and Paul," *JOAS* 58.1 (1938): 82.

[350] Ferdinand Christian Baur, *Paul: The Apostle of Jesus Christ, His Life and Work, His Epistles and His Doctrine*, vol. 1, trans. and ed. Eduard Zeller, 2nd ed., rev. by Allan Menzies (London; Edinburgh: Williams and Norgate, 1876), 53.

[351] John Knox, "Acts and the Pauline Letter Corpus," in Leander E. Keck, and J. Louis Martyn, *Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays Presented in Honor of Paul Schubert* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1966), 283–84.

all people", even to *Ioudaioi* (1 Cor 9.19–23).[352] Even those who reject the historicity of Acts 21.18ff. admit that Paul's actions here are not contradictory to the way he conducts his ministry according to 1 Cor 9.19–23.[353] Eyal Regev states that "we have seen sufficient evidence in both his letters and Acts to suggest that his belief that the Law does not lead to justification—but only to Christ—does not mean that Paul thinks Jews should no longer observe it."[354] However, we cannot assume that Paul's gentile audiences would act as he does in this regard. In his response to the "Paul within Judaism" school of thought, Terence Donaldson proffers this consideration:

> In asking whether Paul can be located "within Judaism," are we thinking just of Paul himself or are we asking about the location of his communities of *ethnē*-in-Christ as well? Both options are complicated, but they are distinct. One could imagine, for example, a Paul who remained embedded within a Jewish world but communities of *ethnē*-in-Christ who existed quite apart from Jewish communities.[355]

We must assume that Paul knew they could (and, indeed, *should*) never partake fully in Judaean ritual life.

On the matter of circumcision in his letter to the Galatians, Paul will ask, "This is the only thing I wish to know from you: was it from works of the law that you received the spirit, or by the hearing of faith?" (3.2). Scholars like Mark Nanos have emphasized the eschatological thinking of

---

[352] To be addressed in the following chapter.

[353] See, e.g., Pervo, *Acts*, 542–43; and Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 31 (New York: Doubleday, 1998), 692.

[354] Eyal Regev, *The Temple in Early Christianity: Experiencing the Sacred* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2019), 94.

[355] Terence L. Donaldson, "Paul within Judaism: A Critical Evaluation from a 'New Perspective' Perspective," in *Paul Within Judaism: Restoring the First-Century Context to the Apostle*, eds. Magnus Zetterholm, and Mark D. Nanos (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2015), 300. In Pamela Eisenbaum's short but succinct overview of Pauline interpretation, she describes proponents of "Paul within Judaism" as sharing the view that "belief in Jesus does not make Paul a Christian.… Paul's belief in Jesus is understood to be well within the bounds of Judaism of the first century, and thus Paul's turn toward Jesus did not turn him into a Christian" ("Paul, Polemics, and the Problem of Jewish Essentialism," *BibInt* 13.3 [2005]: 224–38). For a full articulation of this perspective, see Mark D. Nanos, "Introduction," in *Paul Within Judaism: Restoring the First-Century Context to the Apostle*, eds. Magnus Zetterholm, and Mark D. Nanos (Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress Press, 2015), 1–30. See also Matthew Novenson, "Whither the Paul within Judaism *Schule*?" *JJMJS* 5 (2018): 79–88.

Paul as a means to understand why Paul parted with Judaean contemporaries concerning ritual markers for gentiles. Nanos labels Paul's thinking as "chronometrical", indicating that Paul believed the end of the ages had dawned (cf. Gal 4.4, "the fullness of the time"). This dawning called for a change in ritual requirements, resulting in Paul's position that non-Judaean *should not* be required to undergo circumcision:

> When writing to non-Jews to dissuade them from becoming Jews or to combat the otherwise obvious advantage of being a Jew when entering this movement within Judaism, Paul argued that these uncircumcised non-Jews were full and equal members of the family of God alongside of the Jewish members, indeed, equally children of Abraham and co-heirs of the promises made to him and his seed, and not simply welcome guests. This was based upon the chronometrical claim of the gospel that the day when all of the nations will join the Israelites to worship the One God of all humankind had dawned with the resurrection of Jesus as Messiah.[356]

Matthew Thiessen goes further, arguing that "Paul did not merely think that gentiles should not undergo circumcision. Rather … Paul was convinced that any gentile who underwent circumcision remained a gentile and therefore benefited in no way from the rite."[357] To be clear, on the question of "conversion", Thiessen writes that "Paul not only thought that gentiles *did not need to* or *should not* convert to Judaism to be acceptable to God, but that they *could not* convert to Judaism.… Paul did not think that gentiles could become Jews (i.e., convert to Judaism)" (emphasis his).[358] At the

[356] Mark D. Nanos, *Reading Paul within Judaism: Collected Essays of Mark D. Nanos, vol. 1* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2017), 131. See also, Fredriksen, *Paul: The Pagans' Apostle*, 73–77. Nanos' language here seems a semantic substitute for the emphasis on eschatology rehearsed in the Introduction's History of Research, like that expressed by Schrage: "Evidently, apocalyptic expectations are being reconnected … and the community is understood as the eschatological dimension of the new world. God is present in the end-time church insofar as his Spirit dwells in it." Though Nanos and others certainly do not go further to say that "the congregation as an end-time community takes its place of the (then not yet destroyed!) old temple in the process of renewal of the entire creation…", since they make a ritual distinction between Judaean and gentile. [„Offenbar wird wieder an apokalyptische Erwartungen angeknüpft … und die Gemeinde als eschatologische Größe der neuen Welt verstanden. Gott ist insofern in der endzeitlichen Gemeinde gegenwärtig, als sein Geist in ihr wohnt.… wohl aber steht die Gemeinde als endzeitliche Gemeinschaft an Stelle des (damals noch nicht zerstörten!) alten Tempels im Prozeß der Erneuerung der gesamten Schöpfung…"]. See Wolfgang Schrage, *Der Erste Brief an die Korinther: 1 Kor 1,1–6,11*, EKKNT 7.1 (Zürich/Braunschweig: Benziger; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1991), 305.

[357] Thiessen, *Paul and the Gentile Problem*, 14 n. 63.

[358] Thiessen, *Paul and the Gentile Problem*, 14.

very least, we can assume that the uncircumcised (or, if Thiessen is correct, even the circumcised) of Paul's gentile audiences were aware of their inability to participate in Jerusalem temple ritual to the same degree as lay Judaean men.

Moral and Ritual Purity in Paul

The failures of the Corinthians as detailed by Paul, for example, and the consequences for those sins, are consistent with this distinction between moral and ritual im/purity, a dichotomy specific only to Israel as *insiders*. In his letters, Paul is concerned almost entirely with matters of *moral* impurity rather than with those of *ritual* impurity.[359] Sources of ritual impurity in the Hebrew Bible, Klawans explains, are "(1) generally natural and more or less unavoidable. (2) It is not sinful to contract these impurities. And (3) these impurities convey an impermanent contagion."[360] Examples include childbirth, scale disease, genital discharge, carcasses of certain impure animals, and human corpses. In Paul, such rituals include circumcision,[361] food laws (including matters of table fellowship: 1 Cor 5.11; Gal 2.12ff.),[362] and holy days (Gal 4.10; Rom 14.5–6). On the other hand, moral impurities are seen as acts which *defile*. These include sexual sins (Lev 18.24–30), idolatry (Lev 19:.1; 20.1–3), and bloodshed (Num 35.33–34). Often labelled as "abominations", these defile not only the sinner but the land and the sanctuary as well. The ultimate consequence for such defilement was expulsion from the land in ancient Israel (Lev 18.28; cf. Ezek 36.19).[363]

---

[359] See Klawans, *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism*, 151 n. 105; and E. P. Sanders, *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985), 93–105.

[360] Klawans, *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism*, 23.

[361] See 1 Cor 7.18–19; Gal 2.3, 7–9, 12; 5.2–3, 6, 11; 6.12–13, 15; Rom 2.25–3.1, 30; 4.9–12; 15.8; Phil 3.3, 5.

[362] See 1 Cor 6.13; 8.4, 7–8, 10, 13; 10.25, 27–28, 10.31; Rom 14.2–3, 6, 15, 17, 20–21, 23.

[363] Klawans, *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism*, 26.

There are a number of behaviors in the letter with which Paul takes issue: divisions within the assembly (1 Cor 1.10–17; 3.1–21); the boasting of those who think themselves wise and knowledgeable (1.18–2.16; 8.7–13); recognition of apostolic authority (4.1–21; 6.12–20; 9.1–27); sexual immorality (5.1–13; 6.1–11); marital ethics (7.1–40); consuming food offered to idols (8.1–13; 10.23–11.1); idol worship (10.1–22); gendered dress in the assembly (11.2–16); sacrilege at the Lord's table (11.17–34); abuse of spiritual gifts (12.1–14.40); controversies regarding resurrection (15.1–58); the collection of funds for the those in Jerusalem (16.1–4). Principal among them though is their factitiousness (1 Cor 1.11), which Paul addresses head-on in ch. 3. Because the community is ναὸς θεοῦ (and, needless to say, now *insiders*, according to Paul) the mistreatment of it by certain members brings with it a threat of destruction on par with those abominations warned against in Torah. Paul's view of the new community as a temple, Klawans observes, "coheres well with his concern that moral defilement would violate the integrity of that community. The effect of moral impurity is felt in the new community in the same way as it was perceived, by Jews, to affect the temple."[364] A difference of conception is clear in the so-called Antioch Incident as detailed in Galatians, which is often confused in scholarship on the matter.

The Antioch Incident, with the withdrawal of Cephas (Peter) and others from table fellowship with gentile believers, reveals the disjunction concerning the status of believing gentiles. Some have confused the crux of the controversy there as concerning purity rather than holiness. For example, consider James Dunn's assessment:

> Paul's charge against Peter, then, is most likely that by his action he had raised the *ritual* barriers surrounding their table-fellowship, thereby excluding the Gentile believers unless they 'judaized', that is, embraced a far more demanding discipline of *ritual purity* than hitherto. The reason why Peter had withdrawn (ἀφώριζεν) from the table-fellowship in the

[364] Klawans, *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism*, 154.

> first place was because the *purity* status of the Gentile believers had been called in question…"[365] (emphasis mine).

Paul, however, perceives a deeper contention in their separation, not simply of Judaean impurity rules but of profaneness. Nanos offers a compelling alternative to traditional interpretations, arguing that the controversy concerns neither food nor the manner of eating, but the very presence of gentiles not proselytized at the table.

> The food was Jewish, and the Gentiles were eating it Jewishly, that is, as deemed appropriate for non-Jews to eat with Jewish people. But they were eating together as though these Gentiles and Jews were all equals, although these Gentiles were not Jews; in fact, they were—on principle—not even on their way to becoming Jews, meaning proselytes.… These mixed meals symbolized a principle of identity at stake in the gospel of Jesus Christ. It pronounced these Gentiles full members of the people of God apart from the traditional conventions for rendering them as such.[366]

The withdrawal of Peter and others masked their previous conviction of equality. Ideas of purity and holiness surrounding temple practice challenge the notion that matters of purity were at stake in Antioch, as Paul recounts it. Instead, what we find in Paul is an intensification of the matter beyond mere purity regulations, i.e., the consideration of gentiles as *holy*. Those whom Paul opposes in Antioch seem not to be bothered just by the gentiles' behavior, but by who the gentiles *are*. Bruce Chilton proposes that, "Where James and Paul went their separate ways—ways between which Peter and Barnabas hesitated—was in the identification of non-Jewish believers. For Paul, they were Israel; for James, they were not."[367] In Kirsopp Lake's assessment of the Jerusalem Council's decision in Acts 15, he observes that the regulations to refuse food sacrificed to idols,

---

[365] James D. G. Dunn, "The Incident at Antioch (Gal. 2:11–18)," *JSNT* 5.18 (1983): 32. See also Alan F. Segal, *Paul the Convert: The Apostolate and Apostasy of Saul the Pharisee* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990), 197.

[366] Mark D. Nanos, "What Was at Stake in Peter's 'Eating with Gentiles' at Antioch?" in *The Galatians Debate: Contemporary Issues in Rhetorical and Historical Interpretation*, ed. Mark D. Nanos (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2002), 301. See also Mark D. Nanos, *The Irony of Galatians: Paul's Letter in First-Century Context* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002), 82.

[367] Bruce Chilton, "Paul and the Pharisees," in *In Quest of the Historical Pharisees*, eds. Jacob Neusner and Bruce Chilton (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2007), 161.

blood, things strangled, and fornication (i.e., regulations concerning temple worship that are applied to both Israel *and resident aliens* in Leviticus 17–18) give James and others a framework for understanding the place of believing gentiles in relation to Israel, i.e., as resident aliens.[368] As Chilton posits, "there is nothing intrinsically improbable with the hypothesis that James' stipulations with regard to non-Jewish believers were framed with their compatibility with worship in the Temple in mind."[369] If this is the case, then both James and Paul conceived of believing gentiles' identity in terms of temple devotion, albeit to different ends. For Paul, it was not enough for gentile believers to occupy an intermediate status; they were to be full-fledged members of God's holy people.

Conclusion

The author of Acts wants readers to know that Paul could make a delineation between customs that were good and right for a Judaean way of life, and what was required of gentile Christ-devotees. Through James, we hear the author speaking: "Paul's participation will prove that such accounts about him are not true. He is fully devoted to Moses, circumcision, and Jewish custom for all Judaean at home and abroad. Paul continues to observe and guard the law. What we require of gentile believers is another matter." When the author of Acts addresses the controversy of Paul's teaching, he definitively rejects the notion that Paul preaches "against the people, the law, and this [holy] place" (Acts 21.28), including the claim that Paul wanted to bring non-Judaeans beyond their designated area in the temple complex. But this does not square with our knowledge of Paul from his own writings. If the exclusionary tendencies of Judaean believers in Antioch ruffled Paul,

[368] Kirsopp Lake, "The Apostolic Council of Jerusalem," in *The Beginnings of Christianity: The Acts of the Apostles*, vol. 5, eds. F. J. Foakes-Jackson and Kirsopp Lake (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1979), 208.

[369] Chilton, "Paul and the Pharisees," 162.

then the layout of the temple complex would surely have been bothersome (not to mention total subservience to the request of James [Acts 21.23–24; cf. Gal 2.6]). Acts' account of the allegations of heresy against Paul, his temple attendance, and arrest are construed in such a way as to dampen the controversy of Paul's view on Judaean custom apparent in his own writings. While Paul may not have been begrudged to attend the temple himself, as Acts recounts, we cannot ascribe the degree of value on Judaean custom as seen in Acts to Paul in his letters.

In this chapter, different views were traced throughout ancient Israel and the Second Temple period concerning the relation of gentiles to the temple. These differences persisted into earliest Christianity, where differing conceptions of believing gentiles' occasioned controversies of fellowship. We can only assume that Paul would have felt about gentile temple pilgrimage the way he felt about gentile circumcision. It is a more complicated matter though since there was an area of the temple designated for gentiles as others, not requiring them to "judaize" but recognizing them as *other*. Nevertheless, these divisions were structured as such to represent the reality of gentile inferiority as those *morally* defiled. Paul's language regarding gentiles-in-Christ reflects the exact opposite—they are the holy residence of God's *pneuma*.

Paul is almost entirely concerned with matters of moral purity, the transgression of which were accompanied threats of expulsion and destruction, and an indication that Paul sees gentiles-in-Christ as insiders in the same manner as ethnic members of Israel. Paul conceives of the Corinthians' factitiousness in these terms, addressing it in 1 Corinthians 3 as sacrilege against the temple of God. Given the barring of non-Judaeans from the holy courts of the temple due to their unholy (i.e., profane) status, this is a significant development. Though James and Paul both seem to have conceived of gentiles' place in terms of temple practice, Paul's position that those in Christ are holy regardless of ethnicity is in line with his understanding of the Corinthians as the very

temple of God. The ritual details surrounding gentile temple participation show the need for Paul to build a cultic identity for them, as insiders. In the next chapter, I examine Judaean affiliations apparent in 1 Corinthians as an assembly of those who have already been on the periphery of Judaean religion.

CHAPTER FIVE

GOD'S TEMPLE IN CORINTH:

JUDAEAN RELIGION AMONG GENTILES

Introduction

Though the Corinthian letters indicate a mostly gentile audience, Paul assumes a great deal of familiarity on their part regarding Judaean tradition. Beyond the Corinthian correspondence, we cannot know the extent of the Corinthians' affiliation with Judaean religion prior to Paul, though Acts offers details in this regard. At the very least, Paul has been priming them to grasp the great import of being identified as the dwelling place of God's spirit. Since Paul wants the Corinthians to retain his Judaean monotheism, it hardly serves his purpose well if he wants them to think of themselves in terms of Corinthian temples, as has been suggested.

Related to the question of Paul's temple referent are concerns about his adaptability to diverse audiences. Questions of how far Paul went to relate to the various groups he encountered speak to the broader implication of how Paul conducted himself in relation to Judaean religion. The traditional position in scholarship regards Paul as adaptable to audiences beyond halakhic prescription since they were predominantly gentile; but how could Paul be "all things to all people" when diverse groups were likely present in the same audience (1 Cor 9.19–23)? If we can rightly assume that Paul largely interacts with gentiles already attracted to Judaean religion (i.e., those "under the law"), by his ministry and/or through some other past affiliation, then his adaptability may not be as radical as once assumed.

A Cultic World

Ancient Corinth was considered a commercial and religious hub in the Roman world due to the city's geographic positioning on an isthmus joining the Peloponnese to mainland Greece. It was frequently visited by shipping merchants wishing to avoid storms in the open Mediterranean Sea, which resulted in sailors and travelers bringing their cultic affiliations with them.[370] Strabo describes the temple of Aphrodite atop the Acrocorinth as

> so rich that it owned more than a thousand temple-slaves, courtesans, whom both men and women had dedicated to the goddess. And therefore it was also on account of these women that the city was crowded with people and grew rich; for instance, the ship-captains freely squandered their money, and hence the proverb, "Not for every man is the voyage to Corinth."[371] (*Geogr*. 8.6.20 [Jones, LCL])

Diversity among the city's inhabitants, ethnically and socio-economically, was reflected in the wide array of religions practiced in Corinth.[372] The geographer Pausanias describes Corinth as having "a temple for all the gods", listing a greater diversity of religious cults in Corinth than in any other city in the Peloponnese.[373] Excavations have revealed several ancient sanctuaries and temples within Corinth and its surroundings, particularly in the forum area of the city.[374]

---

[370] See description in Strabo, *Geogr*. 8.6.20–23: "Corinth is called 'wealthy' because of its commerce, since it is situated on the Isthmus and is master of two harbours, of which the one leads straight to Asia, and the other to Italy; and it makes easy the exchange of merchandise from both countries that are so far distant from each other" (*Geogr*. 8.6.20 [Jones, LCL]).

[371] Economics and religiosity went hand-in-hand in Corinth, where religious festivals and processions enhanced the city's economy. Such processions would have attracted large crowds and required items produced in the city or imported from abroad like flowers from local gardens, perfumes, scented oils, and religious utensils of gold and silver. See discussion in Donald W. Engels, *Roman Corinth: An Alternative Model for the Classical City* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1990), 44.

[372] The city had been destroyed by the Romans in 146 BCE but was reestablished by Julius Caesar in 44 BCE. Coinciding with its reestablishment, Strabo records, an extensive colonization program was put in place across the empire which saw the resettlement of 80,000 from among the urban lower social strata, mostly of the freedperson type (*Geogr*. 8.6.23).

[373] Pausanias, *Descr*. 2.1.1ff.

[374] See Mary E. Hoskins Walbank, "Image and Cult: The Coinage of Roman Corinth," in *Corinth in Context: Comparative Studies on Religion and Society*, eds. Steven J. Friesen, Daniel N. Schowalter, and James C. Walters, NovTSup 134 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 170; and Guy D. R. Sanders, "The Sacred Spring: Landscape and Traditions," in

Archaeologists have been able to confirm Pausanias' description of the city's worship sites, uncovering more than two dozen temples, altars, and shrines dedicated to Greek, Egyptian, and Roman deities. The city also erected monuments and buildings and held rituals in dedication to the ruling family of Rome, from the Caesarian games to the temples of Apollo, Aphrodite, and Venus (the patron goddess of the *gens Julia*).[375] Local Judaeans and Jesus-devotees could not avoid the temples and statues that filled the public places of Corinth.[376]

Judaeans in Corinth

Though evidence is scarce, Corinth is known to have had a Judaean population. Philo mentions a contingent in Corinth (*Legat*. 281). Archaeologically, a synagogue's lintel has been discovered, though it is admittedly of questionable dating.[377] According to Acts, Paul first meets Aquila and Priscilla in Corinth (1 Cor 16.19), where there is a synagogue and a significant enough population to occasion the intra-Judaean controversy before Gallio, pronconsul of Achaia (18.12–17).[378] Acts also mentions Crispus (cf. 1 Cor 1.14) and Sosthenes (cf. 1 Cor 1.1), who are introduced as rulers of synagogue(s) (ἀρχισυνάγωγοι) in Corinth (Acts 18.8, 17).[379] Other itinerant Judaeans are

Corinth in Context: Comparative Studies on Religion and Society, eds. Steven J. Friesen, Daniel N. Schowalter, and James C. Walters, NovTSup 134 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 365.

[375] Bronwen L. Wickkiser, "Asklepios in Greek and Roman Corinth," in *Corinth in Context: Comparative Studies on Religion and Society*, eds. Steven J. Friesen, Daniel N. Schowalter, and James C. Walters, NovTSup 134 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 61.

[376] See discussion in Craig S. Keener, *1–2 Corinthians*, New Cambridge Bible Commentary (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 3.

[377] See discussion of evidence in Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, *St. Paul's Corinth: Texts and Archaeology*, *GNS* 6 (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1983), 79. See also Engels, *Roman Corinth*, 20.

