ABSTRACT

The Characterization of the Christ as Ideal King in Ephesians

Julien C. H. Smith, Ph.D.

Mentor: Charles H. Talbert, Ph.D.

Lack of consensus regarding an historical situation that occasioned the writing of Ephesians has led to a recent trend in research, which seeks to read the letter as addressing more broadly the related issues of identity formation and behavior within the early Christian community. The present study will argue that in Ephesians, the characterization of the Christ as a type of ideal king, as understood within Jewish and Greco-Roman thought, would have resonated with the authorial audience's cultural expectations, thereby ensuring comprehension of the letter's argument and purpose. The letter's primary theme, the reunification of the fractured cosmos through the Christ (1:9–10), comes into sharper focus when the Christ is understood as the ideal king who establishes on earth the harmony that is understood to exist in the cosmos. Furthermore, salient aspects of the ideal king's reign function as unifying threads that tie various parts of the letter together under its main theme. "Learning the Christ" (4:20), or the resocialization into a way of life aligned with the Christian community, addresses the enablement of ethical behavior. This peculiar expression reflects the Hellenistic understanding of the ideal king as a "living law," possessing and distributing the benefits of divine reason and virtue. The casting of traditional household management codes into the

realm of the Christ's authority (5:22–6:9) reflects the belief that the reign of the ideal king ensures the stability of the social order. Above all, the reconciliation of Jews and Gentiles within the Christian community (2:11–22) resonates with a pervasive cultural yearning for unity between disparate ethnic groups, and for freedom from factionalism within the social order. In both Greco-Roman and Jewish thought, such a golden age was thought to be the consequence of the reign of an ideal king.

The Characterization of the Christ as Ideal King in Ephesians

by

Julien C. H. Smith, M.A.

A Dissertation

Approved by the Department of Religion

_____

William H. Bellinger, Jr., Ph.D., Chairperson

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
Baylor University in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree
of
Doctor of Philosophy

Approved by the Dissertation Committee

_____

Charles H. Talbert, Ph.D., Chairperson

_____

Lidija Novakovic, Ph.D.

_____

Jeffrey B. Fish, Ph.D.

Accepted by the Graduate School
May 2010

_____

J. Larry Lyon, Ph.D., Dean

Page bearing signatures is kept on file in the Graduate School.

Copyright © 2010 by Julien C. H. Smith

All rights reserved

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES vi
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS vii
DEDICATION viii
CHAPTER ONE. Introduction 1
1. Purpose of the Present Study 1
2. Justification of the Present Study 5
3. Method 12
4. Outline of the Argument 21
CHAPTER TWO. The Ideal King in Greco-Roman Thought 25
1. Classical Period (490–323 B.C.E.) 27
2. Hellenistic Period (323–31 B.C.E.) 46
3. Roman Period (1st c. B.C.E.–117 C.E.) 62
4. Summary and Conclusions 115
CHAPTER THREE. The Ideal King in Jewish Thought 120
1. Kingship in Ancient Israel 123
2. Palestinian Jewish Literature 131
3. Egyptian Jewish Literature 166
4. Roman Jewish Literature: Flavius Josephus 202
5. Literature of Disputed Provenance: *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* 211
6. Summary and Conclusions 221
CHAPTER FOUR. Ephesians: Is There a King in This Text? 226
1. The Christ is the Vicegerent of God 227
2. The Christ Reconciles the Cosmos 272
3. The Christ is the Benefactor of the Church (4:1–16) 286
4. The Christ Enables Moral Transformation in the Church (4:17–5:21) 291
5. The Christ Enables Harmony in the Household (5:22–6:9) 310
6. The Christ Enables Victory Over the Powers (6:10–20) 314
CHAPTER FIVE. Conclusion: Listening to Ephesians with the Authorial Audience 321
1. Ephesians: a Paraphrastic and Interpretive Summary 321
2. Indicative and Imperative Reunited 324
3. Avenues for Further Research 326
WORKS CITED 337

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Poetic Sequence Prioritized 267

Table 2: Referential Sequence prioritized 268

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It gives me great pleasure to thank the many people who have contributed to the writing of this book. From start to finish, this research project has been shepherded by my mentor, Dr. Charles H. Talbert. His influence will be readily apparent to anyone familiar with his scholarship. Indeed, the seed of this study was planted while copy-editing Dr. Talbert's recent commentary on Ephesians in the Paideia series. Throughout my research and writing, he has been uncommonly generous and perceptive with his guidance and encouragement. I am grateful as well to the other members of my committee, Dr. Lidija Novakovic and Dr. Jeffrey B. Fish. Their invaluable comments and questions have helped me clarify my thinking throughout. I am futher grateful for the penetrating questions posed by Dr. Mikeal Parsons and Dr. Bruce Longenecker during a rigorous and lively oral defense. Finally, Dr. Sharyn Dowd provided direction during the beginning stages of this project. My debt of gratitude to these and other fine scholars at Baylor cannot be adequately expressed in these brief words.

My family and numerous friends, in particular the community of saints at Calvary Baptist Church in Waco, Texas, have sustained me with their tender love during many long years of research. My wife and two sons have made life sweet.

For Hope, Eben, and Ian

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

1. *Purpose of the Present Study*

During the reign of Constantine, the church came to look upon Christ as king; by the end of the fourth century C.E., churches are designed to represent the throne room of Christ, and prayers are addressed to Christ as *rex gloriae*. While the development of this tradition prior to Constantine is a matter of debate, its origins lie undeniably in the NT portrayal of Jesus in royal terms.[1] The NT tradition, of course, traces its roots back to the institution of the monarchy in ancient Israel, in which the legitimacy of the king was signified by his having been anointed by Yahweh for the task of governing Israel. Passages such as Deut 17:14–20, 2 Sam 7, and the royal psalms provide evidence that, throughout the monarchy and following its demise, Israel engaged in reflection upon the nature of the ideal king. In the postexilic and Second Temple periods, a hope arose within certain streams of Judaism that God would once again raise up such an ideal king to govern God's people. The extent to which this hope was shared within the various streams of Second Temple Judaism is debated; it is undeniable, however, that certain NT writers saw the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth as the fulfillment of this hope.[2] One may thus trace the roots of the tradition that cast Jesus Christ as an ideal king backwards through the NT and literature of Second Temple Judaism to

---

1. Per Beskow, *Rex Gloriae: The Kingship of Christ in the Early Church* (trans. Eric J. Sharpe; Stockholm: Almquist & Wiksell, 1962), 11–31, gives a concise overview of the problem.

2. The prophecies of fulfillment in Matthew's Gospel are prime examples.

the tradition of the ideal king that arose in ancient Israel and was preserved in the OT.[3]

The comments of J. C. Beker suggest that Ephesians may indeed be a rich source to mine for evidence of this tradition. He describes the portrayal of Christ in Ephesians as similar to that of the *Christus Rex* of later centuries:

> The letter suggests, as it were, a scenario of worship in a Greek Orthodox cathedral, dominated by a picture of a giant *Christus Rex* behind the altar.[4]

Beker's observation is apt and intriguing. It invites the question of whether the authorial audience of the letter would have seen in the letter's presentation of Christ the victorious king that became prominent in later tradition. And if this audience did so see Christ, what difference would it have made for their reading of the text?

In comparison with other letters attributed to Paul, Ephesians contains almost no information regarding its geographical destination, its addressees, or an historical situation that occasioned its writing. The consequent inability of scholars to reach consensus regarding the letter's purpose and setting have led to Ephesians' reputation as a "sublime yet elusive document."[5] E. J. Goodspeed's characterization of Ephesians as "the Waterloo of commentators"[6] seems well deserved. Goodspeed's own thesis, that Ephesians was written to serve as an introduction to

---

3. The problem of anachronism notwithstanding, the term Old Testament, rather than Hebrew Bible, will be used throughout this study. This is not simply a matter of linguistic precision (the writer of Ephesians would likely have been familiar with a Greek translation of the scriptures rather than the Hebrew and Aramaic). Rather, this choice of terminology reflects the continuity with the scriptures of Israel, in which New Testament writers understood themselves to stand.

4. J. Christiaan Beker, *The New Testament: A Thematic Introduction* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994), 60.

5. Nils Alstrup Dahl, *Studies in Ephesians: Introductory Questions, Text- & Edition-Critical Issues, Interpretation of Texts and Themes* (ed. David Hellholm, et al.; WUNT 131; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 447.

6. Edgar Johnson Goodspeed, *The Meaning of Ephesians* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1933), 15.

the collection of the Pauline corpus, has failed to win support, as have a myriad of other proposals that seek to locate the letter's purpose in a concrete historical situation.[7] A brief survey of such proposals will suffice to illustrate the problem. H. Conzelmann proposes that the letter be read as a theoretical, theological essay.[8] The liturgical style and baptismal imagery in the letter lead others to read it as a baptismal homily.[9] P. Pokorný believes that the letter is intended to combat a form of Judaistic Gnosticism.[10] E. Käsemann understands the letter's argument to address a crisis threatening the unity between Jewish and gentile Christians.[11] Not

---

7. Goodspeed, *Meaning*, 1–75; followed by C. Leslie Mitton, *The Epistle to the Ephesians: Its Authorship, Origin, and Purpose* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1951), 45–51. See the review of scholarship in Andrew T. Lincoln, *Ephesians* (WBC 42; Dallas: Word, 1990), lxxix-lxxxi; Gerhard Sellin, *Der Brief an die Epheser* (9th ed.; KEK 8; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008), 54–58.

8. Hans Conzelmann, "Der Brief an die Epheser," in *Die kleineren Briefe des Apostels Paulus* (ed. Hermann Wolfgang Beyer; NTD 8; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972), 56; similarly, Andreas Lindemann, *Die Aufhebung der Zeit: Geschichtsverständnis und Eschatologie im Epheserbrief* (SNT; Gütersloh: Mohn, 1975), 7, 248 (dogmatics in draft form); and Henry Chadwick, "Die Absicht des Epheserbriefes," *ZNW* 51 (1960): 145–153 (demonstrating the antiquity of the Christian message).

9. Nils Alstrup Dahl, "Adresse und Proömium des Epheserbriefes," *TZ* 7 (1951): 263–264; John Coutts, "Ephesians 1:3–14 and 1 Peter 1:3–12," *NTS* 3 (1957): 125–127; cf. J. C. Kirby, *Ephesians: Baptism and Pentecost: An Inquiry Into the Structure and Purpose of the Epistle to the Ephesians,* (London: SPCK, 1968), 144–61 (a homily associated with the renewal of baptismal vows at the Feast of Pentecost).

10. Petr Pokorný, *Der Epheserbrief und die Gnosis: Die Bedeutung des Haupt-Glieder-Gedankens in der entstehenden Kirche* (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1965), 21; cf. Derwood C. Smith, "Ephesian Heresy and the Origin of the Epistle to the Ephesians," *Ohio Journal of Religious Studies* 5 (1977): 78–103 (combatting speculative Judaism among former pagans). In a somewhat similar vein, Clinton E. Arnold, *Ephesians: Power and Magic: The Concept of Power in Ephesians in Light of Its Historical Setting* (SNTSMS 63; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 123–124, contends that the letter was written to those formerly involved in the cult of Artemis at Ephesus. The explanatory power of this thesis is diminished by the fact that the later ascription, "in Ephesus," has little to do with the letter's original recipients; see Ernest Best, "Recipients and Title of the Letter to the Ephesians: Why and When the Designation 'Ephesians'?" *ANRW* 2.25.4 (1987): 3278–79.

11. Ernst Käsemann, "Ephesians and Acts," in *Studies in Luke-Acts* (ed. L. E. Keck and J. L. Martyn; Nashville: Abingdon, 1966), 291. Karl Martin Fischer, *Tendenz und Absicht des Epheserbriefes* (FRLANT 111; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973), 21–39, believes the

unrelated to Goodspeed's earlier thesis, R. P. Martin sees the letter as part of a strategy to regain Asia Minor for the Pauline gospel.[12] As the variety of even this merely illustrative list suggests, efforts to ground the letter's purpose in an historical situation will likely remain inconclusive. A new line of research, however, sees the letter as addressing the related issues of identity formation and behavior.[13] This study is aligned with this more recent trend, and will seek to gain further clarity on the letter's rhetorical strategy to form the identity and behavior of its audience.

The present study will argue that in Ephesians, Christ is characterized as a type of ideal king. Such a portrayal of Christ would have resonated with a constellation of cultural expectations held by letter's authorial audience, thereby ensuring comprehension of the letter's argument and purpose. The letter's primary theme, the reunification of the "fractured cosmos,"[14] comes into sharper focus when Christ is understood as the ideal king who establishes on earth the harmony that is understood to exist in the cosmos (1:3-14). Furthermore, salient aspects of the ideal king's reign function as unifying threads that tie various parts of the letter together under its main theme. Christ, the ideal king, effects reconciliation between Jew and Gentile within the church (2:11-22), and is the basis for harmony

---

letter was written to respond to a different sort of ecclesiastical crisis, that of a new order of episcopacy in Asia Minor.

12. Ralph P. Martin, *New Testament Foundations: A Guide for Christian Students* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975–78), 2:233.

13. Charles H. Talbert, *Ephesians and Colossians* (Paideia; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic, 2007), 11–13; Rudolf Schnackenburg, *Der Brief an die Epheser* (EKKNT 10; Zürich: Benziger, 1982), 34; Andrew T. Lincoln, *Ephesians* (WBC 42; Dallas: Word, 1990), lxxxv; Ernest Best, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Ephesians* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 75; John Paul Heil, *Ephesians: Empowerment to Walk in Love for the Unity of All in Christ* (SBLSBL; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007), 1–4; Harold W. Hoehner, *Ephesians: An Exegetical Commentary* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic, 2002), 106.

14. So Talbert, *Ephesians and Colossians*, 60.

within the Christian household (5:22-6:9). Christ, the ideal king, is the means by which the church enjoys union with God (3:12, 19), and enables the maturation of the church towards holiness (4:17-5:21). The goal of the present study is to demonstrate that such a characterization of Christ is a vital element in the letter's rhetorical strategy.

2. *Justification of the Present Study*

Although the motif of kingship has received some attention in recent scholarship treating various corpora in the NT,[15] no study to date has explored the characterization of Christ as a type of ideal king in Ephesians. In his recent commentary, however, C. H. Talbert proposes a shift in perspective that would greatly facilitate such a project. Talbert suggests that in order to understand the purpose of Ephesians, "one must recognize that the audience functions not only as the *cause* of the composition of Ephesians but also as the *catalyst* for the selection of its language, style, arguments, and *topoi*."[16] He finds that Ephesians addresses the following five aspects of the authorial audience's cultural repertoire, which are crucial for understanding the way in which Ephesians addresses identity formation. (1) The theme of the reunification of the cosmos through Christ (Eph 1:9–10; 3:4–6, 9–11) speaks to a pervasive cultural yearning for unity, and for freedom from factionalism within the political order, widely understood as a mirror of the cosmos. This desire was reflected, for example, in traditions that cast Alexander as the great

---

15. See, e.g., C. Langner, "Was für ein König ist Jseus?" in *Israel und seine Heilstraditionen im Johannessevangelium* (ed. Michael Labahn, et al.; Paderborn: Schöningh, 2004), 247–68; Ulrich Busse, "Metaphorik und Rhetorik im Johannesevangelium: Das Bildfeld vom König ," in *Imagery in the Gospel of John: Terms, Forms, Themes, and Theology of Johannine Figurative Language* (ed. Jörg Frey, et al.; WUNT 200; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 279–318; Joel Willitts, *Matthew's Messianic Shepherd-King: In Search of 'the Lost Sheep of the House of Israel'* (BZNW 147; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007); Costantino Antonio Ziccardi, *The Relationship of Jesus and the Kingdom of God According to Luke-Acts* (Tesi Gregoriana.; Roma: Editrice Pontificia Universita Gregoriana, 2008).

16. Talbert, *Ephesians and Colossians*, 14 (author's emphasis).

uniter of humanity, and was also informed by Roman imperial propaganda. (2) Christ's triumph over cosmic powers in Ephesians (Eph 1:20–23) speaks to the fear of hostile powers, against whom the practice of magic was thought to offer protection. (3) Ephesians makes use of the cultural understanding of benefaction and reciprocity to explain appropriate human response to God, while at the same time critiquing and correcting this understanding. The cultural assumption was that divine benefaction motivated the human response of gratitude, and also obliged the deity to show gratitude for appropriate worship. In the Pauline tradition reflected in Ephesians, humans are neither able to offer an appropriate response to God, nor take any initiative that requires God's response. Instead, Ephesians presents a picture of divinely enabled human response to God.[17] (4) "Learning Christ" (Eph 4:20), or the resocialization into a way of life aligned with the Christian community, addresses the problem of disorderly Christian worship, and the more general critique of immoral gentile behavior. (5) The ordering of the household, widely believed to be a measure of the stability of the state, is taken in hand by Ephesians' casting of traditional household management codes into the realm of Christ's authority (Eph 5:22–6:9).[18]

Talbert suggests that certain themes in particular, such as the reunification of the cosmos through Christ, resonate with the cultural expectation that the rule of the ideal king was a necessary precursor to the establishment of harmony.[19] The present study draws out the implication of this suggestion by arguing that the

---

17. Talbert, *Ephesians and Colossians*, 23–24, reads Eph 1:3-14 as a eulogy of divine benefaction; 3:20-21 as praise for divine benefaction; and Eph 4:1-6:20 as the expected response to divine benefaction.

18. Talbert, *Ephesians and Colossians*, 13–31.

19. Talbert, *Ephesians and Colossians*, 17. See further, Francis Cairns, *Virgil's Augustan Epic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 10–28.

portrayal of Christ as an ideal king functions rhetorically to unify the letter's major themes and clarify its argument and purpose.

The present study benefits from a number of recent studies on Ephesians and other Pauline literature, while at the same time seeking to advance, and in some cases, correct shortcomings of this research. Several of these studies focus on the importance of the theme of reconciliation between Jew and Gentile in Eph 2:11–22 within the argument of the entire letter. This passage is of central importance for the present study, both because this reconciliation is central to the letter's larger theme of the reunification of the cosmos, and because reconciliation figures heavily into expectations associated with the ideal king. E. Faust argues in the revision of his University of Heidelberg dissertation that the universal peace of Christ (*pax Christi*) in Eph 2:11–22 is presented as an antithetical alternative to the degrading integration of Jews within the *Pax Romana*.[20] This passage must be understood both within the context of a Hellenistic Jewish "gnoseological" understanding of salvation,[21] and within the context of fierce ethno-cultural conflict between Greeks and Jews under Roman rule. The purpose of the passage (and by extension the letter) is to elevate the status of Jewish Christians in the eyes of its gentile readers by reminding them of the priority of Jews in the salvation history of God, and also in the present church as mediators of the letter's soteriological perspective. This monograph is noteworthy for its attempt to locate Ephesians' symbolic world within Hellenistic Jewish thought, and its social context within ethno-cultural conflict between Jews and Greeks under Roman rule. However, the argument

---

20. Eberhard Faust, *Pax Christi et Pax Caesaris: Religionsgeschichtliche, traditionsgeschichtliche und sozialgeschichtliche Studien zum Epheserbrief* (NTOA 24; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993), 471–483.

21. "Gnoseological" describes a soteriology conceived in terms of cosmological mysteries, which are understood through noetic and pneumatic understanding (Faust, *Pax Christi*, 19–72).

depends on reading "saints" in 2:19 and "holy apostles and prophets" in 3:5 as referring exclusively to Jewish Christians, a claim for which the exegetical foundation is lacking.[22] Faust thus fails to demonstrate his major thesis, that the purpose of the entire letter is to raise the status of Jewish Christians in the eyes of their gentile co-religionists. His argument that this is also the purpose of 2:11–22 similarly fails to convince.

M. Y. MacDonald's recent article similarly investigates the relationship between the *ekklesia* and contemporary Jews in Eph 2:11–22 against the backdrop of imperial ideology and the shifting political circumstances of the Jews.[23] This passage reflects the ambiguous and flexible community boundaries between the church and contemporary Jews, which suggest correlations between the letter and a social setting in which the church was uncertain whether close association with Judaism would prove beneficial or harmful. MacDonald further demonstrates that the politically charged language of Eph 2:11–22 both resonates with, and subverts imperial ideology. Both Faust and MacDonald assemble an impressive array of texts that illuminate how Ephesians interacts with Roman imperial ideology, but neither draws these insights together to show how the characterization of Christ resonates with this dimension of the audience's cultural repertoire.

T. G. Gombis' recent dissertation argues that Eph 1:20–2:22 reflects the ideology of divine warfare, a tool used throughout the ancient world to assert the supremacy of one's deity over other deities.[24] In Gombis' view, this passage is a

---

22. Faust, *Pax Christi*, 184–88, 207–10.

23. Margaret Y. MacDonald, "The Politics of Identity in Ephesians," *JSNT* 26 (2004): 419–444.

24. Timothy G. Gombis, "The Triumph of God in Christ: Divine Warfare in the Argument of Ephesians," Ph.D. diss. (University of St. Andrews, 2005). The central argument of the dissertation, which focuses on the triumphs of the exalted Christ in Eph 1-2, is presented in slightly abbreviated form in Timothy G. Gombis, "Ephesians 2 as a Narrative of Divine Warfare," *JSNT* 26

tightly constructed argument, which defends the claim of Christ's exaltation to cosmic lordship (1:20–23) by citing the triumphs of the exalted Christ (2:1–16). This is followed by a victory shout (2:17), celebration (2:18), and house-building (2:20–22; analogous to temple-building in the ANE pattern of divine warfare). It is further argued that various interpretive difficulties (e.g., the significance of the author's autobiographical remarks in 3:2–13) find their solution when the letter is read as a cohesive argument animated by divine warfare ideology. Many, if not all, of the parallels Gombis draws between Eph 2 and the ANE pattern of divine warfare are illuminating; his work is without doubt an innovative solution to the problem of Ephesians' argument and purpose. Both Gombis' study and the present one share a concern to understand the significance of certain key element's of Christ's portrayal in Ephesians, most notably his cosmic enthronement. The fact that we come to different (although not mutually exclusive) understandings of Christ's function within Ephesians testifies perhaps to the polysemous nature of this text.

T.-L. N. Yee's revised University of Durham dissertation makes the case that Jewish exclusivist attitudes were the main reason that gentiles were excluded from Israel. In Eph 2:11–22, the author of the letter not only intentionally makes his Gentile readership aware of this attitude, but presents the inclusivism of the Messiah as the antidote for this exclusivism.[25] For Yee, then, Ephesians is written from a Jewish perspective, which regards Christ as the solution to the estrangement and enmity between Jews and Gentiles.[26] While Yee's argument indeed constitutes a provocative attempt to apply insights from the so-called New Perspective on Paul

---

(2004): 403–418.

25. Tet-Lim N. Yee, *Jews, Gentiles, and Ethnic Reconciliation: Paul's Jewish Identity and Ephesians* (SNTSMS 130; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 1–3, 30–33.

26. Yee, *Ethnic Reconciliation*, 187–89.

to Ephesians, the effort founders for the following reasons. First, like Faust, Yee must read "holy ones" in 2:19 as referring to Jews, a usage the term cannot support elsewhere in the letter.[27] Second, by claiming that Eph 2:11–22 aims to upbraid Jews for their ethnocentrism, Yee's study seems to controvert what is a much more straightforward reading of the text, namely that it seeks to remind gentile Christians of their inclusion into the commonwealth of Israel (2:12–13). Finally, one may wonder whether the ethnocentric depiction of Judaism putatively countered by Ephesians is any less of a caricature than the legalistic portrayal of Judaism that the New Perspective sought to replace.

Finally, B. Blumenfeld's monograph does not treat Ephesians, but rather explores the political dimensions of Paul's thought (focusing on a reading of Romans), tracing the genesis of such ideas back to Classical Greek and Hellenistic political philosophers.[28] Blumenfeld brings to light a tremendous wealth of potential conceptual parallels, which, he argues, illuminate the political dimensions of Paul's thought. His study is useful for its thorough analysis of the Neopythagorean conceptualization of the ideal king in particular. Another strength of this volume is that it brings out the extent to which Paul expressed himself in terminology derived from political discourse. Of particular significance for the present study is Blumenfeld's argument (persuasive in our view) that Paul would likely have been familiar with Neopythagorean political thought, based on an abundance of conceptual parallels. Blumenfeld argues, for example, that in Paul's undisputed letters, Christ functions as a "living law" (νόμος ἔμψυχος) as does the

---

27. Yee, *Ethnic Reconciliation*, 196–98.

28. Bruno Blumenfeld, *The Political Paul: Justice, Democracy and Kingship in a Hellenistic Framework* (JSNTSup 210; London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001),

ideal king of the Neopythagoreans and other Greco-Roman authors.[29] This concept, it will be argued, is an important one for understanding the characterization of the Christ as ideal king in Ephesians. Blumenfeld falters, however, in his sweeping effort to apply these insights towards a political reading of Paul's argument in Romans.[30] Chief among the shortcomings of this work is the author's failure to recognize that while Paul derives a number of his conceptual categories from Hellenistic political discourse, Paul himself is not straightforwardly engaging in this same sort of political discourse. Blumenfeld's failure on this point is instructive, as it suggests how *not* to proceed in the present discussion of ideal kingship in Ephesians. More will be said on this matter in the following section, but for the moment it will suffice to make the following distinction between the use of comparative material in Blumenfeld's study and in the present one. For Blumenfeld, the comparative material (e.g., Neopythagorean political philosophers) supplies the meaning of certain terms, as well as the controlling context (i.e., political discourse) needed to understand these terms in Paul's argument in Romans. In the present study, comparative material is used for the more modest goal of describing the cultural repertoire of the authorial audience of Ephesians.

While all of these recent studies bring insight to bear upon important interpretive issues touching upon the argument and purpose of Ephesians, none explore in a comprehensive fashion the interplay between the characterization of Christ and cultural expectations associated with the rule of the ideal king. This study aims to fill this lacuna in scholarship.

---

29. Blumenfeld, *Political Paul*, 331.

30. See the incisive critique by Troels Engberg-Pedersen, review of *The Political Paul*, *TLZ* 133 (2008): 161–162.

3. *Method*

The goal of this study is to understand the literary portrayal of Christ as ideal king in Ephesians within its Greco-Roman and Jewish milieu. The following discussion of the method employed to accomplish this task will consider two questions. First, How will the concept of ideal kingship in Greco-Roman and Jewish literature be used to illuminate the portrayal of Christ in Ephesians? This question has to do with the way in which comparative materials will be used in this study, the subject of chapters two and three. Second, How can we discuss the narrative technique of characterization in relation to a non-narrative text? This question has to do with the literary analysis of Ephesians, the subject of chapter four.

With regard to the first question, we recall that little can be known about the author or recipients of Ephesians from the letter itself. Here, a brief digression on the question of the letter's authorship and intended audience is in order. This study will adopt the perspective that Ephesians was written by a later disciple of Paul, towards the end of the first century C.E. Although, in this writer's judgment, the preponderance of evidence lies in favor of this theory, it must be acknowledged that evidence for the claim of genuine Pauline authorship is by no means lacking. Indeed, adjudicating this dispute is fraught with difficulty, since assessing the evidence (and even determining what should count as evidence) is complex.[31] Determining the identity of the letter's intended recipients is equally difficult and

---

31. Robust arguments for Pauline authorship have been made recently by Peter Thomas O'Brien, *The Letter to the Ephesians* (Pillar New Testament Commentary; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1999), 4–47; Hoehner, *Ephesians*, 2–61. Note further, the skepticism regarding the deuteropauline hypothesis vis-à-vis Colossians and Ephesians raised by N. T. Wright, *Paul in Fresh Perspective* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005), 18–19. Wright perceptively points to the theological presuppositions underlying this hypothesis, noting that it "came from the time when the all-dominant power in New Testament scholarship lay with a particular kind of German existentialist Lutheranism for whom any ecclesiology other than a purely functional one . . . was deeply suspect."

cannot be achieved with any degree of certainty. This is because of the well-known textual issue concerning the phrase ἐν Ἐφέσῳ (1:1). The earliest form of the letter most likely did not contain this geographical descriptor of its intended recipients. In what follows, it will therefore be assumed that the letter was addressed to Christians whose provenance is no longer be known. The best historical evidence, however, points to an intended audience of mostly gentile Christians in the Roman province of Asia Minor.[32]

There are at least two overlapping ways the writer of Ephesians may have thought of his audience. The first would be the actual flesh-and-blood recipients of the letter. Such people would presumably have had some kind of a relationship with the author. Quite possibly he has written to them in the past, and would expect his audience to be familiar with previous letters. This audience may even be familiar with letters the author has written to other recipients. Knowledge of this specific audience and its relationship to the author would of course provide invaluable insight into our understanding of the letter as a chapter in the ongoing relationship between this author and his audience. Secondly, the author may have conceived of his audience in more general terms, as inhabitants of the same cultural milieu occupied by the author himself, that of the first-century C.E. eastern Mediterranean basin. One may think of this hypothetical audience as consisting of contextualized implied readers whose literary competence is not text-specific, but made up of certain socially determined skills of interpretation, and who possess the basic cultural and historical assumptions necessary to understand the author's communication. This is what P. Rabinowitz terms the "authorial audience."[33] This

---

32. For the discussion, see Best, "Recipients and Title," 3247–79; H. Merkel, "Der Epheserbrief in der neueren exegetischen Diskussion," *ANRW* 2.25.4 (1987): 3221–22; Lincoln, *Ephesians*, lxxxi-lxxxiii, 1–7; Hoehner, *Ephesians*, 144–48; Sellin, *Epheser*, 57, 65–70.

33. Peter J. Rabinowitz, "Truth in Fiction: A Reexamination of Audiences," *Critical*

concept of the authorial audience implies that the writer of the letter and its recipients are *both* part of this audience. That is to say, when the author of Ephesians imagines the cultural repertoire of his audience, he would naturally think of the linguistic, historical, social, or religious knowledge that comprise his own cultural repertoire. When the author thinks of the maximally-informed first century audience who will hear his letter, he inevitably thinks of himself. To focus on the reception of Ephesians by its authorial audience is therefore to ask how the author would most likely have intended his letter to be heard by a general audience that shares the same cultural repertoire as the author.

Focusing on the reception of Ephesians by its so-called authorial audience is a practical necessity, warranted by our lack of knowledge concerning the letter's *actual* author and intended recipients. H. R. Jauss suggests that when interpreting a work whose author is unknown, it is helpful to consider the text against the background of works that the author could reasonably have expected his audience to know.[34] This is not to argue that the audience would have necessarily read these texts, but that such texts inform us of the conceptual world of both the author and audience. The goal of the inquiry will be to determine whether the characterization of Christ in Ephesians resonates with the authorial audience's cultural expectations associated with an ideal king, and how such a characterization functions rhetorically to ensure that the message of the letter is understood.

In line with the overall goal of this study—to come to a greater appreciation of how the letter achieves its intended aim of identity formation upon the authorial

---

Inquiry 4 (1977): 121–41; "Whirl Without End: Audience-Oriented Criticism," in *Contemporary Literary Theory* (ed. G. Douglas Atkins and Laura Morrow; Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1989), 81–100.

34. Hans Robert Jauss, "Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory," in *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1982), 3–45.

audience—the method of inquiry should allow us to focus squarely on the final form of the text. Certain lines of investigation, commonly taken in the study of Ephesians, will therefore not be pursued. One such path is the comparison between Ephesians and the undisputed letters of Paul. A few words of apology for this path not taken is perhaps in order. One may wonder why the letters of Paul are not among the bounty of texts considered in chapters two and three of this study. Does this exclusion imply that the authorial audience of Ephesians was more likely to have been familiar with, say, the writings of a little-known Jewish sect at Qumran than they would have been with the other letters written by the very man who is now writing to them? Despite the evident historical value of reading Ephesians in light of Pauline tradition, it is tangential to the aims of the present study for the following reason: the letters of Paul shed little light on the concept of the ideal king in antiquity. Paul neither wrote a kingship treatise, nor engaged in straightforward political discourse. The criterion for selecting comparative literature in this study has been usefulness in portraying the concept of ideal kingship. While certain texts have proven more helpful than others in this regard, the letters of Paul do not come close to meeting this crieterion. One might well argue that the concept of the ideal king informs Paul's portrayal of Christ in other letters, but making such an argument for any one of Paul's letters would merit a study of its own.[35]

---

35. Any meaningful discussion of the relationship between Ephesians and the undisputed Paulines would first have to establish the authorship of Colossians and the relationship between that letter and Ephesians. A survey of recent commentaries demonstrates that there is little in the way of consensus on this issue.See the review of the principal theories of relationship in Sellin, *Epheser*, 54–57. Note further the divergence in theories as presented, e.g., by Ernest Best, "Who Used Whom? The Relationship of Ephesians and Colossians," *NTS* 43 (1997): 72–96 (both letters were written by Pauline disciples, but neither was dependent upon the other); and John Muddiman, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians* (BNTC; London: Continuum, 2001), 20–24 (Ephesians is a composite pseudepigraphical letter interpolated from an earlier genuine letter of Paul to the Laodiceans).

Another common trend in scholarship on Ephesians is the interest in tradition-historical exegesis.[36] In the view of E. Käsemann, Ephesians

> appears to be a mosaic composed of extensive as well as tiny elements of tradition, and the author's skill lies chiefly in the selection and ordering of the material available to him.[37]

This perspective is clearly open to debate, but even if correct, does not necessarily lead to a useful synchronic reading strategy. The present study is not concerned with establishing the genesis and development of traditions. It is, however, keenly interested in the possibility that the authorial audience was aware of such traditions. The following two chapters may strike the reader as preparing the way for a tradition-historical exegesis of Ephesians. The major difference will be what is done with the data collected. Our interest will not be in the way in which the author may have used specific pre-existing traditions (e.g., a hymnic or creedal fragment) in his argument. Rather, we are interested in the way in which the audience's awareness of broader concepts (e.g., the contours of Hellenistic royal ideology) would have affected their reception of the letter. To risk repeating ourselves yet again, this means we are interested in the final form of the text, such as the authorial audience would have encountered it. The question of the author's putative use of sources—both oral and written—will not be a significant concern. Although more will be said in the following section with regard to the argument of chapters two and three, suffice it to note here that these chapters will serve to establish the portrait of the ideal king as recognized by Greco-Roman and Jewish auditors in antiquity. It will be assumed that this cultural repertoire of the authorial audience functioned as background information against which the

---

36. E.g., Faust, *Pax Christi*.

37. Käsemann, "Ephesians and Acts," 288.

audience interpreted the argument of Ephesians. It will not, however, be assumed that the argument of the letter is determined by this cultural repertoire.

One may object that focusing on the authorial audience's cultural repertoire will lead to an artificial construct of ideal kingship. How do we know that a first-century audience would have construed the portrayal of the ideal king in precisely the way we suggest? One could, by analogy, interview ten people today and come up with ten visions of an ideal president. Is not the attempt to reconstruct a commonly held concept of the ideal king in antiquity similarly fraught with subjectivity? The charge of a certain degree of artificiality in our reconstruction of the ideal king cannot be answered in a way that does not beg the question. By definition, any theoretical construct is artificial. The admittedly subjective and artificial construct of the ideal king argued for in this study has, however, a firm textual basis, namely the letter to the Ephesians. Although we cannot be at all certain how widespread this view of the ideal king would have been, we may argue that it was held, at a minimum, by the author of Ephesians. He at least, we contend, believed that his characterization of the Christ as such an ideal king would have resonated with his audience. The burden of the following two chapters is to show that such resonance indeed was likely—by considering a wide swathe of opinion, representing a diversity of geographical, philosophical, and theological perspectives, and by determining the common emphases in the conceptualization of the ideal king that exist between cultures, and across time.

Focusing on the audience affords us the advantage, moreover, of widening the focus of our lens of inquiry, while at the same time lowering the demands for the burden of proof. We will not be arguing, as noted above, that the author knew of, and modified, particular traditions. To do so would bring the focus narrowly on the author, and require a tremendous amount of evidence. Rather, we will argue

that the author could depend on his audience to be familiar with the broadly distributed social stock of knowledge regarding the expectations of an ideal king.[38] Given that both author and audience lived under autocratic rule, as had previous generations, possession of this common stock of social knowledge would not only have been possible, but probable. Further, to focus on how the authorial audience would likely have heard this letter is not to ignore the author's intent in writing the letter. It is simply to acknowledge that we do not have access to the intent of the actual author. The closest one can get to discerning authorial intent is to posit a reading of the text that adequately analyzes individual passages, synthesizes them into a coherent whole, and does so in a manner that a first-century audience would have found comprehensible and persuasive. Such a reading is the goal of this study. In brief, then, the exegetical advantage of this study's audience-oriented approach is that it affords us a lens of inquiry wide enough to understand the letter's argument and rhetorical strategy in a first century Mediterranean milieu.

With regard to the second question of method—how one may discuss the literary technique of characterization in a non-narrative text such as Ephesians—two problems are readily apparent. The first is that characterization in modern and ancient literary theory is associated with narrative genres (e.g., novels, histories, biographies). In order to discuss characterization in non-narrative material, this study will draw from the work N. R. Petersen, whose study of Philemon suggests a method for uncovering the narrative framework within epistolary material.[39] The

---

38. Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckmann, *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1966), 60–62, argue that a common social stock of knowledge is essential to the functioning of institutions in society.

39. Norman R. Petersen, *Rediscovering Paul: Philemon and the Sociology of Paul's Narrative World* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985), 1–88 Petersen's approach followed in this study is significantly different than the recent attempts to understand the narrative substructure of Paul's letters, most notably by R. B. Hays, N. T. Wright, and B. Witherington, III. Cf. the assessment of such efforts in Bruce W. Longenecker, ed., *Narrative Dynamics in Paul: A Critical Assessment*

basic premise of this method is that every letter tells the story of the relationship between its sender and its recipient(s). This relationship may be conceived of as a narrative consisting of a sequence of actions, understood as the *referential sequence*. A letter may make reference to this history of relationship, but the author often takes considerable liberty in rearranging the sequence of actions. The sequence in which these actions are found in the letter is the *poetic sequence*. Petersen finds that by analyzing the relationship between these two sequences, one may find incongruities which illuminate points of emphasis in the letter.[40]

The second problem involves the method by which Christ can be said to be "characterized" in Ephesians. Both ancient and modern discussions of characterization recognize a variety of techniques by which character may be portrayed. In the *progymnasmata*, ancient compositional handbooks, one finds discussion of techniques such as *ethopoeia*, *ekphrasis*, and *synkrisis*.[41] Modern narrative critics, on the other hand, often talk about textual strategies designed to elicit empathy, sympathy, or antipathy on the part of the reader towards a given character in order to persuade the reader of the implied author's ideological point of view.[42] Ephesians makes use of none of these techniques to portray the character of Christ. What, then, will allow us to talk about Ephesians' textual strategies of characterization? F. W. Burnett points out that in classical Greek literature,

---

(Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 2002).

40. Petersen, *Rediscovering Paul*, 71–78.

41. See the treatment of these topics in the *progymnasmata* of Theon, Aphthonius, Ps-Hermogenes, Nicolaus the Sophist, and John of Sardis in George Alexander Kennedy, ed. and trans., *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric* (Writings from the Greco-Roman World 10; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003).

42. See, for example, the discussions of characterization in David M. Rhoads, et al., *Mark as Story: An Introduction to the Narrative of a Gospel* (2nd ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999); R. Alan Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987); and Mark Allan Powell, *What is Narrative Criticism?* (GBS; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990).

characters were most frequently portrayed as types rather than individuals. That is, a character was depicted "either as an ideal representation or as an example of the characteristics of a species of group."[43]

What do we mean when we speak of a character as a type? P. Berger and T. Luckmann contend that the origin of social order lies is in the habitualization and typification of others' behavior.[44] This suggests that characterization may be reflected in the typification of a certain social role, which is exemplified by a constellation of recognized actions. Following Petersen, it will be helpful to speak of the character of Christ in Ephesians not in terms of individual traits, but rather in terms of the social role Christ occupies in the culture at large and in the church.[45] The present study will pursue the following two lines of investigation into the character of Christ in Ephesians. The first, following Petersen, will be to analyze and compare the differences in the referential and poetic sequences of actions presented in the letter. The goal of this analysis will be to establish the story of Ephesians, and to discover what is emphasized by the author in communicating it. The second, following scholars who conceive of characterization in Greco-Roman literature as having to do with roles and types, will be to analyze Christ's actions to determine the role he plays within the symbolic universe of Ephesians. The goal here will be to determine whether Ephesians presents a "typificatory scheme" of Christ's actions. That is, do Christ's actions in Ephesians present us with a type of

---

43. Fred W. Burnett, "Characterization and Reader Construction of Characters in the Gospels," *Semeia* 63 (1993): 6.

44. Berger and Luckmann, *Social Construction*, 54, 67–73.

45. The consideration of social role in characterization was not unknown in ancient literature either. Theon's *progymnasmata* makes clear that a person's training (ἀγωνή) provides valuable information in constructing that person's character (*Prog.* 78.25-27).

character that would be recognizable within antiquity as a type of ideal king? The analytic strategy outlined here will be discussed in further detail in chapter four.

4. *Outline of the Argument*

The argument that Christ is characterized as a type of ideal king in Ephesians will be set forth in three main sections. The first section (ch. 2) will establish the Greco-Roman concept of the ideal king. The procedure will be to trace the development of the concept from its origins in classical Greece to its appropriation within Roman imperial ideology. The survey and analysis of the literary data will be organized chronologically. In the Classical period, Plato, Aristotle, Xenophon, and Isocrates discuss the merits of kingship as an ideal form of government, as well as the character of the ideal king. In the wake of Alexander the Great, the discourse of kingship in the Greek-speaking world evolved to account for the new form of government under which many Greeks found themselves, that of autocratic monarchy. Although their dating is uncertain, the Neopythagorean treatises on kingship appear to reflect the negotiation with this new type of autocratic rule. Alexander's legacy provides a bridge between the era of Hellenistic kings and that of Roman emperors, as evidenced by the idealization of Alexander by Roman-era writers such as Plutarch. Indeed, the memory of Alexander and commonly held perceptions of ideal kingship "did indeed help to transform a Roman *princeps* into a descendant of the Hellenistic kings."[46] The concluding section investigates the Roman ideal of kingship, and is organized chronologically according to Roman dynasties. Augustus, Virgil, and Seneca provide the witnesses for the Julio-Claudian dynasty. Musonius Rufus, Martial, and Statius shed light on

---

46. Fergus Millar, *The Emperor in the Roman World (31 BC-AD 337)* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1977), 3.

the Flavian Dynasty. Finally, the literary portrayal of the ideal king under Trajan's reign is evidenced by Dio Chrysostom, Plutarch, Pliny the Younger, and Suetonius.

The second main section (ch. 3) will establish the character and role of the ideal king in Jewish thought. The survey begins with an overview of the institution of kingship in ancient Israel. Long after its historical demise, the idealized memory of the monarchy inspired hope within certain streams of Second Temple Judaism for a restored monarchy. For some, the object of this hope was an eschatological ideal king, or Messiah. As J. A. Fitzmyer's recent work shows, there is no small debate regarding the existence of messianic expectation in the OT.[47] The present study will not be served by attempting to solve this debate, for two reasons. First, when attempting to reconstruct the cultural repertoire of a first century C.E. Jewish auditor, historical precision regarding the genesis of traditions is not of paramount importance. Since our primary objective is to understand the ideas a first century Jew may have been familiar with, it makes little difference whether such ideas arose in the eighth or fifth century B.C.E. Second, a distinction must be made between an ideal king and an *eschatological* ideal king. The latter is a particular iteration of the former, and refers to God's anointed royal agent who will rule in the eschaton. Such a figure will be referred to in this study by the term, Messiah. The former term is more expansive, referring to the idealized conception of a king from the past, present, or future. This study will focus upon the Jewish concept of the ideal king. To establish this concept, we will investigate a wider swathe of texts from the diverse literature of Second Temple Judaism than those which clearly speak of a Messiah. Here, the nature of the extant data suggests that geographical, rather

---

47. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The One Who is to Come* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2007). Fitzmyer is skeptical that any messianic expectation is to be found in the OT before Daniel. For a more balanced perspective, see the essays in Stanley E. Porter, ed., *The Messiah in the Old and New Testaments* (McMaster New Testament Studies; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2007).

than chronological, ordering of texts is more helpful. The survey begins with Palestinian Jewish literature, including the *Psalms of Solomon* and the Qumran scrolls. The *Sybilline Oracles*, *Letter of Aristeas*, and Philo provide evidence for the portrayal of the ideal king in Egyptian Jewish literature. Josephus provides the perspective from a Roman Jew. Rounding out the picture is a text of disputed provenance, the *Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs*.

The portrait of the ideal king sketched in these two chapters provides us with an important element of the cultural repertoire of the authorial audience of Ephesians. This data serves as the backdrop for the literary analysis of Ephesians in the final section of the study (ch. 4). The goal of this section is twofold. First, it will be shown that the characterization of Christ in Ephesians does indeed present the reader with a type that would be recognizable to the authorial audience as an ideal king. The beginning section demonstrates that Christ is portrayed as God's vicegerent, or deputy, the one authorized to rule in his stead. Second, it will be argued that when the character of Christ is understood in this fashion, the central theme of the letter, the reunification of the fractured cosmos through Christ, is brought more sharply into focus. In reconciling the cosmos, Christ is thus seen as the ideal king who reconciles humanity to God (2:1–10), and who reconciles humanity with itself by reconciling Jew and gentile in the church (2:11–22). As an ideal king, Christ is further understood to function as the church's benefactor, the one through whom the church receives divine blessing (4:1–16). These divine gifts promote the unity of the church, which reflects the divine harmony understood to exist in the cosmos. Christ's benefaction of the church is thus related to the larger theme of the reconciliation of the cosmos. Through the Christ, moral transformation within the church is enabled (4:17–5:21). This reflects the widespread belief that the ideal king would be able to inculcate virtue in his

subjects. The Christ furthermore enables harmony within the household (5:22–6:9), a notion consonant with the expectation that harmony in the household mirrored harmony in the state, which in turn mirrored divine harmony in the cosmos. Thus, harmony within the household and church both accord with the larger theme of God establishing harmony in the cosmos through Christ. Finally, Christ enables the church's victory over hostile powers (6:10–20). This image is consistent with the portrayal of the ideal king as victorious in antiquity.

The final chapter (ch. 5) will present a summary of conclusions, and implications for further research.

CHAPTER TWO

The Ideal King in Greco-Roman Thought

This chapter will trace the development of the concept of the ideal king in Greco-Roman thought, from Classical Greece through the reign of the Roman emperor, Trajan.[1] The concept of the ideal king has a long history in Greek literary, rhetorical and philosophical traditions.[2] As witnessed by the numerous citations of Homer in kingship treatises, many ancient writers believed that the first serious thought about kingship began with Homer himself.[3] In the fourth century, writers such as Plato, Aristotle, Xenophon, and Isocrates began to consider with full treatments the merits of monarchy as an ideal form of government. These largely theoretical discussions gave way to a more robust attempt to devise a political philosophy that could deal with the vastly changed political landscape following the short-lived empire of Alexander the Great. Treatises on kingship abounded during the Hellenistic era, as both the rulers and the ruled sought to legitimate this new

---

1. Except where otherwise noted, the editions and translations consulted for Greek and Roman sources will be from the Loeb Classical Library.

2. The most complete survey of political philosophy, spanning the development from ancient Mesopotamia and Egypt up until the Byzantine period is Francis Dvornik, *Early Christian and Byzantine Political Philosophy: Origins and Background* (2 vols.; Dumbarton Oaks Studies 9; Washington, D. C.: Dumbarton Oaks Center for Byzantine Studies, 1966). Note, however, the cautions advised by Oswyn Murray, "Review of Dvornik (1966)," *JTS* 19 (1968): 673–678. See also the useful summaries in Cairns, *Augustan Epic*, 10–15; Glenn F. Chesnut, "The Ruler and the Logos in Neopythagorean, Middle Platonic, and Late Stoic Political Philosophy," *ANRW* 2.16.2 (1978): 1313–20; W. W. Tarn, *Alexander the Great and the Unity of Mankind* (London: Milford, 1933), 7–14.

3. See, for example, Oswyn Murray, "Philodemus on the Good King According to Homer," *JRS* 55 (1965): 161–182. Philodemus' work dates from the late 70s to 40s B.C.E. and links discussion of kingship with contemporary politics (possibly Julius Caesar depending on date). Dio Chrysostom's orations on kingship are replete with citations of Homer.

form of autocratic government. The evidence, although fragmentary and diverse, nevertheless displays convergence in a number of central themes.[4] The Roman emperors saw themselves to be the legitimate heirs of the Hellenistic kings, and the literature of this period shares many of the same concerns as the Hellenistic kingship treatises.[5] This type of literature functioned as a *Fürstenspiegel* ("mirror of princes"): its goal was to reflect an image of the ideal ruler in the hope that the actual ruler would be inspired to conform himself to it.[6] Out of this vast body of literature, which spans approximately half a millennium, the current task will be to sketch a portrait of the ideal king.

A word about sources will be helpful. A. D. Nock makes an important distinction between sources that demonstrate the official ideology of a ruler, and those which reflect the opinions of the literati. In determining what a given ruler actually said or wished to be known about himself, the latter must be used with extreme caution.[7] This aim of this project, however, is not to establish official

---

4. Cairns, *Augustan Epic*, 15, suggests that "the general picture for the hellenistic period is of a proliferation of books about kingship, written from all viewpoints, including philosophical ones, but on the whole converging in their conclusions." He may be overstating the case here, as there are significant philosophical differences that shape perspectives on kingship. See further, Oswyn Murray, "Philosophy and Monarchy in the Hellenistic World," in *Jewish Perspectives on Hellenistic Rulers* (ed. Tessa Rajak; Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007), 13–28, who attempts to reconstruct a plausible outline of a περι βασιλεας treatise from the scant fragmentary evidence.

5. This point is made forcefully by Elizabeth Rawson, "Caesar's Heritage: Hellenistic Kings and Their Roman Equals," *JRS* 65 (1975): 148–159.

6. P. Hadot, "Fürstenspiegel," in *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, vol. 8 (ed. Georg Wissowa, et al.; Stuttgart: Druckenmüller, 1972), 555f; Oswyn Murray, "Peri Basileias: Studies in the Justification of Monarchic Power in the Hellenistic World," D. Phil thesis (Oxford, 1971).

7. Arthur Darby Nock, "A Diis Electa: A Chapter in the Religious History of the Third Century," *HTR* 23 (1930): 263; followed by J. Rufus Fears, Princeps a Diis Electus: *The Divine Election of the Emperor as a Political Concept at Rome* (Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome 26; Rome: American Academy in Rome, 1977), 9–17.

political ideology, but rather to assemble a portrait of an ideal king such as would have been widely recognized at the turn of the first century C.E. Both official ideology and unofficial literary characterization will be useful in this task. It must further be acknowledged that the volume of primary sources touching on this topic is enormous, and cannot be treated in great detail in this study. The use of sources will therefore be illustrative rather than exhaustive.

The portrait of the ideal king in Greco-Roman antiquity will be established diachronically, tracing its tradition through the Classical, Hellenistic, and Roman eras. The goal will be to demonstrate the essential qualities of the ideal king, rather than exhaustively to catalogue and compare the minutiae of the various qualities espoused by different writers. This procedure will be adequate for the larger purpose of this study, namely to establish the concept of the ideal king with which the first-century audience of Ephesians would likely have been familiar. It is not assumed that the audience would have known all, or even many of the works discussed below. Rather, the assumption is that the works under investigation either reflected or informed a general cultural expectation regarding the reign of the ideal king.

1. *Classical Period (490–323 B.C.E.)*

Early in the Classical period, the term *basileus* was used to refer to the Persian king. Aeschylus, for example, views Persians as the quintessential "other."[8]

---

8. Edith Hall, *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek Self-Definition Through Tragedy* (Oxford Classical Monographs; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), 57, regards Aeschylus' *Persians* to be "the earliest testimony to the absolute polarization in Greek thought of Hellene and barbarian." On the function of the barbarian as a foil for Greek identity, see Jonathan M. Hall, *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 45; François Hartog, *The Mirror of Herodotus: The Representation of the Other in the Writing of History* (trans. Janet Lloyd; The New Historicism: Studies in Cultural Poetics; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988), 11, 35–56; Heleen Sancisi-Weerdenburg, "*Yaunā* by the Sea and Across the Sea," in *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity* (ed. Ira Malkin; Washington, D. C.: Center for Hellenic Studies, Trustees for Harvard University, 2001), 323–46.

This "otherness" was reflected clearly in the different status of the individual vis-à-vis the state. Greeks saw themselves as free persons, while Persians were seen as slaves of the king (Aeschylus, *Pers.* 180–95). Such contempt for monarchy gave way in the late fifth and fourth centuries to sober consideration of monarchy as a potentially viable form of government. This section will consider the development of the monarchic idea during this period through the writing of Plato, Aristotle, Xenophon, and Isocrates.

1.1. *Plato*

For Plato (ca. 429–347 B.C.E.), monarchic rule remained a hypothetical possibility within the theoretical construct of an ideal state. His conception of such a state must be understood within the context of the failure of radical Athenian democracy.[9] Since the masses had proven themselves incapable in their responsibility to cultivate social morality (*Resp.* 494A), this task should fall to the one most capable of ruling (*Resp.* 590D), whose judgment would be regarded as law (cf. *Prot.* 319C–D, 323A). Given that devotion to philosophy was seen as the method *par excellence* of inculcating virtue, it is no wonder that Plato[10] viewed the ideal ruler as a philosopher:

> Unless . . . either philosophers become kings in our states or those whom we now call our kings and rulers take to the pursuit of philosophy seriously and adequately, and there is a conjunction of these two things, political power and philosophic intelligence . . . there can be no cessation of troubles . . . Nor, until this happens, will this constitution which we have been expounding in theory ever be put into practice within the limits of possibility and see the light of the sun. (*Resp.* 473D; cf. 499B; 540D)

Plato's justifiably famous saying laid the basis for the later conceptions of the ideal ruler as one pre-eminent in virtue, the "best man" in society.

---

9. Dvornik, *Political Philosophy*, 1:177–83.

10. One remembers of course that the *Republic* is a dialogue, which makes identification of Plato's own view problematic.