[378] An event often used to construct a timeline for Paul's ministry. See, e.g., Udo Schnelle, *The History and Theology of the New Testament Writings*, trans. M. Eugene Boring (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998). However, see Dixon Slingerland, who concludes that Acts 18.1–18 is "very far from the kind of prose on which anyone would want to depend for the detailed reconstruction of past social, political, or religious history" ("Acts 18:1–18, the Gallio Inscription, and Absolute Pauline Chronology," *JBL* 110.3 [1991]: 441). See also Richard I. Pervo, *Acts: A Commentary*, ed. Harold W. Attridge, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2009), 445–47.

[379] On the understanding of this office in Acts, see Tessa Rajak and David Noy, "*Archisynagogoi*: Office, Title and Social Status in the Greco-Jewish Synagogue," *JRS* 83 (1993): 75–93.

mentioned in 1 Corinthians as having some association with the Christ assembly there: Apollos (1 Cor 1.12; 3.4–6, 22; 4.6; 16.12; cf. Acts 18.27), Cephas (1 Cor 1.12; 3.22; 9.5; 15.5), Barnabas (1 Cor 9.6), Timothy (1 Cor 4.17; 16.10), and Silvanus (2 Cor 1.19).[380]

However, serious doubt has been cast on the historicity of Christian origins in Corinth according to Acts. Christopher Mount argues that the picture of the Christ community emerging from the synagogue (cf. Acts 18:4–8) is "a compositional construct" of the author—a construct which is likely *not* the Pauline community of Paul's historical mission.[381] Mount is quick to mention though that a Christian mission's association with synagogues in the East is not implausible. In this regard, he cites the factionalism among those in Corinth with their various allegiances to Paul, Cephas, or Apollos as possibly stemming from tensions created by a mission to Judaeans alongside Paul's own mission to the gentiles in Corinth.[382]

The Corinthian Assembly

Aside from these Judaean figures who have some history with the Corinthians, the letter of 1 Corinthians indicates a mostly gentile audience. Gordon Fee summarizes important indicators in this regard:

> the whole matter of going to the temple feasts (8:1–10:22; see esp. 8:10) is a strictly Gentile phenomenon; the attitude toward marriage, thinking it to be a sin (chap. 7), scarcely fits

[380] See Steve Mason on Paul's competition with other Judaeans whom some of the Corinthians preferred in "Paul without Judaism: Historical Method over Perspective," in *Paul and Matthew among Jews and Gentiles: Essays in Honour of Terence L. Donaldson*, ed. Ronald Charles, LNTS (London: T&T Clark, 2020), 30–31.

[381] Christopher N. Mount, *Pauline Christianity: Luke-Acts and the Legacy of Paul*, NovTSup 104 (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 134.

[382] Mount, *Pauline Christianity*, 134–35 n. 144. In contrast, Hans Conzelmann perceives Luke to be in possession of good individual pieces of information on Paul's activity in Corinth: "There are factual details not previously encountered in such abundance in Acts—details about working conditions, lengths of time, names, places, and dates." Nevertheless, Conzelmann, while not denying the reliability of this information, admits that "the total picture has been highly stylized here also, as is evident from a comparison with the Corinthian letters.… especially evident in the description of Paul's relationship to the synagogue" (*Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*, trans. James Limburg, A. Thomas Kraabel, and Donald H. Juel, Hermeneia [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988], 151).

> Judaism, even Hellenistic Judaism; going to the proconsul, or city magistrates, for adjudication (6:1–11) fits the normal processes of the Greeks and Romans within the city, whereas the Jews were forbidden to ask Gentiles for judgments. Their arguing for the right to go to the prostitutes (6:12–20) and their denial of a future bodily resurrection (15:1–58) also sound more Hellenistic than Jewish.[383]

Principally, on three occasions Paul mentions their former way of life as "idolaters" (6.9–11; 8.7; 12.2).

Though mostly gentile, Paul's use of scripture and tradition suggests an audience intimately familiar with Judaean traditions. The ways in which Paul speaks to the Corinthians throughout his letter show that they have adopted his monotheism. J. Paul Sampley offers a comprehensive list of examples:

> Accordingly, they view representations of other supposed deities as "idols" and meat offered in sacrifice to those deities as εἰδωλόθυτος (*eidōlothytos*, "meat offered to an idol") [cf. 1 Cor 8.4, 6];[384] Christ is called "Paschal lamb" in a context in which leaven is a primary motif, without any need of explanation (5:7); the scriptures of Israel have become theirs in an authoritative fashion (see 10:26; cf. Ps 24:1); the persons in the exodus out of Egypt are unabashedly called "our ancestors" (10:1). Paul expects his readers to understand the Jewish insiders' term ἀκροβυστία (*akrobystia*) as meaning "uncircumcised" (7:18–19); they have adopted Paul's Jewish terminology for at least one day of the week, the sabbath (16:2, *mia sabbatou*); and they know the Aramaic, pre-Pauline prayer of the earliest believers, μαράνα θά (*Marana tha*, "Our Lord, come," 16:22).[385]

Most pointedly, Paul imagines that these gentiles-in-Christ are equal inheritors of Israel's heritage. In 1 Cor 10.1, Paul wants the Corinthians to be familiar with the traditions of πατέρες ἡμῶν ("our fathers"). Caroline Johnson Hodge has argued that Paul constructs a myth of origins for his gentile believers by means of this patrilineal descent. In the same way that "descendants share the same 'stuff' as ancestors, gentiles are 'of Christ'—they have taken in his *pneuma*—so that he can serve

---

[383] Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, rev. ed., NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014), 139–40.

[384] Furthermore, Sampley notes that gentiles not so "resocialized" would have used the term ἱερόθυτος, which BDAG ("ἱερόθυτος," 470) defines as "devoted/sacrificed to a divinity." See Sampley, "The First Letter to the Corinthians," in *The New Interpreter's Bible*, vol. 10 (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2002), 778 n. 11.

[385] Sampley, "The First Letter to the Corinthians," 778.

as a link for them to the lineage of Abraham."[386] Their baptism is the decisive act in forging this kinship, a baptism shared by their Israelite ancestors who were "baptized into Moses in the cloud and in the sea" (1 Cor 10.2). Fundamentally, it is the Corinthians' reception of the divine *pneuma* that convinces Paul of their new Israelite lineage.[387]

Paul speaks to his gentile audiences as if they are no longer gentiles.[388] In 1 Thessalonians, Paul indicates that his audience has progressed beyond ἔθνος status. The Thessalonians must refrain from the πορνεία of "gentiles who do not know God" (τὰ ἔθνη τὰ μὴ εἰδότα τὸν θεόν [1 Thess 4.3–5]). In every instance of ἔθνος in 1 Corinthians, Paul imagines a grouping of *others* distinct from the Corinthian believers (cf. 1 Cor 1.23; 5.1; 12.2; cf. 2 Cor 11.26). For Paul, the Corinthian audience is firmly identified with Israel since, as he states, their status as ἔθνη is a thing of the past: "when you were *ethnē*…" (ὅτε ἔθνη ἦτε [1 Cor 12.2]).[389]

---

[386] Caroline Johnson Hodge, *If Sons, Then Heirs: A Study of Kinship and Ethnicity in the Letters of Paul* (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 105. See also Trevor Burke on Paul as *pater* to the Corinthians as engendering unity in Burke, "Paul's Role as 'Father' to his Corinthian 'Children' in Socio-Historical Context (1 Corinthians 4:14–21)," in *Paul and the Corinthians: Studies on a Community in Conflict: Essays in Honour of Margaret Thrall*, eds. Margaret E. Thrall, Trevor J. Burke, and J. K. Elliott, NovTSup 109 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 93–113.

[387] According to Cavan Concannon, Paul understands his gospel as "signaling different responses depending on the ethnic group to which it is addressed. For the Ioudaioi the gospel of Christ should rightly signal the arrival of the end time, when the promises of the God of Israel will be enacted. For the Greeks Paul's gospel signals the possibility of a new relationship in the family of Abraham and in relationship to the ethnic signifier Israel" (*"When You Were Gentiles": Specters of Ethnicity in Roman Corinth and Paul's Corinthian Correspondence* [New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2014], 158). On *pneuma* "as a symbol for God's presence and power active among humans," see also Luke Timothy Johnson, *Constructing Paul: The Canonical Paul*, vol. 1. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2020), 236–37.

[388] Cf. again Mark Nanos' contention regarding gentile identity in the Antioch Incident in "What Was at Stake in Peter's 'Eating with Gentiles' at Antioch?" in *The Galatians Debate: Contemporary Issues in Rhetorical and Historical Interpretation*, ed. Mark D. Nanos (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2002), 301; and *The Irony of Galatians: Paul's Letter in First-Century Context* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002), 82.

[389] To be sure, ἔθνος is more nuanced in other places where Paul does, at times, refer to his readers as "gentiles" (see Rom 1.5–6, 13; 11.13). In this regard, Paul's Roman letter is distinct from 1 Corinthians since Paul wants to make a distinction between Judaean and gentile audience members in the former. Due to the return of Judaeans to Rome following the death of the emperor Claudius in 54 CE, N. T. Wright observes that the "historical sequence produces a situation into which Romans fits like a glove." See discussion in Wright, "The Letter to the Romans," in *The New Interpreter's Bible*, vol. 10 (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2002), 406–7.

Some have taken the position that Paul's temple imagery does not refer to the temple in Jerusalem precisely because he was writing to gentiles in Corinth.[390] To assume that this is the case, John Lanci argues, "fails to explain adequately why he would present this concept to a largely Gentile audience."[391] Lanci's thesis is that, while the Jerusalem temple may have been *a* referent for allusion in 1 Cor 3.16–17, it was not the *sole* referent. Paul's temple language, according to Lanci, is generic enough to include all temples, but that Corinthian temples are the *principal* referents for his audience. In so doing, Lanci maintains, Paul would have been exercising his approach to diverse audiences as indicated in 1 Cor 9.19–23. Paul was simply appealing to his gentile audience as well as those Judaeans present. As detailed above, however, Lanci has not adequately reckoned with the likelihood of a gentile audience acutely aware of Judaean religion.[392]

Proselytes and Godfearers

Acts' description of the synagogue in Corinth indicates an ethnically mixed audience ("Judaeans and Greeks" [18.4]). For the author of Acts, J. M. Ford explains, "'Greeks' and 'Gentiles' need not necessarily denote heathens but bear a sense of religious and moral inferiority rather than lack of belief in the Jewish faith."[393] In Corinth, frustrated with Judaean resistance to his message, Paul

---

[390] For example, John R. Lanci, *A New Temple for Corinth: Rhetorical and Archaeological Approaches to Pauline Imagery*, StBibLit 1 (New York: P. Lang, 1997). See also Margaret Mitchell, who does not see 1 Cor 3.17 as referring to temple defilement but rather to the destruction of the community by factionalism, for which she cites numerous Graeco-Roman examples (Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians* [Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993], 99–111). For a similar position, see 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*, eds. Beate Ego et al., WUNT 118 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), 411–25.

[391] Lanci, *A New Temple for Corinth*, 10.

[392] As David Horrell remarks in his review of Lanci, "Paul may have (unconsciously?) assumed, rightly or wrongly, that his converts shared such knowledge (cf. 1 Cor. 10:1 ff.)" (Horrell, review of *A New Temple for Corinth: Rhetorical and Archaeological Approaches to Pauline Imagery*, by John R. Lanci, *JTS* 50.2 [1999]: 711).

[393] Ford, "The First Epistle to the Corinthians or the First Epistle to the Hebrews," 404.

declares that he is turning to the "gentiles" (v. 6). Seen from the point of view of Luke, Ford writes that, "as theologian and 'dramatist,' the utterance might well presage St. Paul's future destiny, not his immediate work in Corinth, and be a hint of God's gradual unfolding of the plan of redemption, to the Jews, the Samaritans, proselytes and then to the pagans."[394] It is described that Paul left the synagogue following his pronouncement and went next door to the house of a man named Titius Justus, "a worshiper of God" (σεβομένου τὸν θεόν) (v. 7). Luke would have us believe that the turn in Paul's ministry was finally solidified in Corinth (cf. Acts 13.46).[395] Did Acts' Paul mean that he would go to "pagan" gentiles or to those already proselytized to varying degrees as synagogue attendees?

It is difficult to ascertain in Acts how gentile characters should be categorized as worshippers of the Judaean deity given the ambiguity in terminology. Labels range from προσήλυτοι ("proselyte"), where there appears to be an indication of utmost devotion to Judaean religion (e.g., the proselyte pilgrims in 2.11 [Eng. v. 10]; cf. also Nicolas of Antioch in 6.15), to the seemingly less devout designation of σεβομένοι/αι (e.g., σεβομέναι γυναῖκαι in 13.50 ["devout women"]; σεβομένη/ος τὸν θεόν in 16.1 and 18.7 ["worshiper of God"]; σεβομένοι Ἕλλήνες in 17.4 ["devout Greeks"]; and simply σεβομένοι in 17.17. We find a combination of these terms in 13.43: σεβομένοι προσηλύτοι ("devout proselytes"). In each instance, those labelled as such are distinct from Ἰουδαίοι (esp. 2.11; 13.43; 13.50; 17.4, 17). BDAG makes a stark distinction between προσηλύτοι and σεβομένοι by identifying the former as "a gentile won for the Israelite community

[394] J. M. Ford, "The First Epistle to the Corinthians or the First Epistle to the Hebrews," *CBQ* 28.4 (1966): 403.

[395] Mount notes the author's intention to portray a Pauline origin for Christianity at Corinth, even though there is doubt as to Luke's sources (*Pauline Christianity*, 132). Mount writes that "The comparative scarcity of episodes in Acts that may be traditional stories about Paul suggests that the author was not in contact with Pauline communities telling (lots of) stories about Paul. Instead … 'traditional' stories about Paul actually appear not to have been readily available to the author" (109).

through missionary efforts",[396] and the latter as "former polytheists who accepted the ethical monotheism of Israel and attended the synagogue, but who did not obligate themselves to keep the whole Mosaic law; in particular, males did not submit to circumcision."[397] In other words, the common assumption has been that a "proselyte" designates a gentile who has converted by means of circumcision in contrast to a "God-fearer".[398]

However, Acts eschews strict categorization on this matter. As Scot McKnight observes,

> That ["proselyte"] indicates "convert" is unquestionable; that some converts were circumcised is clear. But that the term "proselyte" in Acts means "a circumcised Gentile in contrast to the "God-fearer" is not possible to demonstrate…. What we can say for Acts is that a proselyte is a Gentile convert to Judaism, but we cannot specify the degree of adherence for that Gentile.[399]

Having established the adoption of Judaean religion to some degree by the Corinthian believers, whether before Paul and/or because of Paul, we cannot simply assume that all the gentiles to whom Paul writes were uncircumcised. When Paul directs that each "remain in the calling in which he was called", that is, either as circumcised or uncircumcised (1 Cor 7.18–20), it may well be that some of his gentile audience had taken that final step in proselytization.

Judgements varied as to what was required of proselytes, and it is perhaps better to speak of gradations of proximity to Judaean-*ness* during this period. Shaye Cohen demonstrates the varying degrees of proximity through his classification of seven forms of behavior by which

---

[396] BDAG, "προσήλυτος," 880.

[397] BDAG, "σέβω," 917–18.

[398] See Scot McKnight, *A Light among the Gentiles: Jewish Missionary Activity in the Second Temple Period* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), 108. I acknowledge, as Ross Kraemer details, that the relevant evidence does not "reflect a single, static meaning across historical periods" for so-called Godfearers ("Giving Up the Godfearers," *Journal of Ancient Judaism* 5 [2014]: 61). However, the suspicion that Luke has homogenized in this regard does not negate the likelihood that "The god-fearers, those Judaizing pagan adherents of urban synagogues, had presented a wonderful target of opportunity for the early Jesus movement. Because they were already in some sense familiar with Jewish scriptural traditions through their contact with the synagogue…" See Paula Fredriksen, *When Christians Were Jews: The First Generation* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2018), 153.

[399] McKnight, *A Light among the Gentiles*, 108–9.

gentiles tended to show respect or affection for the tradition, though these behaviors may not be sequential or mutually exclusive.[400] As Cohen remarks, even though Judaeans had erected a boundary between themselves and the rest of humanity, that "boundary was always crossable and not always clearly marked."[401] Cohen observes that full conversion (category 7) entailed three elements (though most accounts only mention one or two of these): "practice of the Jewish laws (category 4); exclusive devotion to the god of the Jews (category 5); and integration into the Jewish community (category 6)."[402] In his summarization, Lawrence Schiffman observes four basic requirements for full conversion: (1) acceptance of the Torah, (2) circumcision for males, (3) immersion, and (4) sacrifice (though no longer required after the temple's destruction in 70 CE).[403] In diaspora contexts, opinions regarding certain rituals seem generally more diversified and less stringent than in Palestine. The absence or disregard of certain rituals varies, for example, in texts such as *Sib. Ors.* 3 and 4; *Letter of Aristeas*; *Joseph and Aseneth*, and especially in Josephus regarding the conversion of Izates, king of Adiabene (*Ant*. 20.34–48).[404]

Even Philo on the requirement of circumcision for conversion is unclear. Perhaps due to his diaspora location, Philo saw converts as equal, even special, given the great chasm they had crossed in adopting Judaism:

---

[400] Shaye J. D. Cohen, "Crossing the Boundary and Becoming a Jew," *HTR* 82 (1989): 13.

[401] Cohen, "Crossing the Boundary and Becoming a Jew," 14.

[402] Cohen, "Crossing the Boundary and Becoming a Jew," 26.

[403] Lawrence H. Schiffman, *Who Was a Jew? Rabbinic and Halakhic Perspectives on the Jewish Christian Schism* (Hoboken, NJ: Ktav Publishing House, 1985), 19.

[404] See extensive treatment in John J. Collins, "A Symbol of Otherness: Circumcision and Salvation in the First Century," in *To See Ourselves as Others See Us*, eds. Jacob Neusner and E. S. Frerichs (Chico, CA: Scholars Press Studies in the Humanities, 1985), 163–86. Regarding the controversy over the circumcision of Izates, while the Judaeans involved (Ananias and Eleazer) do represent differing sensibilities on the subject, the concession of Ananias for Izates not to be circumcised still speaks to the seriousness of not undergoing the ritual for "full" conversion: "He told him, furthermore, that God Himself would pardon him if, constrained thus by necessity and by fear of his subjects, he failed to perform this rite" (*Ant*. 20.42 [Feldman, LCL]). Additionally, Ananias' concession is made primarily out of fear of retribution for having converted the king (*Ant*. 20.41).

> [A]ll who spurn idle fables and embrace truth in its purity, whether they have been such from the first or through conversion to the better side have reached that higher state, obtain His approval, the former because they were not false to the nobility of their birth, the latter because their judgement led them to make the passage to piety. These last he calls "proselytes," or newly-joined, because they have joined the new and godly commonwealth. Thus, while giving equal rank to all in-comers with all the privileges which he gives to the native-born, he exhorts the old nobility to honour them not only with marks of respect but with special friendship and with more than ordinary good-will. And surely there is good reason for this; they have left, he says, their country, their kinsfolk and their friends for the sake of virtue and religion. Let them not be denied another citizenship or other ties of family and friendship, and let them find places of shelter standing ready for refugees to the camp of piety. For the most effectual love-charm, the chain which binds indissolubly the goodwill which makes us one is to honour the one God." (*Spec*. 1.9.51–52 [Colson, LCL])

Furthermore, we find spiritualizing language not dissimilar from Paul.[405] Philo writes that

> He demonstrates most clearly that he is a proselyte who is circumcised not in foreskin but in pleasures, desires, and other passions of the soul... But what is the way of thinking of a proselyte? Abandonment of the belief that there are many gods, and appropriation of the worship of the one God who is Father of all."[406] (*QE* 2.2; cf. Rom 2.28–29)

Philo's emphasis on what is necessary for conversion here speaks to the dichotomy between *ritual* and *moral* purity previously discussed, as Terence Donaldson notes: "a proselyte is not this (one who is physically circumcised), but that (one who abandons idolatry, worships the one true God and lives a virtuous life)."[407]

Philo's position is surprising given his emphasis elsewhere on the necessity of Judaean ritual, even though he clearly values the heavenly counterparts of ritual more (a feature not just of

[405] For a comprehensive categorization of the steps of spiritualization, see Stephen Finlan, "Spiritualization of Sacrifice in Paul and Hebrews," in *Ritual and Metaphor: Sacrifice in the Bible*, ed. Christian Eberhart, SBL 68 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2011), 83–97. Finlan offers six different uses or levels of spiritualization: 1) the substitution of one sacrificial thing for another (cf. Gen 22.13; Exod 13.13); 2) attributing new and moralizing meanings to cultic practices or priestly categories (nevertheless pro-cultic, while importing new values into the cult or priesthood) (cf. Malachi; Philo in *Spec. Leg.* 1.206; 4.100); 3) putting all emphasis on spiritual motive (cf. Ps 51.17); 4) the metaphorical appropriation of cultic images to describe other experiences (cf. 4 Macc 6.29; Phil 2.17; 1 John 2.2; 4.10); 5) the outright rejection of sacrifice (cf. Hos 6.6; 1 Sam 15.22); and 6) lacks reference to sacrifice explicitly but rather signifies persons or communities infused with spiritual properties and values.

[406] See translation in Terence L. Donaldson," Proselytes or 'Righteous Gentiles'? The Status of Gentiles in Eschatological Pilgrimage Patterns of Thought," *JSP* 4.7 (1990): 15.

[407] Donaldson, "Proselytes or 'Righteous Gentiles'?" 15. On the distinction between *ritual* and *moral* purity in ancient Israel and early Judaism, see previous chapter.

a Platonic persuasion but also Israelite and Judaean belief).[408] In *Migr*. 89–94, Philo bemoans those who disregard actual ritual practice because of the superiority of the "symbols" or "inner meanings" behind them: "There are some who, regarding laws in their literal sense in the light of symbols of matters belonging to the intellect, are overpunctilious about the latter, while treating the former with easy-going neglect" (89 [Colson and Whitaker, LCL]). Instead, they ought to be devoted to both, according to Philo, whether it be Sabbath, festivals, circumcision, or temple attendance:

> 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. Nay, we should look on all these outward observances as resembling the body, and their inner meanings as resembling the soul. It follows that, exactly as we have to take thought for the body, because it is the abode of the soul, so we must pay heed to the letter of the laws. If we keep and observe these, we shall gain a clearer conception of those things of which these are the symbols; and besides that we shall not incur the censure of the many and the charges they are sure to bring against us. (92–93 [Colson and Whitaker, LCL])

By referring to "us", Philo may have had only fellow native Judaeans in mind and may, therefore, have considered proselytes to be in a different category. Nevertheless, unlike Paul, he would probably not have been begrudged to see converts circumcised as well. Though Paul imagines the Corinthian gentiles to be members of Israel, he contends that circumcision and uncircumcision "mean nothing" but rather "keeping the commandments of God" (1 Cor 7.19).

[408] For example, cf. Exod 25.8–9, 40; Wis 9.8; T. Levi 3.1–5; 2 Bar. 4.2–6; 4Q400 (Songs of the Sabbath) frag. 1, 1.1–4. My thanks to Matthew Thiessen for these references. Josephus, too, is interested in the cosmic symbolism of cultic objects. See Seth Schwartz, *Josephus and Judaean Politics*, Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition 18 (Leiden: Brill, 1990), 40–42. Additionally, see Gupta on the problem with speaking about the "real" temple in Nijay K. Gupta, *Worship That Makes Sense to Paul: A New Approach to the Theology and Ethics of Paul's Cultic Metaphors*, 2nd ed. (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010), 206.

Becoming All Things

The Extent of Paul's Adaptability

First Corinthians 9.20–22 refers to four distinct groups that Paul identifies as objects of his ministry: *Ioudaioi*; those *under* the law; those *without* the law; and the weak. Paul's aim is to "become" like these groups so that he might "win" (κερδαίνω) them.[409] What did this *becoming* entail so that Paul might persuade these audiences to adopt his gospel? Are we to imagine that these groups as drastically different from one another in their religiosity?

A traditional reading of the passage understands Paul to be putting on and taking off various identities for the sake of his audiences. C. K. Barrett, for example, reasons that Paul "could *become* a Jew only if, having been a Jew, he had ceased to be one and become something else. His Judaism was no longer of his very being, but a guise he could adopt or discard at will" (emphasis his).[410] Likewise, Fee posits that

> This opening item serves as the clue for understanding the others. How can a Jew determine to "become like a Jew"? The obvious answer is, In [*sic*] matters that have to do with Jewish religious peculiarities, which Paul as a disciple of the Risen One had long ago given up as having any bearing on one's relationship with God. These would include circumcision (7:19; Gal. 6:15), food laws (8:8; Gal. 2:10–13; Rom. 14:17; Col. 2:16), and special observances (Col. 2:16). On these questions not only was Paul himself free; he also took a thoroughly polemical stance toward any who would impose such requirements on Gentile converts."[411]

Mark Given, in support of Barrett's reading, argues that the key to Paul—a Judaean who becomes *like* a Judaean—is "to understand that in this context Paul is not talking about becoming a Jew in

---

[409] The term κερδαίνω seems to have operated as an early missionary term for Christ-followers and implies the successful persuasion of an audience (cf. Matt 18.15; 1 Pet 3.1). See David Daube, who refers to κερδαίνω as a "rabbinic missionary term" (*The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*, JLCRS 2 [London: University of London, Athlone Press, 1956], 359–60). See also Heinrich Schlier, "κέρδος, κερδαίνω," *TDNT* 3:673.

[410] C. K. Barrett, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2004), 211.

[411] Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 893.

the sense of becoming like a descendant of Abraham, as if his ethnicity was something that Paul could change, but of *practicing* Judaism" (emphasis mine).[412] In this way, "becoming like" involves "temporarily assuming a different identity, not merely adapting a little, being versatile, or being liberal enough to associate with those who for varying reasons are 'other.'"[413]

Amongst ancient orators, it was acknowledged that one needed to adapt their message to the situation and needs of a particular audience (cf. Dio Chrysostom, *Or*. 32.19–33; 33.7–16; Maximus of Tyre, *Or*. 1).[414] Clarence Glad suggests that Paul's approach resembles the "psychagogy" (or "guidance of the soul") of Epicureans (Philodemus of Gadara, in particular), which emphasizes that "particular attention should be paid to the character and disposition of each recipient of the psychagogue's care" (Philodemus, *Lib*. 43).[415] Glad describes the concept as

> a mature person's leading of neophytes in an attempt to bring about moral reformation by shaping the neophyte's view of himself and of the world. Such a reshaping demands in many cases a radical reorientation through social, intellectual, and moral transformation. Psychagogic discourse attempts to effect such a transformation. Such a discourse is then a form of paraenesis or moral exhortation having a twofold focus: on dissuasion and on persuasion. Not surprisingly, psychagogic discourse is often embedded in works of deliberative and epideictic genres, which on the one hand make clear what is honorable and what is shameful, and on the other hand prescribe what course of action is expedient or useful in the future.[416]

---

[412] Mark D. Given, *Paul's True Rhetoric: Ambiguity, Cunning, and Deception in Greece and Rome*, Emory Studies in Early Christianity 7 (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2001), 106.

[413] Given, *Paul's True Rhetoric*, 106.

[414] For Maximus, see text in Maximus Tyrius, *Philosophumena—Dialexeis*, ed. George L. Koniaris, TK 17 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1995). See also discussion in Abraham J. Malherbe, "'Gentle as a Nurse': The Cynic Background to 1 Thessalonians 2," in *Light from the Gentiles: Hellenistic Philosophy and Early Christianity: Collected Essays, 1959–2012*, eds. Carl R. Holladay, John T. Fitzgerald, James W. Thompson, and Gregory E. Sterling, NovTSup 150 (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 53–67.

[415] Clarence E. Glad, *Paul and Philodemus: Adaptability in Epicurean and Early Christian Psychagogy*, NovTSup 81 (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 4.

[416] Glad, *Paul and Philodemus*, 2.

In this sense, becoming like those Paul is attempting to win over is not duplicitous or dishonest, but rather the mark of a gifted teacher who can adapt σχῆμα and λόγος for effectiveness.[417] However, Glad's thesis has been criticized for equating *becoming like* and *associating with*. For example, Mark Given draws attention to Paul's use of *becoming like* (ἐγενόμην … ὡς) as distinct from *associating with* (e.g., ἐκολλήθην). The former is the stronger of the two as concerns adaptability: "*There is, in fact, no example in the NT or LXX where this construction is used simply to express a willingness to associate with someone*. Whether it used in a literal or figurative mode, it refers to concrete, observable changes" (emphasis his).[418]

Much has been made of the presence and absence of ὡς in 1 Cor 9.20–22. Nestle-Aland indicates that ὡς in v. 20a ("to the *Ioudaioi* I became *as* an *Ioudaios*") is absent in certain traditions. Conversely, the preposition in v. 22a, regarding the weak, has been left out of Nestle-Aland, though it appears in a number of traditions.[419] As concerns a Judaean audience, Hans Conzelmann claims that ὡς in v. 20a, though original, is "superfluous" since Paul was after all a Judaean.[420] In v. 22a, the absence of ὡς is "appropriate", according to Conzelmann, implying that Paul had indeed become weak for those who are weak.[421] However, the presence of ὡς with regard to those *under* or *without* the law becomes meaningful for Conzelmann's interpretation of Paul since, not being under or without the law, Paul must become "like" these.[422]

---

[417] Glad, *Paul and Philodemus*, 273.

[418] Given, *Paul's True Rhetoric*, 109.

[419] See Eberhard Nestle and Erwin Nestle, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, eds. Barbara Aland et al., rev. ed. 28 (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2012), 535.

[420] Hans Conzelmann and James Warren Dunkly, *1 Corinthians: A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, ed. George W MacRae, trans. James W Leitch, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975), 159 n. 5.

[421] Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 161 n. 28.

[422] Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 160–61. As concerns v. 22a, Conzelmann speculates that the presence of ὡς in many traditions was meant "to remove the offense of the suggestion that Paul should be said to have been weak" (161 n. 28).

The morality of such adaptability has been questioned by some. Admitting that Paul's "rhetorical tone" obscures the facts of his adaptability in 1 Cor 9.20–22, Wilfred Knox nevertheless notes the gravity of Paul's potential "moral dishonesty" if he is indeed "pretending to observe the Law when in Jewish society and neglecting it in Gentile society."[423] Mark Nanos has likewise challenged the traditional position that Paul adjusted his behavior to suit different audiences. He is concerned that, in the pertinent scholarship,

> the charges of inconsistency and moral dishonesty are treated as if benign, generally discussed without offering explanations sufficient to those who do not share this ideological perspective. In less generous terms, for example, expressed by those not inclined to defend Paul, or instead toward demonstrating his faults, he is portrayed to ape the behaviour of each in order to trick everyone into mistakenly believing that the message he proclaims does not subvert the rational basis or convictional value of living in the particular way that each lives.[424]

Nanos maintains that Paul did not live free of halakhic conviction. Instead, Paul's *becoming* represents "rhetorical" adaptability rather than "behavioral" adaptability.[425]

As evidence of Paul's rhetorical adaptability, Nanos cites his speech before the Areopagus in Acts 17 as well as Antisthenes' positive interpretation of cunning Odysseus from Homer's

---

[423] Wilfred Lawrence Knox, *St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1925), 122 n. 54.

[424] Mark Nanos, "Paul's Relationship to Torah in Light of his Strategy "to Become Everything to Everyone" (1 Corinthians 9.19–23)," in *Paul and Judaism: Crosscurrents in Pauline Exegesis and the Study of Jewish-Christian Relations*, eds. Reimund Bieringer and Didier Pollefeyt, LNTS 463 (London: T&T Clark, 2012), 119. For comparison, Nanos quotes Achilles from Homer's *Iliad*, who says, "For hateful in my eyes as the gates of Hades is that man who hides one thing in his mind and says another. So I will speak what seems to me to be best" (9.312–14 [Murray; Wyatt, LCL]) ("Paul's Relationship to Torah in Light of his Strategy," 135).

[425] Nanos mentions a third category ("convictional adaptability") which, as he states, seems to lack any scholarly backing ("Paul's Relationship to Torah in Light of his Strategy," 119–24). Cf. the categories of theological, epistemological, and ethical offered in Paul W. Gooch, "The Ethics of Accommodation: A Study in Paul," *TynBul* 29 (1978): 93–117.

Odyssey.[426] The reputation of Odysseus, inventor of the Trojan horse, had become increasingly negative over time. He came to be associated with anyone who altered their character and was therefore seen as "unstable, unprincipled, unscrupulous", a practice understood to be common among politicians.[427] Antisthenes, the pupil of Socrates, later attempted to redeem Odysseus' reputation by emphasizing his skill in speaking rather than altering his moral character.[428] Nanos admits, however, that comparison with Antisthenes' Odysseus blurs "the lines between lifestyle and rhetorical adaptability just as arises in discussion of Paul's passage."[429] As W. B. Stanford acknowledges, "we are faced here with one of the fundamental ambiguities in Odysseus' character. The border between adaptability and hypocrisy is easily crossed."[430]

For Nanos, Paul's *becoming* is all or nothing. He counters that Jesus' insistence for his disciples to become like children (γένησθε ὡς τὰ παιδία [Matt 18.3]) did not mean that they were "to conduct themselves childishly in general, for example, in the sense of playing with toys, or teasing each other, and so on, or to pretend to be children."[431] Nanos cites patristic orator John Chrysostom, who defended Paul's variability by citing a physician's practice in tending to the varying needs of patients: "If we accept a physician who does contradictory things, how much more should we praise Paul's soul, which attends to the sick."[432] In response, Nanos argues that,

---

[426] See also Abraham J. Malherbe, *Paul and the Popular Philosophers* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989), 118–19.

[427] See W. B. Stanford, *The Ulysses Theme: A Study in the Adaptability of a Traditional Hero*, 2nd ed. (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1968), 99.

[428] See Augusto Rostagni, "A New Chapter in the History of Rhetoric and Sophistry," in *Rhetoric and Kairos: Essays in History, Theory, and Praxis*, eds. Phillip Sipiora and James S. Baumlin, trans. Phillip Sipiora (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2002), 25–26.

[429] Nanos, "Paul's Relationship to Torah in Light of his Strategy," 134.

[430] Stanford, *The Ulysses Theme*, 91.

[431] Nanos, "Paul's Relationship to Torah in Light of his Strategy," 121

[432] *Laud. Paul.* 5.7 (SC 300.242–44) as cited in Margaret M. Mitchell, "'A Variable and Many-sorted Man': John Chrysostom's Treatment of Pauline Inconsistency," *JECS* 6.1 (1998): 108. Chrysostom was defending Paul

by this logic, Paul's conduct would be "like a patient to patients, student to students, and child to children",[433] meaning that Paul cannot help them if he is like them.

E. P. Sanders suggests that we not read 1 Cor 9.19–23 as a literal description of Paul's life and work.[434] Sanders sees Paul's *becoming* as hyperbolic. As an example, he cites Rom 15.19 as language we should also not take literally. When Paul says that he has "completed" (with the perfect, πεπληρωκέναι) the gospel of Christ from Jerusalem as far (or up to) Illyricum (stretching from Slovenia to Albania today), should we assume that he preached absolutely everywhere in that vast area?[435]

Paul and Jesus

Comparison with Jesus' approach as portrayed in the Gospels has also provided a launching pad for interpreting Paul's adaptability. While the Gospels portray Jesus as freely associating with tax collectors and sinners (which itself occasioned controversy), he is nonetheless never portrayed as temporarily assuming their identity so that he might "gain" them to his movement. In Given's view, Paul's language of *becoming* in 1 Cor 9.20–22 indicates that he in fact does temporarily assume another group's identity, which is where he departs from Jesus' presumed approach.[436]

---

against the charge of inconsistency: "Paul, in imitating his master, should not be blamed if at one time he was as a Jew, and at another as one not under the Law; or if once he was keeping the Law, but at another time he was overlooking it; at one time clinging to the present life, at another despising it; at one time demanding money, at another rejecting what was offered; once offering sacrifices and shaving his head, and again anathematizing those who did such things; at one time circumcising, at another casting out circumcision" (*Laud. Paul.* 5.6 [SC 300.240] as cited in Mitchell, "'A Variable and Many-sorted Man,'" 107).

[433] Nanos, "Paul's Relationship to Torah in Light of his Strategy," 111.

[434] E. P. Sanders, *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985), 185. For Sanders, the behavioral aspect presents a practical difficulty though, not a theological one. See further discussion on "Pauline theory" in Sanders, *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People*, 176–79.

[435] See discussion in Sanders, *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People*, 186.

[436] Given, *Paul's True Rhetoric*, 106.

David Rudolph takes issue with this conclusion, arguing that Paul was not only aware but also imitative of Jesus' approach to differing groups. Rudolph points to Paul's use of Jesus tradition in 1 Cor 9.14 (cf. Luke 10.7) regarding the wages of a gospel laborer, as well as 1 Cor 10.27 (cf. Luke 10.8) in the instruction to eat what is set before you.[437] In this way, Paul is informed by Jesus' "example and rule of adaptation with respect to commensality."[438] Coupled with the evidence that some diaspora Judaeans ate with gentiles *within* the defined bounds of Judaean flexibility,[439] Rudolph concludes that Paul's *becoming*, in all likelihood, "did not mean that he imitated them like a chameleon but that he closely associated with them through table-fellowship, and conformed to their customs (within the limits of God's law) in keeping with the Jewish ethic of hospitality."[440] Nevertheless, Rudolph has not saved Paul from behavioral adaptability. Furthermore, and against Nanos, Rudolph shows that there was a diversity of approaches among Judaeans broadly on how to judge engagement with non-Judaean custom.

The Extent of Paul's Audience

The strength of arguments against the traditional understanding of Paul's adaptability lies not just in the practical difficulty of Paul *becoming all things to all people* when different groups are present in the same audience, but also in the Corinthians' familiarity with and adoption of Judaean tradition, as discussed above. As Knox writes, "it would be impossible for him to conceal from Jews whom he hoped to convert the fact that he disregarded the Law when not in Jewish

[437] See discussion in David J. Rudolph, *A Jew to the Jews: Jewish Contours of Pauline Flexibility in 1 Corinthians 9:19–23*, 2nd ed. (Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2016), 187–90.

[438] Rudolph, *A Jew to the Jews*, 190.

[439] Cf. Let. Aris. 257; T. Ab. Rec. A 4.7; Rec. B 4.15; Philo, *Abr*. 107–8, 115, 118; Gen. Rab. 48.14; Exod. Rab. 47.5.

[440] Rudolph, *A Jew to the Jews*, 191.

company."[441] It is one thing to imagine Paul altering his behavior from town to town, or even from assembly to assembly (which in itself would be difficult if there was the slightest divergence), but how indeed could Paul have been an *Ioudaios* to *Ioudaioi* and a gentile to gentiles in the same assembly?[442] I propose that the distance between these groups in these assemblies is not as vast as has been assumed.

Furthermore, there should be even greater concern over the fact that Paul gives himself away by sharing his tactics in 1 Cor 9.20–22. It is obvious though that Paul is not concerned to keep his ways secret. As Peter Richardson and Paul Gooch acknowledge, Paul's adaptability is "stated as a positive principle of behaviour.… He was not ashamed or embarrassed about this, but acted openly and stated the principle forthrightly."[443] Why is Paul not worried? Because he did not think his adaptability would occasion controversy, at least among these assemblies.

Here, I am primarily concerned with the identity of those considered to be "under" the law, whom I maintain constitute the majority of Paul's gentile audiences. The phrase ὑπὸ νόμον in 1 Cor 9.20 is used by Paul seven times in other letters (Gal 3.23; 4.4, 5, 21; 5.18; Rom 6.14, 15).[444] The phrase probably refers not to *Ioudaioi*, since they are just mentioned in v. 20a, but to gentiles attempting to live "under the law" (cf. Gal 4.4 in reference to Christ).[445] As Stanley Stowers observes, Paul often presupposes an audience that "consists of gentiles who had or still have a lively interest in Judaism. Such people existed and most likely made up the bulk of the early gentile

[441] Knox, *St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem*, 122 n. 54.

[442] See Sanders, *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People*, 185.

[443] Peter Richardson and Paul W. Gooch, "Accommodation Ethics," *TynBul* 29 (1978): 93.

[444] Cf. ἐν [τῷ] νόμῳ in Rom 2.12; 3.19.

[445] See discussion in Johnson Hodge, *If Sons, Then Heirs*, 124–25 nn. 44–45. See also Given, *Paul's True Rhetoric*, 107; Gaston, *Paul and the Torah*, 30; Glad, *Paul and Philodemus*, 255. Cf. Rudolph, who identifies those "under the law" as stricter Jews (Rudolph, *A Jew to the Jews*, 190).

converts to Christ."[446] This crowd would have consisted of those "caught between two cultures", and had likely already been drawn to Judaean religion as a school for self-mastery.[447] Likewise, Cavan Concannon holds that the phrase fits better as a description of a particular kind of gentile, as

> Gentiles who had tried to follow the demands of the Mosaic law. In Jewish texts of the period, being ὑπὸ νόμον is not generally used to describe the relationship between Ioudaioi and the law. If the phrase is not one that would apply to Ioudaioi, it may fit better as a description of a particular kind of Gentile: those who have sought to keep the law but have failed because of the limitations of their passions and lack of self-mastery as Gentiles.[448]

Such was the case with the Galatians, whom Paul describes as those seeking to be "under the law" (οἱ ὑπὸ νόμον θέλοντες εἶναι [4.21]). The Judaean features of 1 Corinthians gives us no reason to assume a different makeup of the Corinthian assembly. What we have then between the *Ioudaios* and the *anomos* is a distinct audience well-versed in Judaean religion but, as indicated by Paul, plagued by the demands upon them (as distinct from a Judaean like Paul [cf. 2 Cor 11.21–23; Phil 3.4–6]). How then might Paul become "under" the law to those non-Judaeans attracted to the tradition who felt crushed beneath the weight of its demands?[449]

---

[446] Stanley K. Stowers, *A Rereading of Romans: Justice, Jews, and Gentiles* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994), 277. See again McKnight's discussion of God-fearers as a distinct group in *A Light among the Gentiles*, 110–14; as well as Cohen regarding the gradations of proximity and assimilation in the Second Temple period (Cohen, "Crossing the Boundary and Becoming a Jew," 13–33).

[447] Stowers, *A Rereading of Romans*, 278, 269. Cf. Johnson Hodge, *If Sons, Then Heirs*, 124–25. Consider the lack of self-mastery mentioned in Euripides, *Med.* 1077–80: "I know well what pain I am about to undergo, but my wrath overbears my calculation, wrath that brings mortal men their gravest hurt" (Kovacs, LCL); and *Hipp*. 377–83: "Rather, one must look at it this way: what we know and understand to be noble we fail to carry out, some from laziness, others because they give precedence to some other pleasure than honor. Life's pleasures are many, long talks and leisure, a pleasant bane, and modest restraint" (Kovacs, LCL).

[448] Concannon, *"When You Were Gentiles"*, 30. Paul identifies with gentiles in Galatians 3 as well when he writes "we" (v. 23) but then switches to "you" at the climax of that passage (vv. 26–29; cf. also Romans 7). See discussion in Lloyd Gaston, *Paul and the Torah* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1987), 29. Cf. Sanders, *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People*, 68–69.

[449] See discussion in Emma Wasserman, *The Death of the Soul in Romans 7: Sin, Death, and the Law in Light of Hellenistic Moral Psychology*, WUNT 2 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 114–15.