Plato's philosopher-king is not only supremely virtuous, but is also able to make those under him virtuous.[11] According to Plato, the ideal ruler is the one who possesses the "single art [τέχνη] called both kingly and statesmanlike" (*Pol.* 267C). If it is axiomatic for Plato that the possessor of a τέχνη produces something (e.g., a cobbler is one who produces shoes), then what does the philosopher-king produce? R. K. Sprague contends that Plato's answer is simple: "The statesman makes good men."[12] To make his case, Plato compares the king, the "herdsman and tender of the human herd" (*Pol.* 268C) to the divine shepherd, Cronus (*Pol.* 269C; 274E; 276A–D). The king is like a shepherd, who

> tends the herd, he is their physician, he is their matchmaker, and he alone knows the midwife's science of aiding at the birth of their offspring. Moreover, so far as the nature of the creatures allows them to enjoy sport or music, none can enliven or soothe them better than he. (*Pol.* 268A–B)

Just as the herdsman mates his herd and educates them with sport and music, the methods by which the king betters his people are eugenics (intermarriage between those predisposed to virtue) and education. Plato uses the analogy of a weaver to describe the ideal state created by the philosopher-king:

> This, then, is the end, let us declare, of the web of the statesman's activity, the direct interweaving of the characters of restrained and courageous men, when the kingly science has drawn them together by friendship and community of sentiment into a common life, and having perfected the most glorious and the best of all textures, clothes with it all the inhabitants of the state, both slaves and freemen, holds them together by this fabric and omitting nothing which ought to belong to a happy state, rules and watches over them. (*Pol.* 311C)

---

11. Rosamond Kent Sprague, *Plato's Philosopher-King: A Study of the Theoretical Background* (Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 1976), 100–117.

12. Sprague, *Plato's Philosopher-King*, 115.

In Plato's ideal state, government would be entrusted to the elites of the upper two classes, the "best men" of society.[13] Such men, because of their training in philosophy, would not need laws:

> In a sense, however, it is clear that law-making belongs to the science of kingship; but the best thing is not that the laws be in power, but that the man who is wise and of kingly nature be ruler. . . . Because law could never, by determining exactly what is noblest and most just for one and all, enjoin upon them that which is best. (*Pol.* 294A–B)

Here, the idea is that laws provide the general framework of a just government, but require human intelligence for interpretation and implementation. The one most suited to this task is naturally the one pre-eminent in virtue: "whenever the greatest power coincides in man with wisdom and temperance, then the germ of the best polity is planted" (*Leg.* 712A). Since such persons are rarely, if ever, found in society, Plato argued in his last dialogue, *Laws*, that one should strive for the pragmatic alternative of a government of strict laws, established and implemented by wise men. In such a society, law would rule supreme, and the rulers would be "servants of the law" (*Leg.* 715D; 762E). To become like a king would be "to become subject to kingly laws (δουλεῦσαι νόμοις βασιλικοῖς)" (*Ep.* 8.354C; cf. *Symp.* 196B–C).[14] If, however, Providence should allow one man to be supreme in virtue, Plato was willing to accept that this "best man" should rule alone (*Resp.* 445D; cf. 576E; 587B; *Pol.* 105). The notion of rule by the "best man" became further developed in the political philosophy of Plato's student, Aristotle.

---

13. The three faculties of the human soul—appetite, reason, spirit—provide an analogy for the basis of Plato's ideal state. The faculty of appetite is paralleled by the lower class, made up of the masses, who pursue material desires. Reason is mirrored in the upper class, who pursue wisdom. Spirit represents the middle class, which pursues honor, and is charged with the protection of the other two classes. See further: Ernest Barker, *Greek Political Theory: Plato and His Predecessors* (London: Methuen, 1918), 145–270; Ernest Barker, *The Political Thought of Plato and Aristotle* (New York: Putnam's sons, 1906), 81–207; Werner von Jaeger, *Paideia: Die Formung Des Griechischen Menschen* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1936), 2:198–370.

14. On Plato's view of government as honorable servitude to law, see Hans Volkmann, "Ἔνδοξος δουλεία als ehrenvoller Knechtsdienst gegenüber dem Gesetz," *Phil* 16 (1956): 53–54.

1.2. *Aristotle*

Like his teacher, Plato, Aristotle (384–322 B.C.E.) believed that the goal of the state should be the pursuit of the common good, and the inculcation of social morality (*Eth. nic.* 1179b–81b). Constitutions may be divided into two classes: legitimate constitutions contribute to the common good; illegitimate ones serve the desires of those in power at the expense of the common good. Kingship is an example of the former, while tyranny is an example of the latter (*Pol.* 1279a.26–1279b.18; cf. 1280b.80–85; 1289a.39–1289b.5). Indeed the contrast between kingship and tyranny provides a platform for Aristotle to extol the virtues of the ideal ruler (*Pol.* 1310b.40–1311a.6; 1313b.17–33). If a tyrant wishes to stay in power, he would do well to conform himself to the character of a king. To this end, he should become a guardian of the public fund rather than his personal estate; conduct himself in a dignified manner; show respect and honor; be moderate in his appetites; adorn the city; be zealous in religious observance; carry out justice; maintain the balance of power in the state; and provide for the security of both rich and poor alike (*Pol.* 1314a.30–1315a.40). Aristotle thus makes clear that the king rules as a steward of the common weal, whose beneficent and virtuous leadership does not crush those under his authority, nor cause them to hate and fear him (*Pol.* 1315a.41–1315b.10). The tyrant, by contrast, rules solely for his own benefit, and imposes his irresponsible rule on his subjects by violence (*Pol.* 1295a.18–21).[15] Tyranny is the worst type of rule, since it is the deviation of "the first and most divine" of all constitutions, monarchy (*Pol.* 1289a.40).[16]

---

15. Pierre Carlier, "La notion de *pambasileia* dan la pensée d'Aristote," in *Aristote et Athènes* (ed. Marcel Piérart; Fribourg: Séminaire d'histoire ancienne de l'Université de Fribourg, 1993), 113.

16. Carlier, "*Pambasileia*," 113–18, argues that when Aristotle speaks of monarchy (βασιλεία), he has in mind absolute, or universal monarchy (παμβασιλεία). See further the discussion below.

Aristotle may thus be seen to follow Plato's view that the government should fall to the "best man" in society:[17]

> But if there is any one man so greatly distinguished in outstanding virtue, or more than one but not enough to be able to make up a complete state, so that the virtue of all the rest and their political ability is not comparable with that of the men mentioned, if they are several, or if one, with his alone, it is no longer proper to count these exceptional men a part of the state; for they will be treated unjustly if deemed worthy of equal status, being so widely unequal in virtue and in their political ability: since such a man will naturally be as a god among men. (*Pol.* 1284a.3–11)

Such a person would not be bound by laws, but would rather be a law unto himself (*Pol.* 1284a.11–14).[18] Although it cannot by itself make people virtuous and just, law is foundational for the pursuit and preservation of the common good, since it forms the contract between citizens for a just society (*Pol.* 1280b.11–13). As though obeying a law of nature, all would happily obey the one who should rule as a king for life (*Pol.* 1284b.32–34). The type of rule, wherein a king "acts in all matters according to his own will" is called παμβασιλεία, or universal kingship (*Pol.* 1287a.1–11).[19] Echoing Plato's pragmatism, Aristotle concedes that in most cases, rule by the aristocracy in adherence to law would be preferable to rule by one man, since the rule of law, characterized as "wisdom without desire (ἄνευ ὀρέξεως νοῦς)" (*Pol.* 1287a.30), is less susceptible to being carried away by passions (*Pol.* 1286a.8–1286b.8). When the king's rule becomes contrary to the law, monarchy devolves into tyranny (*Pol.* 1312b.39–1313a.16). The crux of the problem for Aristotle is that the law, which by definition is to a certain extent general in nature, is incapable of

---

17. So Dvornik, *Political Philosophy*, 1:183–86.

18. See further, *Nic. Eth.* 5.1132a22, where Aristotle speaks of the magistrate as a "living righteousness" (δίκαιον ἔμψυχον); this approaches the notion of the king as living law, about which more will be said below.

19. That Aristotle does not consider παμβασιλεία to be inherently illegitimate is made clear by his contrast of παμβασιλεία with tyranny. The latter is a perversion of the former (*Pol.* 4.1295a.18-21).

ruling over every situation; on the other hand, the king is apt to be controlled by passions rather than reason. Nevertheless, if a populace were of the sort that could naturally produce a royal family pre-eminent in virtue, then its kings should be obeyed absolutely (*Pol.* 1288a.8–10, 15–19, 28–29).[20] Two features of the ideal king stand out in the political philosophy of Plato and Aristotle. The ideal king must be the "best man" in society, and he must rule in accordance with the laws of society. Both of these notions would later prove instrumental in the development of the monarchic ideal.

1.3. *Xenophon*

Xenophon (ca. 429–357 B.C.E.), like his contemporary Plato, believed that the government should fall to the "best man," the one pre-eminent in virtue and ability (*Cyr.* 8.1.37). Although both men had experience with monarchic rule,[21] Xenophon seems more willing than Plato to treat monarchy as an actual, rather than a merely theoretical, form of government.[22] The following discussion will highlight three defining elements of Xenophon's portrait of the ideal ruler: (1) the one who is pre-eminent in virtue, (2) who inculcates virtue in his subjects, and (3) whose rule is in perfect conformity with the law.

---

20. Carlier, "*Pambasileia*," 111–12.

21. Plato was familiar with Dionysius II, tyrant of Syracus, for example.

22. There is disagreement regarding Xenophon's assessment of monarchy. Dvornik, *Political Philosophy*, 1:187–91, contends that Xenophon viewed the expansion of the state beyond the borders of the *polis* as a benefit to its citizenry, which was only achievable by absolute monarchy. By contrast, Pierre Carlier, "L'idée de monarchie impériale dans la Cyropédie de Xénophon," *Ktèma* 3 (1978): 133–63, argues that Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* was written to show his mid 4th c. audience that the inevitable consequence of imperial power would be the abandonment of traditional παιδεία, which in turn would guarantee the decadence and downfall of the empire. See further, Ragnar Höistad, *Cynic Hero and Cynic King: Studies in the Cynic Conception of Man* (Uppsala: Gleerup, 1948), 77–79, who argues that Xenophon's primary goal is to present an alternative to the Sophistic education of Athens.

Purporting to reflect the opinion of his teacher, Socrates, Xenophon characterizes the ideal king as the one who is most capable of ruling:

> Kings and rulers, he said, are not those who hold the sceptre, nor those who are chosen by the multitude, nor those on whom the lot falls, nor those who owe their power to force or deception; but those who know how to rule. (*Mem.* 3.9.10)

The portrait of Cyrus the Great in *Cyropaedia* makes clear that the ideal king's pre-eminence in virtue and concomitant ability to rule is a product of his *paideia*, or education.[23] Xenophon begins his work by claiming that, notwithstanding popular opinion to the contrary, "to rule men might be a task neither impossible nor even difficult, if one should only go about it in an intelligent manner" (*Cyr.* 1.1.3). Cyrus, as one who leads through his own virtuous example, provides the paradigm for such rule, setting the example for his subjects to follow in matters pertaining to: religion, moral uprightness, showing respect for others, obedience and temperance (*Cyr.* 8.1.23–33); generosity (*Cyr.* 8.4.6–8); and military tactics (*Cyr.* 8.5.1–16). Indeed, the king's virtue safeguards his well-being (*Cyr.* 7.5.84). People of all nations are devoted to him because of his benefaction; they seek to please him, knowing that they will thereby prosper (*Cyr.* 8.6.23). Because of his role as benefactor, he is seen as a father to his people, even to the people he has subdued (*Cyr.* 8.2.9; cf. 8.1.44). Because of his concern for his subjects he is characterized as a shepherd (*Cyr.* 8.1.2). Cyrus, the ideal king, is descended from the gods (*Cyr.* 4.1.24; 7.2.24).

Xenophon further discusses the education of rulers in *Memorabilia*, by means of a dialogue between Socrates and his intemperate companion, Aristippus. Socrates attempts to persuade his friend that a ruler is a servant of the people,

---

23. James Tatum, *Xenophon's Imperial Fiction: On the Education of Cyrus* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989), 56, 90–91, 227–29. See further Tatum's discussion of the reception history of the *Cyropaedia*, in particular its usage as a *Fürstenspiegel* (10–12).

willingly experiencing deprivation and suffering for the sake of the people, for such a virtuous life is truly the better life. The one trained to be fit for rule must learn to be temperate with regard to food, sleep, drink, and passions (*Mem.* 2.1.2–7). A ruler must not use his office to gratify his own desires, since he occupies the position of a servant with respect to the state. That is to say, "states hold it to be the business of the ruler to supply them with all manner of good things, and to abstain from all of them himself" (*Mem.* 2.1.9). Socrates regards favorably the voluntary suffering of "those who are trained in the art of kingship" because it is good for the soul, and because "strenuous effort leads up to good and noble deeds" (*Mem.* 2.1.17–20). Socrates concludes by recounting a story in which Heracles seeks the advice of two women with regard to "which path to take towards life" (*Mem.* 2.1.21–34). Virtue (Ἀρετή) offers Heracles a life of honor and illustrious blessing if he will commit himself to the pursuit of good and noble deeds, since the gods have decreed that good things require toil. Happiness (Εὐδαιμονία), or Vice (Κακία), the nickname by which she is known to her detractors, offers him a life of sensual indulgence, the absence of hardship, and the fruit of others' labor. Virtue counters that such pleasures will be empty if he has not given himself to the toil which makes reward sweet. This excellent example of a Two Ways formula of ethical exhortation[24] makes clear that the ideal ruler is above all to pursue virtue, viewing his office as a mandate to serve the people rather than gratify himself.[25]

---

24. M. Jack Suggs, "The Christian Two Ways Tradition: Its Antiquity, Form and Function," in *Studies in New Testament and Early Christian Literature: Essays in Honor of Allen P. Wikgren* (ed. David Edward Aune; NovTSup 33; Leiden: Brill, 1972), ; George W. E. Nickelsburg, "Seeking the Origins of the Two Ways Tradition in Jewish and Christian Ethical Texts," in *A Multiform Heritage: Studies on Early Judaism and Christianity in Honor of Robert A Kraft* (ed. Benjamin G Wright; Scholars Press Homage Series 24; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999), 95–108.

25. See further the comments that Xenophon puts into the mouth of King Cyrus: "that the ruler ought to surpass those under his rule not in self-indulgence, but in taking forethought and willingly undergoing toil" (*Cyr.* 1.6.8).

As noted above, Plato believed that the ideal ruler should facilitate the growth of the citizenry towards virtue. Xenophon conceived of this enablement of the virtuous life as a kind of "transformation by vision."[26] Xenophon concludes his work, *Oeconomicus*, with a discussion of the varying aptitudes for command. The ideal commander is one who can transform those under his authority, giving them a will to obey him, rather than forcing them to obey against their will. Ischomachus, Socrates' interlocutor, gives a number of examples from agriculture, politics, estate-management, and warfare:

> For example, on a man-of-war . . . some boatswains can say and do the right thing to sharpen the men's spirits and make them work with a will, while others are so unintelligent that it takes them more than twice the time to finish the voyage. Here they land bathed in sweat, with mutual congratulations, boatswain and seamen. There they arrive with a dry skin; they hate their master and he hates them. (*Oec.* 21.3)

The good commander is able to persuade those under his authority to cheerfully exert themselves, while his antithesis produces laziness and mutual contempt. What distinguishes the one from the other is an ability to transform the will of his subordinates to the end that they find the motivation for obedience within themselves.

This ability extends even to the cultivation of a virtuous inner disposition. In contrast with a bad general who breeds dishonorable character in his men:

> Contrast the genius, the brave and scientific leader: . . . What effect has he on them? They are ashamed to do a disgraceful act, think it better to obey, and take a pride in obedience, working cheerfully, every man and all together, when it is necessary to work. Just as a love of work may spring up in the mind of a private soldier here and there, so a whole army under the influence of a good leader is inspired with love of work and ambition to distinguish itself under the commander's eye. . . . he is the strong leader . . . who can make his soldiers feel that they are bound to follow him through fire and in any adventure. . . . and truly great is he who can do great deeds by his will rather than his strength. (*Oec.* 21.5–8)

---

26. Characterization of this phenomenon as "transformation by vision" is from Charles H. Talbert, *Reading the Sermon on the Mount: Character Formation and Decision Making in Matthew 5–7* (Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 2004), 41–42.

The ideal general thus inspires his soldiers to honorable behavior, obedience, cheerful toil, and devotion. He does so not by force, but through his will, or intelligence.

But what is it precisely that brings about this wondrous transformation? Earlier, Xenophon had mentioned the boatswain's ability to "say and do the right thing" to effect the desired behavior in his sailors. On the surface, this could be understood as simply the natural effect of a well-honed rhetorical ability. Yet, as Xenophon makes clear in the following illustration from the realm of business, the true leader's gift transcends the power of mere verbal persuasion:

> But, Socrates, if the appearance of the master in the field . . . makes no striking impression (ἐπίδηλον) on the men at work, I for one cannot envy him. But if at sight of him they bestir themselves, and a spirit of determination and rivalry and eagerness to excel falls on (ἐμπέσῃ) every workman, then I should say: this man has a touch of the kingly nature (ἤθους βασιλικοῦ) in him. (*Oec.* 21.9–10)

It is not the master's words, but his very appearance that sparks the change in behavior. Xenophon is as illuminating for what he omits here as for what he actually writes. He does not indicate that the master sets an example for his workers to follow. That is perhaps to be assumed, but it does not appear to be the focus of the interaction. Rather, it is literally the physical impression of the master that elicits noble behavior: at the sight of the master, something "falls" on every person present. This ability, Xenophon suggests, is integral to the nature of the ideal king.

The ability to inculcate virtue in another cannot be learned overnight. Rather, it is a result of education, which is "part of the divine aspect of royalty":

> On the contrary, to acquire these powers a man needs education; he must be possessed of great natural gifts; above all, he must be a genius (θεῖον). For I reckon this gift is not altogether human, but divine (θεῖον)—this power to win willing obedience: it is manifestly a gift of the gods to the true votaries of prudence (σωφροσύνῃ). Despotic rule over unwilling subjects they give, I fancy, to those whom they judge worthy to live the life of Tantalus, of whom

> it is said that in hell he spends eternity, dreading a second death. (*Oec.* 21.11–12)

The final sentence suggests that the ideal king, in contrast to the despot, is the rightful beneficiary of this divine gift. Furthermore, this gift marks the king as being in some measure divine (θεῖος).

For Xenophon, the kingly art of ruling necessitates being just (*Mem.* 4.2.11; cf. 3.6.2). Legitimate kingship is thus rule in conformity with law of the *polis*; the opposite is tyranny, or despotism.[27] Reflecting the teaching of Socrates, he writes:

> Kingship and despotism, in his judgment, were both forms of government, but he held that they differed. For government of men with their consent and in accordance with the laws of the state (κατὰ νόμους τῶν πόλεων) was kingship; while government of unwilling subjects and not controlled by laws (μὴ κατὰ νόμους), but imposed by the will of the ruler, was despotism. (*Mem.* 4.6.12)

Again, Xenophon reflects Plato's belief that the king rules in accordance with the laws, and with the consent of those governed.

While rule in accordance with the law is good, it is far better if the ruler himself has internalized the law, and is not beholden to an external written law. In *Cyropaedia*, Xenophon writes of King Cyrus that,

> he believed that he could in no way more effectively inspire a desire for the beautiful and the good than by endeavouring, as their sovereign, to set before his subjects a perfect model of virtue in his own person. For he thought he perceived that men are made better through even the written law, while the good ruler he regarded as a law with eyes for men, because he is able not only to give commandments but also to see the transgressor and punish him. (*Cyr.* 8.1.21–22)

Reflected in this passage is the "mimetic exchange" that takes place between Cyrus and his lieutenants: imitation of Cyrus becomes the central task of those administering his empire.[28] One sees here perhaps the germ of the notion that the

---

27. Erwin R. Goodenough, "The Political Philosophy of Hellenistic Kingship," *YCS* 1 (1928): 61; Volkmann, "Ἔνδοξος δουλεία," 59.

28. James Tatum, *Imperial Fiction*, 207–8.

ideal king rules in perfect accordance with the law, because the law resides within the king.[29] This concept of the law animate, or ensouled law (νόμος ἔμψυχος) lies at the center of a philosophical tradition that saw

> the ruler as the embodiment or agent or representative on earth of the Law or Reason or Logos of God. . . . [whose] task was to be in his own life the ensoulment of cosmic order and thereby bring it down to earth, so that the earthly state might mirror the cosmic harmony.[30]

Although hints of this concept may be found in Aristotle and Xenophon, it is not found clearly expressed until the Hellenistic era, when it appears in the kingship treatises of the Neopythagorean philosophers.[31] Xenophon does not speak of an "ensouled law" *per se*, but the identification of the law with the king strongly suggests that the king in some fashion embodies the law.[32] Again, the idea appears to be that the ideal king understands the spirit of the law and possesses the intelligence to apply it justly. The identification of the king with the law is clearly connected with his capacity to inspire the desire for the good among his subjects, and is intimately connected with his status as the one pre-eminent in virtue.[33]

---

29. So Volkmann, "Ἔνδοξος δουλεία," 59–60.

30. Chesnut, "Ruler and Logos," 1310–12.

31. Malcolm Schofield, "Social and Political Thought," in *The Cambridge History of Hellenistic Philosophy* (ed. Keimpe Algra, et al.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 743, n. 12. See further, Gerhard Jean Daniel Aalders, "ΝΟΜΟΣ ΕΜΨΥΧΟΣ," in *Politeia und Res Publica: Beiträge zum Verständnis von Politik, Recht und Staat in der Antike* (ed. Peter Steinmetz; Palingensia: Monographien und Texte zur Klassischen Altertumswissenschaft 4; Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1969), 315–29.

32. Dvornik, *Political Philosophy*, 1:245–48; Carlier, "L'idée de monarchie," 156; F. W. Walbank, "Monarchies and Monarchic Ideas," in *Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. 7.2 (ed. F. W Walbank, et al.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 81–82; Busse, "Das Bildfeld vom König ," 300.

33. Xenophon describes the function of law and *paideia* in Persian society as contributing to the elimination of wicked desire (*Cyr.* 1.2.3, 6) (Höistad, *Cynic Hero*, 77–79).

1.4. *Isocrates*

Isocrates (436–338 B.C.E.), the last of the fourth century Greek thinkers to be discussed here, arguably did the most to advance the monarchic ideal during this period.[34] His Cyprian orations provide a wealth of insight into the conception of the ideal king immediately prior to the Hellenistic era, in which the concept becomes shaped by the person of Alexander the Great. Most likely written between 372–365 B.C.E., Isocrates' Cyprian orations are concerned with Evagoras (ca. 411–374 B.C.E.), king of Salamis on Cyprus, and his son, Nicocles, who ruled after him. *Evagoras* is an encomium to the deceased king, while *Ad Nicoclem* and *Nicocles* are companion pieces, expounding the rule of an ideal king, and the responsibilities of his subjects, respectively. Evagoras is without a doubt the epitome of the ideal king for Isocrates, and Nicocles is exhorted to become such a king (*Evag.* 77–81). A composite portrait of the ideal king assembled from these three discourses describes a ruler who: is pre-eminent in virtue; preserves harmony and is a lover of humankind; is a benefactor and civilizer; and demands obedience from his people, which results in the ideal state.

The ideal king is descended from Zeus (*Evag.* 12–19, 81), and monarchy is seen to be the best form of government, as evidenced by the fact that the gods are ruled by a king, Zeus (*Nic.* 26).[35] The king's accession to the throne is ensured by the Deity (*Evag.* 25),[36] and he rules "with the just sanction of the gods and men" (*Nic.* 13). The king is god-fearing, led by the gods (*Evag.* 28–29), and equal to the

---

34. Dvornik, *Political Philosophy*, 1:200.

35. Isocrates admits here that the existence of a heavenly monarchy may simply reflect the high esteem in which humankind holds earthly monarchy.

36. Fears, Princeps, 29–45, demonstrates that the notion of the divine election of kings may be traced back to Homer.

gods (*Ad Nic.* 5). Through the study of philosophy (*Evag.* 77–78, 81),[37] he is pre-eminent in virtue (*Evag.* 33; *Ad Nic.* 10–11), and his character is revealed in his words and deeds (*Evag.* 43–46; cf. *Ad Nic.* 33–38). The most sovereign of the virtues are temperance (σωφροσύνη) and justice (δικαιοσύνη), because they benefit others, as well as the holder (*Nic.* 29–35).[38] The king's natural intelligence results in a well-ordered state, "for he believed that if he should prepare his mind well, all would be well with his kingdom also" (*Evag.* 41; cf. *Ad Nic.* 10, 48–54).[39] He must govern himself in order to govern others (*Ad Nic.* 29; *Nic.* 38), and his virtuous life stands as an example for others to follow, since "the manners of the whole state are copied from its rulers" (*Ad Nic.* 31; cf. *Nic.* 36–37).

The king is responsible for the good morals of his subjects (*Nic.* 10), and the prosperity of the *polis* (*Ad Nic.* 9). To rule he must be a lover of both humankind and *polis* (φιλάνθρωπον εἶναι δεῖ καὶ φιλόπολιν) (*Ad Nic.* 15). Kings

> must try to preserve harmony (ἐν ὁμονοίᾳ), not only in the states over which they hold dominion, but also in their own households and in their places of abode; for all these things are the works of temperance and justice. (*Nic.* 41)

An emphasis on the need for ὁμόνοια is found in *Panegyricus.* This address, which takes up the theme of Pan-hellenic unity, was written ca. 380 B.C.E. to be delivered at the Pan-hellenic games. Isocrates' intent is clear: "I have come before you to give my counsels on the war against the barbarians and on concord (ὁμονοίας) among

---

37. For Isocrates, the study of philosophy may simply indicate a life marked by the love of wisdom and culture; see the introduction by G. Norlin in *Isocrates* (3 vols; trans. George Norlin and Larue van Hook; Loeb Classical Library; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1954), 1:xvi-xvii.

38. Isocrates further highlights Evagoras' courage (ἀνδρία) and wisdom (σοφία) (*Evag.* 22–23). These four Socratic virtues comprised the cardinal virtues of Greek philosophy.

39. The correlation between the state and the mind of the king contains perhaps a hint of the concept of the rule by ensouled law.

ourselves" (*Paneg.* 3.41).[40] Some thirty-five years later, in *Philippus* (346 B.C.E.), Isocrates repeats the plea for unity found in *Panegyricus*, but now envisions Philip at the helm, uniting Greece through war on Persia. He urges Philip to choose a noble course of action, imitating his ancestor, Heracles, "in the qualities of the spirit, in devotion to humanity (φιλανθρωπίαν), and in the good will which he cherished toward the Hellenes" (*Phil.* 114). In urging Philip of Macedon to unite the Greeks, Isocrates was preparing the way for two key concepts of kingship: φιλανθρωπία (love of humankind)—what motivated the king; and ὁμόνοια (unity)—his chief business.[41]

Isocrates urges Nicocles to enact good laws and dispense justice fairly. With regard to the creation of laws, he must "originate what is best (εὑρετὴς γίγνου τῶν βελτίστων)" (*Ad Nic.* 17–18).[42] He is to display magnificence in his legislation, and "in the benefits which you bestow upon your friends (ταῖς τῶν φίλων εὐεργεσίαις); for such expenditures will not be lost to you while you live, and you will leave to those who follow you a heritage worth more than you have spent" (*Ad Nic.* 19).[43] Because of his benefactions, and his role in defeating the Spartans off Cnidus in 394 B.C.E., Evagoras is likened to Zeus, the savior (*Evag.* 51–57). The reign of the ideal king affects not only his subjects, but has a salutary effect on neighboring

---

40. Tarn, *Unity of Mankind*, 4–6, credits Isocrates with having been the first to argue for Panhellenic unity. The Persian Wars, however, seem to presuppose a high degree of Panhellenism as well.