Paul's Adaptability as Restrictive, not Liberal

Ultimately, we should understand Paul's relational methods as *restrictive* rather than *liberal*. Paul frames the approach to his ministry with the analogy of an athlete, "bruising" his body and "enslaving" it (1 Cor 9.27). The interactions Paul envisions in his letter, where two parties differ, come with the entreaty to restrict oneself for the sake of the other, most notably, by not eating for the sake of weak members (1 Corinthians 8, 10). Paul hopes that his adaptability, as expressed in these restrictive ways, will serve as an example to the assembly of the immense strain he puts himself under for the sake of others. After all, restriction is the very theme of 1 Corinthians 9: "Am I not free? Am I not an apostle? Haven't I seen Jesus our Lord? Are you not my workmanship in the Lord?" (v. 1). Whether it be restriction in provision (v. 4), marriage (v. 5), or vocation (v. 6), Paul's "becoming" tactics are not for personal gain as some "charlatan sophist".[450] Paul seems unconcerned about such a charge against him, at least in 1 Corinthians (cf. though 2 Cor 1.15–24).[451] In Paul's mind, such behavior is not contradictory but rather follows the example of Christ himself, for it was Christ who became what he was not for the sake of others (2 Cor 5.21). Paul shares his tactics precisely because he wants his readers to imitate him as he imitates Christ (1 Cor 11.1).

While it may be unfounded to interpret Paul's adaptability as radically as the traditional reading would suggest, it is nevertheless clear that another ethic or law-code now drives Paul. As

[450] Cf. Dio Chrysostom on the "charlatan sophist" in *Or*. 4.33–35. Paul differs greatly from what we find discussed in Plutarch's *Moralia* on "How to Tell a Flatterer from a Friend" (52A–C) as well as the Socratic dialogue on lying and deceit in Xenophon's *Memorabilia* (4.2.14), where the purposes are plainly self-serving. Nevertheless, Paul did face an onslaught of criticism on several fronts, one of which being his consistency (cf. 2 Cor 1.15–24).

[451] Though unlikely, Henry Chadwick entertains that "the very wording of the confession that he was as a Jew to the Jews and as a Gentile to the Gentiles could conceivably have been in the charge-sheet against him, whether in Galatia or at Corinth. It is possible, though not demonstrable, that here he is actually quoting from his adversaries. It would be quite consistent with his usual practice if he were doing so, and in the Corinthian letters Paul appears especially inclined to take the charges of his opponents and to quote them back in an ironical tone" (Chadwick, "All Things to All Men," *NTS* 1.4 (1955): 263.

he states in 1 Cor 9.21, "I became … to those who are without the law, as without the law, though not being without the law of God but *within* the law of Christ [ἔννομος Χριστοῦ], so that I might win those who are without the law."[452] C. H. Dodd captures the force of Paul's claim here: "It is evident that (in this place at least) the Torah is not conceived as being identical, or equivalent, or at any rate co-extensive, with the law of God, which is either a different, or more inclusive, law than the law of Moses."[453] The distinction between ὑπὸ νόμον and ἔννομος is worth noting in this regard. Paul could very well have used the same construction, ὑπὸ νόμον, in reference to this "law of Christ". The term ἔννομος ("*within* the law of Christ"), however, seems to imply a spatial distinction: it is not something to move in and out from under but rather is all-encompassing. The following rendering is offered in BDAG: "I identified as one outside Mosaic jurisdiction with those outside it; not, of course, being outside God's jurisdiction, but inside Christ's.[454] The idea is that God's bounds in Christ are wider than that indicated in Mosaic code. Dodd imagines the implied debate in 1 Corinthians 9 as such:

> Paul declares that he is not ὑπὸ νόμον, meaning, not subject to Torah. His Jewish adversary counters, "Then you are, by your own confession, an ἄνομος, a lawless, ungovernable, dissolute heathen". "No", Paul retorts, "you are assuming an unwarranted identity of the Torah with the ultimate law of God. A man may be free from Torah and yet be loyal to the law of God, as it is represented or expressed in the law of Christ. Being myself subject to the law of Christ, I am no stranger to the law of God, although I claim freedom from the Torah".[455]

We should also cite again 1 Cor 7.19, showing that Paul can distinguish circumcision from "keeping the commandments of God". For Paul, ethnic and religious restrictions are, in the end, a

[452] On ἄνομοι as the "lawless" and not the "immoral," see Given, *Paul's True Rhetoric*, 109.

[453] C. H. Dodd, "ΕΝΝΟΜΟΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ," in *Studia Paulina* (Haarlem: Erven F. Bohn, 1953), 98.

[454] BDAG, "ἔννομος," 338.

[455] Dodd, "ΕΝΝΟΜΟΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ," 99.

sub-field within the greater law of God. Paul beckons his readers to endure with each other's sub-field for the sake of their faith (cf. 1 Cor 8.10–13).[456]

Paul's approach to become like those he seeks to win stands in contrast to those "with knowledge" among the Corinthians. The obvious example for determining how Paul *becomes* to the groups mentioned is the matter of eating food sacrificed to idols in 1 Corinthians 8 and 10. Those with knowledge eat before the weak without regard for, or perhaps in an attempt to alter, the views of the weak (1 Cor 8.12; cf. Rom 14.20). It is important to note that Paul does not distinguish between the two groups as right and wrong in terms of their outlook on eating.[457] Paul does not even condemn the attempts of the knowledgeable, as Glad notes: "Paul does not question the right of the wise to guide the weak but rejects their pedagogy and mode of spiritual guidance. Paul disapproves not only of the attitude of the 'wise' but also the way in which they attempt to reform the weak."[458] Paul rebukes the knowledgeable (even though he shares their views) for having no regard for the sensitivity of others who see the world differently. They display their liberty rather than *becoming* to them as weak. The effect of eating meat sacrificed to idols before a weak member ultimately occurs only in the realm of the weak member's conscience.

[456] Fredriksen cleverly points out that Paul's mission involved "judaizing" as well, albeit to a different extent than his opponents. Nevertheless, "These pagans were to abandon the gods native to them, and to worship exclusively Paul's god, the god of Israel—a much more radical form of Judaizing than diaspora synagogues ever requested, much less required." See discussion in Paula Fredriksen, "Why Should a 'Law-Free' Mission Mean a 'Law-Free' Apostle?" *JBL* 134.3 (2015): 644–45.

[457] The weak, as Peter Gooch notes, are not "false (whether ignorant or in error or deceived)" (*Dangerous Food: 1 Corinthians 8–10 in Its Context* [Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1993], 78).

[458] Glad, *Paul and Philodemus*, 278. See also Glad's discussion of the same criticism lodged against Stoics: "In spite of their deterministic view of things and often condescending attitude towards others, Stoics shared the common concern of moralists to reform others and continued to use both praise and blame in their attempt to influence others" (281).

Nonetheless, to transgress this sensitivity, because of its resulting guilt, is to sin against Christ (1 Cor 8.11–12). *Becoming* involves a restrictive change in way of life for the sake of others.[459]

This restriction is further expressed in the example Paul sets for his audience by his self-discipline. This is seen principally in the use of μετασχηματίζω ("to change one's form), which Paul uses negatively in 2 Corinthians when referring to his opponents who disguise themselves as apostles of Christ and servants of righteousness. They do so in imitation of Satan, who disguises himself as an angel of light (2 Cor 11.13–15). In 1 Corinthians, however, Paul uses the term when he says that the things he requires of the Corinthians he has already "*figuratively applied* [μετασχηματίζω] to myself and Apollos for your sakes, so that in us you may learn not to exceed what is written, so that none of you will become arrogant" (1 Cor 4.6).[460] As discussed above, such an ethic is derived from Christ's example. Their sufferings as apostles are "on display" or "theatre" (θέατρον) for the cosmos, for angels, and for people (4.9).

Conclusion

While 1 Corinthians indicates a mostly gentile audience with a "pagan" past, indicators in the letter show them to have adopted Judaean tradition to a great extent. If Acts offers an accurate portrayal, or at the very least a probable scenario, some may have even proselytized fully prior to the founding of the assembly in Corinth when they were members of the synagogue (cf. Acts 17.1–

[459] This can be compared to the rhetorical practice of "speech-in-character". See esp. Stowers, *A Rereading of Romans*, 269. In the first-person testimony of Rom 7.7–25, Paul speaks as one who wants to do what is good but finds that evil lies close at hand (vv. 21–23). That Paul is in character here, see Krister Stendahl's famous article which drew attention to Paul's "robust" conscience in Phil 3.4–11 ("The Apostle Paul and the Introspective Conscience of the West," *HTR* 56.3 [1963]: 199–215). Rhetorically, Paul's speech-in-character from Rom 7.7–25 represents an identification with those gentiles who feel the weight of Torah upon them. See also Wasserman, *The Death of the Soul in Romans 7*, 77–81.

[460] See treatment in Corin Mihaila, *The Paul-Apollos Relationship and Paul's Stance Toward Greco-Roman Rhetoric: An Exegetical and Socio-Historical Study of 1 Corinthians 1–4*, LNTS 402 (London: T&T Clark International, 2009).

17). For this reason, Paul's temple metaphor does not have to be evoking the temples of Corinth, as Lanci and others maintain. Instead, the Corinthian gentiles would have been primed to think of the Judaean temple in Jerusalem, especially since Paul assumes their familiarity (cf. 1 Cor 10.18).

Furthermore, if we can rightly assume that Paul interacts with gentiles already intimately familiar with Judaean religion, then his adaptability as stated in 1 Cor 9.19–23 is not as radical as once argued. While adaptability has precedent in Graeco-Roman writings that praise the philosopher who alters message and self for the needs of a particular audience, one's adaptability, if taken too far, could occasion charges of deception. In 1 Corinthians, Paul is unconcerned about such charges, which must speak to the makeup of his audience and demands a more nuanced interpretation of his approach to become "all things to all people" (9.22). The traditional position has assumed that Paul put on and took of the practice of his Judaean-*ness* for diverse audiences, especially since his audiences were predominantly gentile. However, it has been shown here that, for the Corinthians, their life as *ethnē* was a thing of the past.[461] They did not need Paul to meet them as "pagans" without the law. Rather, their need concerns their inability to access the cultic life of Israel—even though Paul considers them members of Israel—per Paul's rule to remain as one is (i.e., uncircumcised) in all assemblies where he carries influence (1 Cor 7.17). Having established the identity of the Corinthians as well as their ritual realities, we are now able to feel the full impact of Paul's temple metaphor.

[461] Those Paula Fredriksen refers to as "ex-pagan pagans", by which she means "those non-Jewish members of the first generation of the messianic movement around Jesus… The term's inelegance highlights the extreme anomaly, socially and therefore religiously, that this first generation represented: they were non-Jews who, *as* non-Jews, committed themselves to the exclusive worship, in some specifically Jewish ways, of the Jewish god" (*Paul: The Pagans' Apostle* [New Haven: Yale University Press, 2017], 34).

APPENDIX

DID THE CORINTHIANS KNOW?

ANALOGY AND HOMOLOGY IN THE OYK OIΔATE QUESTION

Introduction

The overwhelming use of the οὐκ οἴδατε question ("Don't you know?") in 1 Corinthians (ten out of the twelve occurrences in Paul) is consistent with the confrontational tone typical of ancient diatribe.[462] The question even occurs in both instances where Paul employs his temple metaphor in 1 Corinthians (3.16; 6.19), which seems to indicate that he is presuming past knowledge on the part of his audience, that is, that they were already taught to think of themselves as ναὸς θεοῦ. Did the Corinthians already think of themselves as the temple of God, though they are rebuked by Paul for living in a manner inconsistent with that status? Or was it news to them that such a status had been bestowed on them? Many have assumed that Paul must be drawing on instruction which he imparted at an earlier date. However, recent comparison of the question's use in ancient instances of diatribe (e.g., as found in Epictetus) has challenged this assumption, arguing instead that the question arises logically from preceding material in the text rather than referring to past instruction. The implication is that Paul's temple metaphor is a random occurrence rather than a regular feature of his thinking. In response, I hold that the genre of regular letter writing to communities means

[462] As first observed in Rudolf Bultmann, *Der Stil der paulinischen Predigt und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe*, FRLANT 13 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1910), 65. Cf. no awareness in Johannes Weiss, *Der Erste Korintherbrief*, KEK 5 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1910), 85. See also Abraham J. Malherbe, "Mh Γenoito in the Diatribe and Paul," *HTR* 73.1–2 (1980): 231–40.

that Paul's use of the question cannot be equally compared to the other instances of the question in diatribal writings.

Categorization is offered below which seeks to delineate between information occasioned by οὐκ οἴδατε regarding what was plausibly known or unknown by the Corinthians. By analyzing the different uses of this diatribal feature in Paul, I consider whether Paul's temple metaphors are mere analogies made for the first time, or an ascribed status of which the Corinthians, while delinquent, were already aware. I conclude that Paul's temple metaphor falls into the latter category.

Occurrences

Pauline Writings

Paul uses the οὐκ οἴδατε question twelve times in total, ten of which occur in 1 Corinthians and two of which pertain to the community as temple (Rom 6.16; 11.2; 1 Cor 3.16; 5.6; 6.2, 3, 9, 15, 16, 19; 9.13, 24). In addition to the temple metaphor in 1 Cor 3.16 and 6.19, other topics broached in 1 Corinthians by using the question include: knowing that a little leaven leavens an entire batch of dough (5.6); that the Corinthian believers as οἱ ἅγιοι will judge the world (6.2); that they will also judge angels (6.3); that the unrighteous will not inherit the kingdom of God (6.9); that their individual bodies are actual body parts of Christ (6.15); that those who sleep with prostitutes fuse their bodies with them (6.16); that those who preside over temple altars get their food from the sacrifices offered (9.13); and that, although many compete in a race, only one receives the winning prize (9.24).

We only find οὐκ οἴδατε two other times in Paul outside of 1 Corinthians. Paul's letter to the Romans displays his theology for the assembly there so that he might find support among them once he arrives, since he did not know them personally (cf. 15.23–34). Use of the question in

Romans clearly denotes tension regarding the topics addressed. Paul clarifies his position on sin and grace, which was likely to have been controversial (6.16). Paul also addresses the apparent contradiction of Israel's election yet unbelief in Christ (11.2). These instances occur closely with another feature of diatribe, the use of μὴ γένοιτο—"May it never be!"[463]

Other NT Examples

Outside of Paul, other New Testament examples of οὐκ οἴδατε as a rhetorical question include Mark 4.13; Luke 2.49; John 19.10; and James 4.4. Jesus uses the question in Mark 4.13 as a rebuke. He is exacerbated by the disciples' lack of insight regarding the parable of the sower and says to them: "Can you not interpret [οὐκ οἴδατε] this parable? [If not] How then will you divine [γνώσεσθε] all the parables?" In Luke 2.49, the child Jesus presumes that Mary and Joseph should know why he was not with them for the journey home: "'Why were you looking for me? Did you not realize [elevated form: οὐκ ᾔδειτε] that I must attend to my father's affairs?" In John 19.10, Pilate asks Jesus rhetorically, since he assumes Jesus is well aware of the power with which he is vested as procurator: "Are you not going to speak to me? Do you not know [οὐκ οἶδας] that I have the authority either to release you or to crucify you?" James 4.4 is especially confrontational by beginning with the vocative: "Adulteresses, do you not know [οὐκ οἴδατε] that to be in a state of friendship with the world is to be in a state of enmity with God?"

The Question in Classical Diatribe

The question in Paul differs from typical usage in terms of genre and audience. J. L. Moles offers the following description of classic diatribe as a

[463] See Malherbe, "Mh Γenoito in the Diatribe and Paul," 232 n. 8; and Weiss, *Der Erste Korintherbrief*, 84 n. 1.

> Modern term for works of Greek or Roman popular philosophy, generally implying the following: that they are direct transcriptions or literary developments of addresses given by Cynic or Stoic … philosophers on the streets, before large audiences or by way of moral exhortation to pupils; that they focus on a single theme; that their main aim is to attack vices (hence the modern meaning); that they employ a vigorous, hectoring, colloquial (sometimes vulgar) style, with colourful, everyday imagery; that they sometimes have an anonymous interlocutor, thereby providing a dramatic illusion, a degree of argument and (usually) a butt. Such works are regarded as the pagan equivalent of the Christian sermon, which they are supposed to have influenced (from Paul onwards).[464]

The antagonistic "do you not know?" is not typical of common letter writing but rather the kind of teacher-student contexts described above. Instead, one finds gentler expressions in epistolary correspondence, such as "as you know…" or "you know…",[465] though Paul does take a combative tone since he is addressing moral failings in his letters to the Corinthians. Furthermore, occurrences in Socrates, Dio Chrysostom, and Epictetus, who account for the greatest number of uses in diatribe elsewhere, are expressed in the second person singular rather than the second personal plural. Paul uses the plural since he is addressing communities.[466] Paul's use of the οὐκ οἴδατε question, therefore, is saddled between two literary worlds as a feature of diatribal discourse, yet also an expression of real frustration in epistolary form at the delinquency of his correspondents.[467]

---

[464] J. L. Moles, "diatribe," *OCD*, 22 December 2015. See also Douglas A. Campbell, *The Deliverance of God: An Apocalyptic Reading of Justification in Paul* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 535–38; and Paul M. Robertson, *Paul's Letters and Contemporary Greco-Roman Literature: Theorizing a New Taxonomy*, NovTSup 167 (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 49 n. 135.

[465] See Benjamin A. Edsall, "Paul's Rhetoric of Knowledge: The OYK OIΔATE Question in 1 Corinthians," *NovT* 55.3 (2013): 264 n. 44.

[466] As Abraham Malherbe describes of ancient letters, they are "real communications and not technical treatises" (cf. Demetrius of Phalerum, *De Eloc.* 230–31). See Malherbe, *Ancient Epistolary Theorists*, SBLSBS 19 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988), 12.

[467] See Robertson's contention that "Despite the many insights derived from applying the diatribe to Paul's letters, this diatribal approach to Paul's letters has two main limitations. The first is that only certain sections of Paul's letters can be accurately described as a diatribe, or perhaps diatribal. The second is the confusion, both ancient and modern, surrounding the precise definition of the word 'diatribe'" (*Paul's Letters and Contemporary Greco-Roman Literature*, 50ff.).

Though letter-writing was used in educational settings as well,[468] Stanley Stowers cautions against equating letter-writing with advanced rhetoric:

> My study of the diatribe, focusing on its dialogical and pedagogical features, illuminated just such an alternative tradition of rhetoric nourished by moral teachers and philosophers who may or may not have had high rhetorical educations. My work on letter writing tried to show the limited and complex relationship between epistolography and the dominant rhetorical tradition.[469]

Paul's prior education may well have situated him among the small number of people in his first-century Mediterranean world who could produce complex literary work.[470] But, as Paul Robertson argues,

> Paul was no rhetorician like Quintilian, nor do Paul's letters seem to indicate that he possessed the ideal sort of education we find detailed by someone like Quintilian. Although I find it likely that students with advanced rhetorical educations would gain facility with certain compositional skills derived from an epistolary-specific education such as we might find in a bureaucratic setting, the inverse is by no means true and we have evidence for specialized letter-writers and letter-writing education. Given the shortcomings in thinking of Paul as advanced rhetor, it seems more prudent to think of Paul as a trained letter-writer instead of rhetorician.[471]

For these reasons, we should be cautious in drawing a straight line between the occurrence of diatribe in Paul from that found in writings more classically considered so.

History of Research

The question in Paul has been understood as either referring to 1) what is obvious, and/or to 2) past instruction. Concerning those instances relating to the audience's temple status, Bertil Gärtner

---

[468] See discussion in Malherbe, *Ancient Epistolary Theorists*, 6–7.

[469] Stanley K. Stowers, "Apostrophe, Προσωποποιία and Paul's Rhetorical Education," in *Early Christianity and Classical Culture: Comparative Studies in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe*, eds. Abraham J. Malherbe, John T. Fitzgerald, Thomas H. Olbricht, and L. Michael White, NovTSup 110 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 368.

[470] On biographies of Paul as "Hellenistic diaspora Pharisee", see Martin Hengel and Roland Deines, *The Pre-Christian Paul* (London: SCM Press, 1991), 27, 42; and Jürgen Becker, *Paul: Apostle to the Gentiles* (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993), 40–51.

[471] Robertson, *Paul's Letters and Contemporary Greco-Roman Literature*, 48–49.

takes the question to mean that "temple symbolism formed part of Paul's teaching in Corinth, since he begins by saying 'Do you not know that, οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι', the implication being that he is reminding them of something they have heard before."[472] R. J. McKelvey suggests that Paul is "returning what is familiar and accepted."[473] C. K. Barrett writes that "it is implied that they ought to know, perhaps that Paul himself had told them."[474] Joseph Fitzmyer remarks that Paul, at least, "implies that the Corinthian Christians should be familiar already with what he is about to ask."[475] According to Michael Newton, the question in Paul indicates that "the statement he is about to make is self-evident or that it is a basic tenet of his teaching which the readers have already received."[476]

Others have taken a more cautious approach, noting the use of the question as a feature of classic diatribe.[477] Gordon Fee suggests that to assume Paul had previously given them the image of the assembly as temple is "to put too much weight on the language of what seems rather to be a rhetorical device."[478] However, Fee also considers that it may be more than simply a rhetorical device, detecting irony or sarcasm in the question based on the boasting of those who think

---

[472] 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*, SNTSMS 1 (Cambridge: University Press, 1965), 57.

[473] R. J. McKelvey, *The New Temple: The Church in the New Testament*, Oxford Theological Monographs (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969), 100.

[474] Barrett, *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 90.

[475] Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 32 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), 202.

[476] Michael Newton, *The Concept of Purity at Qumran and in the Letters of Paul*, SNTSMS 53 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 54. See also Albert L. A. Hogeterp, *Paul and God's Temple: A Historical Interpretation of Cultic Imagery in the Corinthian Correspondence*, BTS 2 (Leuven: Peeters, 2006), 326; Martin Vahrenhorst, *Kultische Sprache in den Paulusbriefen*, WUNT 230 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 146.

[477] Fascher recognizes the feature from diatribe but still maintains that it recalls a foundational teaching of Paul's in Erich Fascher, *Der Erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther: Einführung und Auslegung der Kapitel 1–7*, THKNT 7.1 (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1975), 138.

[478] Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 146 n. 4.

themselves wise and knowledgeable. In this case, the question could be rendered: "Can it be that you who boast in γνῶσις [1 Cor 8.1ff.; 13.2, 8] do not know that?"[479] Hans Conzelmann likewise counsels caution, noting that "This frequent, pedagogical phrase from the diatribe style must not be taken to mean that Paul had never given the readers instruction on this matter."[480] Stanley Stowers discerns an almost catechetical function in the question. With οὐκ οἴδατε,

> Paul introduces basic traditional Christian or scriptural material which should be a matter of common in-group knowledge. This is reminiscent of our οὐκ οἶδας, ἢ ἀγνοεῖς, etc., in the diatribe, which is used in indicting address and suggests that the imaginary or real student may be ignorant of basic ethical or philosophical principles.[481]

We find the question in connection with the two instances of temple metaphor in 1 Corinthians, but not with the temple metaphor in 2 Cor 6.16.[482] McKelvey speculates that 2 Cor 6.16 may constitute the earliest use of the temple metaphor in Paul's Corinthian correspondence, and that which Paul draws upon in 1 Cor 3.16 and 6.19. The absence of οὐκ οἴδατε in 2 Cor 6.16 "suggests that the teaching was new to the readers. It is not unlikely, of course, that the idea of the church as the temple of God, or at least the doctrine of indwelling Spirit, was treated of by [*sic*] the apostle during his stay at Corinth (Acts 18.1ff.)."[483] Relatedly, Barrett posits the likelihood that

---

[479] Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 146 n. 3. Such is J. C. Hurd's understanding, if indeed the claim "all have γνῶσις" (8.1) were actually true (*The Origin of 1 Corinthians* [London: SPCK, 1965], 85).

[480] Hans Conzelmann and James Warren Dunkly, *1 Corinthians: A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, ed. George W MacRae, trans. James W Leitch, Hermeneia [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975], 77 n. 87). See also Weiss, *Der Erste Korintherbrief*, 84 n. 1; and Christophe Senft, *La première épître de Saint-Paul aux Corinthiens*, CNT 2.7 (Neuchâtel: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1979), 61.

[481] Stanley K. Stowers, *The Diatribe and Paul's Letter to the Romans*, SBLDS 57 (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981), 152.

[482] Though lacking οὐκ οἴδατε, it should be noted that even 2 Cor 6.16 in expressed in question form.

[483] McKelvey, *The New Temple*, 100. See also D. R. de Lacey, "Οἵτινές Ἐστε Ὑμεῖς: The Function of a Metaphor in St Paul," in *Templum Amicitiae: Essays on the Second Temple presented to Ernst Bammel*, ed. William Horbury, JSNTSup 48 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), 403. The position of 2 Cor 6.14–7.1 in the conceptual flow of 2 Corinthians, in addition to the number of *hapax legomena*, have given many pause. Fitzmyer has concluded that the passage is an interpolation of Essene elements ("Qumran and the Interpolated Fragment in 2 Cor 6:14–7:1," *CBQ* 23.3 [1961]: 271–280). For an in-depth discussion on the possibilities of origin, see Victor Paul Furnish, *II Corinthians: Translated, with Introduction and Commentary*, AB32a (Garden City, NY: Doubleday,

"no Corinthian Christian (however inadequate his understanding of the Spirit's work) doubted that his church was the home of the Holy Spirit…"[484] McKelvey, however, acknowledges the different contexts between 2 Cor 6.16–7.1 and 1 Cor 3.16–17: "The only difference lies in the nature of the danger to which the church is exposed; here it is internal (divisiveness), whereas at 2 Cor. 6.16–7.1 it is external (heathen society)."[485] Paul does feel the need to clarify in 1 Corinthians previous instruction regarding association with outsiders, stating,

> I wrote you in the letter not to associate with the sexually immoral, not at all the immoral people of this world, or the greedy, extortionists, idolaters, for if so you would have to go out of the world. Now, what I meant when I wrote to you was to not associate with any so-called "brother" if they are a sexually immoral person, a greedy person, an idolater, an abusive person, a drunkard, an extortionist—not even to eat with such a one." (1 Cor 5.9–11).

The harsh labels used here could coincide with those employed in 1 Cor 6.14–16: ἀπίστοι, ἀνομία, σκότος, βελιάρ, εἰδώλον, ἀκαθάρτος. However, the key term which Paul seeks to clarify in 1 Cor 5.9, πόρνοι, is missing from 2 Cor 6.14–17 (cf. though mention of needing to "cleanse" from "defilement" in 7.1).

Most recently, Benjamin Edsall has taken issue with the assumption that Paul must be drawing upon past material, considering it a premature conclusion. By means of detailed categorization in writings where diatribe has been observed, Edsall argues that the question "do you not know?" does not always presume of the audience the knowledge introduced by the phrase and, therefore, neither may Paul. He offers the categories of information known and unknown and, within these, uses the following sub-categories. In the first category of *known* information, there

---

1984), 371–83. For a focused treatment, see esp. J. Ayodeji Adewuya, *Holiness and Community in 2 Cor 6:14–7:1: Paul's View of Communal Holiness in the Corinthian Correspondence*, StBibLit 40 (New York: Peter Lang, 2001).

[484] Barrett, *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 90. As Fitzmyer writes, "Paul speaks of the indwelling Spirit as the animating presence of God in the midst of the Christian community, making it in a special sense the place where God is present to Christians in their corporate being" (*First Corinthians*, 202).

[485] McKelvey, *The New Temple*, 102.

is 1a) "general information about the world or humanity" and 1b) "context-specific information known at least to the speaker and interlocutor". In the second category of *unknown* information, there is 2a) "a conclusion drawn from previously discussed material", 2b) "new information introduced, as it were, out of the blue", and 2c) the "coercive bluff".[486] Edsall describes a "coercive bluff" as when "the speaker 'presumes' consent among their audience on a certain topic, which he or she knows to be new information, and never goes on to elucidate it. The question thus introduces this unknown point as though it were obvious in an effort to assert his or her authority over the interlocutor by means of censure or shame" (e.g., Fee's interpretation above).[487] Edsall acknowledges, however, that this is not a dominant use of the question in Paul.

> Edsall observes common elements between these regardless of the variety of usage.
>
> > First, "do you not know?" contains both an emphatic quality and a note of censure, from gentle rebuff to overt antagonism. Second, in all cases the speaker effectively sets himself or herself up as an authority who is speaking down to those more ignorant. These qualities set this question apart from the related rhetorical phrases "as you know" or "you know" since the latter at least pretends cordiality, even when the rhetorical context shows the presumed consent to be coercive. Finally, the "do you not know?" question tends to recur in situations of conflict and/or high emotion.[488]

For my purposes, Edsall places Paul's temple metaphor into category 2a as drawing a conclusion from previous material.[489] In this sense, according to Edsall, the use of οὐκ οἴδατε is not used as a reminder but merely for rhetorical force. Edsall concludes that, rather than drawing upon material with which the Corinthians were already familiar, Paul reaches a conclusion from preceding

[486] Edsall, "Paul's Rhetoric of Knowledge," 258.

[487] Edsall, "Paul's Rhetoric of Knowledge," 258.

[488] Edsall, "Paul's Rhetoric of Knowledge," 265.

[489] Edsall, "Paul's Rhetoric of Knowledge," 270.

material "as though the interlocutor ought to have reached it herself, though in fact she had not" (again, cf. Fee).[490]

It is worth asking: If Paul had yet to ascribe the status of ναὸς θεοῦ explicitly to the Corinthians prior to 1 Corinthians, does that somehow detract from the significance of the imagery, as if Paul is merely reaching for imagery with which to exhort the Corinthians without setting them up as an alternative temple? I am not claiming that Paul began his ministry with a clear program to combat the status of the temple. Additionally, I acknowledge that the temple metaphor may simply be an instance of Paul working out his theology in real-time. As Luke Johnson writes, "Paul is far from a deductive or systematic thinker. He responds rather to what is happening in his own life and what he perceives as happening in the lives of believers. Specifically, his concern is always with what God is doing now in real human lives. If we miss this … we miss everything."[491] Likewise, Carl Holladay characterizes Paul's writings as *situational theology* in that they show Paul developing theological positions in response to questions from within specific situations; and *dialogical theology*, reflecting an ongoing conversation between Paul and his assemblies. Paul not only brings theological conviction "to the conversation", but he also works out his positions "in the conversation".[492] In the end, the theory of metaphor applied here negates the need to prove one way or the other whether Paul had previously referred to them as ναὸς θεοῦ. What matters it that Paul perceives the system of associated commonplaces, i.e., the five characteristics of the Corinthians detailed above, among the assemblies to whom he writes. These features lead him to

[490] Edsall, "Paul's Rhetoric of Knowledge," 265.

[491] Luke Timothy Johnson, *Constructing Paul: The Canonical Paul*, vol. 1 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2020), 224; see also 246.

[492] Carl R. Holladay, *Introduction to the New Testament: Reference Edition* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2017), 393.

what McFague considers the point of desperation in language, where all Paul can call them is ναὸς θεοῦ.

Relatedly, if Paul understood the communities to which he wrote as places where God's spirit dwells, why do we find temple imagery so infrequently? Surely, part of the answer is that cultic imagery permeates his undisputed writings. But, as I have argued, Paul's temple metaphor is the climax of his attempt to create for his gentiles-in-Christ an alternate world of cultic devotion given their ritual circumstances in relation to Schwartz's definition of some normative Judaean religion. Why, then, do we not find it more often in Paul's letters, especially when he speaks of the divine spirit as present among other believers elsewhere? For example, given the likelihood of factions among the Roman believers to whom he writes, i.e., between Judaean and gentile, would not Paul's temple metaphor have been fitting? There may, however, be reason for the absence of any significant temple discourse in Paul's letter to the Romans, where he uses identical language to that found in the Corinthian correspondence regarding the effects of the community being the temple of God (e.g., Rom 8.9: "the spirit of God dwells in you"). Nonetheless, he never refers to the Romans as the temple of God as he does the Corinthian body (1 Cor 3.16–17; 6.19; 10.16–21). Paul is dealing with a more mixed assembly there, not simply a majority of gentile believers and sympathetic Judaeans. Perhaps he refrains from explicitly saying so to the Roman assembly because: 1) he wanted to be sensitive to the temple sensibilities of Judaean believers who either still traveled to Jerusalem or gave for its upkeep, since 2) he was in fact unknown to them and was appealing for support on his way to Spain (Rom 15.24). Given his intimate fellowship with the Corinthians, Paul could perhaps speak more freely with them regarding the significance of the divine spirit's presence among them.

Categories: Analogy and Homology in 1 Corinthians

I place topics broached in the letter by means of οὐκ οἴδατε into one of two categories of grammatical structure. Occurrences can be roughly divided between those that build upon an *analogy* and those that are *homologous* in construction. This is determined using two formulas. For instances in the first category of analogy, the construction of the logic can be expressed by the following formula: "Don't you know x? Obviously, you do. Now, isn't x like y? Therefore, do y." For those in the second category, the logic is constructed as follows: "Don't you know that *you are* x? Therefore, *be* x." For instances in the first category, I argue that the information communicated is indeed new, while instances in the second category concern information previously imparted.

Analogy

The first category concerns matters of common knowledge about everyday experiences in the social world of the Corinthians. These matters are not ends in themselves but rather are used by Paul to extrapolate deeper truths by means of *analogy*. The purpose is to get his audience thinking about a more profound reality in terms of the very common phenomena cited. This material, therefore, is likely not to have been imparted prior to its mention in 1 Corinthians but rather is logically drawn from preceding discussion in the letter.

There are three instances in the letter where the content occasioning the question pertains to an analogy with common knowledge. First, Paul invokes the nature of leaven to show that one case of sin in the community actually affects the entire community, which the Corinthians seem not to have realized given their inaction regarding the man committing πορνεία (1 Cor 5.1–2). Second, Paul refers to the economics of temples and priests, making the analogy that, like priests who eat what is offered at their altars, so ought those who devote their life to heralding the gospel

ought to be compensated by the people they serve in this way (9.14). Finally, by drawing on the competitive nature of athletic events, Paul urges the Corinthians not just to run but to compete, i.e., run to win (9.24). The deeper reality here concerns eschatological reward: more than mere involvement is required. This leads to a discussion about the need for personal discipline so as to receive an "imperishable wreath" (vv. 25–27).

As an example of the analogical formula, let us consider the priestly analogy of 1 Cor 9.13. Paul wants the Corinthians to think differently about the work and compensation of gospel heralds like himself by analogizing it with literal priestly ministry—a phenomenon with which they would have been quite familiar. The logic of the analogy with priestly service is constructed as such:

> "Don't you know x [i.e., that those who perform sacred services get their food from the temple, and that those who attend to the altar have a share in it]?
>
> Obviously, you do.
>
> Now, isn't x like y? [i.e., those who proclaim the gospel get their living from the gospel]?
>
> Therefore, do y."

In this category, though the audience is familiar with the cited phenomenon, they have not yet grasped the deeper truth to which it points nor the actions which are to proceed from such knowledge. His tone suggests animosity between him and the Corinthians on this topic (cf. 9.15).[493] Paul assumes that the Corinthians are well aware of the means by which priests are compensated for their service, but the use of οὐκ οἴδατε shows that the Corinthians do not draw the logical conclusion with regard to those who labor in gospel ministry. The use of "do you not know?" amplifies his hostile tone. Paul's rhetoric in the instances of both categories is antagonistic

[493] See discussion of debate on whether Paul refused support in Ryan S. Schellenberg, "Did Paul Refuse an Offer of Support from the Corinthians?" *JSNT* 40.3 (2018): 312–36.

but particularly so in the second, which may indicate that it pertains to material already imparted and, therefore, should already have been digested, so to speak.

Homology

Grammatical construction in the second category leaves out the step of analogy with a phenomenon that is commonly perceived. Though a profound lesson is drawn from the commonly perceived phenomenon in the first category, information occasioned by οὐκ οἴδατε in the second category is more revelatory in that commonly known phenomena do not act as a springboard into the information (e.g., "Do you not know that your body is a temple of the holy spirit who is in you" [1 Cor 6.19]). Use of the question in this category pertains to matters of *homology* (i.e., as indicating a sameness of relation or correspondence). The audience must be *reminded*, I argue, of an identity with which their actions are out of sync. This differs from a construction that would simply say, "Don't you know what a temple is like? Therefore, be like a temple in this or that manner." To be sure, they must draw on a common conception of the Jerusalem temple, but *grammatically*, the information does not present itself as new in the way we see with instances of analogy above.

Like instances in category one, the purpose of this content occasioned by οὐκ οἴδατε likewise operates as impetuses for altered behavior. In both categories, Paul's intention is to get his audience acting in a way that is consistent with an identity of which they are either unfamiliar or negligent. As R. A. Harrisville writes, the question signals "a contradiction between what is and what ought to be, between what Corinth knows and does."[494]

[494] R. A. Harrisville, *1 Corinthians*, ACNT (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1987), 84.

However, content in category two has no common element but rather has likely already been imparted. This is not to say that the deeper truths drawn from common phenomena in category one are no less profound or revelatory, but they are not the only analogies that could be made with leaven, priestly compensation, or athletic competition, for example. In category two, the rebuke evident in οὐκ οἴδατε concerns an understanding imparted on an earlier occasion, though they are ignorant of the implications of that understanding, which Paul makes clear in his writing. As Anthony Thiselton observes, "It indicates both Paul's intensity of feeling (surely you know *this!)* and his belief that the principle at issue is axiomatic for the Christian and should not have escaped attention as a cardinal element in the community's thinking."[495] In the temple metaphor of 1 Cor 3.16 and 6.19, the desired effect of regarding the community as the very dwelling place of God's spirit is that the Corinthians will conduct themselves in a way that befits that holy status. The grammar of 1 Cor 3.16–17 and 6.19 is not analogous but rather homologous and thus the logic is constructed as follows:

> "Don't you know that you are x [i.e., that you are the temple of God and that the spirit of God dwells in/among you]?
>
> Therefore, be x [i.e., the temple of God]."

Knowledge in category two is 1) without analogy, therefore, 2) likely imparted beforehand.

The same construction can be deduced from other uses of οὐκ οἴδατε where Paul does not use common phenomena as a step to a more profound reality. That the saints will judge the world (6.2) and angels (v. 3) is shared with the inference that they should not be bringing their internal legal disputes before those outside the assembly. In this case, the construction would seem to be a matter of analogy: "Don't you know x? Therefore, don't do y." However, the analogy is ultimately

[495] Anthony C. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 316.

an extension of status and can be further distilled: "Don't you know that you are x? Therefore, act like x." Because of the profound task they know they will have as holy ones in judging the world and angelic beings, Paul considers it a failure that they have legal disputes among them (6.7). It is inconsistent with their status as holy.

The same construction can be seen with the second use of the temple metaphor in 1 Corinthians. Paul asks whether the Corinthians realize that their individual bodies are actual body parts of Christ (6.15) and that those who sleep with prostitutes become one body with them (v. 16). Concerning the latter, Dale Martin notes that the concept of blending a man and woman's bodies into one by means of sexual intercourse probably would have struck Paul's Greek readers as odd upon first hearing.[496] Paul emphatically denies the possibility that Christ's body and that of a prostitute's can be blended. "The man", Martin writes, "by penetrating the prostitute, is himself penetrated by the sinful cosmos."[497] In this case, such knowledge is not common to the Corinthians, but the concept of their assembly as ναὸς θεοῦ, I argue, would have been. Paul could very well be drawing upon this previous instruction for the situation so as to discourage sexual activity among them that they were not seeing as contradictory. Pneumatic union between the believing man's body and Christ's implicates Christ in πορνεία by extension, to put it more mildly than Martin.[498] The homologous construction is evident: "We've talked about this. Don't you know that you are x? Therefore, be x in this or that circumstance."

[496] Dale Martin, *The Corinthian Body* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 177.

[497] Martin, *The Corinthian Body*, 178.

[498] Martin, *The Corinthian Body*, 178. Here occurs the only use of μὴ γένοιτο in 1 Corinthians, a regular feature of diatribe in Epictetus (Malherbe, "Mh Γenoito in the Diatribe and Paul," 232 n. 8).

Epictetus' *Discourses*

The question "do you not know?" occurs in the work of former slave turned Stoic philosopher, Epictetus (roughly 50–120 CE).[499] Fifteen times we find the question in the *Discourses*—teachings of Epictetus recorded by his pupil, Flavius Arrian. Like Edsall, I am interested in dividing material between the likelihood of known and unknown. However, my categorization concerns whether the knowledge imparted is analogous in structure or homologous, i.e., information not grammatically based on analogy but direct teaching. Again, knowledge is imparted in both categories. In category one, however, that which is commonly observed is utilized as the means to understand a more profound reality that follows by comparison. The homology of category two likely concerns information previously imparted.

Analogy

On one occasion, Epictetus urges his student not to forsake civic involvement. He starts with an analogy of a foot to the body:

> For I will assert of the foot as such that it is natural for it to be clean, but if you take it as a foot, and not as a thing detached, it will be appropriate for it to step into mud and trample on thorns and sometimes to be cut off for the sake of the whole body; otherwise it will no longer be a foot. We ought to hold some such view also about ourselves.[500] (*Diatr.* 2.5.24–25)

[499] See Luke Timothy Johnson, *Among the Gentiles: Greco-Roman Religion and Christianity* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 158–71. Johnson considers Epictetus and Paul (as well as James and the author of Hebrews) to share a sense of religiosity that emphasizes moral transformation more than participation in divine benefits. See also A. A. Long on these overlaps yet differences in *Epictetus: A Stoic and Socratic Guide to Life* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002), 3–4. On further comparisons with Paul, specifically, see Robertson, *Paul's Letters and Contemporary Greco-Roman Literature*, 72–76; and Timothy Luckritz Marquis, *Transient Apostle: Paul, Travel, and the Rhetoric of Empire* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013), 98–102.

[500] Translations throughout quoted from Epictetus, *Discourses, Books 1–2*, trans. W. A. Oldfather, LCL 131 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1925); and Epictetus, *Discourses, Books 3–4. Fragments. The Encheiridion*, trans. W. A. Oldfather, LCL 218 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1928).

Epictetus shifts from the purpose of a foot to a body to the purpose of a man in society. If one lives *detached* from the hard work of life, then that person is likely to live to old age, be rich, and enjoy good health. Epictetus contends that such a person is no longer a man in the same way that the *detached* foot is no longer a foot. A man's identity is intrinsically tied to the world around him as a foot is to the body: "if you regard yourself as a man and as a part of some whole, on account of that whole it is fitting for you now to be sick, and now to make a voyage and run risks, and now to be in want, and on occasion to die before your time" (*Diatr.* 2.5.25–26). Epictetus wishes to curb the anxiety of his student about such things:

> Why, then, are you vexed? *Do you not know* [οὐκ οἶδας] that as the foot, if detached, will no longer be a foot, so you too, if detached, will no longer be a man? For what is a man? A part of a state; first of that state which is made up of gods and men, and then of that which is said to be very close to the other, the state that is a small copy of the universal state. (*Diatr.* 2.5.26)

The relation of a foot to the body is obvious enough. This is the analogical springboard into a reality not commonly observed, i.e., the man's intrinsic attachment to the state and therefore to the universe. The logic of the construction is expressed in the formula:

> "Don't you know x? [i.e., the relation of a foot to a body]?
>
> Obviously, you do.
>
> Now, isn't x [the relation of a foot to a body] like y [i.e., man's relation to the state and, therefore, the universe]?
>
> Therefore, do y [i.e., be a part of the state]."