41. However, this ὁμόνοια was only extended to Greeks; barbarians were still considered enemies and slaves.

42. This is not the same as the concept of rule by ensouled law, but it does suggest that the genesis of law comes from the king.

43. The king's benefaction obligates his subjects and friends in a relationship of reciprocity: "his friends he made subject to himself by his benefactions, the rest by his magnanimity he enslaved" (*Evag.* 45). See further Isocrates' passing comment in reference to gifts given to the king by friends, "which you purchase at a much greater cost from those who give than from those who sell" (*Ad Nic.* 54). The idea here is every gift incurs a cost, namely the obligation to reciprocate.

kingdoms. After elevating Salamis from a state of barbarism and decline to become respected and feared in the whole region, Evagoras "advanced the whole region surrounding the island to a régime of mildness and moderation (πραότητα καὶ μετριότητα)" (*Evag.* 49). Although the surrounding peoples were previously hostile, under Evagoras' influence "they have undergone so great a change that they strive with one another to see who shall be regarded as most friendly to the Greeks, and the majority of them take their wives from us and from them beget children," and in other ways partake of Greek culture (*Evag.* 50).[44] Judging by the numerous blessings of Fortune, Evagoras has earned immortality more than many others who have received this honor (*Evag.* 70–72).

The king's pre-eminence in virtue demands the obedience of his subjects. They are to carry out their assigned tasks with diligence and justice. They must contribute willingly to the good of the state, considering no task insignificant, knowing that the success of the whole is dependent upon the efforts of all. They are to have concern for the king's interest as much as their own, for which they will be rewarded richly with honors. They must treat others as they expect the king to treat them, striving for virtue and honor rather than riches (*Nic.* 47–51).

Nicocles admonishes his subjects to conduct themselves in a manner worthy of him, whether he is present or absent:

> Let none of you imagine that even what he secretly thinks in his own heart will be hidden from me; nay, let him believe that, though I may be absent in body, yet my thoughts are present at what goes on; for being of this opinion, you will be more restrained in your deliberations on all matters. (*Nic.* 51)[45]

---

44. Later, rehearsing Evagoras' "deeds and perilous enterprises," Isocrates writes: "the citizens of barbarian birth he transformed into Hellenes . . . and having taken over a country wholly inhospitable and utterly reduced to savagery, he made it more civilized and gentler (ἡμερώτερον καὶ πραότερον)" (*Evag.* 65–69).

45. See further: "Even as are the words which you speak about me in my presence, so let your thoughts of me be in my absence. Manifest your good will towards me in deeds rather than in words" (*Nic.* 60–61).

The motivation for, and standard of, good behavior should be the esteem of the king:

> Scrutinize (δοκιμάζετε) your actions and believe that they are evil when you wish to hide from me what you do, and good when my knowledge of them will be likely to make me think better of you. (*Nic.* 52)

Those disloyal to the king must be refuted: "Do not keep silent if you see any who are disloyal to my rule, but expose (ἐξελέγχετε)[46] them" (*Nic.* 53). Wrongdoers will suffer many ills, but the innocent will receive favor (χάριν ἀπολαβεῖν) (*Nic.* 53). Children also must be taught obedience to the king; if they are faithful and just (πιστοὶ μὲν ὄντες καὶ δίκαιοι), thus they will gain a share in the king's privileges (*Nic.* 57). Finally, Nicocles commands his subjects: "Regard my words as your law, and try to abide by them, knowing that those of you who most faithfully do what I desire will most quickly be able to live as they themselves desire" (*Nic.* 62). The result of this obedience is a happy and prosperous state. Nicocles promises his subjects, "you will soon see your own life advanced, my empire increased, and the state made happy and prosperous." Even though this end would be worthy of supreme effort, they will be able, "merely by being loyal and true (πιστοῖς μόνον καὶ δικαίοις οὖσιν) to bring all these things to pass" (*Nic.* 63–64).

1.5. *Classical Period: Summary and Conclusions*

From Plato to Isocrates, one sees a development in thought, both in regard to the willingness to consider monarchic rule as a viable constitution, and in the clarity with which such rule was envisioned. Plato and Aristotle allowed for the possibility that if society could reliably produce a man so pre-eminent in virtue as to be like the gods, such a man should be entrusted with absolute rule. Given that society would rarely, if ever, produce such rulers, both men favored rather the rule

---

46. The translation here seems misleading, as though the exhortation is to inform on those disloyal to the king. The verb more properly conveys a meaning of "to refute" or "to confute."

of laws, created and implemented by wise men. Nevertheless, the rule of law, being by definition general, would always be inferior to the rule of the "best man," who by virtue of his reason would be above the law. Xenophon showed considerably greater willingness than Plato or Aristotle to contemplate the actual, rather than theoretical, rule of a king. *Cyropaedia* presents a portrait of a king in ideal terms, and portions of *Memorabilia* discuss the *paideia* that would produce such a ruler. Xenophon's *Oeconomicus* advances the notion that the ideal ruler is one pre-eminent in virtue, suggesting that the person of the ruler is integral to the inner transformation of the will of those under his authority. Like Plato's philosopher-king, Xenophon's ideal ruler is not simply pre-eminent in virtue; he is also able to inculcate virtue in his subjects. Even more so than his contemporary, Xenophon, Isocrates placed his hope in the rule of an actual king, inspired by the ideal of φιλανθρωπία, who would unify all of Greece. His Cyprian orations are important not only for the details they provide of the ideal king's character and rule, but also for making explicit the obligations required of the ideal king's subjects. Plato, Aristotle, and Xenophon had all agreed that the responsibility of governing should fall to the "best man" in society, the one whose pre-eminence in virtue made him like the gods, above the law yet in harmony with the law. According to Isocrates, the king's virtue not only gave him the right to rule, but further demanded the obedience of his subjects, an obedience that would result in the achievement of an ideal state. Isocrates' monarchic ideal took a dramatic step towards realization in the person of Alexander the Great. To the era inaugurated by the rule of Alexander and his successors we now turn.

2. *Hellenistic Period (323–31 B.C.E.)*

The rapid unraveling of Alexander the Great's short-lived empire following his death in 323 B.C.E. has often been viewed as a period of disintegration. Yet the concomitant establishment of many new monarchies throughout the Hellenistic world surely indicates that this was a period of profound creativity as well.[47] These dynastic monarchies, the eventual outcome of the succession crisis following Alexander's death, were established on the basis of military achievement and the ability to produce progeny. These two elements constituted a king's "demonstrated ability to maintain and transmit power."[48] It was thus critical for a king to show himself victorious; "spear-won" territory was vital for the a king's continued ability to rule, which was largely imposed through military might.[49] Rule by force, however, was a costly and inefficient method of achieving the king's primary goal, namely the extraction of surplus from communities within his territory.[50] Rule by the fiction of consent was much easier as far as the king was concerned, and usually more beneficial for those ruled as well. To achieve this, Hellenistic monarchs sought, with consummate diplomatic skill, to rule in accordance with local laws and customs.[51] They presented themselves in the local idiom of their subjects, and

---

47. A. B. Bosworth, *The Legacy of Alexander: Politics, Warfare, and Propaganda Under the Successors* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 3–6.

48. Erich Gruen, "The Coronation of the Diadochoi," in *The Craft of the Ancient Historian: Essays in Honor of Chester G. Starr* (ed. John William. Eadie; Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1985), 262; Bosworth, *Legacy*, 247.

49. Claire Préaux, "L'image du roi de l'époque hellénistique," in *Images of Man in Ancient and Medieval Thought: Studia Gerardo Verbeke Ab Amicis et Collegis Dicata* (ed. Fernand Bossier; Symbolae A/1; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1976), 56; Walbank, "Monarchies," 66, 73–74; Busse, "Das Bildfeld vom König ," 287.

50. John Ma, "Kings," in *A Companion to the Hellenistic World* (ed. Andrew Erskine; Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World.; Oxford: Blackwell, 2003), 183–86.

51. Volkmann, "Ἔνδοξος δουλεία," 52–61; Leon Mooren, "The Nature of the Hellenistic Monarchy," in *Egypt and the Hellenistic World* (ed. E. Van't Dack, et al.; Louvain: Orientaliste,

adopted native institutions.[52] This must be seen as a self-conscious effort to make monarchic rule acceptable to their subjects.[53]

Although many in the Greek-speaking world had lived under monarchic rule prior to Alexander, this "more intimate and more ambiguous" form of rule affected all aspects of life, and elicited a new political theory which sought to justify monarchy as the ideal form of governance.[54] The fruit of this lengthy process of legitimation through the course of the Hellenistic era is that the ideal king came to be viewed, in the words of F. Dvornik, as

> the incarnation and source of all law and justice: benefactor, savior, shepherd and father of his people, a manifestation of God's greatness to men, a faithful replica of God's virtue which by its example drew men nearer to God.[55]

This section will sketch the character of the ideal Hellenistic king, which became the prototype, *mutatis mutandi*, for the Roman emperors.

Although no Περὶ Βασιλείας treatise from this period is extant in its entirety, the abundant references to titles of lost treatises give evidence of a widespread preoccupation with the legitimation of monarchic rule.[56] Because of the problem of

---

1983), 204–40; Busse, "Das Bildfeld vom König ," 288, 291.

52. Dvornik, *Political Philosophy*, 1:227–31; Bosworth, *Legacy*, 3–5; Ma, "Kings," 179–83.

53. Kings cast themselves into a variety of roles, including: liberator (Préaux, "L'image du roi," 73–74); hero (Bosworth, *Legacy*, 278); and kindly protector (A. E. Samuel, "The Ptolemies and the Ideology of Kingship," in *Hellenistic History and Culture* [ed. Peter Green; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993], 190).

54. Walbank, "Monarchies," 62–64.

55. Dvornik, *Political Philosophy*, 1:278. Although perhaps no more so than the political philosophers he writes about, Dvornik is given to grandiloquence upon occasion, as this quotation demonstrates. One must remember that he makes these remarks apropos of the *ideal* king.

56. See the discussion in Goodenough, "Political Philosophy," 58–59; Murray, "Philodemus," 161–82; Traute Adam, *Clementia Principis: Der Einfluss hellenistischer Fürstenspiegel auf den Versuch einer rechtlichen Fundierung des Principats durch Seneca* (Kieler historische Studien 11; Stuttgart: Klett, 1970), 12–18.

fragmentary sources, the following discussion will proceed topically, rather than chronologically by author.[57] The principal sources under investigation are three treatises on kingship attributed to the Pythagorean philosophers Diotogenes, Ecphantus and Sthenidas, which have survived in fragments long enough to give an idea of the contours of their philosophy. Fragments also exist of a pseudonymous treatise entitled, Περὶ νόμου καὶ δικαιοσύνης. The work is attributed to the Pythagorean philosopher, Archytas of Tarentum, and while it does not address the subject of kingship directly, it contains ideas that are important for the understanding of it. [58] These fragments are preserved in an anthology compiled by Johannes Stobaeus for the education of his son Septimius, which probably dates from the first half of the fifth century C.E.[59] They are likely pseudonymous texts whose date is uncertain, with estimates ranging from the third century B.C.E. to the second century C.E.[60] They will be considered in this section because although their

---

57. See Oswyn Murray's recent discussion of the problem of fragmentary sources in "Philosophy and Monarchy," 13–28.

58. See the detailed discussion of these and other Neopythagorean texts in Blumenfeld, *Political Paul*, 120–274.

59. Curtius Wachsmuth and Otto Hense, eds. and trans., *Ioannis Stobaei Anthologium* (Berlin: Weidmann, 1884–1912). The fragments of Diotogenes, Ecphantus, Sthenidas and Archytas are all found in Stobaeus 4.1, 6–7. Critical editions of these three fragments may also be found in Louis Delatte, *Les traités de la royauté d'Ecphante, Diotogène et Sthénidas* (Paris: Droz, 1942) (with French translation); and Holger Thesleff, *The Pythagorean Texts of the Hellenistic Period* (Acta Academiae Aboensis 30.1; Åbo: Åbo Akademi, 1965). English translations may be found in Kenneth Sylvan Guthrie, trans., David R. Fideler, ed. & intro., *The Pythagorean Sourcebook and Library: An Anthology of Ancient Writings Which Relate to Pythagoras and Pythagorean Philosophy* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Phanes, 1987); and Goodenough, "Political Philosophy". When citing these texts, I have included in the parenthetical reference the location in Stobaeus, the location in Thesleff's critical edition (page and line number), and the translator, if not myself.

60. There is by no means consensus on this date. Tarn, *Unity of Mankind*, 8–9, places them in the third century B.C.E. A Hellenistic date is also proposed by Goodenough, "Political Philosophy". Holger Thesleff, *An Introduction to the Pythagorean Writings of the Hellenistic Period* (Åbo: Åbo akademi, 1961), 30–72, argues extensively that they were produced in the third century B.C.E. as philosophical textbooks for laypersons. See further his article, "On the Problem of the Doric Pseudo-Pythagorica: An Alternative Theory of Date and Purpose," in *Pseudepigrapha* (ed. Kurt von Fritz; Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique 18; Geneva: Fondation Hardt, 1972), 57–87.

dating is debated, it is generally agreed that they contain a "Hellenistic kernel."[61] Although not representative of all Hellenistic political philosophy, these fragments provide us with a fascinating portrait of the ideal king as a divine benefactor who inculcates virtue in his subjects, and through the living law effects harmony within his realm.

2.1. *The Divinity of the Ideal King*

Above and beyond the ways in which Hellenistic kings legitimated their rule through the fiction of consent, the ruler cult evolved as a powerful vehicle for making absolute, divinized rule palatable to the Greek mind. The deification of Alexander the Great marked a watershed in Greek religious thought, which previously had observed a distinction between mortals and immortals.[62] Although the Hellenistic ruler cults were modelled upon divine cults rather than hero cults,[63] the previous Greek tradition of hero worship was an important preliminary to the acceptance of Alexander's cult. In the final stages of this tradition, it had become conceivable to bestow "anticipatory honors" upon a hero prior to death, upon the assumption that his deeds would merit divinization after death. Dvornik argues that, given the belief articulated by Plato and Aristotle that the "best man" in

---

Delatte, *Les Traités*, 282–90, argues for a date in the first-second centuries C.E. He is followed by Walter Burkert, "Zur geistgeschichtlichen Einordnung einiger Pseudopythagorica," in *Pseudepigrapha* (ed. Kurt von Fritz; Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique 18; Geneva: Fondation Hardt, 1972), 23–56. Neopythagorean revivals in the first century B.C.E. and again at the beginning of the first century C.E. make a date during this period plausible (Guthrie and Fideler, *Pythagorean Sourcebook*, 37–40).

61. Marianne Bergmann, *Die Strahlen der Herrscher: theomorphes Herrscherbild und politische Symbolik im Hellenismus und in der römischen Kaiserzeit* (Mainz: Von Zabern, 1998), 40.

62. See the discussion in A. B. Bosworth, *Conquest and Empire: The Reign of Alexander the Great* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 278–90.

63. S. R. F. Price, *Rituals and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 25–40.

society should be ruler and accorded with divine honors, Alexander's deification may be understood as the anticipation of the divine honors which would surely be bestowed upon him in recognition of his remarkable achievement as κοσμοκράτωρ.[64] If this is correct, it implies that Alexander's deification, which paved the way for the acceptance of a living, divine, and absolute sovereign, was acceptable to Greeks because he had achieved what none before him were able to: the unification of the entire known world into a single state. Whether Alexander himself believed that he possessed a divine mandate to achieve ὁμόνοια through world domination is probably unknowable, although the consensus in scholarship is that the myth of Alexander's divinity and world domination was created by his followers.[65]

Regardless of the process by which it came to be accepted, the ruler cult was the defining feature of the Hellenistic monarchies, the legitimation of which was a goal of Hellenistic political philosophy.[66] The conventional (modern) distinction between religion and politics cannot be usefully applied to the Hellenistic ruler

---

64. Dvornik, *Political Philosophy*, 1:215–21.

65. The argument that the ideal of the unity of humankind can be traced back to Alexander himself is made cogently by Tarn, *Unity of Mankind*; *Alexander the Great* (2 vols.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1948), 2:399–449; Henry M. de Mauriac, "Alexander the Great and the Politics of 'Homonoia'," *JHI* 10 (1949): 104–114. Tarn's argument was persuasively refuted by Ernst Badian, "Alexander the Great and the Unity of Mankind," *Historia* 7 (1958): 425–44; see also M. H. Fisch, "Alexander and the Stoics: Part I," *AJP* 58 (1937): . The unity of humankind as a vision of Alexander has been pronounced dead more recently as well by A. B. Bosworth, "Alexander and the Iranians," *JHS* 100 (1980): 1; Peter Green, *Alexander of Macedon, 356–323 B.C.: A Historical Biography* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991), 456; Ernst Fredricksmeyer, "Alexander the Great and the Kingship of Asia," in *Alexander the Great in Fact and Fiction* (ed. A.B. Bosworth and E.J. Baynham; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 136–66. Paul Goukowsky, *Essai sur les origines du mythe d'Alexandre (336–270 av. J.C.)* (2 vols.; Annales de l'Est 60; Nancy: Université de Nancy II, 1978–81), 1:151–65, argues that the myth of Alexander as divine κοσμοκράτωρ is due to the popularization of Alexander in the history of Cleitarchus, now mostly lost. Diodorus (d. ca. 30 B.C.E.) represents an early belief that Alexander had a plan for world domination, the goal of which was the establishment of harmony throughout the world. When Darius sues for peace, Alexander responds, "the earth could not preserve its plan and order if there were two suns nor could the inhabited world remain calm and free from war so long as two kings shared the rule" (17.54.5).

66. Dvornik, *Political Philosophy*, 1:205–77.

cults. They were, as S. R. F. Price argues, a religious response to a political problem, namely this new form of autocratic rule:

> It was by solving the crucial problem of classification that the Greeks were able to represent to themselves otherwise unmanageable power . . . The significance of the classification of the ruler in divine terms is that it disguised the novelty of the monarchies and formed a significant element in the relationship of power between subject and ruler.[67]

It was thus the king's personal qualities, chief among them his divine status, that became the justification of his rule.[68]

It would appear, however, that not all were comfortable with the attribution of divinity to the king; this discomfort may have been particularly acute among intellectuals.[69] Theocritus, for example, describes Ptolemy Philadelphus in terms which recall Plato and Aristotle's "best man" (*Id.* 14.61–63). His *Encomium to Ptolemy* (*Id.* 17) further praises the king's divine birth, good omens, wealth and power bestowed by Zeus, virtues and peace, and benefaction. Theocritus does not, however, straightforwardly attribute divine character to the king. Similarly, Callimachus takes the absolute sovereignty of Ptolemy as a given, and understands his kingship to be a gift from Zeus, but does not portray the king himself as divine (*Hymn. Jov.* 69–83).

Among Neopythagoreans, the king's relationship to the divine was conceived in various manners. Diotogenes believed an essential component to kingship was the priesthood: "So a good king must necessarily be a good general, judge and

---

67. Price, *Rituals and Power*, 52.

68. Walbank, "Monarchies," 80. In the Ptolemaic dynasty, for example, the king's divine character is emphasized rather than his position within the administrative hierarchy (Samuel, "The Ptolemies and the Ideology of Kingship," 181, 192). The divinity of the Ptolemaic king is reflected abundantly in numismatic evidence (Andrew F. Stewart, *Faces of Power: Alexander's Image and Hellenistic Politics* [Hellenistic Culture and Society; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993], 239–40; Dvornik, *Political Philosophy*, 1:231–32, 235–39).

69. Dvornik, *Political Philosophy*, 1:241–45, 250–52, 276.

priest, which things are inseparable from the goodness and virtue of a king" (Stob. 4.7.61; Thesleff 72.3–6 [Guthrie, 222]). Reticence to characterize the ideal king as fully divine is also found in Ecphantus:

> On the earth and among us, humankind has the best nature of all; but the king is a more divine being, prevailing over the common nature by his superior principle. He is comparable to others by his body [lit. σκᾶνος,[70] tabernacle] considering that he was made from the same material; but he was made by the best artist, who created him by taking himself for the model. The king is thus truly the only and unique creature capable of representing the king on high: he is known always by his creator, and also by his subjects, because they see him in royalty as if in a light. (Stob. 4.7.64; Thesleff 79.20–80.6)

The king is unique among humankind in his ability to represent divinity, but is distinct from the king on high. In like fashion, Sthenidas claims that the First God (τὸν πρᾶτον θεὸν) "is the nourisher and preceptor of everything beautiful, and the legislator to all things equally. Such also ought to be a king who on earth rules over men" (Stob. 4.7.63; Thesleff 188.8–10 [Guthrie, 255]). The ideal king is only divine in the sense that he imitates the First God in his magnanimity (μεγαλόφρονα), and in his care for his subjects. This points to an important corollary of the king's divinity, namely his role as benefactor.[71]

---

70. The writings of the Neopythagoreans—Diotogenes, Ecphantus, Sthenidas, and Archytas—are in literary Doric prose, which accounts for the unusual spelling of many words. Actually, the texts are not properly speaking, Doric, but rather an archaistic Doricizing of Koiné or Attic Greek. For discussion of the literary quality of these texts, see Delatte, *Les Traités*, 59–122; Thesleff, *Introduction*, 71–96.

71. Walbank, "Monarchies," 93, remarks that the worship of a king began as an act of gratitude for some service performed, such as the liberation of the city. For example, a hymn preserved by Douris of Samos praises Demetrius Poliorcetes as a savior god for having liberated Athens from Demetrius of Phalerum (Préaux, "L'image du roi," 73). The conferral of divine honors upon a Hellenistic king thus primarily recognized the benefits received from the king rather than his virtues.

2.2. *The Ideal King as Benefactor*

Although Hellenistic kings made concessions to local autonomy in order to achieve legitimacy, the administration of the state was firmly in the hands of the king's *philoi*, a bureaucracy made up almost exclusively of Macedonians and Greeks. Local inhabitants were largely left out of the higher echelons of government, resulting in marked ethnic stratification.[72] In such a system where the king effectively ruled by might over a population in which the ethnic majority was politically disenfranchised, the king sought to acquire and maintain the loyalty of his subjects through benefaction.[73] The establishment of good relations with a city was thus a delicate balance between power and persuasion. The king exerted as much power as he thought would be tolerated, but also became the city's benefactor: giving gifts of grain; building and repairing theaters, gymnasia, porticoes, and walls; furnishing timber for ships; reducing taxes; financing artistic competitions; endowing cultic celebrations; and patronizing native temples. The king's benefaction created an intricate web of obligation. In return for his gifts, the king would receive not only prestige, but also the loyalty and obedience of the recipients.[74] These gifts were at times rejected or received with skepticism as little more than bribery, since they often spelled the end of a city's independence.[75]

---

72. Walbank, "Monarchies," 69–70.

73. The idea of the king as benefactor precedes Hellenistic monarchies. Already Aristotle recognized the antiquity of the idea, claiming the first governments were those of kings. He explains that men of eminent excellence were made kings because of their benefaction, noting that only good men can bestow benefits upon people (*Pol.* 1286b9–12).

74. Klaus Bringmann, "The King as Benefactor: Some Remarks on Ideal Kingship in the Age of Hellenism," in *Images and Ideologies Self-Definition in the Hellenistic World* (ed. A. W. Bulloch, et al.; Hellenistic Culture and Society; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), 7–24; Busse, "Das Bildfeld vom König ," 289, 294–96; Walbank, "Monarchies," 71–72.

75. Walbank, "Monarchies," 71–72; Busse, "Das Bildfeld vom König ," 292; Bringmann, "King as Benefactor," 21–23.

Nevertheless, the Hellenistic monarch's efforts to cast himself as the benefactor of his people was largely successful, to the extent that the ideal king came to be viewed as the source of a city's benefits.[76]

As Diotogenes makes clear, the king's wealth is not intended for the gratification of his bodily appetites, but rather for the fulfillment of his role as benefactor:

> It must be observed that a king ought to be wealthy so as to benefit his friends, relieve those in want, and justly punish his enemies. Most delightful is the enjoyment of wealth in conjunction with virtue. (Stob. 4.7.62; Thesleff 72.30–73.1; cf. 74.2 [Guthrie, 222])

Moreover, the king's beneficence is regarded as evidence of his divine nature. Diotogenes continues:

> A good king must extend assistance to those in need of it and be beneficent, and this assistance should be given not in one way only, but in every possible manner. . . . Good kings, indeed, have dispositions similar to the Gods, especially resembling Zeus, the universal ruler, who is venerable and honorable through the magnanimous preeminence of virtue. He is benign (χραστὸς) because he is beneficent (εὐεργετικός), and the giver of good (ἀγαθοδότας). (Stob. 4.7.62; Thesleff 75.1–11 [Guthrie, 224])

The beneficence of the king mirrors the beneficence of the gods. Moreover, it is the king's beneficence that enables humanity to become like him, and by extension, to become like God, whose nature he imitates. Ecphantus thus claims that the king "will beneficently endeavor to assimilate (ὁμοιοῦν) all his subjects to himself. . . . For without benevolence, no assimilation is possible" (Stob. 4.7.65; Thesleff 82.29–83.1 [Guthrie 259]). The ideal king is thus a benefactor who bestows upon his subjects the gift of his divine virtue. The Neopythagorean philosophers maintain that the ideal king is able to transmit this divine virtue to his subjects by his very presence.

---

76. J. Joel Farber, "The *Cyropaedia* and Hellenistic Kingship," *AJP* 100 (1979): 509–513; Oswyn Murray, "Aristeas and Ptolemaic Kingship," *JTS* 18 (1967): 353–354; W. Schubart, "Das hellenistische Königsideal nach Inschriften und Papyri," *APF* 12 (1935): 10–11, 14–17.

2.3. *The Ideal King Transforms his Subjects by his Presence*

Diotogenes stresses that the king should conceive of his office as the pursuit of virtue, ruling over his own passions in order to rule others; the true king is temperate, generous and prudent (Stob. 4.7.62; Thesleff 72.25–73.9). According to Ecphantus, virtue is transmitted from God to the king: "just as the king is an alien and foreign thing which has come down from heaven to man, so anyone would suppose that his virtues were the work of God, and have become the king's through God" (Stob. 4.7.64; Thesleff 81.10–13 [Goodenough, 78]).[77] Becoming like the king in virtue is the solution to the problem of sin for the common person: "if they sin (αἴκα ἁμαρτάνωντι), their most holy purification is to make themselves like the rulers, whether it be law or king" (Stob. 4.7.64; Delatte 29.13–30.2 [Goodenough, 77]). The ideal king's transcendent virtue is spoken of evocatively in terms of his luminous presence. Ecphantus likens the king's brilliance to the sun:

> For he is judged and approved by this light, as is the mightiest of winged creatures, the eagle, set face to face with the sun. Thus royalty is explained in the fact that by its divine character and excessive brilliance it is hard to behold, except for those who have a legitimate claim. . . . he who stands in it [i.e., the king] must be pure and radiant in nature, so that he may not tarnish its exceeding brightness by his own blemishes (Stob. 4.7.64; Thesleff 80.7–11, 14–17 [Goodenough, 77]).[78]

The ideal king is furthermore able to transmit divine virtue to his subjects by the sheer fact of his overwhelming presence. The most compelling example of what appears to be "transformation by vision" in the Neopythagorean writings is found

---

77. Goodenough, "Political Philosophy," 78, claims that this characterization of royalty employs a mixture of Platonic-Pythagorean, Egyptian, or Persian sun symbolism, in which light streams out from the deity and touches a single person. The function of the light is "not so much to illuminate some individual and make him royal, as to bring the king down along with it [i.e., the divine light] from heaven, made of flesh and blood in his , but actually of a different sort from men altogether in what is truly the man . . . the ψυχή."