As seen above in Paul, the common is used to communicate something more profound.

In *Diatr.* 1.4.15–17, Epictetus does not want his student to simply be confined to the books of others, but to go and write books of their own. Epictetus asks a series of questions that are rhetorical and, therefore, meant to be instructive: "And what will you gain thereby? *Do you not know* [οὐκ οἶδας] that the whole book costs only five denarii? Is the expounder of it, then, think

you, worth more than five denarii?" His instruction is to "never look for your work in one place and your progress in another." The *cost* of a book is not the same as the *worth* of its author. The analogous construction can be nuanced here as: "Don't you know x [i.e., the cost of a book]? Obviously, you do. Now, isn't x [the cost of a book] *unlike* y [i.e., the worth of that book's author]? Therefore, don't do z [i.e., equate the worth of a book with that of its author]."

The rhetorical use of "don't you know?" is antagonistic, making the teacher appear frustrated at the student for not arriving at the more profound truth from things which are commonly observed, though the following truth that is imparted is not always commonly perceivable. Epictetus asks in *Diatr.* 4.5: "*Do you not know* [οὐκ οἶδας] that disease and death must overtake us, no matter what we are doing?" Epictetus uses this common knowledge to get his student to think about the purpose of his life:

> They overtake the farmer at his work in the fields, the sailor on the sea. What do you wish to be doing when it overtakes you? For no matter what you do you will have to be overtaken by death. If you have anything better to be doing when you are so overtaken, get to work on that. (*Diatr.* 4.5–6)

In other words, "Don't you know x [i.e., that disease and death are inevitable]? Obviously, you do. Now, in light of x [the inevitability of disease and death], do y [i.e., spend your time doing what is worthwhile]."

Homology

In category two, the question is no less antagonistic but for a different reason. Instead of using knowledge commonly held, the teacher imparts information not readily known but without the step of analogy. It has either been imparted to the student on a past occasion or for the first time here, but the profound nature of the information suggests itself to be a regular feature of the philosopher's teaching.

The starting point pertains to an identity ascribed to the audience: "you are a being of primary importance; you are a fragment of God; you have within you a part of Him. Why, then, are you ignorant of your own kinship? Why *do you not know* [οὐκ οἶδας] the source from which you have sprung?" (*Diatr.* 2.8.11–12). Epictetus instructs his student by means of rhetorical questioning in the profound truth about the student's actual identity. From this self-understanding, the student is to act in a way that reflects the reality not easily observed.

> Will you not bear in mind, whenever you eat, who you are that eat, and whom you are nourishing? Whenever you indulge in intercourse with women, who you are that do this? Whenever you mix in society, whenever you take physical exercise, whenever you converse, *do you not know* [οὐκ οἶδας] that you are nourishing God, exercising God? You are bearing God about with you, you poor wretch, and know it not! Do you suppose I am speaking of some external God, made of silver or gold? It is within yourself that you bear Him, and do not perceive that you are defiling Him with impure thoughts and filthy actions. Yet in the presence of even an image of God you would not dare to do anything of the things you are now doing. But when God Himself is present within you, seeing and hearing everything, are you not ashamed to be thinking and doing such things as these, O insensible of your own nature, and object of God's wrath! (*Diatr.* 2.8.12–14)

Unlike category one, there is no analogical step in the delivery of the information. The individual is simply to act in a way that is keeping with their not commonly perceived identity. As we see in Paul, there are specific mandates that stem from such an identity, but the construction can ultimately be distilled to, "Don't you know that you are x [i.e., a fragment of God]? Therefore, be x [i.e., do those things in keeping with that identity]." Rather than a common occurrence which is replicated on a more profound stage, this category of knowledge has to do with acting in a way that is consistent with the realization of an identity likely already known.

In *Diatr.* 1.12.11–12, Epictetus ridicules the one who would say, "But I would have that which seems best to me happen in every case, no matter how it comes to seem so." Epictetus calls the one who would approach life in this manner "mad" and "beside yourself". "*Do you not know* [οὐκ οἶδας]," Epictetus asks, "that freedom is a noble and precious thing?" Such knowledge is not

necessarily common. Epictetus' greater point is to be free, not simply to be pushed about by circumstances: "But for me to desire at haphazard that those things should happen which have at haphazard seemed best to me, is dangerously near being, not merely not noble, but even in the highest degree shameful."

A little later in *Book 1*, Epictetus again uses a body analogy to emphasize the greater whole to which a person belongs. Epictetus imagines one losing a leg (something with which he may have been familiar given his lameness [*Diatr*. 1.16.20]) and asks rhetorically:

> [D]o you then, because of one paltry leg blame the universe? Will you not make a free gift of it to the whole? Will you not relinquish it? Will you not gladly yield it to the giver? And will you be angry and peevish at the ordinances of Zeus, which he defined and ordained together with the Fates who spun in his presence the thread of your begetting? *Do you not know* [οὐκ οἶσθα] how small a part you are compared with the whole? (*Diatr.* 1.12.24–26)

The knowledge is not necessarily common regarding one's outlook on the world and their place in it. Epictetus has likely imparted this information before but revisiting here through the "do you not know?" device. The knowledge imparted ultimately concerns identity and how one should act in light of that identity: "*Do you not know* how small a part you are compared with the whole? That is, as to the body; for as to the reason you are not inferior to the gods, nor less than they; for the greatness of the reason is not determined by length nor by height, but by the decisions of its will." The lesson drawn is that the lame individual should not judge himself by physical dimensions, but by the "decisions of [his] will."

Homology in Dio Chrysostom's *Discourses*

Given the overwhelming frequency of drawing upon common knowledge for analogy's sake, I briefly focus here on examples of category two in sophist turned Stoic philosopher, Dio Chrysostom (ca. 40 – ca. 120 CE). I locate three instances in his *Discourses* of the "do you not know?" device (two of which he puts on the lips of Cynic philosopher Diogenes of Sinope [died

ca. 320 BCE]) where this rhetorical question communicates something profound about an imagined identity. These carry the force that an interlocutor should be who they really are, i.e., "Don't you know that you are actually x? Therefore, be x."

Two of the instances occur in the Dio's telling of the famous meeting between Diogenes and Alexander the Great. In *Or*. 4, Alexander is nervous about appearing ignorant of the nature of kingship. He asks Diogenes, "And who, think you, imparts this art, or where must one go to learn it?" (26–27).[501] Diogenes tells him that he would know the answer if he were a son of Zeus, "for it is he [Zeus] who first and chiefly possesses this knowledge and imparts it to whom he will; and all they to whom he imparts it are sons of Zeus and are so called" (27–28). The sophists cannot teach kingship—"most of them do not even know how to live, to say nothing of how to be king" (28). "*Do you not know* [οὐκ οἶσθα]," Diogenes rhetorically asks, "that education is of two kinds, the one from heaven, as it were, the other human?" (29). The implication is that, as king and therefore a son of Zeus, Alexander should be as one educated by heaven (though human education, frail as it is, must be addended to the heavenly if "everything is to be right" [30]).

In another exchange, Diogenes ventures to say that Alexander does "not even possess the badge of royalty" (*Or*. 4.60). Alexander responds in amazement,

> "Did you not just declare that the king needs no badges?" "No indeed," he replied; "I grant that he has no need of outward badges such as tiaras and purple raiment—such things are of no use—but the badge which nature gives is absolutely indispensable." "And what badge is that?" said Alexander. "It is the badge of the bees," he replied, "that the king wears. Have you not heard that there is a king among the bees, made so by nature, who does not hold office by virtue of what you people who trace your descent from Heracles call inheritance?" "What is this badge?" inquired Alexander. "Have you not heard farmers say," asked the other, "that this is the only bee that has no sting, since he requires no weapon against anyone? For no other bee will challenge his right to be king or fight him when he has this badge. I have an idea, however, that you not only go about fully armed but even sleep that way. (61–64)

[501] Translations throughout quoted from Dio Chrysostom, *Discourses 1–11*, trans. J. W. Cohoon, LCL 257 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1932).

All of this brings Diogenes to the question, "*Do you not know* [οὐκ οἶσθα] … that it is a sign of fear in a man for him to carry arms? And no man who is afraid would ever have a chance to become king any more than a slave would." At this offense, Alexander nearly hurls his spear at Diogenes. Diogenes' purpose, however, was "to encourage him to put his trust in well-doing and devotion to righteousness and not in arms" (65). Information is obviously imparted here for the first time to Alexander in this exchange. While the knowledge concerning bees is claimed to be observable by farmers, the ensuing lesson is not easily grasped. Nevertheless, it is to Alexander's embarrassment that he is unaware of this important facet of legitimate kingliness.

One might say that "do you not know?" in this instance functions analogously since Alexander is compared with a king bee and, therefore, ought to be more like the king bee. While that is true enough, Diogenes is really asking Alexander to be what he already is by nature, i.e., a king. As saw above in other cases where there is an obvious desire on the part of the author to change the behavior of their audience, the construction can ultimately be distilled to: "Don't you know that you are actually x [i.e., a son of Zeus, a king]? Therefore, be x."

We find another example in Dio, though not easily categorized, somewhat like the leaven lesson in 1 Corinthians 5. In *Or.* 10, Dio reflects on the sufficiency of the human body which has typical anatomical qualities. He begins by reviling slaves whom he thinks fail to look after their own physical health. He theorizes that some do not so because they think their masters will see to their health. He points to the sufficiency of the human body in and of itself:

> *Do you not know* [οὐκ οἶσθα] that nature has made each man's body to be sufficient to serve him?—feet so as to move about, hands to work with and to care for the rest of the body, eyes to see, and ears to hear. Besides, she has made his stomach of a size in keeping, so that man does not require more nourishment than he is able to provide for himself, but this amount represents what is quite adequate for each man and best and most wholesome. (10–11)

The logic can be constructed as follows: "Don't you know x [i.e., the self-sufficiency of the human body]? Obviously, you do. Now, in light of x [the self-sufficiency of the human body], don't do y [i.e., look to someone else to keep you healthy]." The heart of the matter for Dio is identity though. A man must see himself as sufficient, i.e., "Don't you know that you are actually x? Therefore, be x." Once this has been grasped, the individual will not dependent.

Conclusion

Paul's use of οὐκ οἴδατε ("don't you know?") in 1 Corinthians is consistent with the confrontational tone typical of ancient diatribe. The only other writer to which Paul can be compared in this regard is Epictetus, in whom we find other overlaps with Paul. The question occurs in both instances where Paul employs his temple metaphor, which seems to indicate that he is presuming past knowledge on the part of his audience. I offered categorization here which seeks to delineate between different information occasioned by οὐκ οἴδατε regarding what was plausibly known or unknown by the Corinthians. For instances in the first category of analogy, the construction of the logic can be expressed by the following formula: "Don't you know x? Obviously, you do. Now, isn't x like y? Therefore, do y." For those in the second category, the logic is constructed as follows: "Don't you know that *you are* x? Therefore, *be* x." In doing so, I considered whether Paul's temple metaphors are mere analogies made for the first time, or an ascribed identity of which the Corinthians, while delinquent, were already aware.

It is overwhelmingly common to use examples from everyday observable life to analogize with a more profound truth or reality. It is far less common to find pronouncements of identity by means of the device. In our second category, the initial step of analogy is left out. While there are also ethical directives derived from what is pronounced by using "do you not know?" in this category, the nature of the construction is *homologous* rather than *analogous*. Given the even more

revelatory nature of this information, the author is likely drawing upon past instruction to confront behavior inconsistent with an identity previously pronounced upon them. The purpose of the construction in category two ("Don't you know that you are actually x? Therefore, be x.") is meant to re-spark in the audience a way of life that reflects who they really are in the eyes of the author. For Paul, the Corinthians who have been called and sanctified (1 Cor 1.2) must live up to that which they really are—the very dwelling place of God's spirit.

CONCLUSION

It was noted at the outset that the Jerusalem temple, specifically, rarely features in Paul's letters at all. This was the focus of Chapter Three, where I considered instances of temple language in Paul to determine whether Paul's attitude toward the Jerusalem temple can be ascertained. To say the least, Paul's relationship with the temple is not clear. After all, Paul seems to have not gone up to Jerusalem for a fourteen-year period according to his travelogue in Galatians. While he praises Israel's *latreia* ("worship" or even "temple service") in Rom 9.4, as a letter Romans (especially chs. 9–11) is so rhetorically nuanced that we should be careful picking out one passage to determine what Paul definitively thought on a given matter. Furthermore, such praise seems rather to indicate the benefit of Israelite institutions for positioning Judaeans to receive the Christ. While these do not necessitate the conclusion that Paul *rejected* the temple establishment in Jerusalem altogether, neither does it permit Paula Fredriksen's overly positive evaluation that Paul "values supremely" the Jerusalem temple.[502]

Unlike what we have received from Qumran, there is no explicit criticism directed at a priestly establishment in Jerusalem by Paul (cf. 1QpHab 11.4–6, 10–15; 12.2–6). The Serek ha-Yahad indicates that some at Qumran took on an atoning function by means of their piety (cf. 1QS 8.1–10; 9.3–6; 4Q174 1.6–7). It is difficult to read Paul in the same manner since 1) he never

[502] Fredriksen," Judaizing the Nations: The Ritual Demands of Paul's Gospel," 248. I was critical of certain sentiments in recent Pauline scholarship that have colored the ways in which we understand Paul, especially his temple imagery. While Paul's temple imagery is not compounded with explicit criticism of the temple establishment in Jerusalem, I cannot attribute to Paul the positive outlook that Fredriksen does. As noted, the temple is addressed so sparingly in Paul that this level of positivity seems unwarranted. I prefer the more measured assessment in Friedrich W. Horn, "Paulus und der Herodianische Tempel," *NTS* 53 (2007): 191.

speaks of his relationship with the Jerusalem cult, and 2) because Acts offers accounts of his temple attendance (21.24–26; cf. 18.18). In Chapter Four, I addressed Acts' attestations to the temple attendance of the first generation of Christ-followers, including that of Paul (Acts 21.26–27; cf. also 18.18). However, in addition to questions of historicity, accounts of temple attendance in Acts concern Judaeans by birth and proselytes, not the uncircumcised who make up the majority if not totality of Paul's Corinthian audience (though some may have included circumcised proselytes [cf. 1 Cor 7.18–20]). Luke appears anxious over Paul's commitment to Judaean custom. Perhaps Luke attempts to patch over this anxiety through affirmation from James, Paul's submission to James' authority, and Paul's participation in temple ritual. Furthermore, Luke seeks to acquit Paul of claims that he sought entry at the temple for the uncircumcised. In relation, I rehearsed a history of gentile temple attendance in Jerusalem from ancient Israel through the Second Temple period to understand the reasoning behind their lack of access according to Acts.

Overall, I sought to demonstrate the role that metaphor as a device plays in bolstering Paul's message that the temple in Jerusalem is not an applicable form of devotion for gentiles-in-Christ. I leaned on Qumran scholar Jutta Jokiranta's sentiment that "to ask if the communities, by being compared to the temple, somehow replaced the temple is too *unspecific*; it must be asked which functions or properties of the temple they may have claimed (exclusively) for themselves" (emphasis mine).[503] For this reason, I have been concerned here with gentile access and participation at the Jerusalem temple in the Second Temple period, and how these ritual circumstances should inform the way we read Paul's temple metaphor to a predominantly gentile audience.

[503] Jutta Jokiranta, "Rule Scrolls: Introduction, 1QS, 1QSa, 1QSb" (Forthcoming).

The Herodian temple complex was constructed on the basis that the nations were not permitted cultic access beyond the most outer court. Paul's application of temple imagery to the Corinthians speaks to his radical view that these *ethnē*-in-Christ are imbued with the holiness of God's dwelling place on earth. Therefore, the access that they would be denied in Jerusalem is rendered meaningless by the ways in which Paul builds his metaphor per the five-part framework used here. Perhaps no Corinthian was ready or even able to run off to Jerusalem, but perhaps some were as Josephus attests of non-Judaean attendance. Furthermore, the outer court was constructed to allow such attendance. Instead, through the divine spirit observed in and amongst them, the Corinthians gain access to the very presence of God in their community.

In Chapter Five, I argued that the Corinthians were indeed suitable hearers to Paul's Judaean-conceived temple metaphor as an audience that would have fallen between two worlds of cultic participation: one "pagan" in its variety and multiplicity, and the other Judaean. The prominence of Judaean details that pervade the letters, in addition to the scriptural triangulation of *naos*, *hagios*, and *pneuma* from the Septuagint, make it difficult to maintain that Paul has any *naos* in mind, regardless of whether the Corinthians had ever been to Jerusalem (though he assumes some familiarity in 1 Cor 10.18). While we cannot know the extent of their affiliation with prior to Paul (though it was shown that Acts offers something in this regard), we can be certain of an intimate familiarity with Judaean religion due to indications in 1 Corinthians.[504] Because of the proposed familiarity, and perhaps even prior proselytization in the case of some, I argued that the Corinthian gentiles would have been able to grasp the great import of being identified as the place of God's presence, an honor historically associated with the Jerusalem temple. If we can assume

[504] For this study, I used Schwartz's God-Temple-Torah paradigm as a shorthand for "traditional" Judaean-*ness* as well as his approach to state something and then later clarify the varieties in a particular period. Seth Schwartz, *Imperialism and Jewish Society: 200 B.C.E. to 640 C.E.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009), 49.

that Paul has the Judaean temple of Jerusalem in mind, then what "parallel changes" are induced in a Judaean ναὸς θεοῦ for his gentile audience in Corinth?

The "parallel changes" I have been interested in concern the place of uncircumcised *ethnē* in relation to the Jerusalem temple by the way Paul has built his temple metaphor, per Max Black's interaction theory of metaphor:

> (i) the presence of the primary subject [the Corinthian believers] incites the hearer to select some of the secondary subject's [ναὸς θεοῦ] properties; and (ii) invites him to construct a parallel implication-complex [i.e., a system of associated commonplaces] that can fit the primary subject [the Corinthian believers]; and (iii) reciprocally induces parallel changes in the secondary subject [ναὸς θεοῦ].[505]

Because he discourages their involvement in Corinthian cults, but does not direct them toward Jerusalem, Paul's communities find themselves suspended between traditional cultic realms in the Graeco-Roman world. For Paul, gentiles-in-Christ are not a new people but descendants of Israel, made so by their baptism. Paul, therefore, frames the new identity of these in relation to Israel, and their worship in terms of Judaean cult. In his letters to predominantly gentile Christ assemblies, Paul employs several metaphors that span the range of cultic activity, going so far as to say to the Corinthians that "You all are the temple of God, and the spirit of God is housed amongst you" (1 Cor 3.16). These metaphors indicate a new world of cultic practice for gentiles-in-Christ that is linked to Israel's worship, though detached from its literal expression.

My focus has been on *how* Paul's metaphorical language works with regard to the realities of his non-Judaean audience and Jerusalem temple access. Uncircumcised gentile pilgrimage to Jerusalem was not unheard of, though involvement would have been limited given their status as *profane*. The ritual circumstances were dire, even if one had fully proselytized by means of circumcision, which may have been the case for some among Paul's Corinthian audience.

[505] Black, "More about Metaphor," 442.

Evidence cited here suggests that the inner court for lay Jewish men would never have been open to circumcised proselytes given their foreign genealogy as *allogenēs* ("other-born"). This would mean that, regardless of a male proselyte's circumcision, they would always be consigned to the outer court of the temple. This is where Paul's temple metaphor reveals its creative power by opening new cultic possibilities for his gentiles-in-Christ.

Among the several cultic metaphors that Paul employs, he speaks of the Corinthian assembly in terms of being ναὸς θεοῦ, "God's temple" (1 Cor 3.16–17; 6.19; 2 Cor 6.16).[506] Paul's language in these instances is cultic in that he refers to actual rituals of veneration. There seems to have been a mutual understanding of these cultic categories between Paul and the audiences to whom he wrote, which was equally useful and troublesome for Paul.[507] Paul attests to the prevalence of cult in these ancient contexts by using such reference points to understand and explain his work among gentile Christ-devotees. They are also instances of metaphor in that they "speak about one thing in terms which are seen to be suggestive of another."[508] While metaphor does not technically permit the collapsing of two things compared, paradoxically, such rituals

[506] I limited discussion to 1 Corinthians primarily due to questions of authorship surrounding 2 Cor 6.14–7.1. Furthermore, doing so also allowed me to focus on how the temple metaphor in 1 Corinthians, specifically, works toward that letter's occasion. If from Paul himself, we would have the very scriptural passages from which he draws prophetic fulfillment for Christ assemblies as *naos theou*. If 2 Cor 6.14–7.1 is original to Paul either as author or by way of citation, then he understands this reality to be the prophetic fulfillment of several LXX texts, particularly Ezek 37.27 (cf. also Exod 29.45; Lev 26.11–12; 2 Sam 7.14; Isa 43.6; 52.11; Jer 31.1). It would show more concretely that these assemblies, built upon the "foundation" (θεμέλιος) of Jesus Christ (1 Cor 3.11), are the "holy mountain" to which the nations will stream per ancient prophetic hopes, not Jerusalem (cf. Isa 2.2–4; 66.20; Mic 4.1–5).

[507] See again Kathy Ehrensperger, *Paul at the Crossroads of Cultures: Theologizing in the Space Between*, LNTS 456 (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2013), 176.

[508] Janet M. Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), 15. My assessment of metaphor aligned with those studies ranging from ancient to modern that consider metaphor to be utterly pervasive in the ways we structure our realities. See George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003), 3.

provide Paul with the only adequate language to express how he views this community where divine *pneuma* is manifest.[509]

In addition to grammatical considerations, from a scriptural perspective the number of occurrences of *naos*, *hagios*, and *pneuma* in the Septuagint (many times together), in addition to warnings against damaging God's dwelling place, show that Paul did not need to go outside of Israel's scriptures for his conception of *naos*. For these reasons, in addition to Paul's persistent opposition to idolatry in the letters (cf. 1 Cor 8.1, 4, 7, 10; 10.14, 19, 28; 12.2; 2 Cor 6.16), I concluded that he would not have meant any *naos* when employing this metaphor, regardless of how the Corinthians would have received such language. Rather, I argued the opposite, that is, that they would have been conditioned by Paul and/or other itinerant Judaeans to think of the Jerusalem temple.

Methodologically, I employed various methods as the texts at hand required.[510] My approach was largely historical-critical and exegetical in method since the goal was to reconstruct from the pertinent texts the perceived realities for gentiles in relation to the Jerusalem temple. Only then could we appreciate the effect of Paul's temple imagery as applied to the Corinthian assembly.

Paul seeks to offer some explanation of his audience's experiences of God's *pneuma* through the message of Christ crucified in light of Israel's history and traditions. Additionally, because he seems to still value Judaean cult, at least historically (cf. Rom 9.4), but does not encourage actual Judaean cultic devotion on their part, he makes use of such rituals in new ways by means of metaphor. Metaphor allows Paul to describe the holiness with which his gentiles-in-

[509] Carol A. Newsom, *The Self as Symbolic Space: Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran* (Leiden: Brill, 2018), 157.

[510] I utilized John Lanci's defense for a multi-methodological approach. Lanci embraces a range of analytical approaches such as word studies, ancient epistolary theory, social anthropology, archaeology, in addition to methods of historical criticism (*A New Temple for Corinth*, 4).

Christ are now imbued (the target domain of the metaphor) as the holiness of God's presence in the Jerusalem temple (the source domain of the metaphor).

Paul does not acknowledge or explain his employment of metaphor, which fits with the ancient understanding of the device's ambiguity and necessity for basic speech. It has been increasingly argued by modern metaphorology that metaphor is necessary feature of basic understanding and communication, an observation going back to the earliest writers on the subject in the Graceo-Roman tradition. It was shown that metaphor, in the words of Sallie McFague, is a strategy of *desperation*, not *decoration*.[511] In Chapter One, I surveyed Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian as those considered the ancient authorities on the use of metaphor in Graeco-Roman thought due to their extensive treatments. Beyond the entertaining aspect of metaphor, as a device that "gives perspicuity, pleasure, and an air of unfamiliarity" (*Rhet*. 3.2.8 [Freese; Striker, LCL]), Aristotle explains that some things simply cannot be described without it. Furthermore, he holds that the use of metaphor is something that cannot be learned. In this way, it is a feature of language found even among the most common of peoples. Paul's writings represent this innate ability to employ metaphor. Similarly, Roman rhetorician Quintilian holds that metaphor is "both a gift which Nature herself confers on us, and which is therefore used even by uneducated persons and unconsciously, and at the same time so attractive and elegant that it shines by its own light however splendid its context" (*Inst*. 8.6.4 [Russell, LCL]).

From the ways in which he qualifies *naos* in these instances, we can determine what being a *naos* entails for Paul. From the immediate contexts of these passages, I constructed a five-part framework as to what Paul expects of the Corinthians as *naos*. The Corinthian assembly are/are to be: 1) a domain devoted to God (i.e., ναὸς θεοῦ [1 Cor 3.16–17; 6.19; 2 Cor 6.16]); 2) a domain

[511] McFague, *Sallie McFague: Collected Readings*, 87.

where God's spirit resides (1 Cor 3.16; 6.19); 3) a "holy" domain that is not be "corrupted" (1 Cor 3.17); 4) a domain that God will avenge if "corrupted" (1 Cor 3.17); and 5) a domain that should be void of other gods, i.e., "idols" (2 Cor 6.16). This framework finds support throughout the Corinthian letters. Per Black's theory of metaphor, the above framework provides the "system of associated commonplaces" between *naos* and the Corinthian assembly.[512]

In Chapter Two, I favored Black's "interaction" theory of metaphor, which challenges "substitution" and "comparison" understandings of metaphors. The instability introduced by Paul's temple imagery to the Corinthians is in applying concepts of God's temple (ναὸς θεοῦ) to a people fundamentally barred full access to that temple in Jerusalem. The subsequent creativity introduced concerns the way in which Paul has overcome that exclusion, that is, by means of metaphor. Black argues that the creative dynamic of metaphorical expression is lost when metaphor is considered merely as "substitution" or "comparison". While such views may suffice for *simple* metaphors, Black holds that *complex* metaphors are better understood as based upon a "system of associated commonplaces" between both domains (subjects A and B) of a metaphor. Ideally, a "suitable hearer" shares a similar system of commonplaces with the speaker so that the intention of the metaphor is intelligible. Doing so sparks the creative process of selecting, emphasizing, and organizing information from the source domain to see the target domain in a new light.[513] I argued that Paul's temple metaphor is an example of a *complex* metaphor that does not merely operate as rhetorical substitution or comparison.

[512] Max Black, *Models and Metaphors: Studies in Language and Philosophy* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1962), 40. In a later publication, Black used the designation "parallel implication-complex." See Max Black, "More about Metaphor," *Dialectica* 31.3/4 (1977): 442.

[513] Black, *Models and Metaphors*, 41.

More recent studies have argued for an understanding of metaphor as merely unilateral in that no effect is perceived upon the "primary subject" or "source domain", only upon the "secondary subject" or "target domain". What has exercised so many studies on the subject is whether identifying the Corinthians as God's temple carries with it a judgment of the referent, that is, whether the Jerusalem temple is rendered void as the place of God's dwelling and, therefore, the means of cultic relation to God. Paul does not offer any such criticism, but his metaphor does have the effect of emphasizing further to his gentile audience that the traditional Judaean cult is not for them. Against theories of metaphor which argue that metaphors map in only one direction, an "interaction" theory better explains the bilateral effect of metaphor when there are cultic roadblocks to consider, such as those encountered by uncircumcised gentiles worshiping the God of Israel. An interaction theory proposes that shifts in meaning occur for both the primary (e.g., the temple) and secondary (e.g., the Corinthian believers) subjects as opposed to a unilateral understanding of metaphor which "maps" in only one direction from the source domain (temple) to the target domain (Corinthian believers). Where there are ritual realities to consider, these shifts in meaning can help to enact and explain ritual change. Since the Corinthians are discouraged from other cults in Corinth, yet are never directed toward Jerusalem, Paul's temple metaphor has the effect of creating a new cultic reality consistent with, though detached from, actual Judaean cult.

Such is the case with the Qumran community, who employed temple metaphors for its community as an expression of the ritual predicament in which they found themselves. Because they were still cultic in their understanding of relation to God, they appropriated the temple's function of atonement for themselves. Not only does this dictate new meaning and ritual, but it also simultaneously pronounces judgement on the expression of cult in Jerusalem from which they have separated. Paul's temple metaphor, in light of the ritual realities of uncircumcised

Corinthians, works in both directions by indicating new cultic access for them whilst also negating their need for the cult in Jerusalem.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adewuya, J. Ayodeji. *Holiness and Community in 2 Cor 6:14–7:1: Paul's View of Communal Holiness in the Corinthian Correspondence*. StBibLit 40. New York: Peter Lang, 2001.

Alon, Gedalia. *Jews, Judaism, and the Classical World: Studies in Jewish History in the Times of the Second Temple and Talmud*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1977.

Aristotle, Longinus, Demetrius. *Poetics. Longinus: On the Sublime. Demetrius: On Style.* Translated by Stephen Halliwell, W. Hamilton Fyfe, Doreen C. Innes, W. Rhys Roberts. Revised by Donald A. Russell. LCL 199. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995.

Aristotle. *Art of Rhetoric.* Translated by J. H. Freese. Revised by Gisela Striker. LCL 193. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2020.

Barclay, John M. G. "The Empire Writes Back: Josephan Rhetoric in Flavian Rome." Pages 315–32 in *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome*. Edited by Jonathan Edmondson, Steve Mason, and James Rives. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

_____. "Stoic Physics and the Christ-event: A Review of Troels Engberg-Pedersen, *Cosmology and Self in the Apostle Paul: The Material Spirit* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010)." *JSNT* 33.4 (2011): 406–414.

Barrett, C. K. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2004.

_____. *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*. HNTC. New York: Harper & Row, 1968.

Barth, Markus. *Ephesians: Introduction, Translation, and Commentary on Chapters 1–3*. AB 34. New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2008.

Bauckham, Richard. *The Jewish World Around the New Testament: Collected Essays I*. Edited by Jörg Frey. WUNT 233. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.

_____. *The Jewish World Around the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010.

Baumgarten, J. M. "Exclusions from the Temple: Proselytes and Agrippa I." *JJS* 33.1–2 (1982): 215–25.

_____. "The Pharisaic-Sadducean Controversies about Purity and the Qumran Text." *JJS* 31 (1980): 157–70.

Baur, Ferdinand Christian. *Paul: The Apostle of Jesus Christ, His Life and Work, His Epistles and His Doctrine*. Vol. 1. Translated and edited by Eduard Zeller. 2nd ed. Revised by Allan Menzies. London; Edinburgh: Williams and Norgate, 1876.

Beale, Gregory K. *The Temple and the Church's Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God*. Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 2004.

Becker, Jürgen. *Paul: Apostle to the Gentiles*. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993.

Becker, Adam H., and Annette Yoshiko Reed. *The Ways That Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007.

Bertholet, A. *Die Stellung der Israeliten und der Juden zu den Fremden*. Freiburg: J. C. B. Mohr, 1896.

Best, Ernest. "The Use and Non-use of Pneuma by Josephus." *NovT* 3 (1959): 218–25.

Bickerman, Elias J. *Studies in Jewish and Christian History*. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

_____. "The Warning Inscriptions of Herod's Temple," *JQR* 37.4 (1947): 387–405.

Black, Max. *Models and Metaphors: Studies in Language and Philosophy*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1962.

_____. "More about Metaphor." *Dialectica* 31.3/4 (1977): 431–57.

Botterweck, G. Johannes, Helmer Ringgren, and Heinz-Josef Fabry, eds. Translated by John T. Willis, Geoffrey W. Bromiley, David E. Green, and Douglas W. Stott. *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. 25 vols. Grand Rapids; Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1977–2012.

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 et al. WUNT 118. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999.

Bovon, François. *Luke 1: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1–9:50*. Edited by Helmut Koester. Translated by Christine M. Thomas, Donald S. Deer, and James E. Crouch. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002.

Bruce F. F. *The Acts of the Apostles: The Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary*. 3rd rev. ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990.

Burke, Trevor J. "Paul's Role as 'Father' to his Corinthian 'Children' in Socio-Historical Context (1 Corinthians 4:14–21)." Pages 93–113 in *Paul and the Corinthians: Studies on a*

Community in Conflict: Essays in Honour of Margaret Thrall. Edited by Margaret E. Thrall, Trevor J. Burke, and J. K. Elliott. NovTSup 109 (Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Cadbury, Henry J. "All Things to All Men (I Cor IX.22)." *NTS* 1.4 (1955): 261–75.

_____. *The Making of Luke-Acts*. London: S.P.C.K., 1958.

Cameron, Ron, and Merrill P. Miller. *Redescribing Paul and the Corinthians*. ECL 5. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011.

Campbell, Douglas A. *The Deliverance of God: An Apocalyptic Reading of Justification in Paul*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.

Charles, Ronald, ed. *Paul and Matthew among Jews and Gentiles: Essays in Honour of Terence L. Donaldson*. LNTS. London: T&T Clark, 2020.

Chilton, Bruce. "Paul and the Pharisees." Pages 149–73 in *In Quest of the Historical Pharisees*. Edited by Jacob Neusner and Bruce Chilton. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2007.

Cho, Paul K.-K. *Myth, History, and Metaphor in the Hebrew Bible*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019.

Ciampa, Roy E., and Brian S. Rosner. *The First Letter to the Corinthians*. PNTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.

Cicero. *Brutus. Orator.* Translated by G. L. Hendrickson, H. M. Hubbell. LCL 342. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1939.

Cicero. *On the Orator: Book 3. On Fate. Stoic Paradoxes. Divisions of Oratory.* Translated by H. Rackham. LCL 349. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1942.

Clermont-Ganneau, Charles. "Une stèle du temple de Jérusalem." *RAr* 23 (1872): 214–34.

Cohen "The Temple and the Synagogue." Pages 298–325 in *The Cambridge History of Judaism*. Edited by W. Horbury, W. Davies, and J. Sturdy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Cohen, Shaye J. D. *The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties*. HCS 31. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.

_____. "Crossing the Boundary and Becoming a Jew." *HTR* 82 (1989): 13–33.

Cohn, Naftali. *The Memory of the Temple and the Making of the Rabbis*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012.

Collins, John J. *The Invention of Judaism Torah and Jewish Identity from Deuteronomy to Paul.* Taubman Lectures in Jewish Studies. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2017.

_____. “A Symbol of Otherness: Circumcision and Salvation in the First Century.” Pages 163–86 in *To See Ourselves as Others See Us*. Edited by Jacob Neusner and E. S. Frerichs. Chico, CA: Scholars Press Studies in the Humanities, 1985.

Collins, Raymond F. *The Power of Images in Paul*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2008.

Colwell, E. C. “A Definite Rule for the Use of the Article in the Greek New Testament.” JBL 52.1 (1933): 12–21.

Concannon, Cavan W. *“When You Were Gentiles”: Specters of Ethnicity in Roman Corinth and Paul’s Corinthian Correspondence*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2014.

Conzelmann, Hans. *1 Corinthians: A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Edited by George W MacRae. Translated by James W Leitch. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975.

_____. *Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*. Translated by James Limburg, A. Thomas Kraabel, and Donald H. Juel. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987.

Danker, Frederick W., and Walter Bauer, eds. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 3rd ed. Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

Daube, David. *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*. JLCRS 2. London: University of London, Athlone Press, 1956.

de Lacey, D. R. “Οἱτινές Ἐστε Ὑμεῖς: The Function of a Metaphor in St Paul.” Pages 391–409 in *Templum Amicitiae: Essays on the Second Temple presented to Ernst Bammel*. Edited by William Horbury. JSNTSup 48. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.

Delling, Gerhard. “Josephus und die heidnischen Religionen.” *Klio* 43 (1965): 263–69.

Dignas, Beate. *Economy of the Sacred in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor*. Oxford Classical Monographs. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Dio Chrysostom. *Discourses 1–11*. Translated by J. W. Cohoon. LCL 257. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1932.

Dodd, C. H. “ΕΝΝΟΜΟΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ.” *Studia Paulina*. Haarlem: Erven F. Bohn, 1953.

Donaldson, Terence L. “Proselytes or ‘Righteous Gentiles’? The Status of Gentiles in Eschatological Pilgrimage Patterns of Thought.” *JSP* 4.7 (1990): 3–27.

Dunn, James D. G. “The Incident at Antioch (Gal. 2:11–18).” *JSNT* 5.18 (1983): 3–57.

_____. *The Partings of the Ways: Between Christianity and Judaism and their Significance for the Character of Christianity*. 2nd ed. London: SCM Press, 2006.

Eco, Umberto. “The Scandal of Metaphor: Metaphorology and Semiotics.” *Poetics Today* 4 (1983): 217–57.

Edsall, Benjamin A. “Paul’s Rhetoric of Knowledge: The OYK OIΔATE Question in 1 Corinthians.” *NovT* 55.3 (2013): 252–71.

Eliade, Mircea. *The Sacred and the Profane: The Nature of Religion*. Translated by Willard R. Trask. San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1987.

Engberg-Pedersen, Troels, ed. *Paul Beyond the Judaism/Hellenism Divide*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001.

Engels, Donald W. *Roman Corinth: An Alternative Model for the Classical City*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1990.

Enslin, Morton S. “‘Luke’ and Paul.” *JOAS* 58.1 (1938): 81–91.

Epictetus. *Discourses, Books 1–2*. Translated by W. A. Oldfather. LCL 131. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1925.

_____. *Discourses, Books 3–4. Fragments. The Encheiridion*. Translated by W. A. Oldfather. LCL 218. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1928.

Euripides *Cyclops. Alcestis. Medea.* Edited and translated by David Kovacs. LCL 12. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994.

Euripides. *Children of Heracles. Hippolytus. Andromache. Hecuba.* Edited and translated by David Kovacs. LCL 484. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995.

Fascher, Erich. *Der Erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther: Einführung und Auslegung der Kapitel 1–7*. THKNT 7.1. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1975.

Fauconnier, Gilles, and Mark Turner. *The Way We Think: Conceptual Blending and the Mind’s Hidden Complexities*. New York: Basic Books, 2002.

Fee, Gordon D. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Revised edition. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014.

Fine, Steven. “Did the Synagogue Replace the Temple?” *BRev* 12.2 (1996). http://cojs.org/steven-fine-synagogue-replace-temple-bible-review-12-2-1996/.

_____. *This Holy Place: On the Sanctity of the Synagogue During the Greco-Roman Period*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 1997.

Finlan, Stephen. “Spiritualization of Sacrifice in Paul and Hebrews.” Pages 83–97 in *Ritual and Metaphor: Sacrifice in the Bible*. Edited by Christian Eberhart. SBL 68. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2011.

Fiorenza, Elisabeth Schüssler. “Cultic Language in Qumran and in the NT.” *CBQ* 38 (1976): 159–77.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Acts of the Apostles: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 31. New York: Doubleday, 1998.

_____. *First Corinthians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 32. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008.

_____. *Romans: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 33. New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2008.

_____. “Qumran and the Interpolated Fragment in 2 Cor 6:14–7:1.” *CBQ* 23.3 (1961): 271–280.

Foakes-Jackson, F. J., and Kirsopp Lake, eds. *The Beginnings of Christianity: The Acts of the Apostles*. 5 vols. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1979.

Forceville, Charles. Review of *The Way We Think: Conceptual Blending and the Mind’s Hidden Complexities*, by Gilles Fauconnier and Mark Turner. *Metaphor and Symbol* 19.1 (2004): 83–89.

Ford, J. M. “The First Epistle to the Corinthians or the First Epistle to the Hebrews.” *CBQ* 28.4 (1966): 402–16.

Fowl, Stephen E. *Ephesians: A Commentary*. Edited by C. Clifton Black, M. Eugene Boring, and John T. Carroll. NTL. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2012.

Fox, Robin Lane. *Pagans and Christians*. New York: Knopf, 1987.

Fraeyman, Marcel. “La Spiritualisation de l’Idée du Temple dans les Epitres pauliniennes.” *ETL* 33 (1947): 378–412.

Fredriksen, Paula. “Judaizing the Nations: The Ritual Demands of Paul’s Gospel.” *NTS* 56 (2010): 232–52.

_____. *When Christians Were Jews: The First Generation*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2018.

_____. “Why Should a ‘Law-Free’ Mission Mean a ‘Law-Free’ Apostle?” *JBL* 134.3 (2015): 637–50.

Freedman, David Noel, et al., eds. *The Anchor Yale Bible Dictionary*. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

Frey, Jörg. *Qumran, Early Judaism, and New Testament Interpretation: Kleine Schriften III*. Edited by Jacob N. Cerone. WUNT 424. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019.

Frye, Northrop, and Jay Macpherson. *Biblical and Classical Myths: The Mythological Framework of Western Culture*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004.

Furnish, Victor Paul. *II Corinthians: Translated, with Introduction and Commentary*. AB32a. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1984.

Gager, John. *Reinventing Paul*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Garland, David E. *1 Corinthians*. BECNT. 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*. SNTSMS 1. Cambridge: University Press, 1965.

Gaston, Lloyd. *Paul and the Torah*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1987.

Gerdmar, Anders, "Baur and the Creation of the Judaism-Hellenism Dichotomy." Pages 107–28 in *Ferdinand Christian Baur und die Geschichte des frühen Christentums*. Edited by Martin Bauspiess, Christof Landmesser, and David Lincicum. WUNT 333. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.

Gill, Christopher. "The School in the Roman Imperial Period." Pages 33–58 in *The Cambridge Companion to the Stoics*. Edited by Brad Inwood. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Gilman, Sander L. Carole Blair, and David J. Parent, eds. *Friedrich Nietzsche on Rhetoric and Language*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.

Given, Mark D. *Paul's True Rhetoric: Ambiguity, Cunning, and Deception in Greece and Rome*. Emory Studies in Early Christianity 7. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2001.

Glad, Clarence E. *Paul and Philodemus: Adaptability in Epicurean and Early Christian Psychagogy*. NovTSup 81. Leiden: Brill, 1995.

Gooch, Paul W. "The Ethics of Accommodation: A Study in Paul." *TynBul* 29 (1978): 93–117.

Gooch, Peter D. *Dangerous Food: 1 Corinthians 8–10 in Its Context*. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1993.

Goodblatt, Chanita, and Joseph Glicksohn. "Bidirectionality and Metaphor: An Introduction." *Poetics Today* 38:1 (2017): 1–14.

Goodman, Martin. "Constructing Ancient Judaism from the Scrolls." Pages 81–92 in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Timothy H. Lim and John J. Collins. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

_____. *Judaism in the Roman World: Collected Essays*. AGJU 66. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Greene, Joseph R. "Did God Dwell in the Second Temple? Clarifying the Relationship Between Theophany and Temple Dwelling." *JETS* 61.4 (2018): 767–84.

_____. “The Spirit in the Temple: Bridging the Gap between Old Testament Absence and New Testament Assumption.” *JETS* 55 (2012): 717–42.

Gregory, Andrew F., and C. Kavin Rowe. *Rethinking the Unity and Reception of Luke and Acts*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2010.

Gunkel, Hermann, and Joachim Begrich. *Einleitung in Die Psalmen: Die Gattungen Der Religiösen Lyrik Israels*. HKAT. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1933.

Gupta, Nijay K. *Worship That Makes Sense to Paul: A New Approach to the Theology and Ethics of Paul's Cultic Metaphors*. 2nd ed. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010.