78. In antiquity, the eagle was considered to have the strongest eyes of all animals (Lucian, *Icaromenippus* 14). According to a legend preserved by Aristotle, newborn eagles are nourished and strengthened by the sun's rays, while those that cannot tolerate the light of the sun are shoved out of the nest as bastards (*Hist. Anim.* 620a, 1ff) (Goodenough, "Political Philosophy," 82–83).

in Diotogenes' fragment. He claims that the king will win admiration and honor from the multitude if his aspect and discourse are worthy of respect, if he appears to deserve the authority he holds, if his countenance and beneficence bespeak benign behavior, and if he has "venerable gravity [or, majesty] (σεμνότας θεόμιμον), something which imitates divinity" (Stob. 4.7.62; Thesleff 73.19–74.4 [Guthrie, 223]). Diotogenes further elaborates on the nature of this σεμνότας θεόμιμον: "Majesty must be imprinted upon him" (Stob. 4.7.62; Thesleff 74.4).[79] The king's majesty should not be vulgar, but admirable and worthy of his rule:

> Hence he should invest his aspect and reasonings with such a gracefulness and majesty, and also in his mental conceptions and soul-manners, in his actions, and body motions and gestures, that those who observe him may perceive that he is adorned and fashioned with modesty and temperance, and a dignified disposition. *A good king should be able to charm* (τρέπεν) *those who behold him* (τῶν ποταυγασμένων),[80] *no less than the sound of a flute and harmony attract those that hear them.* (Stob. 4.7.62; Thesleff 74.12–19) [Guthrie 223]; emphasis added)

The verb Guthrie translates "to charm" (τρέπω) has as its most basic meaning "to turn"; it may convey the act of repentance or of a change of heart.[81] Vision of the king thus effects a change in behavior or attitude.[82]

Ecphantus further speaks of the king's ability to transform his subjects through the divine *logos* within him:

> The king alone is capable of putting this good into human nature so that by imitation of him, their Better, they will follow in the way they should go.

---

79. Delatte's translation captures the embodied nature of majesty: "Il faut que la majesté soit empreinte sur sa personne" (*Les Traités*, 54).

80. ποταυγασμένων (Doric for προσαυγασμένων) literally refers to those who hear the music of the flute. Guthrie's rendition of ποταυγασμένων with "those who behold him" accords with the overall theme of visual, rather than aural, perception in this passage. So Delatte: "la contemplation du bon roi doit transformer les âmes des contemplateurs" (*Les Traités*, 55).

81. Note the occurrences of τρέπω in the deuterocanonical writings, which carry this meaning: 2 Macc 4:37 (Antiochus is filled with pity); 8:5 (God's wrath turns to mercy); 12:42 (Judas Maccabbeas turns to pray for repentance); 3 Macc 1:27 (people turn in prayer); 5:49 (people turn to weeping); 4 Macc 7:3 (Eleazar did not "turn the rudder of religion" = did not apostasize).

82. Goodenough, "Political Philosophy," 91.

> But his logos, if it is accepted, strengthens those who have been corrupted by evil nurture as if by drink, and who have fallen into forgetfulness; it heals the sick, drives out this forgetfulness which has settled upon them as a result of their sin, and makes memory live in its place, from which so-called obedience springs. . . . the logos, associating with man, restores what has been lost by sin. (Stob. 4.7.65; Thesleff 83.9–14 [Goodenough, 89])[83]

The ideal king thus transmits divine benefits to humankind as a benefactor, inculcating divine virtue in the souls of his subjects through his presence, and through the divine *logos* within him. The primary importance, however, of the king's *logos* or law residing within him is that through it, the king effects harmony within his realm.

2.4. *The Ideal King Effects Harmony Through the Living Law Within Him*

The ideal king, because of his love for humanity (φιλανθρωπία), was considered the source of benefits for his people, among which was the harmony (ὁμόνοια) he effected.[84] It was noted above that the acceptance of Alexander's cult may have been partly due to the recognition that he had effected harmony throughout the known world, an achievement which paralleled and surpassed the ideal of harmony within the *polis*.[85] The term ὁμόνοια referred originally to the absence of faction (στάσις) within the *polis*; only during the civil wars of the fifth century B.C.E. was the concept extended to include peaceful relations between

---

83. The emphasis appears to be on the mystical power of the king's *logos* rather than on the power of the king's persuasion. This nuance is brought out in the Delatte's translation, in which persuasion "is born" within the person. "le Verbe, accueilli par eux, les fortifie et guérit leurs maladies et après avoir chassé l'oubli qui habite en eux à cause de leurs vices, il rétablit en eux le souvenir, *duquel naît ce qu'on apelle la persuasion*" (Delatte, *Les Traités*, 51, emphasis added).

84. Schubart, "Hellenistische Königsideal," 10–11, 14–17; Tarn, *Alexander the Great*, 2:403, 409–17, 423; Murray, "Philodemus," 169; Murray, "Aristeas and Ptolemaic Kingship," 353–54; Farber, "*Cyropaedia*," 509–11–513; Walbank, "Monarchies," 83–84.

85. Préaux claims that the ideal Hellenistic king was a development from the model citizen of the Greek *polis* ("L'image du roi," 55–75).

cities.[86] It must be remembered, moreover, that during the Classical period, this harmony was only conceived of as existing between Greeks, and not between Greeks and barbarians.[87] By contrast, the harmony envisioned by Neopythagorean fragments is cosmic in scope.[88]

The Neopythagorean fragments attest to a belief that the ideal king effected harmony throughout his realm by means of the law, or *logos* residing within him. Since the king had absolute power, he created the law. But was he also bound by it? In practice, he was expected to act responsibly and in moderation, but ultimately he was free to legislate as he wished.[89] Concern over this uneasy relationship between king and law is evidenced by the attention given to law in philosophical discussion of kingship.[90] Diotogenes claims that justice is essential to kingship:

> A king should be one who is most just; and he will be most just who most closely attends to the laws. Without justice it is impossible to be a king, and without law there can be no justice. For justice is such only through law, justice's effective cause. A king is either animated by law (νόμος ἔμψυχος), or a legal ruler (νόμιμος ἄρχων), when he will be most just and observant of the laws. (Stob. 4.7.61; Thesleff 71.18–23 [Guthrie, 222])

Furthermore, according to Diotogenes, the king's justice is essential in order for the state to function harmoniously: "For justice is the binding and holding together of

---

86. Jacqueline de Romilly, "Vocabulaire et propagande ou les premiers emplois du mot ὁμόνοια," in *Mélanges de linguistiqe et de philologie grecques offerts à Pierre Chantraine* (Etudes et Commentaires 79; Paris, 1972), 199.

87. Tarn, *Unity of Mankind*, 3–6. Plato, for example, had earlier regarded enmity as the natural relation between Greeks and barbarians (*Resp.* 470C–D). Aristotle went a step further than his teacher, assuming the naturally inferior status of barbarians, who being by nature slaves, naturally submitted to despotic rule (*Pol.* 1252b.7–11; 1256b).

88. Höistad, *Cynic Hero*, 110, argues that Antisthenes had a major role in transforming the concept of *homonoia* at the end of the fifth century from a political to an individual-ethical concept.

89. Walbank, "Monarchies," 80–81.

90. Volkmann, "Ἔνδοξος δουλεία," 52–55, argues that in Hellenistic philosophical circles, kingship was understood as a glorious servitude (ἔνδοξος δουλεία) to the law. This attitude is reflected in the comment of Antigonus Gonatus to his son, as preserved by the second century C.E. historian, Aelian (*Var. Hist.* 2.20).

the community (κοινωνίας) [of the soul], and such a state of the soul is the only basis for harmony with one's neighbors (διάθεσις ἄρμοσται τᾶς ψυχᾶς)" (Stob. 4.7.62; Thesleff 74.20–23 [Goodenough, 72]).

The characterization of the king as living law referred to more than his just legislation. The author of a pseudonymous rhetorical treatise attributed to Aristotle claims that law is simply the embodiment of reason, as defined by the state's agreement. While law, as defined in this narrow sense, is useful for the regulation of society, royal rule must be based upon reason, understood as a principle embodied by the ruler:

> And it will be proper for you to know that the greatest part of mankind regulate their conduct either by the law or by your life and principle (ὁ σὸς βίος καὶ λόγος); therefore you must make every effort to excel all Greeks and foreigners, in order that those who occupy themselves in these pursuits[91] may by means of the elements of virtue draw a fair copy therefrom. (*Rhet. Alex.* 1420b)

In this view, the king as living law, or *logos*, provides the example of virtue for his subjects to imitate.

According to the Neopythagorean, Archytas (Περι νόμου καὶ δικαιοσύνης), the law is much more than a civil code. The king as living law is the organizing principle for a harmonious state:

> Law bears the same relation to the human soul and life as harmony (ἁρμονία) to hearing and speech. For as law educates the soul and organizes the life, so harmony (ἁρμονία) makes hearing intelligent and speech consistent. . . . Now laws are of two kinds, the animate law, which is the king (ἔμψυχος βασιλεύς), and the inanimate, the written law (ἄψυχος γράμμα). So law is primary; for with reference to it the king is lawful, the rulership is fitting, the ruled are free, and the whole community happy" (Stob. 4.1.135; Thesleff 33.4–10 [Goodenough, 59]).

---

91. Dvornik adds the following gloss to "these pursuits": "which means, probably, those who make your life and logos their guide" (*Political Philosophy*, 1:260).

Central to the political philosophy of Diotogenes was the belief that the order of the cosmos is reflected in the state. The king, as living law, effects this harmony within his realm:

> Now the king bears the same relation to the state [πόλιν] as God to the world; and the state is in the same ratio to the world as the king is to God. For the state, made as it is by a harmonizing together of many different elements, is an imitation of the order and harmony of the world, while the king who has an absolute rulership, and is himself Animate Law (ὢν νόμος ἔμψυχος), has been metamorphosed into a deity among men. (Stob. 4.7.61; Thesleff 72.19–23 [Goodenough, 68])[92]

The king effects this harmony by conforming the state to himself, the living law that reflects divine reason:

> The king should therefore organize the well-legislated city like a lyre, first in himself establishing the justest boundary and order of law, knowing that the people's proper arrangement should be organized according to this interior boundary, the divinity having given him dominion over them. (Stob. 4.7.62; Thesleff 73.15–19 [Guthrie, 223])

Thus the king establishes the law in himself, which naturally leads to a suitable arrangement among the people. Once justice is established through the king's graciousness (χρηστότης), harmony will exist in the state. Clearly then, the concept of νόμος ἔμψυχος pertains not simply to governance, but more expansively to the principle by which the king establishes on earth the harmony that is understood to exist in the cosmos. Understood this way, the king is "the vivid representation to men of *the* law, that will of the gods to which all local state law must conform." The king has this unique quality not only by virtue of office, but "by virtue of his own moral character, which itself must be νόμιμος, that is, in accordance with the higher law."[93]

---

92. The same idea is found in the brief fragment of Sthenidas, who writes: "As the former [i.e., the supreme god] rules in the universe and in the whole of things, so does the latter in the earth" (Stob. 4.7.63; Thesleff 187.13 [Guthrie, 255]).

93. Goodenough, "Political Philosophy," 61; author's emphasis.

Obedience to the ideal king is absolutely necessary for harmony to reign. This is seen clearly in Ecphantus' description of the king's relations with his subjects, at the end of which he declares:

> For the first and most necessary of all things for the human race is that communion shared in by the king over men as well as by the master who rules all things in the universe. . . . Out of these things there is produced a common good, viz., a sort of fine harmony and tuning of the mass together which results from their concordant obedience. (Stob. 4.7.64; Thesleff 81.13–16, 25–26 [Goodenough, 83])[94]

Thus, as Goodenough concludes, although the king is distantly removed from his subjects by his divine nature, he is nevertheless "the immediate means by which men may get into harmony with the universe."[95]

2.5. *Hellenistic Period: Summary and Conclusions*

Although the literary evidence from this period is fragmentary, it suggests a momentous development from the Classical era concept of the ideal king. Plato and Aristotle had characterized the king as the "best man" in society, like a god because of his virtue, who ruled in accordance with law. Xenophon had further suggested that the ideal ruler would be able to inculcate virtue in the lives of his followers. Isocrates had placed his hopes for the unification of Greeks in the leadership of an actual king, Philip II. The ideal state would come about when the people willingly fulfilled their obligation of obedience to their ideal king. The Neopythagorean fragments attest to the continuing currency of these concepts in the political philosophy of the Hellenistic era.[96] They portray the ideal king as a divine and

---

94. Note further that Ecphantus likens the relationship between king and subjects to that of a father and son, and a shepherd towards his sheep, and a law towards those who use it (Stob. 4.7.64; Thesleff 82.5–6).

95. Goodenough, "Political Philosophy," 84.

96. Just how much currency these ideas held during the Hellenistic era is difficult to say. One is wise to heed the cautious, even skeptical, appraisal of Murray, "Philosophy and Monarchy," 17–21. Murray contends that these literary forgeries reflect an infatuation with Pythagorean ideas dating from a later period. The fact that both Musonius Rufus and Plutarch pick

beneficent being, the source of divine benefits for his people. Such a king is able to transform his subjects by the radiance of his divine presence. He rules justly through the animate law within him, by which he also effects harmony within his realm, and between his people and God. This harmony is in part the result of the people's obedience to their king. Perhaps the most significant aspect of this development has to do with the shift from the consideration of monarchy as a theoretical possibility to its justification as an empirical reality. As the rule of an absolute, divinized monarch became the dominant political reality over the course of the Hellenistic era, political philosophers sought both to justify this rule, and to form the character of the ideal ruler. They present the reign of the ideal king as the best and surest hope for a harmonious state, thus calling implicitly for the people's obedience. At the same time, this literature functioned as a *Fürstenspiegel*, a mirror which ostensibly showed the king what he looked like, but in fact told the king what he *should* look like. Both of these functions may be seen in the literary portrayals of the Roman emperors, the successors to the legacy of the Hellenistic kings.

3. *Roman Period (1st c. B.C.E.–117 C.E.)*

This section will focus on the literary characterization of the ideal king in Greco-Roman thought from the late Republic through the reign of Trajan. Although at least initially, the Roman emperor did not consider himself to be king, but rather *princeps inter pares*, imperial rule was in many ways the direct heir of the institution of the Hellenistic monarchy.[97] To the extent that the Roman

---

up these ideas in the first century C.E. show, however, that they are relevant to the larger purposes of this investigation, namely describing the cultural repertoire of Ephesians' authorial audience.

97. Andrew Erskine, "Approaching the Hellenistic World," in *A Companion to the Hellenistic World* (ed. Andrew Erskine; Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World; Oxford: Blackwell, 2003), 1; Millar, *Emperor*, 3, 11; Rawson, "Caesar's Heritage". Otto Weippert, "Alexander-Imitatio und römische Politik in republikanischer Zeit," PhD diss. (Augsburg: University

emperors took the place of the Hellenistic monarchs whose kingdoms they conquered, the literary presentation of the emperor illuminates the concept of the ideal king. This literary evidence will be presented chronologically, sub-divided according to periods of Roman rule. First to be considered are witnesses from the Julio-Claudian dynasty: the *Res gestae divi Augustus*, and the writings of Virgil and Seneca. Next will be witnesses from the Flavian dynasty: Musonius Rufus, Martial, and Statius. Finally, witnesses from the reign of Trajan: Dio Chrysostom, Plutarch, Pliny the Younger, and Suetonius. It is apparent that a number of these witnesses could be placed in more than one chronological category. This is due in some cases to a lack of reliable biographical information (e.g., Musonius), or lengthy literary careers (e.g., Dio Chrysostom and Plutarch). In such instances, considerations such as literary influence (Dio was reportedly a student of Musonius) and historical context (Plutarch's literary career flourished after Domitian) have been determinative. It is further evident that, as in the preceding two sections, many valuable witnesses have not been consulted. The resulting portrait of the ideal king, although incomplete, is yet sufficient to reconstruct the cultural repertoire of a late first-century C.E. auditor of Ephesians.

3.1. *Julio-Claudian Dynasty*

The reign of Augustus represents the transition from republic to empire.[98] Although Julius Caesar's bid to become Rome's *de jure* monarch failed, the turbulent period of the triumvirate prepared the way for Octavian to be gratefully

---

of Würzburg, 1972), 37, notes, for example, that emperors frequently compared themselves with Alexander the Great (Suet., *Jul.* 7; *Aug.* 18; 50; 98; *Cal.* 52; *Nero* 19). Nock, "A Diis Electa," 263, remarks that, in particular, Hellenistic observers who did not understand the nature of the Principate would have seen the emperor as a king.

98. See the insightful discussion of Dvornik, *Political Philosophy*, 2:453–520.

received as a new Romulus.[99] Augustus was careful to preserve the fiction of a restored republic, yet what he created would be best characterized as a monarchical republic, or a constitutional monarchy.[100] Evidence for his self-understanding as Rome's ideal king may be found in his *Res gestae divi Augusti*. Virgil regards Augustus' reign as the return to a golden age. Later, Seneca takes up the theme again, this time pinning his hopes upon the last of the Julio-Claudian emperors, Nero.

3.1.1. *Res gestae divi Augusti*. In the *Res gestae divi Augusti*, the emperor presents himself as pre-eminent in virtue, a generous benefactor, and the one who has brought peace to the Roman people. Although he was loathe to take on the mantle of absolute monarch, Augustus' encomiastic rehearsal of his achievements uses categories of evaluation which are suggestive of the ideal Hellenistic king.[101] By recalling his pre-eminence in virtue, the emperor evokes the commonplace that the "best man" in society should rule. Towards the conclusion of the *Res gestae*, Augustus therefore recounts the bestowal by the senate of a golden shield "on account of my courage, clemency, justice and piety" (34.2).[102] The emperor is not

---

99. Ronald Syme, *The Roman Revolution* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1939), 186, 305–6. On Augustus as the new Romulus, see Suetonius, *Aug*. 95

100. Syme, *The Roman Revolution*, 516; Dvornik, *Political Philosophy*, 2:478–83; Dietmar Kienast, *Augustus, Prinzeps und Monarch* (3d ed.; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1999), 204–12.

101. See further the examples taken from Augustus' life gathered in Dvornik, *Political Philosophy*, 2:483–86.

102. M. P. Charlesworth, "The Virtues of a Roman Emperor: Propaganda and the Creation of the Belief," *Proceedings of the British Academy* 23 (1937): 105–33, argues that these four virtues comprised a canon of imperial virtues that were part of Roman imperial propaganda designed to convince the masses that the emperor had the requisite qualities for his position as supreme ruler. See further Lothar Wickert, "Princeps (Civitatis)," in *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, vol. 22.2 (ed. Georg Wissowa, et al.; Stuttgart: Druckenmüller, 1954), 2222–31. Andrew Wallace-Hadrill, "The Emperor and His Virtues," *Historia* 30 (1981): 298–323, argues that in fact there was no fixed "canon" of imperial virtues. Instead, a multiplicity of virtues and

only virtuous himself, but undertakes the supervision of laws and morals (*curator legum et morum*) of the Roman people in his role as censor (6.1).[103] In this capacity he claims his legislation provided for the populace "exemplary practices to posterity for their imitation" (8.5).

The mention of Augustus' virtues must be understood in the context of the Roman cult of Virtues. Established during the period of Roman imperialism stretching from the Samnite Wars (343–290 B.C.E.) to the defeat of Antiochus III (190 B.C.E.),[104] the cult of Virtues functioned as a vehicle for the appropriation and modification of Hellenistic political and religious concepts.[105] The ideal Hellenistic king was a model of divine virtues, the source of divine benefits, and the means by which divine order was established in the commonwealth. Such a king was ascribed

---

personifications were used in imperial coinage not so much as intentional propaganda, but rather as response to the pressure from the elites that the emperor conform to a set of virtues that would ensure stability.

103. On the supervision of public morals as part of the office of censor, see Jaakko Suolahti, *The Roman Censors: A Study on Social Structure* (Suomalaisen Tiedeakatemian Toimituksia.; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1963), 47–52; cf. Ronald Syme, *The Augustan Aristocracy* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), 74, 176. Augustus claims to have rejected this appointment, yet as P. A. Brunt and J. M. Moore, eds., *Res Gestae Divi Augusti: The Achievements of the Divine Augustus* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1967), 45–46 n.6.1, point out, Augustus may simply have rejected the mode of office, that is, as a virtual dictator. Suetonius (*Aug.* 27.5) also notes that he was appointed as censor.

104. J. Rufus Fears, "The Cult of Virtues and Roman Imperial Ideology," *ANRW* 2.17.2 (1981): 848–49. Duncan Fishwick, *The Imperial Cult in the Latin West: Studies in the Ruler Cult of the Western Provinces of the Roman Empire* (7 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1991–2004), 2.1:456, places the inception of the cult earlier, in 367 B.C.E. with the founding of a temple to Concordia, on the eastern slope of Capitol. The following discussion of the cult of Virtues is indebted to the treatment found in both Fears and Fishwick.

105. The Romans did not naively adopt these Hellenistic concepts, but rather made them their own. For example, Erik Wistrand discusses the Roman appropriation of Hellenistic connotation for the word *felicitas*. Originally, this word denoted a divinely bestowed favor or luck, which ensured victory in battle to the commander-in-chief (the consul) in archaic Rome. At the end of the Republic, however, this word took on messianic overtones from the Hellenistic east. This messianic idea of *felicitas* then became attached to the Roman emperor (*Felicitas Imperatoria* [Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia 48; Göteborg, Sweden: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis, 1987]).

divine honors not only for the virtues he possessed, but for the ability to bring the conditions of virtue into effect through his rule. Whereas, however, Greeks divinized rulers who embodied virtues, Romans divinized the virtues themselves. These virtues should not be understood as personified abstract ideas, but rather as concrete conditions brought about by divine power. Cicero called them *utilitates*, since each one brought a particular benefit (*utilitas*). J. R. Fears renders them "Virtues": "the power or operative influence inherent in a supernatural being."[106] The emphasis on the emperor's virtues not only enhanced his charisma, but ensured stability and continuity, since virtues could be attributed to a new emperor. It also allowed for innovation, since new virtues could be emphasized as the hallmark of the new emperor's reign (e.g., Tiberius—*Clementia, Moderatio*; Claudius—*Constantia*).[107] A. Wallace-Hadrill argues that the imperial virtues represented on official coinage presents a contrast to the Greek philosophical perspective, namely that the ruler must possess the requisite virtues (i.e., internal moral qualities) in order to rule. The objective of imperial propaganda was not to persuade the public that the emperor possessed the needed virtues of the ideal king, but rather that he had the divine power needed to rule, "the power to conquer, to save, to bring harmony and stability, and to distribute benefits."[108] The personification of the emperor's virtues on coinage succinctly expressed the benefits of royal rule. In sum,

> the Augustan Virtues bespoke clearly the establishment of monarchy at Rome. The kingdoms and royal ideology of Hellenistic dynasts provided the prototypes; but with unparalleled skill and success the alien forms were molded to a Roman context, creating a mythology of imperial power capable of supporting the framework of oecumenical monarchy.[109]

---

106. Fears, "Cult of Virtues," 828–33.

107. Fishwick, *Imperial Cult*, 456–59.

108. Wallace-Hadrill, "Virtues," 316.

109. Fears, "Cult of Virtues," 889.

Augustus also presents himself as a benefactor. In a lengthy excursus (15–24), the emperor rehearses the extent of his largesse, which consists of: numerous gifts of money, and assistance to the treasury (17); gifts of grain (5.2; 18); construction and restoration of public buildings and temples (19–21; 24);[110] and gladiatorial games and other amusements (22–23). These expenditures mentioned are not for routine items, but rather those that demonstrate the emperor's generosity and liberality. Most, if not all, of Augustus' largesse came out of his own private wealth, or from booty taken in war, a point which he takes care to mention often (15.1; 17.1, 2; 18; 21.1, 2). Augustus' benefaction was no doubt calculated to gain political support, and constituted one of the means by which he maintained control over the state.[111] Benefaction was also, since Xenophon's *Cyropaedia*, the explicit mode of demonstrating kingly behavior, and thus Augustus' rehearsal of his benefactions may be seen as a demonstration that he was able "to fulfil the role demanded of a true 'king' in Greek thought, in dispensing gifts."[112]

---

110. The rebuilding and restoration of temples also demonstrates Augustus' *pietas* (correct social relation to the gods), and was important to the restoration of *pietas* among citizens. Augustus' maintenance of tradition was crucial to his legitimacy (John Scheid, "Augustus and the Roman Religion: Continuity, Conservatism, and Innovation," in *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Augustus* [ed. Karl Galinsky; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005], 178–82, 192). Note further the emperor's election as *pontifex maximus* (10.2). Dvornik, *Political Philosophy*, 2:483–86, suggests that this reflects the priestly role of Hellenistic kings; cf. Diotogenes (Stob. 4.7.61; Thesleff 72.3–6); Busse, "Das Bildfeld vom König ," 287.

111. Walter Eder, "Augustus and the Power of Tradition," trans. Karl Galinsky, in *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Augustus* (ed. Karl Galinsky; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 23; Brunt and Moore, *Res Gestae*, 58.

112. Millar, *Emperor*, 190, 133–34, 191–200; Millar further argues that the dispensing of both justice and *beneficia* were indivisible in the role of a king (466–67).

Augustus further characterizes his rule as one of tremendous military success, describing at length his campaigns against foreign peoples (26–33; cf. 2–3, 25.1).[113] In this memorable passage, he boasts of having brought peace to the entire empire:

> It was the will of our ancestors that the gateway of Janus Quirinus should be shut when victories had secured peace by land and sea throughout the whole empire of the Roman people; from the foundation of the city down to my birth, tradition records that it was shut only twice, but while I was the leading citizen the senate resolved that it should be shut on three occasions. (13 [Brunt and Moore])

Augustus' achievements reflect the hope expressed by contemporary poets that all the world would be brought under Roman rule (Virgil, *Aen.* 1.278–96; Horace, *Carm.* 4.15). Not only does Augustus bring peace by subduing Rome's enemies abroad, he also frees the Republic from internal strife as well:

> At the age of nineteen on my own responsibility and at my own expense I raised an army, with which I successfully championed the liberty of the republic when it was oppressed by the tyranny of a faction. (1.1 [Brunt and Moore])[114]

Augustus regards the significance of his military exploits to be the peace that they achieved for Rome. He does not boast of his victories for their own sake, but rather to show that through them he established harmony within the empire.