Hamilton, Neill. “Temple Cleansing and Temple Bank.” *JBL* 83.4 (1964): 365–72.

Harrisville, R. A. *1 Corinthians*. ACNT. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1987.

Hays, Richard B. *The Faith of Jesus Christ: The Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1–4:11*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.

_____. *First Corinthians*. IBC. Louisville, KY: John Knox Press, 1997.

Hengel, Martin, and Roland Deines. *The Pre-Christian Paul*. London: SCM Press, 1991.

Hodge, Caroline Johnson. *If Sons, Then Heirs: A Study of Kinship and Ethnicity in the Letters of Paul*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Hogeterp, Albert L. A. *Paul and God’s Temple: A Historical Interpretation of Cultic Imagery in the Corinthian Correspondence*. BTS 2. Leuven: Peeters, 2006.

_____. “Paul and God’s Temple: A Historical Interpretation of Cultic Imagery in the Corinthian Correspondence.” PhD diss., University of Groningen, 2004.

Holladay, Carl R., *Introduction to the New Testament: Reference Edition*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2017.

Holmes, Michael W. *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1999.

Horn, Friedrich W. “Paulus und der Herodianische Tempel.” *NTS* 53 (2007): 184–203.

Horrell, David. Review of *A New Temple for Corinth: Rhetorical and Archaeological Approaches to Pauline Imagery*, by John R. Lanci. *JTS* 50.2 (1999): 708–11.

Horsley, Richard A. “Consciousness and Freedom among the Corinthians: 1 Corinthians 8–10.” *CBQ* 40.4 (1978): 574–89.

Howe, Bonnie, and Joel B. Green. *Cognitive Linguistic Explorations in Biblical Studies*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2014.

Hurd Jr., J. C. *The Origin of 1 Corinthians*. London: SPCK, 1965.

Jeremias, Joachim. *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus*. Translated by F. H. Cave and C. H. Cave. London: S.C.M. Press, 1969.

Johnson, Luke Timothy. *Among the Gentiles: Greco-Roman Religion and Christianity*. AYBRL. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.

_____. *Constructing Paul: The Canonical Paul*. Vol. 1. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2020.

Jokiranta, Jutta. "Rule Scrolls: Introduction, 1QS, 1QSa, 1QSb." Forthcoming.

Josephus. *Jewish Antiquities, Volume IX: Book 20.* Translated by Louis H. Feldman. LCL 456. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1965.

Käsemann, Ernst. *New Testament Questions of Today*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969.

Keck, Leander E., and J. Louis Martyn. *Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays Presented in Honor of Paul Schubert*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1966.

Keener, Craig S. *1–2 Corinthians*. NCBC. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

_____. *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary. Introduction and 1:1–2:47*. Volume 1. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012.

_____. *Romans: A New Covenant Commentary*. NCCS 6. Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2009.

Kittel, Gerhard, Geoffrey W. Bromiley, and Gerhard Friedrich, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–76.

Klawans, Jonathan. *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

_____. "Notions of Gentile Impurity in Ancient Judaism." *AJSR* 20.2 (1995): 285–312.

_____. *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*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971.

Knohl, Israel. *The Sanctuary of Silence: The Priestly Torah and the Holiness School*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995.

Knox, Wilfred Lawrence. *St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1925.

Knust, Jennifer Wright, and Zsuzsanna Varhelyi, eds. *Ancient Mediterranean Sacrifice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Kovecses, Zoltan. *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Kraabel, A. Thomas. "Social Systems of Six Diaspora Synagogues." Pages 257–68 in *Diaspora Jews and Judaism: Essays in Honor of, and in Dialogue with, A. Thomas Kraabel*. Edited by J. A. Thomas Kraabel, Andrew Overman, and Robert S. MacLennan. SFSHJ 41. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.

Kraemer, Ross. "Giving Up the Godfearers." *Journal of Ancient Judaism* 5 (2014): 61–87.

Krentz, Edgar. "The Name of God in Disrepute: Romans 2:17–29 [22–23]." *CurTM* 17.6 (1990): 429–39.

Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003.

Lakoff, George, and Mark Turner, *More Than Cool Reason: A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989.

Lanci, John R. *A New Temple for Corinth: Rhetorical and Archaeological Approaches to Pauline Imagery*. StBibLit 1. New York: P. Lang, 1997.

Levine, Lee I. *Jerusalem: Portrait of the City in the Second Temple Period (538 B.C.E.–70 C.E.)*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 2002.

Liddell, Henry George, et al. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.

Lightfoot, J. B. *Notes on Epistles of St. Paul from Unpublished Commentaries*. London: Macmillan, 1895.

Lim, Kar Yong. *Metaphors and Social Identity Formation in Paul's Letters to the Corinthians*. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2017.

Lincoln, Andrew T. *Ephesians*. WBC 42. Dallas: Word, Inc., 1990.

Liu, Yulin. *Temple Purity in 1–2 Corinthians*. WUNT 2/343. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.

Long, A. A. *Epictetus: A Stoic and Socratic Guide to Life*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002.

Luckritz Marquis, Timothy. *Transient Apostle: Paul, Travel, and the Rhetoric of Empire*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013.

Lüdemann, Gerd. *Das Frühe Christentum Nach Den Traditionen Der Apostelgeschichte: Ein Kommentar*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987.

Malherbe, Abraham J. *Ancient Epistolary Theorists*. SBLSBS 19. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988.

_____. "'Gentle as a Nurse': The Cynic Background to 1 Thessalonians 2." Pages 53–67 in *Light from the Gentiles: Hellenistic Philosophy and Early Christianity: Collected Essays, 1959–*

2012. Edited by Carl R. Holladay, John T. Fitzgerald, James W. Thompson, and Gregory E. Sterling. NovTSup 150. Leiden: Brill, 2014.

_____. "Mh Γenoito in the Diatribe and Paul." *HTR* 73.1/2 (1980): 231–40.

_____. *Paul and the Popular Philosophers*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989.

Malherbe, Abraham J., John T. Fitzgerald, Thomas H. Olbricht, and L. Michael White. *Early Christianity and Classical Culture: Comparative Studies in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe*. NovTSup 110. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Marcus, Joel. "Thoughts on the Parting of the Ways Between Judaism and Christianity." Paper presented at Duke Divinity School, Durham, NC, 30 April 2019.

Marlatte, Read Ward. "The Setting and Early Effective-History of Paul's Temple Metaphors." PhD diss., University of Oxford, 2017.

Marquette, Scarlet. "Metaphors We Lie by: Cognitive Blending in the Poetry of Elena Shvarts." *Slavic and East European Journal* 51.4 (2007): 693–715.

Martin, Dale B. *The Corinthian Body*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.

Martínez, Florentino García, and Eibert J. C Tigchelaar, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*. Volume 1. Leiden: Brill; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.

Mason, Steve. "Jews, Judaeans, Judaizing, Judaism: Problems of Categorization in Ancient History." *JSJ* 38 (2007): 457–512.

_____. *Josephus and the New Testament*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1992.

Maximus Tyrius. *Philosophumena—Dialexeis*. Edited by George L. Koniaris. TK 17. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1995.

McClymond, Kathryn. "The Nature and Elements of Sacrificial Ritual." *MTSR* 16.4 (2004): 337–66.

McFague, Sallie. *Sallie McFague: Collected Readings*. Edited by David B. Lott. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2013.

McKelvey, R. J. *The New Temple: The Church in the New Testament*. Oxford Theological Monographs. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969.

McKnight, Scot. *A Light among the Gentiles: Jewish Missionary Activity in the Second Temple Period*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991.

Meeks, Wayne A. *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983.

Meyers, Eric M., and James F. Strange. *Archaeology, the Rabbis, and Early Christianity: The Social and Historical Setting of Palestinian Judaism and Christianity*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1981.

Mihaila, Corin. *The Paul-Apollos Relationship and Paul's Stance Toward Greco-Roman Rhetoric: An Exegetical and Socio-Historical Study of 1 Corinthians 1–4*. LNTS 402. London: T&T Clark International, 2009.

Milgrom, Jacob. "Israel's Sanctuary: The Priestly 'Picture of Dorian Gray.'" *RB* 83 (1976): 390–99.

_____. "Religious Conversion and the Revolt Model for the Formation of Israel." *JBL* 101.2 (1982): 169–76

Mitchell, Margaret M. "'A Variable and Many-sorted Man': John Chrysostom's Treatment of Pauline Inconsistency." *JECS* 6.1 (1998): 93–111.

_____. *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians*. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993.

Moule, C. F. D. *The Birth of the New Testament*. BNTC. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1962.

Mount, Christopher N. *Pauline Christianity: Luke-Acts and the Legacy of Paul*. Supplements to *NovT* 104. Leiden: Brill, 2002

Mowinckel, Sigmund. *The Psalms in Israel's Worship*. 2 vols. Translated by Dafydd Rhys ap Thomas. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.

Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome. *1 Corinthians*. NTM 10. Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, Inc., 1982.

_____. *St. Paul's Corinth: Texts and Archaeology*. *GNS* 6. Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1983.

Nanos, Mark D. *The Galatians Debate: Contemporary Issues in Rhetorical and Historical Interpretation*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2002.

_____. *The Irony of Galatians: Paul's Letter in First-Century Context*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002.

_____. "Paul's Relationship to Torah in Light of his Strategy 'to Become Everything to Everyone' (1 Corinthians 9.19–23)." Pages 106–40 in *Paul and Judaism: Crosscurrents in Pauline Exegesis and the Study of Jewish-Christian Relations*. Edited by Reimund Bieringer and Didier Pollefeyt. LNTS 463. London: T & T Clark, 2012.

Nanos, Mark D., and Magnus Zetterholm, eds. *Paul within Judaism: Restoring the First-Century Context to the Apostle*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2015.

Nestle, Eberhard, and Erwin Nestle. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. Edited by Barbara Aland et al., 28th rev. ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2012.

Neusner, Jacob. *From Politics to Piety: The Emergence of Pharisaic Judaism*. 2nd ed. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2003.

Newman, Hillel, and Ruth Ludlam. *Proximity to Power and Jewish Sectarian Groups of the Ancient Period: A Review of Lifestyle, Values, and Halakhah in the Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes, and Qumran*. BRLA 25. Leiden: Brill, 2006.

Newsom, Carol. *The Self as Symbolic Space: Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran*. Leiden: Brill, 2018.

Newton, Michael. *The Concept of Purity at Qumran and in the Letters of Paul*. SNTSMS 53. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

Niehoff, Maren. *Philo of Alexandria: An Intellectual Biography*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2018.

Novenson, Matthew. "Whither the Paul within Judaism *Schule*?" *JJMJS* 5 (2018): 79–88.

Origen. *Origen: Contra Celsum*. Translated by Henry Chadwick. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.

Pausanias. *Description of Greece, Volume I: Books 1–2 (Attica and Corinth).* Translated by W. H. S. Jones. LCL 93. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1918.

Pervo, Richard I. *Acts: A Commentary*. Edited by Harold W. Attridge. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2009.

Philo. *On the Decalogue, On the Special Laws, Books 1–3*. Translated by F. H. Colson. LCL 320. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1937.

Plummer, Alfred. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians*. ICC 34. New York: Scribner, 1915.

Plutarch. *Moralia, Volume I: The Education of Children. How the Young Man Should Study Poetry. On Listening to Lectures. How to Tell a Flatterer from a Friend. How a Man May Become Aware of His Progress in Virtue.* Translated by Frank Cole Babbitt. LCL 197. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1927.

Popović, Mladen, ed. *The Jewish Revolt against Rome: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. Supplements to *JSJ* 154. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

Quintilian. *The Orator's Education, Volume III: Books 6–8.* Edited and translated by Donald A. Russell. LCL 126. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002.

Rajak, Tessa, and David Noy. "*Archisynagogoi*: Office, Title and Social Status in the Greco-Jewish Synagogue." *JRS* 83 (1993): 75–93.

Regev, Eyal. "Community as Temple: Revisiting Cultic Metaphors in Qumran and the New Testament," *BBR* 28.4 (2018): 604–31.

_____. *The Temple in Early Christianity: Experiencing the Sacred*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2019.

Rich, Audrey N. M. "The Platonic Ideas as the Thought of God." *Mnemosyne* 7 (1954): 123–33

Richards, I. A. *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1936.

Richardson, Peter, and Paul W. Gooch, "Accommodation Ethics." *TynBul* 29 (1978): 89–142.

Ricœur, Paul. *The Rule of Metaphor: The Creation of Meaning in Language*. Translated by Robert Czerny, Kathleen McLaughlin, and John Costello, SJ. London; New York: Routledge, 2003.

Rives, James B. "Flavian Religious Policy and the Destruction of the Jerusalem Temple." Pages 145–66 in *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome*. Edited by Jonathan Edmondson, Steve Mason, and James B. Rives. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Rives. *Religion in the Roman Empire*. Blackwell Ancient Religions. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2007.

Robertson, Archibald, and Alfred Plummer. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians*. 2nd ed. ICC 33. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1911.

Robertson, Paul M. *Paul's Letters and Contemporary Greco-Roman Literature: Theorizing a New Taxonomy*. NovTSup 167. Leiden: Brill, 2016.

Robinson, John A. T. *Redating the New Testament*. London: SCM Press, 1976.

Roloff, Jürgen. *Die Apostelgeschichte*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1981.

_____. *Die Kirche im Neuen Testament*. GNT 10. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993.

Rostagni, Augusto. "A New Chapter in the History of Rhetoric and Sophistry," Pages 23–45 in *Rhetoric and Kairos: Essays in History, Theory, and Praxis*. Edited by Phillip Sipiora and James S. Baumlin. Translated by Phillip Sipiora. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2002.

Rudolph, David J. *A Jew to the Jews: Jewish Contours of Pauline Flexibility in 1 Corinthians 9:19–23*. 2nd ed. Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2016.

Rutherford, Ian. “Concord and Communitas: Greek Elements in Philo’s Account of Jewish Pilgrimage.” Pages 257–72 in *Journeys in the Roman East: Imagined and Real*. Edited by Maren R. Niehoff. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017.

Safrai, Shmuel, Yvonne Glikson, and Semah Cecil Hyman. “Pilgrimage.” Pages 154–57 in *Encyclopaedia Judaica*. Edited by Fred Skolnik and Michael Berenbaum. 16 vols. 2nd ed. Detroit: Macmillan; Keter Publishing House, 2007.

Sampley, J. Paul. “The First Letter to the Corinthians.” *NIB* 10. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2002.

Sanders, E. P. *Judaism: Practice and Belief, 63 BCE–66 CE*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2016.

Sanders, Guy D. R. “The Sacred Spring: Landscape and Traditions.” Pages 356–80 in *Corinth in Context: Comparative Studies on Religion and Society*. Edited by Steven J. Friesen, Daniel N. Schowalter, and James C. Walters. NovTSup 134. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

Sanders. *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985.

Satlow, Michael L., ed. *Strength to Strength: Essays in Honor of Shaye J. D. Cohen*. BJS 363. Providence, RI: Brown Judaic Studies, 2018.

Schiffman, Lawrence H. *Who Was a Jew? Rabbinic and Halakhic Perspectives on the Jewish Christian Schism*. Hoboken, NJ: Ktav Publishing House, 1985.

Schiffman, Lawrence H., Yigael Yadin, and Hagop Kevorkian Center for Near Eastern Studies. *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin*. JSPSup 8. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990.

Schmeller, Thomas. *Der Zweite Brief an die Korinther (2 Kor 1,1–7,4).* EKKNT 8.1. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Theologie, 2010.

Schnelle, Udo. *The History and Theology of the New Testament Writings*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998.

Schrage, Wolfgang. *Der Erste Brief an die Korinther: 1, 1 Kor 1,1–6,11*. EKKNT 7.1. Zürich/Braunschweig: Benziger; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1991.

Schwartz, Seth, “How Many Judaisms Were There? A Critique of Neusner and Smith on Definition and Mason and Boyarin on Categorization.” *JAJ* 2 (2011): 203–38.

_____. *Imperialism and Jewish Society: 200 B.C.E. to 640 C.E.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009.

_____. *Josephus and Judaean Politics*. Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition 18. Leiden: Brill, 1990.

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

Senft, Christophe. *La première épître de Saint-Paul aux Corinthiens*. CNT 2.7. Neuchâtel: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1979.

Shanor, Jay. "Paul As Master Builder Construction Terms in First Corinthians." *NTS* 34.3 (1988): 461–71.

Slingerland, Dixon. "Acts 18:1–18, the Gallio Inscription, and Absolute Pauline Chronology." *JBL* 110.3 (1991): 439–49.

Smith, Morton. *Palestinian Parties and Politics That Shaped the Old Testament*. New York: Columbia University, 1971.

Sommer, Benjamin D. *The Bodies of God and the World of Ancient Israel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Soskice, Janet M. *Metaphor and Religious Language*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.

Stanford, W. B. *The Ulysses Theme: A Study in the Adaptability of a Traditional Hero*. 2nd ed. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1968.

Stendahl, Krister. "The Apostle Paul and the Introspective Conscience of the West." *HTR* 56.3 (1963): 199–215.

Stowers, Stanley K. *A Rereading of Romans: Justice, Jews, and Gentiles*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994.

Stowers. *The Diatribe and Paul's Letter to the Romans*. SBLDS 57. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981.

Strabo. *Geography, Volume IV: Books 8–9.* Translated by Horace Leonard Jones. LCL 196. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1927.

Strobel, August. *Der Erste Brief an die Korinther*. ZBK 6.1. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1989.

Susman, Y. "The Study of the History of *Halakha* and the Dead Sea Scrolls." *Tarbiz* 59 (1990): 11–76.

Tacitus. *Histories: Books 4–5. Annals: Books 1-3.* Translated by Clifford H. Moore, John Jackson. LCL 249. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1931.

Theissen, Gerd. *Die Religion der ersten Christen: Eine Theorie des Urchristentums*. Gütersloh: Chr. Kaiser/Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2000.

Thiessen, Matthew. *Contesting Conversion: Genealogy, Circumcision, and Identity in Ancient Judaism and Christianity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

_____. *Paul and the Gentile Problem*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.

_____. "'The Rock Was Christ': The Fluidity of Christ's Body in 1 Corinthians 10.4." *JSNT* 36.2 (2013): 103–126.

Thiselton, Anthony C. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.

Tyson, Joseph B. *Marcion and Luke-Acts: A Defining Struggle*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2006.

Udoh, Fabian E., et al., eds. *Redefining First-Century Jewish and Christian Identities: Essays in Honor of Ed Parish Sanders*. Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity 16. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2008.

Uro, Risto. *Ritual and Christian Beginnings: A Socio-Cognitive Analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.

Vahrenhorst, Martin. *Kultische Sprache in den Paulusbriefen*. WUNT 230. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.

van Hecke, Pierre. *Metaphor in the Hebrew Bible*. BETL 187. Leuven: University Press, 2005.

Vanhoozer, Kevin J. *Biblical Narrative in the Philosophy of Paul Ricœur: A Study in Hermeneutics and Theology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Verde, Danilo. "Metaphor as Knowledge: A Hermeneutical Framework for Biblical Exegesis with a Sample Reading from the Song of Songs (Song 8:10)." BibAn 6 (2016): 45–72.

Votaw, Clyde Weber. "The Temple at Jerusalem in Jesus' Day." *BW* 23.3 (1904): 169–79.

Walbank, Mary E. Hoskins. "Image and Cult: The Coinage of Roman Corinth." Pages 145–92 in *Corinth in Context: Comparative Studies on Religion and Society*. Edited by Steven J. Friesen, Daniel N. Schowalter, and James C. Walters. NovTSup 134. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996.

Walton, Steve. "A Tale of Two Perspectives? The Place of the Temple in Acts." Pages 135–49 in *Heaven on Earth*. Edited by T. Desmond Alexander and Simon Gathercole. Carlisle, UK: Paternoster Press, 2004.

Wassén, 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 *Holiness, and Identity in Judaism: Essays in Memory of Susan Haber*. Edited by Carl S. Ehrlich et al. WUNT 305. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.

Wasserman, Emma. *Apocalypse As Holy War : Divine Politics and Polemics in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2018.

_____. *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.

Wedderburn, Alexander J. M. *A History of the First Christians*. London: Clark, 2005.

Weinfeld, Moshe. *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972.

Weiss, Johannes. *Der Erste Korintherbrief*. KEK 5. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1910.

Wenschkewitz, Hans. *Die Spiritualisierung der Kultusbegriffe: Tempel, Priester und Opfer im Neuen Testament*. Leipzig: Eduard Pfeiffer, 1932.

Whybray, R. N. *Isaiah 40-66*. New Century Bible Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981.

Wickkiser, Bronwen L. "Asklepios in Greek and Roman Corinth," Pages 34–63 in *Corinth in Context: Comparative Studies on Religion and Society*. Edited by Steven J. Friesen, Daniel N. Schowalter, and James C. Walters. NovTSup 134. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

Wilken, Robert Louis. *The Christians as the Romans Saw Them*. 2nd ed. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003.

Williams, H. H. Drake. *The Wisdom of the Wise: The Presence and Function of Scripture Within 1 Cor. 1:18-3:23*. AGJU 49. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

Willis, Wendell L. *Idol Meat in Corinth: The Pauline Argument in 1 Corinthians 8 and 10*. SBLDS 68. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1985.

Wilson, Stephen G. *Luke and the Law*. SNTSMS 50. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Wise, Michael O., Martin G. Abegg Jr., and Edward M. Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation*. New York: HarperOne, 2005.

Witherington, Ben. *Conflict and Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.

Wolff, Christian. *Der Erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther*. THKNT 7. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1996.

Wright, N. T. "The Letter to the Romans." *NIB* 10. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2002.

_____. *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*. 2 vols. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2013.

Xenophon. *Memorabilia. Oeconomicus. Symposium. Apology.* Translated by E. C. Marchant and O. J. Todd. Revised by Jeffrey Henderson. LCL 168. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2013.