Augustus' claim to have established peace, both within and without Rome, reflects the expectation that the ideal king was supposed to establish harmony.[115] Isocrates hoped that Philip II would unify the Greeks, and the Neopythagoreans believed that the ideal king would establish in his realm the divine harmony of the

---

113. He is careful to point out, however, that none of these conquests was unjust (26.2–3). See further, J. Rufus Fears, "The Theology of Victory at Rome: Approaches and Problems," *ANRW* 2.17.2 (1981): 736–825.

114. Elsewhere Augustus boasts of having "extinguished civil wars" and gained complete control of the state with "universal consent" (34.1); on this assertion of consensus, see Syme, *Aristocracy*, 80–81.

115. Cairns, *Augustan Epic*, 87; Syme, *The Roman Revolution*, 519.

cosmos. Just as it was expected that the Hellenistic king establish ὁμόνοια, the prerogative of the Roman emperor was to effect *concordia*.[116] The Virtue of *Pax* was initially attributed to Julius Caesar and Augustus in recognition of their having restored the *pax civilis*. More importantly, Augustus was regarded as having "restored the *pax deorum*, that peace between gods and men the shattering of which had been so catastrophically revealed in the horrors of the civil war."[117] Gradually, the notion of *pax* (a cessation of hostility) was subsumed under the concept of *concordia* (a more affective and holistic sense of harmony and well being).[118] In certain circles, in particular, within Stoic philosophy, the empire began to be viewed as a living organism, whose integrity could only be vouchsafed by the establishment of *concordia*. In such a construct, *concordia* attained cosmic proportions: it "took on almost the meaning of a mechanical force—the Empire being conceived as machine . . . upon which the existence and functioning of one's own being depended."[119] If the emperor was believed to actually confer the Virtue associated with him, it may be easily believed that the emperor was crucial for the establishment of *concordia* within the empire and within the lives of its citizens.[120]

---

116. Arnaldo Momigliano, "Camillus and Concord," *CQ* 46 (1942): 111–120, argues that the Roman concept of *concordia* and the Greek notion of ὁμόνοιαare theoretically indistinguishable; cf. Cairns, *Augustan Epic*, 89–90.

117. Fears, "Cult of Virtues," 885–87. On Augustus' having restored concord as an argument in favor of the Principate, see Syme, *Aristocracy*, 448.

118. *Stefan Weinstock, Divus Julius* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1971), 267: Pax "was not an idyllic peace but the peace of Roman imperialism."

119. P. Jal, "'Pax Civilis'–'Concordia'," *Revue des études latines* 39 (1961): 229: "La 'concordia' revêtait à la limite la signification d'une force mécanique—l'Empire étant conçu comme un immense assemblage . . . dont l'existence et le fonctionnement conditionnaient les siens propres." Jal claims that this view, whose antecedents lay in Greek philosophy, was in part a response to the ravages of civil war (228).

120. For the belief that the emperor's role was to establish *concordia*, see further Lester K. Born, "The Perfect Prince According to the Latin Panegyrists," *AJP* 55 (1934): 22–23. Jean Béranger, "Remarques sur la Concordia dans la propagande monétaire impériale et la nature du principat," in

Augustus concludes his encomium to himself by noting that he was named "Augustus" by decree of the senate (34.2), and given the title "Father of my Country" by the whole people of Rome, the crowning symbol of his acceptance by the people of Rome as their ruler (35.1).[121] It should be remembered, however, that although every conceivable honor is bestowed upon Augustus, he refuses many of these honors (at least initially), and never accepts divine honors (4.1; 5.1, 3; 10.2; 24.2).[122]

3.1.2. *Virgil.* The writings of the Roman poet, Publius Vergilius Maro (70–19 B.C.E.), cannot be considered kingship literature *per se*, although the theme of kingship is important to his poetry. Virgil envisioned a return to a golden age ushered in by the reign of Augustus. To bring about such a return, Augustus would not only have to restore peace, but abolish *scelus*, "an offence that incurs the wrath of the gods, and is liable to bring down retribution unless set right or 'expiated' by the requisite ceremony (*piaculum*)."[123] Roman hope for a return to a golden age may be traced to Virgil's fourth *Eclogue*, a poem which reflects the tumult of the

---

Beiträge zur alten Geschichte und deren Nachleben: Festschrift Franz Altheim (ed. R. Stiehl and H. E. Stier; Berlin: De Gruyter, 1969), 478, claims that the Roman concept of *concordia* was influenced by the Greek solution to faction within the *polis*, namely the appointment of a man endowed with royal virtue (ἀνηρ βασίλικος) who would assume monarchic control and resolve all disputes. There was, thus, a strong precedent to the idea that *concordia* was the prerogative of the king.

121. Eder, "Power," 27–29; cf. Brunt and Moore, *Res Gestae*, 80 n. 35.

122. He is saluted twenty-one times as *imperator* by the Senate, and thanksgivings to the gods are made on his behalf (4.1, 2); vows are taken and prayers spoken for his health (9.1–2); altars and temples are consecrated in his honor, and sacrifices made on his behalf (11; 12.2). This conspicuous display of modesty appears to be due to Augustus' deference to Roman tradition (M. P. Charlesworth, "The Refusal of Divine Honours: An Augustan Formula," *Papers of the British School at Rome* 15 [1939]: 8).

123. Andrew Wallace-Hadrill, "The Golden Age and Sin in Augustan Ideology," *Past and Present* 95 (1982): 24 The close of Virgil's first *Georgic* implies that the people's *scelus* is responsible for the current age of civil war (*Georg.* 1.463-68). As to the solution, Virgil prays to the "gods of our fathers" not to prevent Caesar from saving the world from ruin (*Georg.* 1.498-500).

triumvirate.[124] Drawing on Hesiod's myth of the "Ages of Metal" (*Op.* 106–201) and the "Life under Cronus" myth (Aratus, *Phaenomena* 114–43),[125] Virgil claims that in this golden age, guilt (*scelus*) and its effects are done away with: "whatever traces of our guilt (*scelus*) remain will vanish and loose the world from its perpetual fear" (*Ecl.* 4.11–14).[126] This age is furthermore associated with the reign of a child, which is characterized by virtue and peace (*Ecl.* 4.15–17).[127] The created order's voluntary submission to this child (*Ecl.* 4.18–25)[128] results in such agricultural bounty that the land does not even need to be tilled, and sheep give purple and crimson wool (*Ecl.* 4.28–45)! It is an age when all creation rejoices (*Ecl.* 4.52).

Virgil takes up the theme of a return again in the *Aeneid*, in which Jupiter prophesies to Venus that the golden age will come when a "Trojan Caesar" named Julius shall arise. His empire will be bounded only by the ocean, his fame by the stars, and the gates of war will be shut (*Aen.* 1.286–94). This last descriptor refers to Augustus having ended civil strife, prompting the resolution by the Senate to shut the gates of the temple of Janus (cf. *Res gest. divi Aug.* 13). That the golden

---

124. Wallace-Hadrill, "Golden Age," 20–21; R. G. M. Nisbet, "Virgil's Fourth Eclogue: Easterners and Westerners," *Bulletin of the Institute for Classical Studies* 25 (1978): 63–64; Syme, *The Roman Revolution*, 217–20.

125. H. C. Baldry, "Who Invented the Golden Age?" *Classical Quarterly* 2 (1952): 83–92; Bodo Gatz, *Weltalter, goldene Zeit und sinnverwandte Vorstellungen* (Spudasmata 16; Hildesheim: Olms, 1967), 28–51, 114–53.

126. Barbara Hughes Fowler, trans., *Vergil's Eclogues* (Chapel Hill, N. C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1997), 36. English translations of the *Fourth Eclogue* are from this version.

127. The child's identity is not made clear, but he is described as the "sweet child of the gods, great increment of Jove" (*Ecl.* 4.49). Nisbet, "Virgil's Fourth Eclogue," 70–71, believes that the poem's enigmatic ending may be a deliberate effort to show that the child is out of the ordinary, and perhaps will have a superhuman destiny.

128. The influence of Jewish sources (Isa 11:6-9; *Sib. Or.* 3.743-59) may lie behind the descriptions of this golden age. See Nisbet, "Virgil's Fourth Eclogue," 65–67; Wallace-Hadrill, "Golden Age," 21; Gatz, *Weltalter*, 79–83.

age will be ushered in by Augustus is made clear in Book Six, as Anchises announces:

> This, this is he . . . Augustus Caesar, son of a god, who shall again set up the Golden Age amid the fields where Saturn once reigned, and shall spread his empire past Garamant and Indian, to a land that lies beyond the stars, beyond the paths of the year and the sun. (*Aen.* 6.791–97)

Virgil imagines the Augustan golden age to be one in which Rome rules the world in peace (*Aen.* 6.850–54). It will be a return to the reign of Saturn, in which the people are "righteous not by bond or laws, but self-controlled of their own free will and by the custom of their ancient god" (*Aen.* 7.202–04).[129] Augustus, inheriting the reign of Saturn, is viewed by Virgil as the earthly Jupiter, that is, Jupiter's vicegerent on earth.[130]

The social implications of such a return are significant. The ideology functions to put the emperor, as the sole hope for the abolition of *scelus*, at the center of the return and urge subjection of all to him. Moreover, as evidenced by Horace, one sees a shift over time in the definition of *scelus* from civil strife (*Epod.* 7.1–4, 18; *Carm.* 1.35.33–34) to moral degeneration (*Carm.* 3.6.17 [adultery]; 3.24.50 [greed]).[131] Horace makes a direct identification between immorality and

---

129. In the vision of a people for whom law is no longer necessary to produce righteousness, one may detect a faint echo of the concept of the νόμος ἔμψυχος. At the same time it must be acknowledged that the peoples' righteousness is not dependent upon the ruler's possession of the animate law. Furthermore, note that elsewhere Saturn is described as giving humanity laws: "First from heavenly Olympus came Saturn . . . He gathered together the unruly race, scattered over mountain heights, and gave them laws" (*Aen.* 8.321). The reign of Saturn is further characterized by peace (*Aen.* 8.325–27), and the absence of personal property or greed (*Georg.* 1.125–28).

130. R. J. Getty, "Romulus, Roma, and Augustus in the Sixth Book of the *Aeneid*," *CP* 45 (1950): 1–12; Fears, Princeps, 123–25. Dvornik, *Political Philosophy*, 2:491–94, claims that Cicero's "Dream of Scipio" (*Rep.* 6.13, 24), in which rulers are envisioned as coming from and returning to heaven, represents an earlier stage in the development of the belief that rulers are the divinely elected vicegerent of the gods.

131. Gordon Williams, "Poetry in the Moral Climate of Augustan Rome," *JRS* 52 (1962): 28–29. The reason for the shift is Augustus' program of moral legislation, passed in 18 B.C.E., about which Horace is optimistic (*Carm.* 4.5.22). See further J. H. W. G. Liebeschuetz, *Continuity and Change in Roman Religion* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1979), 92–100.

civil strife: "Whoe'er will banish impious slaughter and intestine fury, whoe'er shall seek to have inscribed upon his statues, 'Father of Cities,' let such have courage to curb our lawless license" (*Carm.* 3.24.25–29).[132] For Virgil and his contemporaries,

> The Return of the Golden Age theme . . . belongs to a complex of ideas the effect of which was to provide Augustus with a role that made him essential for the preservation of Roman society. Since the Fall, man is burdened by his own *scelus*, his greed and lust; these vices have driven the Romans to a frenzy of mutual destruction, beyond the point where traditional devices can appease the wrath of the gods. Only through voluntary submission to the great mediator Augustus can they recapture innocence and Paradise.[133]

One final aspect of Virgil's poetry should be noted, namely his apparent interest in kingship at a time when the term *rex* was out of fashion. On the one hand, Romans were aware that Greeks held monarchy to be the ideal form of government, and with some exceptions, held their own kings in high esteem.[134] On the other hand, kingship and freedom were often considered mutually exclusive.[135] Virgil's treatment of Roman history in *Aeneid* 6.756–853 provides evidence of the positive view of kingship amongst Romans. In Anchises' speech to Aeneas rehearsing the glories of Roman rulers, Virgil has not so subtly altered the chronological order of these great men's reigns. Julius Caesar and Augustus are inserted after Romulus (6.789–92), while the senators of the Republic are placed at the very end of the list (6.841–45). By deliberately associating these two contemporary rulers with Rome's greatest king, Virgil reveals his own favorable estimation of kingship. He presents a contrast to what scholars of the Augustan era have called the official view, namely that Augustus represents the restoration of the

---

132. See further, Livy, *Ab urbe condita, praef.* 9, where *vitia* is understood to denote civil strife *and* immorality; so Wallace-Hadrill, "Golden Age," 26.

133. Wallace-Hadrill, "Golden Age," 29.

134. Cairns, *Augustan Epic*, 3–10, 15–18. Cairns further notes that Virgil's interest in kingship reflects Cicero's Romanized view of Hellenistic kingship.

135. Rawson, "Caesar's Heritage," 148–54; Cairns, *Augustan Epic*, 6–7.

Republic, the *princeps* being nothing more than a magistrate, or at most the first among equals. F. Cairns finds in Virgil evidence for the existence of an unofficial view: "the rule of one man as a permanent necessity; that man was a god-to-be, if not a god on earth, as well as a king."[136]

3.1.3. *Seneca.* While Virgil put his hope for the return to a golden age in the reign of Augustus, Seneca (ca. 4 B.C.E.–65 C.E.) placed a similar hope in the reign of Nero, whom he saw as a more virtuous successor to Claudius. Seneca's satire, *Apocolocyntosis*, whose title means something like "the pumpkinification of the divine Claudius," mocks the deification of the deceased emperor. It is important to recognize, however, that Seneca did not disapprove of deification as such, but rather the deification of this one man, "whom he wishes to hand down to posterity as a cold-blooded murderer."[137] With irreverent and mildly scatological humor,[138] Seneca proclaims that Claudius' death is "the beginning of a very blessed age" (*Apoc.* 1). This is so not merely because a cruel emperor is no more, but because his successor holds the promise of ushering in a golden age through his virtuous rule.[139] Hermes, who has dispatched one of the Fates to end the dying Claudius' life, declares, "Let him die; allow a better man to reign in his empty

---

136. Cairns, *Augustan Epic*, 60–62.

137. Seneca, *Apocolocyntosis Divi Claudii* (ed. and trans. Apostolos N. Athanassakis; Lawrence, Kan.: Coronado, 1973), 49–50. English translations will be taken from this version.

138. See the puns on his inability to break wind, necessitating the provision of an enema by the Fate sent to dispatch him (*Apoc.* 3). Seneca describes the moment of Claudius passing thus: "His last voice was heard among men, after he had let loose a thunderclap from the part through which he was more easily inclined to talk: 'Poor me! I think I've shit all over myself.' I don't know whether he did this, but he certainly shit over everything else" (*Apoc.* 4). On Seneca's use of humor to create a "negative *Fürstenspiegel*," see Ruurd R. Nauta, "Seneca's 'Apocolocyntosis' as Saturnalian Literature," *Mnemosyne* 40 (1987 1987): 76, 84–88, 90–96.

139. This idea gains currency if the *Apocolocyntosis* was written for the *Saturnalia* of 54. In imperial Rome, this festival was interpreted as the temporary return of the golden age of Saturn (Nauta, "Seneca's 'Apocolocyntosis'," 88–89).

court" (*Apoc.* 3).[140] As the Fates cut Claudius' thread and spin the thread of Nero, Seneca offers an encomium of the new emperor, the radiant description of whom recalls the luminous description of the ideal king in Ecphantus:[141] "Such is the present Caesar; such our ruler Nero on whom Rome will gaze. His shining face glitters, while on his neck his flowing hair falls" (*Apoc.* 4; cf. *Clem.* 1.8.4–5; Virgil, *Aen.* 6.791–94). When Claudius arrives in heaven, the gods cannot decide whether to let him stay. Eventually Augustus is summoned, who castigates Claudius for his unjust rule:

> Is it for this that I brought peace over land and sea? Is it for this that I curbed civil wars, strengthened the city with laws, embellished her with public works . . . Tell me, Divine Claudius, why is it that you condemned the men and women who were executed, before you studied or heard their cases? Where else is this done? Certainly not in heaven! (*Apoc.* 10)

Several inferences may be made from Augustus' speech with regard to the ideal ruler: (1) such a ruler brings peace and establishes harmony; (2) such a ruler should be just; and (3) that the rule of humans on earth should mirror rule of the gods in heaven, which is to say that the state is a microcosm of heaven.

Written in late 55 or 56 C.E., after the murder of Britannicus, Seneca's *De clementia* urged Nero to commit to a policy of *clementia*, or mercy.[142] Inasmuch as the essay was addressed to Nero and sought to hold up a mirror to the prince, it

---

140. This line may echo Virgil's fourth *Georgic*, a poem in which the life of bees is described in such a way as to suggest parallels with human communities. Frequent analogies are made, for example, between the leader of the hive and human kings. Virgil describes a battle between two king bees, at the end of which the inferior one is to be put to death, "and leave the palace free for the better one to rule" (*Georg.* 4.91-92).

141. Shining kings go back as far as Homer (*Il.* 2.514–15; 3.174–77). See further Bergmann, *Strahlen*. Astral symbolism was a well-known theme in Hellenistic and imperial *encomia* (J. Rufus Fears, "The Solar Monarchy of Nero and the Imperial Panegyric of Q. Curtius Rufus," *Historia* 25 [1976]: 495).

142. Arnaldo Momigliano, "Seneca Between Political and Contemplative Life," in *Quarto contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico* (Storia e Letteratura 115; Rome: Storia e letteratura, 1969), 249–51.

functions as a type of *Fürstenspiegel*. Yet the essay was also intended to reassure the public that the terror of Claudius' reign had come to an end.[143] Furthermore, Seneca hoped to persuade his readers that they needed the emperor, and that he deserved their good behavior. *De clementia* may be seen as an "official" expression of golden age ideology in the reign of Nero: the emperor's *clementia* leads to the people's good behavior, which in turn leads to return of the golden age. The contours of this ideology, as A. Wallace-Hadrill perceives it, are as follows:[144] (1) Seneca assumes the basic sinfulness (*scelus*) of humanity. The Roman people are described as "discordant, factious, and unruly, ready to run riot alike for the destruction of itself and others if it should break its yoke" (*Clem.* 1.1.1). Seneca goes on to consider how desolate Rome would be if everyone were judged strictly, since "we have all sinned . . . and not only have we done wrong, but we shall go on doing wrong to the very end of life" (*Clem.* 1.6.3; cf. 1.22.1). (2) As the gods' chosen vicegerent, the emperor is the only hope for the Roman people to escape the destructive effects of *scelus*. Seneca puts into Nero's mouth the claim to be the one "chosen to serve on earth as vicar of the gods," and the "arbiter of life and death for the nations." The world prospers only by his favor, and is kept at peace by his control: "all those many thousands of swords which my peace restrains will be drawn at my nod" (*Clem.* 1.1.2).[145] Indeed, the emperor is indispensable to Rome. If the people were bereft of their king, "Such a calamity would be the destruction of the Roman peace, . . . this unity and this fabric of mightiest empire will fly into

---

143. Miriam T. Griffin, *Seneca: A Philosopher in Politics* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976), 133–38.

144. Wallace-Hadrill, "Golden Age," 29–32.

145. On the portrayal of Nero as the divinely elected vicegerent of the gods, see Adam, *Clementia Principis*, 40–45; J. Rufus Fears, "Nero as the Vicegerent of the Gods in Seneca's *De Clementia*," *Hermes* 103 (1975): 486–96; Fears, Princeps, 136–41.

many parts, and the end of this city's rule will be one with the end of her disobedience" (*Clem.* 1.4.2). (3) The emperor is urged to rule with *clementia*, the most effective means of dealing with offenses against himself and others. Seneca declares to Nero that "you are the soul of the state (*tu animus rei publicae tuae es*) and the state your body." Therefore, Seneca declares, "you are merciful to yourself when you are seemingly merciful to another" (*Clem.* 1.5.1). This mercy will have the effect of abolishing vice: "The morals of the state, moreover, are better mended by the sparing use of punitive measures . . . Good morals are established in the state and vice is wiped out if a prince is patient with vice" (*Clem.* 1.22.2–3). (4) Finally, since Nero has demonstrated such *clementia*, the stage is set for a return to a golden age. In the beginning of the second book, Seneca praises the emperor for his mercy, as demonstrated in his reluctance to sign the death warrants of two brigands. His conduct in the matter is

> worthy of the universal innocence of mankind, in favour whereof that long past age should be renewed. Now assuredly it were fitting that men, thrusting out covetousness from which springs every evil of the heart, should conspire for righteousness and goodness, that piety and uprightness along with honor and temperance should rise again, and that vice, having misused its long reign, should at length give place to an age of happiness and purity. We are pleased to hope and trust, Caesar, that in large measure this will happen. That kindness of your heart will be recounted, will be diffused little by little throughout the whole body of the empire, and all things will be moulded into your likeness. It is from the head that comes the health of the body . . . and uprightness will return to the whole world. (*Clem.* 2.1.3–2.2)

The people owe their obedience to a *princeps* as merciful as Nero, and it is this obedience that will usher in the golden age.[146]

Finally, one notes that Seneca, much in the same way as Virgil before him, does not shy away from the term, *rex*, despite the fact that it was a term of opprobrium commonly used to denote a tyrant.[147] Although he does not

---

146. Wallace-Hadrill, "Golden Age," 31–32.

147. Griffin, *Seneca*, 142–46.

specifically refer to Nero as *rex*, Seneca regards *rex* as a legitimate equivalent to *princeps*.[148] Miriam Griffin argues that the general public would have accepted the fact of the Principate, by Seneca's time. He wrote, thus, not to argue for the Principate's legitimacy, but for a particular metaphysical understanding of the *princeps*. This is reflected in Seneca's frequent use of the term, *rex*, and in the parallels between the first book of *De clementia* and Hellenistic περὶ βασιλείας treatises, which exhort their subject to conform his rule to a theoretical ideal.[149] Seneca is not simply carelessly importing a Greek concept, but rather is deliberately drawing on traditional theories of kingship, applying them to the Principate. His use of *rex* in *De clementia* is a self-conscious effort to apply to the *princeps* the concept of βασιλεύς instead of τύραννος.[150] Seneca had previously written for Nero a speech in which he promised to observe the proper form of relations with the Senate.[151] With *De clementia*, Seneca is claiming that not only the form, but the virtues underlying the form are crucial. Seneca's task was to instill virtue in Nero; Nero's virtue would then result in the flowering of good morals in the state (*Clem.* 2.2.1).[152] In the desire to instill in Nero the virtue of *clementia* must be seen an implicit acknowledgement that the law was insufficient in and of itself to ensure good governance. As M. Griffin puts it, "The character of those who governed, not

---

148. "Therefore it is not strange that kings and princes (*principes regesque*) and guardians of the public order, whatever different name they bear, are held more dear even than those bound to us by private ties" (*Clem.* 1.4.3).

149. Griffin, *Seneca*, 153–54; Adam, *Clementia Principis*, 12–20; Dvornik, *Political Philosophy*, 2:526.

150. Griffin, *Seneca*, 142–48; cf. Momigliano, "Seneca," 250.

151. Griffin, *Seneca*, 79.

152. See M. P. Charlesworth, "Virtues," 112, for the historical precedent in Hellenistic kingship treatises of applying virtues to the king.

the law, now determined how men were ruled."[153] Here again, one may detect an echo of the concept that the ideal king rules through the animate, or living law.[154]

3.1.4. *Summary.* Although Augustus was careful not to portray himself explicitly as an absolute monarch, nevertheless his *Res gestae* presents him as having fulfilled certain expectations of an ideal king. In casting himself as a generous benefactor, Augustus places himself in the stream of an ancient tradition which saw the ideal king as the source of his people's benefits. Augustus further boasts of having established harmony, understood both as the cessation of strife within Rome, and as peace through subjugation of Rome's enemies. He thus fulfills the hope for ὁμόνοια that Isocrates had placed in Philip II, and was later expounded in the writings of the Neopythagoreans. Virgil views Augustus' achievement as inaugurating a glorious return to a golden age, and later Seneca expresses the hope that such a return will be brought about by Nero. Both Virgil and Seneca regard the people's voluntary submission to the emperor as crucial to the realization of this hope. Here may be detected the echo of Isocrates, who had argued that obedience to the king is not merely the people's reasonable obligation, but further results in the establishment of a prosperous and happy state (*Nic.* 47–64). Finally, Virgil and Seneca both view the emperor as the gods' vicegerent on earth.

---

153. Griffin, *Seneca*, 170.

154. Dvornik, *Political Philosophy*, 2:528, finds a "faint echo" of the law animate in the comparison of the emperor's mercy to the healing art of a physician (*Clem.* 1.17.2). Again, when Nero says, "Anyone can violate the law to kill, none but I to save" (*Clem.* 1.5.4), Dvornik interprets this to mean that only he can pardon a death sentence.

3.2. *Flavian Dynasty*

The beginning of the Flavian dynasty coincided with, and was responsible for, a new development in the Roman imperial cult.[155] The process of the cult's development may be organized into four stages.[156] The first stage (31 B.C.E.–14 C.E.) in the evolution of ruler cult began in the first decade of Augustus' reign, and saw first the cult of the emperor's *genius*, followed by the cult of his own *numen*.[157] The second stage (14–69 C.E.) extended from the accession of Tiberius to the revolution that put the Flavian dynasty in power; its distinguishing feature was the deified Augustus in the Romanized provinces of the west. The third stage (69–96 C.E.), the most important since Augustus, was one of expansion and reformulation during the Flavian era. To bolster the authority of this "upstart dynasty of uncertain legitimacy and authority," official worship was inaugurated.[158] In the

---

155. A previous generation of scholars viewed the imperial cult purely as an expression of political pragmatism, and as the final decay of Roman paganism. Glen Bowersock describes the former scholarly paradigm as "combining prejudice with a lack of evidence" ("Greek Intellectuals and the Imperial Cult in the Second Century A.D," in *Le Culte des souverains dan L'Empire Romain* [ed. Willem den Boer; Geneva: Fondation Hardt, 1973], 179). The perspective taken in this project is that the complex nexus of politics and religion embodied in the imperial cult was a means of addressing the inherent instability caused by the transition from ruler to ruler, and hence should be regarded as a "reaction to power" (Price, *Rituals and Power*, 52, 25–52).

156. Fishwick, *Imperial Cult*, 3.1:5, 41, 95–96, 172.

157. Lily Ross Taylor, *The Divinity of the Roman Emperor* (American Philological Association Monograph Series 1; Middletown, Conn.: American Philological Association, 1931), 220, 227, 282; Kenneth Scott, *The Imperial Cult Under the Flavians* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1936), 117–19, regard *genius* and *numen* to be synonymous. Duncan Fishwick, "Genius and Numen," *HTR* 62 (1969): 360–361, argues that *genius* referred to a person's (or a city's or a people's) guardian spirit, commonly represented by a snake. *Numen*, by contrast, referred to a divine power, a god. On the development of the cult of the emperor's *numen*, see Allen Brent, *The Imperial Cult and the Development of Church Order: Concepts and Images of Authority in Paganism and Early Christianity Before the Age of Cyprian* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 59–67.

158. Fishwick, *Imperial Cult*, 3.1: 95–96 stresses that this development occurred under Vespasian (69–79), not, as sometimes thought, under Domitian (81–96). Wallace-Hadrill, "Virtues," 311, claims that the dramatic uptick in the personification of imperial virtues on Flavian coinage is further evidence of this bid for legitimacy.

fourth stage (96–193 C.E.) of extension and consolidation, beginning with Nerva (96–8 C.E.), there is a move "from the *dominatio* of Domitian to a more moderate, conservative outlook."[159] Two of the writers under consideration in this section—Martial and Statius—reflect the increase in divine honors paid the emperor in the cult under the Flavians. In their eyes, Domitian is Jupiter's vicegerent on earth. Although evidence of this idea was seen earlier in Virgil and Seneca, it figures far more prominently in the writings of these two Flavian panegyrists. By contrast, Musonius Rufus, the other writer to be considered, betrays a greater intellectual debt to Plato's vision of the philosopher-king.

3.2.1. *Musonius Rufus.* The political writings of the Roman Stoic philosopher, Gaius Musonius Rufus (ca. 30–101/2 C.E.),[160] reflect the influence of Greek and Hellenistic thought. Among his extant fragments preserved by Stobaeus (*Anth.* 4.7) is a treatise entitled, *That Kings Also Should Study Philosophy.*[161] This short work takes the form of advice given to a Syrian client king of Rome. Musonius shows his debt to Hellenistic political philosophy by claiming that the first duty of a king is to be a benefactor:

> For the first duty of a king is to be able to protect (σῴζειν) and benefit (εὐεργετεῖν) his people, and a protector (σώσοντα) and benefactor (εὐεργετήσοντα) must know what is good for a man and what is bad, what is helpful and what is harmful, what advantageous and what disadvantageous. (60.8–12)

---

159. Fishwick, *Imperial Cult*, 3.1:172. The cult continues to develop into the fourth century, but this is not germane to the discussion here.

160. No biographical record exists of Musonius' life, although the main facts are given in Cora E. Lutz, "M. Rufus, 'The Roman Socrates'," *YCS* 10 (1947): 14–18.

161. All further citations of Musonius Rufus will refer to this work. References to the Greek text correspond to the page and line numbers in the edition of Lutz, "Roman Socrates," 61–67. The English translation is also from Lutz's edition.

In order to fulfill his role as benefactor, the ideal king must be able to distinguish what constitutes a true benefit to his people. Following the tradition begun by Plato and Aristotle, Musonius believes that the king will best develop this critical faculty through the study of philosophy:

> But to distinguish between good and bad, advantageous and disadvantageous, helpful and harmful is the part of none other than the philosopher, who constantly occupies himself with these things, and has made it his art to understand what conduces to a man's happiness or unhappiness. Therefore it appears that the king should study philosophy. (60.16–21)[162]

Above all, philosophy is necessary to train the soul in virtue, and through the course of this brief treatise, Musonius Rufus spells out the virtues a king must possess. He must be just (60.21–28; 62.8–9); able to exercise self-control (62.10–23); courageous (62.29–31); and "invincible in reason" (62.31–34).[163] The ideal king's supreme ability "to rule peoples and cities well and to be worthy to govern men" (66.3–11) is due in part to his nature, in part to his *paideia*:

> But how could anyone be such a king if he were not endowed with a superior nature (φύσει τε διαφερούσῃ), given the best possible education (κεχρημένος παιδείαν), and possessed of all the virtues which befit a man? (64.15–17)

Here, Musonius stands in the tradition of Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* and *Memorabilia*.

Musonius reflects the long-standing concern with the just rule of the king. Again, the king's ability to rule justly is a direct result of having studied philosophy, which teaches him the true meaning of justice:

> Furthermore it is fitting for a king, or rather it is an absolute necessity for him, to arbitrate justice as between subjects so that no one may have more or less than his just desserts, but may receive honor or punishment as he

---

162. Note his comments at the conclusion of the discourse: "For this reason it seems to me that Socrates too called philosophy the statesmanlike and royal discipline, because one who masters it immediately becomes a statesman" (66.24–26),a possible reference to Plato, *Resp.* 473d (see above, p. 28).

163. Socratic in origin, these are the four cardinal virtues of Greek philosophy: bravery (ἀνδρεία), temperance (σωφροσύνη), justice (δικαιοσύνη), and wisdom (φρόνησις, σοφία). Sometimes as in the earlier dialogues of Plato is added religious piety (ὁσιότης, εὐσέβεια). This group of five is in Xenophon, *Ages.* 3;4; 5; 6.1–3, 4–8. See Wallace-Hadrill, "Virtues," 300–301.

> deserves. . . . And how would anyone ever be just (δίκαιος) if he did not understand the nature of justice (δικαιοσύνην)? Here again is a reason the king should study philosophy, for without such study it would not be plain that he knew justice (δικαιοσύνην) and the just (δίκαιον). (60.21–28; cf. 62.8–9)

The king who both understands justice and rules justly is further characterized as a "living law." This term encompasses far more than the king's relationship to law. Musonius appears to use it as a catch-word that denotes the sum total of the ideal king:

> In general it is of the greatest importance for the good king to be faultless and perfect in word and action, if indeed, he is to be a "living law" (νόμον ἔμψυχον) as he seemed to the ancients, effecting good government and harmony (εὐνομίαν μὲν καὶ ὁμόνοιαν μηχανώμενον), suppressing lawlessness and dissension (ἀνομίαν δὲ καὶ στάσιν ἀπείργοντα), a true imitator of Zeus and, like him, father of his people. (64.10-15)

Note that Musonius Rufus attributes his idea to "the ancients." He may have in mind Xenophon, who regarded Cyrus as a "law with eyes for men" (*Cyr.* 8.21–22), or the Neopythagorean philosophers. At any rate, his characterization of this idea as ancient is suggestive both of the longevity and importance of the notion of rule by animate law.[164] For Musonius then, the ideal king is identified with animate law, a concept which encompasses the notion of the king as a benefactor, a model of virtue through his imitation of Zeus, and a just ruler who establishes harmony.

3.2.2. *Martial.* In his poetry, Martial (38/41–101/04 C.E.) takes on the role of Flavian apologist and propagandist.[165] Martial's effusive praise of Domitian, generally regarded in antiquity as a bad emperor (e.g., by Dio Chrysostom,

---

164. *Pace* Murray, "Review of Dvornik (1966)", who regards the work of Goodenough and Dvornik to be misguided in their emphasis on the idea of the animate law. It must be remembered, however, that Murray objects to the claim that the notion of animate law was characteristic of *Hellenistic* political philosophy. Even if it is a later idea, Musonius Rufus provides evidence that it had gained currency before the turn of the common era.

165. J.P. Sullivan, *Martial, the Unexpected Classic: A Literary and Historical Study* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 33.

Suetonius), has often been interpreted as concealed criticism or self-preservation.[166] It is better viewed, however, as a form of social exchange along the lines of a patron-client relationship.[167] Martial's praise legitimated Domitian's rule, in exchange for which the emperor was expected to play the role of benefactor.[168] In this light one may understand his ubiquitous attestations of the emperor's sanctity and divinity.[169] One thus finds an emphasis on the emperor's divine *numen*, or *genius*, as evidenced by the fact that in *On the Spectacles*, the emperor, Titus, is frequently worshiped by beasts.[170] Even though Titus did not ascribe divinity to himself, writers had more license to do so.[171] The worship of animals points to the true divinity of the emperor: "Power divine hath Caesar: sacred, sacred is this puissance (*numen habet Caesar: sacra est haec, sacra potestas*). Believe it ye: beasts

---

166. See the discussion in Sven Lorenz, *Erotik und Panegyrik: Martials Epigrammatische Kaiser* (Classica Monacensia 23; Tübingen: Narr, 2002), 42–50; Ruurd R. Nauta, *Poetry for Patrons: Literary Communication in the Age of Domitian* (Mnemosyne, Bibliotheca Classica Batava; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 412–30.

167. Although the language of *amicitia* is preferred by Martial, the basic relationship is one of patronage (R. P. Saller, "Martial on Patronage and Literature," *CQ* 33 [1983]: 246–257). The term, *rex*, as used by Martial (*Epig.* 2.68.2) and Statius (*Sylv.* 4.1.46) can also denote Domitian as patron (Wickert, "Princeps," 2108–10).

168. John Garthwaite, "The Panegyrics of Domitian in Martial Book 9," *Ramus* 22 (1993): 94–96; Art L. Spisak, *Martial: A Social Guide* (London: Duckworth, 2007), 53–56, 61–68. Spisak notes that after Domitian's assassination, Martial was critical of the emperor's failure in his patronal duties (*Epig.* 10.72; 12.5). Sullivan, *Martial*, 48–55, attributes this critique to the author's instinct for self-preservation in a period when the emperor's assassination had to be justified by a *damnatio memoriae*. On the praise of benefaction in the poetry Martial and Statius, see Nauta, *Poetry for Patrons*, 327–35, 387–88; Sullivan, *Martial*, 13–14; Jens Leberl, *Domitian und die Dichter: Poesie als Medium der Herrschaftsdarstellung* (Hypomnemata 154; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004), 266–80.

169. Leberl, *Domitian und die Dichter*, 291–321.

170. Sullivan, *Martial*, 6–12. See further M. P. Charlesworth, "Virtues".

171. Sullivan, *Martial*, 10; cf. Pliny the Elder's preface to his *Natural history*, praef. 11.

have not learned to lie" (*Spec.* 30.7–8).[172] The emperor's divinity is underscored by frequent comparison to Jove (*Spec.* 16B.3–4): his birthday is considered more propitious than Jove's (*Epig.* 4.1.1–2); he is merciful like Jove (*Epig.* 1.104.21); and he rules as Jove's vicegerent (*Epig.* 9.20.9–10; 9.36.9). Domitian is referred to explicitly as a god (*Epig.* 5.8.1; 7.5.3), identified with Jove (*Epig.* 6.10.4; 8.5.2; 8.36.12; 9.28.8–10),[173] and by inference even considered superior to Jove (*Epig.* 9.3; 9.20; 9.36.2).[174]

While previous writers such as Virgil and Seneca hoped for a return to the golden age, Martial declares that under Domitian's reign, such an age has already come.[175] Praising the emperor for his many military triumphs, Martial writes, "If one may trust truth, no ages, most mighty Caesar, can be set above your times. . . . under what prince was liberty (*libertas*) so great?" (*Epig.* 5.19.1–2, 6). Domitian is the savior of the state, whose rule is a sign of Jove's favor (*Epig.* 5.1.7–8). His rule brings Jupiter's protection of Rome (*Epig.* 7.60.1–2). He is hailed as "governor of the world" (*Epig.* 5.3.3), praised for having established peace (*Epig.* 9.70.7–8; 9.101.21; 14.34), and it is hoped that he will enjoy a long reign to benefit the earth (*Epig.* 5.65.15–16; 8.39.5–6).[176] Even when Domitian is physically absent, he is present among his people: "thou ruler supreme of the universe and father of the

---

172. See further, *Spec.* 17.1, 4; *Epig.* 4.2.4; 4.30; 7.1.4; 7.2.5.

173. On Domitian's identification with Jove in Martial and Statius, see Kenneth Scott, *Imperial Cult*, 133–39; Fears, Princeps, 134–36; J. Rufus Fears, "The Cult of Jupiter and Roman Imperial Ideology," *ANRW* 2.17.1 (1981): 74–78.

174. Garthwaite, "Panegyrics," 80–81, 93.

175. See the discussion of Martial's pastoral vision and its association with the golden age in Spisak, *Social Guide*, 90–95; cf. Nauta, *Poetry for Patrons*, 434; Franz Sauter, *Der römische Kaiserkult bei Martial und Statius* (Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 21; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1934), 19–21.

176. Sauter, *Kaiserkult*, 17–19.

world, yet thou canst not be parted from our prayers. There, where thou art, are we in vision and in soul, Caesar" (*Epig.* 7.7.5–7).

Martial also praises Domitian for his salutary effect on public morality. In 84, a year before Books I–II were published, Domitian assumed the office of censor in perpetuity, an important step in making the Principate openly autocratic.[177] Book VI, published in 91, praises Domitian for upholding the morals of the state: "Greatest of censors and Prince of Princes, albeit she already owes thee so many triumphs . . . yet more Rome owes thee, in that she is chaste" (*Epig.* 6.4.1–5).[178] J. Garthwaite argues that a number of the epigrams in Book IX constitute an "imperial cycle," which rehearses the themes of Domitian's reign. Although it is not a prominent theme in this cycle, the emperor's moral leadership is praised (*Epig.* 9.5; 7; 28.7).[179] Moreover, Martial claims that Domitian's virtue has a transformative effect on those of his household:

> No servant of Caesar—such is the mood of an imperial hall—displays his own manners, but those only of his master. (*Epig.* 9.79.7–8).

The final epigram in this "imperial cycle" offers a concluding synopsis of the benefits of Domitian's leadership:

> temples he gave the Gods, morals to the people, rest to the sword, immortality to his own kin, to heaven stars, wreaths to Jove. (*Epig.* 9.101.21–22)

---

177. Suolahti, *Roman Censors*, 597; Sullivan, *Martial*, 29.

178. See further *Epig.* 6.2 for Martial's approval of Domitian's legislation against castration and adultery. Sullivan, *Martial*, 38, takes Martial's praise at face value. John Garthwaite, "Martial, Book 6, on Domitian's Moral Censorship," *Prudentia* 22 (1990): 13–22, however, takes into account the critical tone of *Epig.* 6.7.3–6, arguing that Martial's ironic intent is to hint at the suspected scandal of the emperor's private life.

179. Garthwaite, "Panegyrics," 78–86. Martial is not unaware that Domitian's actual conduct falls far short of the portrait of the emperor in his epigrams. He decries moral hypocrisy repeatedly (*Epig.* 9.27; 40; 70), and Garthwaite suggests that Martial even covertly critiques the emperor's personal life (97–99).

For Martial then, the reign of the ideal ruler brings about a golden age characterized by the flowering of virtue and the establishment of peace. The emperor, as Jove's vicegerent, imitates the rule of Jove to such an extent that he can be thought of as a god himself.

3.2.3. *Statius.* The picture of the emperor in the *Sylvae* of Statius (ca. 45/50–95/96 C.E.) shares much in common with the portrait of the emperor drawn by his older contemporary, Martial.[180] Statius' panegyrical poetry expresses both praise for, and encoded (although not subversive) critique of the myth of Domitian's divinity. In the tradition of the *Fürstenspiegel* genre, it "becomes a means by which an emperor can be judged. It invites the reader to measure the extent to which the emperor has lived up to the model of the good prince presented to him."[181] Domitian is presented as divine:[182] the emperor and his possessions are sacred (*Sylv.* 5.intro; 5.1.3, 85–6, 187, 190); his *genius* is worshiped (*Sylv.* 5.1.74); and he possesses power over dumb beasts (*Sylv.* 2.4.5–6). Because of his bountiful provision, Domitian is regarded as a benefactor[183] to be compared with Jove (*Sylv.* 4.2.10–12; cf. 5.1.13–15 [with Apollo]), and even identified with Jove (*Sylv.* 1.6.25–27; 4.2.53ff; 4.4.58; 4.7.50).[184] Yet the emperor is in fact superior to the gods of Olympus in that he is a present god (*Sylv.* 5.2.168–170), a god on earth

---

180. Kenneth Scott, "Statius' Adulation of Domitian," *AJP* 54 (1933): 259, contends that Statius' laudatory language and concepts are drawn from imperial cult.

181. Carole E. Newlands, *Statius'* Silvae *and the Poetics of Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 21. John W. Geyssen, *Imperial Panegyric in Statius: A Literary Commentary on Silvae 1.1* (Studies on Themes and Motifs in Literature 24; New York: Lang, 1996), 1–12, 143–44, argues, moreover that Statius' flattery should not be read as ironic, or containing hidden resentments.

182. Leberl, *Domitian und die Dichter*, 167–80.

183. Leberl, *Domitian und die Dichter*, 199–215.

184. Nauta, *Poetry for Patrons*, 381, 392–93.

(*Sylv.* 1.1.61-2; 1.6.46–47). His radiant appearance has an effect on those who behold him. Statius describes an encounter at Domitian's banquet:

> so eager was I to gaze upon himself, ay himself, calm-visaged and in majesty serene tempering his rays and gently veiling the glory of his state; yet the splendour that he would fain conceal shone in his countenance. . . . nor can I yet find any rival to thy countenance, O Germanicus: such is the monarch of the gods. (*Sylv.* 4.2.40–44, 53-55)

Even the beauty of his statue is such that those building it find the work easy: "The present beauty of the god (*forma dei praesens*) itself makes labour sweet, and the workmen intent upon their task marvel at their greater vigour" (*Sylv.* 1.1.61-63).[185]

The emperor is Jove's vicegerent on earth: "Lo! a god is he, at Jove's command he rules for him the happy world . . . a friend is he to peace, and terrible in arms, more bountiful than Nature and more powerful" (*Sylv.* 4.3.124–129, 134). As vicegerent, one of Domitian's important tasks is to fight Jove's wars on behalf of Rome (*Sylv.* 1.1.79).[186] Domitian is thus understood to be "father of the world" (*Sylv.* 4.1.17), and "ruler of the nations and mighty sire of the conquered world" (*Sylv.* 4.2.14–16). He is "the god who holds the reins of the earth, he who nearer than Jove directs the doings of mankind" (*Sylv.* 5.1.37-39; cf. 4.3.128–9). Hence Statius prays that Domitian will reign on earth for the benefit of humankind, rather than ascend into heaven (*Sylv.* 1.1.105–107).

Domitian will usher in a golden age in which all shall partake as the emperor's guests:

> Come now, Antiquity, compare with ours the age of primeval Jove and the times of gold: less bounteously then did the vintage flow, not thus did the harvest anticipate the tardy year. . . . And now everyone, be he rich or poor, boasts himself the Emperor's guest. (*Sylv.* 1.6.39–50)

---

185. Kenneth Scott, "Adulation," 255, says of this verse: "The emperor is an epiphany, a *deus praesens*." In the accompanying footnote he adds, "the *praesens* almost certainly describes the god as well as his beauty."

186. Fears, Princeps, 135.

The golden age is characterized by the peace (*Sylv.* 1.1.74-83; 4.1.13; 4.1.14; 4.1.44; 4.3.9–10; 4.3.134) and joy (*Sylv.* 1.1.73; 4.1.20–21; 4.3.128–29) that Domitian brings.[187] It is an age that will continue in perpetuity (*Sylv.* 1.6.98–102; cf. 4.1.17, 37).[188]

3.2.4. *Summary.* Musonius' conception of the ideal king is distinct from that held by Martial and Statius. Musonius is indebted to Plato's notion of the philosopher-king, as well as the Hellenistic understanding of the king as the benefactor of humanity. Such a king imitates divine virtue, and is the source of divine benefits for his people. The ideal king is furthermore a living, or animate, law (νόμος ἔμψυχος), a concept which encapsulates his ability to establish harmony within his realm and inculcate virtue among his people. The concept of the king as a living law is noticeably absent in Martial and Statius' encomiastic treatment of Domitian. Lacking also is Musonius' emphasis on the ruler's virtue.[189] Domitian is regarded as divine not so much because he imitates divine virtue, but because he is Jove's vicegerent on earth.[190] What the three writers share in common, however, is the belief that the reign of the ideal king or emperor will bring about a golden age of peace,[191] harmony, and virtue.

---

187. Kenneth Scott, *Imperial Cult*, 94–95, 137–38; Geyssen, *Imperial Panegyric*, 66–73; Michael Mause, *Die Darstellung des Kaisers in der lateinischen Panegyrik* (Palingenesia 50; Stuttgart: Steiner, 1994), 222; Sauter, *Kaiserkult*, 21–24.

188. Nauta, *Poetry for Patrons*, 390, 399–400.

189. Concern for emperor's moral conduct is not completely absent however; see Newlands, *Poetics*, 23; Garthwaite, "Domitian's Moral Censorship," 78–86.

190. Fears, Princeps, 151, claims that these panegyrical references do not constitute an official imperial propaganda of divine election, which does not appear until Pliny; cf. Nock, "A Diis Electa," 264, who claims the official propaganda does not appear until Aurelian, in the third century.

191. On the characterization of Domitian as "peace-bringer" (ἐιρηνοποιός) by Martial and Statius, see Sauter, *Kaiserkult*, 17–19; Leberl, *Domitian und die Dichter*, 149–51.

3.3. *Trajan*

One of the corollaries of the surging current of monotheism in the high empire was the belief in a divinely elected mediator who stood between God and humankind and through his reign ushered in a golden age. The political literature of Dio Chrysostom and Pliny the Younger reflect the hope that the emperor Trajan (98–117 C.E.) would be such a mediator. J. R. Fears observes that this hope was widespread, as indicated in the symbolism of the Arch at Beneventum:

> Trajan appears as the divine mediator. Jupiter has entrusted him with care over mankind. His *virtus* will carry him to the stars; for the moment it has brought about the triumph of the new era of blessings attested in the lower reliefs of the arch, a golden age which Trajan will continue to assure even after his departure from earth.[192]

This section will explore the characterization of the ideal king at the turn of the second century C.E., as evidenced by Dio Chrysostom, Plutarch, Pliny the Younger, and Suetonius.

3.3.1. *Dio Chrysostom.* Dio Chrysostom (ca. 40–120 C.E.) was an ardent Hellenist who looked forward to a cultural revival that would make the Hellenic cities the moral leaders of the Roman world.[193] The rule of the ideal king figures prominently in Dio's eclectic social vision, which embodies the philosophical perspective of Cynicism, although Platonic and Stoic features are visible as well.[194]

---

192. Fears, "Cult of Jupiter," 95.

193. Donald Reynolds Dudley, *A History of Cynicism from Diogenes to the 6th Century AD* (2d ed.; Bristol Classical Paperbacks; London: Bristol Classical, 1998), 148–49; cf. C. P. Jones, *The Roman World of Dio Chrysostom* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1978), 34–35.

194. John L. Moles, "The Date and Purpose of the Fourth Kingship Oration of Dio Chrysostom," *Classical Antiquity* 2 (1983): 252, 268, 274; Dudley, *History*, 154–56; Edmund Berry, "Dio Chrysostom the Moral Philosopher," *Greece & Rome* 30, no. 1 (April 1983): 76; Höistad, *Cynic Hero*, 189–95; P. A. Brunt, "Aspects of the Social Thought of Dio Chrysostom and of the Stoics," *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 19 (1973): 9–24. See also the pseudonymous Cynic Epistles, which were likely written between the first century B.C.E. and the second century C.E. (Abraham J. Malherbe, ed., *The Cynic Epistles: A Study Edition* [Sources for Biblical Study 12; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1977], 2–22).

The placement of Dio Chrysostom's four orations, or discourses, "On kingship" (Περι βασιλειας) at the head of his collection is furthermore suggestive of the importance of this topic in antiquity. Although there is no firm historical evidence that confirms the occasion of their delivery, an inference suggests that some, or possibly all, of these orations were written for, and perhaps recited in the presence of the Emperor Trajan (*Or.* 1.36).[195] Drawing on traditional Greek notions of rule, Dio presents the emperor with "the characteristics and disposition of the good king (τὴν διάθεσιν τοῦ χρηστοῦ βασιλέως)" (*Or.* 1.11; cf. 3.25), in the hope that he will reject the tyranny of his predecessor, Domitian, in favor of a just and benevolent rule.[196]

Citing Homer (*Il.* 2.205–06), Dio claims in the first oration that the good king receives the scepter from Zeus. He must use his divinely conferred office for the welfare of his people, becoming "a guide and shepherd of his people, not, as someone has said, a caterer and banqueter at their expense" (*Or.* 1.12–13; cf. 3.51–54; Plato, *Resp.* 1.345c; 4.421b).[197] Just as the good king is set on the throne by Zeus, the king who abuses his office for personal gain will be deposed by Zeus (*Or.* 2.75–76).[198] In order to rule over his people, he must first rule over himself (*Or.*

---

195. Berry, "Moral Philosopher," 76; Dvornik, *Political Philosophy*, 2:537–42; Jones, *Roman World of Dio*, 115; Hans Friedrich August von Arnim, *Leben und Werke des Dio von Prusa* (Berlin: Weidmann, 1898), 402; John L. Moles, "The Kingship Orations of Dio Chrysostom," in *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar* (vol. 6; Leeds: F. Cairns, 1990), 297–375.

196. Jones, *Roman World of Dio*, 53, 176 n. 68; Moles, "Date and Purpose," 251–55, 267–68. Domitian exiled Dio, probably several years before his general ban on philosophers in 93 C.E. Dio reports that during Domitian's reign, many looked back longingly on the reign of Nero, some even believing him to still be alive (*Or.* 21.6–10); see Arnim, *Leben und Werke*, 293–96.

197. Dio's characterization of the king as shepherd may have been inspired by the Dacian leader, Decebalus (Dudley, *History*, 151–52; Arnim, *Leben und Werke*, 302–3).

198. V. Valdenberg, "La théorie monarchique de Dion Chrysostome," *REG* 40 (1927): 147–149, claims that the theocratic ideal, namely that kings are divinely elected, and that all power emanates from God, was widespread in Dio's time. See further, Fears, Princeps, 154–58.

1.13–14; cf. 4.25; 62.1). He must give the greatest honor to the gods as the exemplars of the just and good; next he must be a lover of humankind (φιλάνθρωπος), caring for them as a shepherd cares for the sheep (*Or.* 1.15–20; cf. 3.55–57). Although superior to his subjects, he is to be gentle in his leadership, like a bull with the herd (*Or.* 2.65–66; cf. Homer, *Il.* 2.480–83). Shunning luxury, he undertakes a life of ceaseless toil on behalf of his people (*Or.* 1.21–23; cf. 3.73–85, 111, 123–27). He is a lavish benefactor (*Or.* 1.23–24) in the tradition of Heracles, who "fully believed that everything belonged to him exclusively and that gifts bestowed would call out the good-will of the recipients" (*Or.* 1.62–63; cf. 3.109–10).[199] In all that he does, he is to be an imitator of Zeus, "that supreme king and ruler whom mortals and those who administer the affairs of mortals must always imitate in discharging their responsibilities, directing and conforming their ways as far as possible to his pattern" (*Or.* 1.37).[200] In particular, the king imitates Zeus by effecting harmony, and by ruling justly (*Or.* 1.41, 45).[201]

Dio concludes the oration by recounting Heracles' choice of Royal Virtue over Tyranny (*Or.* 1.48–84; cf. Xenophon, *Mem.* 2.1.21–34). Significantly, it is only after Heracles chooses the path of virtue that Zeus "entrusted him with the kingship

---

199. See Jones, *Roman World of Dio*, 104–13, on the importance of benefactors for Greek cities, and the problem caused by the flight of benefactors from cities in the late empire (24).

200. Phidias' defense of his statue of Zeus in the Olympian oration (*Or.* 7) makes clear that for Dio, Zeus is a "kind, gentle, beneficent, good, and great god" (Berry, "Moral Philosopher," 74–75). The notion that the mind of Zeus/Jupiter is the *logos* or reason that pervades the universe betrays Stoic influence (Fears, "Cult of Jupiter," 92–94).

201. Indeed, the king's imitation of, and election by Zeus were regarded as the guarantee of his just reign (Fears, "Cult of Jupiter," 90–91).

over all mankind as he considered him equal to the trust" (*Or.* 1.83).[202] More significant still is Dio's concluding observation:

> 'And so wherever Heracles discovered a tyranny and a tyrant, he chastised and destroyed them, among Greeks and barbarians alike; but wherever he found a kingdom and a king, he would give honor and protection.' This, she maintained, was what made him Deliverer of the earth and of the human race [τῆς γῆς καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἔφη Σωτῆρα εἶναι], not the fact that he defended them from the savage beasts—for how little damage could a lion or a wild bear inflict?—nay, it was the fact that he chastised savage and wicked men, and crushed and destroyed the power of overweening tyrants. And even to this day Heracles continues this work and you have in him a helper and protector of your government as long as it is vouchsafed you to reign. (*Or.* 1.84)

Dio's remarks here imply that the chief threat to human society is tyrannical rule, and that the ideal king is justly called a savior because he liberates humankind from tyranny. He furthermore suggests that the ideal king receives divine aid and protection in carrying out the duties of his office.

Dio's second oration on kingship takes the form of a dialogue between the young Alexander and his father, Philip. The theme of the conversation is the practical affairs of the king. Alexander is Dio's mouthpiece, but much of what he says betrays the influence of Homer and the Stoics.[203] The king must be a shepherd to his people (*Or.* 2.6; cf. Homer, *Il.* 4.296). He should study philosophy, here understood as the cultivation of a life marked by "a character that is humane, gentle, just, lofty, and brave as well, and above all, one that takes delight in bestowing benefits (εὐεργεσίαις)—a trait which approaches most nearly to the nature divine" (*Or.* 2.26). Avoiding luxury, the king should adorn himself not with fine clothes, but with courage and justice (*Or.* 2.35, 49, 54; cf. Homer, *Il.* 3.179).

---

202. Heracles was the Cynic king *par excellence*. Höistad, *Cynic Hero*, 56–63, 181–82, argues that the characterization of Heracles (*Or.* 1.59–65) demonstrates Cynic influence, while the accompanying allegory is Stoic (*Or.* 1.66–83).

203. J. Rufus Fears, "The Stoic View of the Career and Character of Alexander the Great," *Philologus* 118 (1974): 116, 119 n. 37.

He must abolish vice, first within himself, then within his kingdom (*Or.* 2.55–56); the virtuous king "forces the unrighteous to mend their ways" (*Or.* 2.77).[204] Indeed, it is the abolition of vice that paves the way for harmony, as Dio expresses in the second Tarsic discourse:

> For only by getting rid of the vices that excite and disturb men, the vices of envy, greed, contentiousness, the striving in each case to promote one's own welfare at the expense of both one's native land and the common weal—only so, I repeat, is it possible ever to breathe the breath of harmony in full strength and vigor and to unite upon a common policy. (*Or.* 34.19; cf. 7; 32.1, 7, 9, 99; 36)

The need for harmony between cities figures prominently in several of Dio's orations (*Or.* 32–34, 38–40). Although Dio does not mention the role of the king in establishing harmony in these orations, he doubtless would have seen this as an expected result of royal rule, since as C. P. Jones notes, "every right-thinking politician was expected to strive for harmony within and between cities."[205] What is noteworthy is the way in which, taken together, Dio's orations understand the reign of the ideal king to contribute to harmony. First, the king rules over the vices in his own soul, thereby inculcating virtue in the lives of his subjects. When vice is abolished, harmony naturally results.

The third oration on kingship purports to follow Socrates' teaching on kingship, possibly drawing on Xenophon's *Memorabilia*. The aim of the speech is to delineate the ways in which the ideal king differs from the pretender (*Or.* 3.25;

---

204. Valdenberg, "Théorie Monarchique," 151–53, regards the education of the people towards virtue as the highest goal of Dio's ideal king. Note that in this passage, Dio cites Cyrus the Great as one of his examples of such a king. On the Stoic use of Cyrus as the *exemplum* of the ideal king, see J. Rufus Fears, "Cyrus as a Stoic Exemplum of the Just Monarch," *AJP* 95 (1974): 265–267. For a similar Cynic perspective on the abolition of vice and the cultivation of virtue, see *Ep. Anacharsis* 3.6–9; 4, 5, 6; 7.2–5; 9.7–12 (Malherbe, *Cynic Epistles*, 40–48).

205. Jones, *Roman World of Dio*, 94; cf. Berry, "Moral Philosopher," 78–79. Arnaldo Momigliano, "Dio Chrysostomus," in *Quarto contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico* (Storia e Letteratura 115; Rome: Storia e letteratura, 1969), 265–66, regards Dio's writing on the subject "politically frivolous and immature" for not connecting his theory of monarchy with the problem of disharmony actually facing the Greek cities.

cf. 62.1–7). The true king is just, courageous, assiduous, austere, kinder than a father, feared by enemies, and a savior and protector of his people (*Or.* 3.5–6). The king's virtuous soul, being visible to all, makes his subjects virtuous (*Or.* 3.7–9, 11). A great king is not so by virtue of his conquest, but rather his character; he possesses legitimate authority over his people only if he is solicitous for their good (*Or.* 3.1, 29–41; cf. Plato, *Gorg.* 470e). The bad king, or tyrant, is simply not a king at all (*Or.* 62.7).[206]

Dio's discussion of legitimate and illegitimate types of rule permits conflicting readings (*Or.* 3.42–50). He appears to be following Aristotle (*Pol.* 1324b.23–29) when he writes:

> "Government" (ἀρχὴ) is defined as the lawful (νόμινος) ordering of men and as oversight over men in accordance with the law (κατὰ νόμον); "monarchy," (βασιλεία) as an irresponsible government (ἀνυπεύθυνος ἀρχή) where the king's will is law (ὁ δὲ νόμος βασιλέως δόγμα); "tyrant," (τύραννος) or rather "tyranny," (τυραννὶς) on the contrary, as the arbitrary and lawless (παράνομος) exploitation of men by one regarded as having superior force on his side. (*Or.* 3.43–44; cf. 56.5)

This definition of monarchy contains an apparent contradiction: the primary character of government in general (ἀρχὴ) is that it is "according to law," while royal power, in which law is equated with the decree of the king, is irresponsible. V. Valdenberg argues, however, that ἀρχή is rule in conformity with law, and monarchy, being a species of ἀρχή, is also in conformity with law.[207] Monarchy's secondary character, that it is ἀνυπεύθυνος, is not opposed to its primary characteristic of conformity to law.[208] The term ἀνυπεύθυνος does not mean that the

---

206. Momigliano, "Dio Chrysostomus," 264. Höistad, *Cynic Hero*, 186–89, claims that the opposition between king and tyrant found in *Or.* 62 is a relatively fixed one by Dio's time. Dio's denunciations of tyrants (*Or.* 3.13; 13.12–13; 45.1) may have in view Domitian, who sent him into exile (Jones, *Roman World of Dio*, 48; Moles, "Date and Purpose," 251–60, 267–68).

207. Valdenberg, "Théorie Monarchique," 156–60.

208. On the term see Julius Kaerst, *Geschichte des hellenistischen Zeitalters* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1927), 2:320. Dvornik, *Political Philosophy*, 2:541–42, sees in this description of

king's power is without limits, but simply that he is not accountable to anyone. To say that ὁ νόμος βασιλέως δόγμα does not indicate that the δόγμα of the king is opposed to legality;[209] it simply indicates that law is in effect because of royal decree.[210] Moreover, when Dio claims that the king is above the law (*Or.* 3.10; 62.3; 76.4), he is not thinking of the essence of royal power, but rather the simple political fact that kings *were* above the law, and hence *could* violate it.[211] Dio, however, believes that royal power is legal and in submission to the law. The king submits to divine and human laws, ruling with justice and following the laws of Zeus. If he is not νόμινος but rather ἄνομος or παράνομος ἄρχων he is a tyrant. If Valdenberg's interpretation does not convince, it is nevertheless clear that Dio is in favor of monarchy as the best reflection of divine rule: "However, there could be no more striking or beautiful illustration than that government of the universe which is under the control of the first and best god" (*Or.* 3.50).[212] Indeed, it is a law of nature that the superior should rule over the inferior. As the sun, like a god, rules solicitously over humankind, the king should rule over his subjects (*Or.* 3.62–85). Dio's analogy suggests that monarchy is the indirect rule of God over humankind.[213]

---

monarchy an allusion to the king's rule by animate law.

209. Volkmann, "Ἔνδοξος δουλεία," 56–58, demonstrates that the decrees of Hellenistic kings often existed alongside the laws of the *polis*.

210. According to Valdenberg, "Théorie Monarchique," 158, the phrase ὁ νόμος βασιλέως δόγμα "ne veut que fixer un certain ordre de la publication des lois: la loi est en vigueur (*legis habet viorem*), si c'est un règlement du roi et non de l'assemblée du peuple."

211. On the status of kings with respect to the law, see Kaerst, *Hellenistischen Zeitalters*, 2.323.

212. Dio considers other forms of government, such as democracy (*Or.* 3.47), hopelessly impractical (Goodenough, "Political Philosophy," 55).

213. Momigliano, "Dio Chrysostomus," 264.

Although he is above the law, the king not only rules justly, but voluntarily subjects himself to the counsel of his friends. The king's voluntary submission is exemplified by Agamemnon's acceptance of the punishment meted out by Nestor and by the role of the council (βουλή) in his reign (*Or.* 56.3, 8–10; cf. 49.8).[214] The king's friends are his most valuable possession, for by them his reign is made more effective (*Or.* 3.86–87, 107, 113). Indeed, only tyrants rule alone (*Or.* 3.116-19; cf. Xenophon, *Cyr.* 8.6.12). The king's friends not only share in his felicity, but are partners in his authority because of their virtue (*Or.* 3.120).

Dio's fourth oration on kingship takes the form of a lengthy discourse between a young Alexander and the Cynic philosopher, Diogenes. Its measured criticism of Alexander's ambition is a skillful critique of the emperor Trajan's well-known militarism.[215] The first part of the dialogue is focused on the true nature of kingship (*Or.* 4.19-72). The true king gives evidence of his divine descent not by diadem, tiara, or scepter, but by his pre-eminent virtue (*Or.* 4.20–25).[216] He learns the royal art of kingship not from the sophists, but from Zeus (*Or.* 4.27–39).[217] Diogenes concludes that the true king must be a shepherd to his people, whose duty is to oversee, guard, and protect the flock, not to butcher it like the Persian kings who sacrifice their people to their ambition (*Or.* 4.43–44). Alexander will only become a true king if he abandons ambition, seeks wisdom and virtue, and dons a servant's tunic (*Or.* 4.46–51, 65–70).

---

214. Dio may be seeking to convince his interlocutor that monarchy is not irresponsible government (Valdenberg, "Théorie Monarchique," 160–62); a critique of the absolute power of the emperor may also be implied (Momigliano, "Dio Chrysostomus," 262).

215. Moles, "Date and Purpose," 251–78; Momigliano, "Dio Chrysostomus," 265. Cf. *Ep. Diogenes* 33, 40 (Malherbe, *Cynic Epistles*, 140, 168).

216. Cf. *Ep. Diogenes* 24.10–12 (Malherbe, *Cynic Epistles*, 116).

217. Only as the recipient of divine παιδεία is one able to master oneself, and hence others (Höistad, *Cynic Hero*, 173).

Diogenes' stern warning to Alexander provides the climax to the above discussion:

> Be assured . . . that you will never be king until you have propitiated your attendant spirit (δαίμονα) and, by treating it as you should, have made it commanding, free-spirited and kingly, instead of, as in your present state, slavish (δοῦλον), illiberal (ἀνελευθερον), and vicious (πονηρόν). (*Or.* 4.75)

Alexander fails to understand, presuming that Diogenes is talking about making sacrifices to a god. This prompts a lengthy disquisition by Diogenes on the three bad spirits that afflict humankind—avarice, hedonism, and ambition (*Or.* 4.87–138). Through the tutelage of Diogenes, Alexander must proceed along the path towards virtue, ruling over these spirits and cultivating the good spirit (εὐδαιμονία).[218] Dio ends the discourse abruptly with the following exhortation on the lips of Diogenes:

> But come, let us attain a pure harmony, better than that which we enjoyed before, and extol the good and wise guardian spirit or god (τὸν ἀγαθὸν καὶ σώφρονα . . . δαίμονα καὶ θεόν)—us who the kindly Fates decreed should receive Him when we should have gained a sound education and reason. (*Or.* 4.139)

There is debate regarding what Dio means here by "spirit".[219] J. L. Moles reads the conclusion in light of both Dio's "conversion" to philosophy[220] and Dio's hope that Trajan will liberate the Roman empire from the tyranny of Domitian. The good king, whom Dio hopes Trajan will become, rules in accord with his reason, or *nous*, which should conform itself with the divine will of Zeus.[221] Trajan therefore

---

218. On the whole, it is Diogenes rather than Alexander that embodies the ideal of kingship in this discourse (*Or.* 4.17–18) (Höistad, *Cynic Hero*, 204–9; Moles, "Date and Purpose," 268).

219. Arnim, *Leben und Werke*, 402; Dvornik, *Political Philosophy*, 2:541–42, understand it to be an allusion to emperor Trajan's genius.

220. John L. Moles, "The Career and Conversion of Dio Chrysostom," *JHS* 98 (1978): 79–100, regards this conversion as a literary fraud created by Dio himself; so also Momigliano, "Dio Chrysostomus," 258; cf. Jones, *Roman World of Dio*, 10–11.

221. Dvornik, *Political Philosophy*, 2:541–42; Moles, "Date and Purpose," 260–61.

symbolizes the good spirit which is the end result of pursuing virtue, as well as "the 'good spirit' of the Roman empire and Savior God (θεός), whose accession has allowed—or, indeed, is synonymous with—the spiritual regeneration of the suffering world."[222]

Dio Chrysostom thus portrays the ideal king as one who: is appointed to the royal office by Zeus; rules by imitating Zeus' divine virtue; inculcates virtue in his subjects; cares for his subjects like a shepherd; rules in accordance with the law; and liberates the world from tyranny, bringing peace and harmony.

3.3.2. *Plutarch.* The career of Plutarch (ca. 50–120 C.E.) belongs to a period characterized by "the absorption of Greek men of culture into the social and administrative conditions of the empire."[223] Born into a family of means in the Greek city of Chaeroneia, he attained the distinction of the equestrian rank and received numerous honors from both Trajan and Hadrian.[224] Plutarch was not, however, uncritical of Rome, as evidenced by his treatment of Roman history and certain Roman emperors, most notably Domitian.[225] For all this, Plutarch's writing does not evince a clear stance of resistance against Rome.[226] He shared the

---

222. Moles, "Date and Purpose," 260; cf. Dudley, *History*, 154–56.

223. C. P. Jones, *Plutarch and Rome* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1971), 38.

224. Trajan honored him with the *ornamenta consularia*, and Hadrian made him procurator of Greece. Both emperors were benefactors of the shrine at Delphi where Plutarch was priest (Jones, *Plutarch and Rome*, 28–38, 48–49).

225. *Praecepta gerendae rei publicae* (*Mor.*798A–825F); see esp. 813D–E; 824B–F; 825B–D. See further, Tim Duff, *Plutarch's Lives: Exploring Virtue and Vice* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1999), 293–98, 302. Plutarch's distaste for Domitian, and his literary paucity during his reign may have been out of fear of reprisal (*Plutarch and Rome*, 20–27; C. P. Jones, "Towards a Chronology of Plutarch's Works," *JRS* 56 [1966]: 73).

226. Jones, *Plutarch and Rome*, 68; C. B. R. Pelling, "Plutarch's *Caesar*: A Caesar for the Caesars?" in *Plutarch and History* (London: Duckworth, 2002), 253–61. The synkritic structure of Plutarch's *Lives* appears to demonstrate the superiority of Greek culture, however (Duff, *Virtue and Vice*, 302–9; C. B. R. Pelling, "Plutarch and Roman Politics," in *Essays on Plutarch's Lives* [ed.

perspective of his contemporary, Dio Chrysostom, that the problem of Greek cities was not Roman paternalism, but rather Greek factionalism.[227] He views the Roman emperor as an ideal king through whose reign concord will be established. Plutarch's most succinct treatment of ideal kingship is found in a slender discourse entitled, *Ad principem ineruditum* (*To an uneducated ruler* [*Mor.* 779D–782F]). The following discussion of Plutarch will begin with this work, incorporating his other writings, in particular his treatment of Alexander the Great, as they illuminate or expand upon it.

Plutarch begins his advice to the unnamed ruler by addressing the common reluctance of rulers to submit to reason, fearing that it may curtail their power. On the contrary, Plutarch contends that when reason becomes "the ruler's coadjutor and guardian, it removes the hazardous element from his power" (*Princ. iner.* 779F). Reason alone can hold the power of the king in check (*Princ. iner.* 782C–D). The foolish king believes the essence of his majesty and dignity lies in his physical appearance, but the reign of such a king comes to catastrophe because of his ignorance. The good king is like a straight measuring rod (κανὼν), which makes straight any object that conforms to it. Echoing the hoary notion that a king must rule himself in order to rule, Plutarch insists that "the sovereign must first gain command of himself, must regulate his own soul and establish his own character, then make his subjects fit his pattern" (*Princ. iner.* 780B). This conviction is further reflected in Plutarch's *Alexander*, which presents the life of its subject as a process of self-mastery along the path of virtue.[228] Plutarch does not consider

---

Barbara. Scardigli; Oxford: Clarendon, 1995], 346–53). Duff, *Virtue and Vice*, 309 argues, moreover, that the *Lives* should be read as a "statement of resistance" against Rome.

227. Jones, *Plutarch and Rome*, 120–21.

228. Duff, *Virtue and Vice*, 288; N. G. L. Hammond, *Sources for Alexander the Great: An Analysis of Plutarch's* Life *and Arrian's* Anabasis Alexandrou (Cambridge Classical Studies;

Alexander to have been entirely virtuous; indeed, the disastrous results of his character defects serve to highlight the need for the ideal king to rule himself before he rules others.[229] Only then will he be able to inculcate virtue among his people.

How does the ideal king effect such a transformation among his subjects? Plutarch's concluding comments concerning the reign of Numa, the legendary successor to Rome's founder, Romulus, are illuminating. According to tradition, Numa enjoyed a long and peaceful reign, which later generations regarded as a golden age. Plutarch describes this remarkable era:

> For not only was the Roman people softened and charmed by the righteousness and mildness of their king, but also the cities round about, as if some cooling breeze or salubrious wind were wafted upon them from Rome, began to experience a change of temper, and all of them were filled with longing desire to have good government, to be at peace, to till the earth, to rear their children in quiet, and to worship the gods. . . . honor and justice flowed into all hearts from the wisdom of Numa, as from a fountain, and the calm serenity of his spirit diffused itself abroad. . . . For there is no record either of war, or faction, nor political revolution while Numa was king. (*Num.* 20.1–5)

Plutarch continues, commenting that Numa's reign was the fulfillment of Plato's vision of an ideal state governed by a philosopher-king who establishes virtue and masters vice (*Num.* 20.6–7). The subjects of such a king are not made virtuous by force,

> but when they see with their own eyes a conspicuous and shining example of virtue in the life of their ruler, they will of their own accord walk in wisdom's ways, and unite with him in conforming themselves to a blameless and blessed life of friendship and mutual concord (ὁμόνοια), attended by righteousness and temperance. Such a life is the noblest end of all government, and he is most a king who can inculcate such a life and such a disposition in his subjects. (*Num.* 20.8)

Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 163–87.

229. In the second half of the *Life*, cracks begin to appear in Alexander's personality: his self-mastery gives way to fits of drunken rage, with disastrous results (50–51); he demonstrates lack of reason (72.3) and indulges in despair (74.1) and superstition (75.2). His demand for obeisance is regarded as disgraceful (54.3).

The king's ability to inculcate virtue goes beyond setting an example for his subjects to follow. The very appearance of the king implants a noble desire within his people; his presence is a crucial element in the inculcation of virtue. Plutarch appears here to be following in the footsteps of Xenophon and Diotogenes, who understood the king's ability to inculcate virtue as a kind of "transformation by vision."

If, Plutarch asks of the unnamed prince, the essence of ruling is to be ruled well, who will rule over the king? Plutarch's response recalls the words of Musonius:

> The 'Law, the king of all, both mortals and immortals,' as Pindar [Plato, *Gorg.* 784B; *Leg.* 690B] says—not law written outside him in books or on wooden tablets or the like, but reason endowed with life within him (ἔμψυχος ὢν ἐν αὐτῳ λόγος), always abiding with him and watching over him and never leaving his soul without its leadership. (*Princ. iner.* 780C)

In contrast to the king of Persia, who must be told by a servant to reflect on divine matters, the educated and wise (πεπαιδευμένου καὶ σωφρονοῦντος) ruler has an internal voice which so exhorts him (*Princ. iner.* 780D). That is, the ideal king rules by animate law.[230]

Plutarch suggests to the unnamed prince that the ideal king is a benefactor, distributing divine benefits to his subjects. He writes that "rulers serve god for the care and preservation of men, in order that of the glorious gifts which the gods give to men they may distribute some and safeguard others" (*Princ. iner.* 780D). Indeed, the gifts and blessings which the gods send to earth "cannot be rightly enjoyed nor used without law and justice and a ruler" (*Princ. iner.* 780E).

---

230. Dvornik, *Political Philosophy*, 1:269–73, suggests that Plutarch's thinking here owes a debt to Hellenistic political thought, especially to ideas found in Diotogenes and Ecphantus: the ideal prince's imitation of God induces the people to imitate the prince; the correlation between the prince's knowledge of the *logos* and his likeness to God; and the prince as incarnation of the divine *logos*.

Plutarch's presentation of Alexander the Great portrays him as such a munificent benefactor. It went without saying that a king was naturally wealthy; a good king, however, because of his love for humankind, took delight in spending his wealth liberally on his friends and subjects:[231]

> Alexander was naturally munificent, and became still more so as his wealth increased. His gifts, too, were accompanied by a kindly spirit (φιλοφροσύνη), with which alone, to tell the truth, a giver confers a favour. (*Alex.* 39.1)

In his solicitude for his subjects, the ideal king is contrasted with the tyrant. The latter fears only for himself, living in terror of his subjects. The former despises his own safety and fears only for the well-being of his people, "'Just as the dogs keep their watch, toiling hard for the flocks in the sheepfold [Homer, *Il.* 10.183–84]'" (*Princ. iner.* 781C). The ideal king is thus regarded as the benefactor and shepherd of his people.

The ideal ruler faithfully reflects the image of God, which is to say that he embodies divine justice:

> Now justice is the aim and end of law, but law is the work of the ruler, and the ruler is the image of God who orders all things. . . . by his virtue he forms himself in the likeness of God and thus creates a statue most delightful of all to behold and most worthy of divinity. (*Princ. iner.* 780E–F)

Plutarch is at pains to correct what he believes to be an illegitimate conception of the divine image. The king does not imitate divinity in possessing "sceptre or thunderbolt or trident" as some rulers erroneously believe, thereby inviting God's wrath. Rather, the king must conform to God's "goodness and mercy," receiving a share of God's "equity, justice, truth, and gentleness." This he does by emulating "the ruling quality of his virtue; for this is divine" (*Princ. iner.* 780F–781A). Plutarch furthermore understands divine virtue to consist chiefly in justice. He recalls Anaxarchus' wrong headed consolation of Alexander after his having

---

231. See further *Alex.* 25.8; 39–42.2; 59.1–5; cf. 15.3–6; 23.9f; 29.5f; Diodorus, 17.69.9; 85.6; 109.2; Hammond, *Sources*, 176–78, 185–86.

murdered Cleitus, to the effect that every action of the king is just. Plutarch counters that Zeus "is himself Justice (Δίκη) and Right (Θέμις) and the oldest and most perfect of laws . . . without Justice not even Zeus can rule well" (*Princ. iner.* 781B–C).

In Plutarch's conception of the ideal king, virtue rather than external appearance is the *sine qua non* of the king's imitation of divinity.[232] His extreme disdain for the excessive honors paid by the Greeks to their kings may be seen clearly in his treatment of Demetrius Poliorcetes. After liberating Athens from Demetrius of Phalerum, he restores the city's democratic government and becomes a generous benefactor. In short, he is the quintessential Hellenistic savior-king. Yet Plutarch has this to say about the man:

> And now that Demetrius had shown himself great and splendid in his benefactions, the Athenians rendered him odious and obnoxious by the extravagance of the honours which they voted him. (*Demetr.* 10.2–)[233]

Plutarch further narrates Demetrius' arrogance and moral decline, the details of which "disgrace the fair fame of the city" (*Demetr.* 24.1–2). Finally, he flatly concludes that the reception of divine honors is inappropriate:

> And verily the least cogent proof, as it would seem, of a people's goodwill towards a king or potentate is an extravagant bestowal of honours . . . since it is certainly true that a people will often, in the very act of conferring its honours, have most hatred for those who accept such honours immoderately, ostentatiously, and from unwilling givers. (*Demetr.* 30.4–5)

These words should not be construed as Plutarch's categorical rejection of divine kingship, nor of its official expression in the imperial cult.[234] Such a view does not

---

232. W. Jeffrey Tatum, "The Regal Image in Plutarch's Lives," *JHS* 116 (1996): 141–151

233. Plutarch appears to get his facts wrong in his exaggerated description of these divine honors, perhaps in an effort to portray their absurdity (Kenneth Scott, "The Deification of Demetrius Poliorcetes: Part I," *AJP* 49 [1928]: 148).

234. Jones, *Plutarch and Rome*, 123–24. Contra Kenneth Scott, "Plutarch and the Ruler Cult," *TAPA* 60 (1929): 135, who finds "only scorn for the ruler cult" in Plutarch's work. Scott points to passages that show Alexander to be unconvinced of his own divinity, using his divine

allow for the possibility that Plutarch distinguished between appropriate and inappropriate expressions of divinity within the imperial cult.[235] The excessive pomp and finery that marked the external appearance of both Hellenistic kings and Roman emperors was not an appropriate expression of divinity. Rather, the ideal king was divine insofar as he reflected divine virtue, and possessed the divine *logos*.[236]

Just as God has established the sun as his likeness in the heavens, so he has established justice and knowledge of himself in the state, which the wise king imitates with the aid of philosophy. Alexander exemplifies the royal pursuit of philosophy. Plutarch recounts that when the young king met Diogenes in Corinth, he was so impressed with the philosopher that he exclaimed, "If I were not Alexander, I should be Diogenes." Plutarch further remarks that, by becoming a philosopher, Alexander retained his outward fortunes while gaining the disposition of Diogenes (*Princ. iner.* 782A–B; cf. *Alex.* 14–15). That is, through philosophy, Alexander was able to imitate God. Plutarch's *De Alexandri magni fortuna aut virtute* (*On the fortune or virtue of Alexander* [*Mor.* 326D–345B]) is a defense of Alexander as a virtuous philosopher-king, whose success was due primarily to his virtue rather than his good fortune. As proof of this claim, Plutarch demonstrates that Alexander civilized the barbarians (i.e., the Persians) and fulfilled his royal duty

---

status merely to subdue the Persians (*Alex. fort.* 330F–331A; *Alex.* 28). Yet he fails to account for places in the text where Plutarch appears to take for granted that "the deity . . . sent down Alexander's soul into this world of ours" (*Alex. fort.* 330E). Moreover, as Bowersock observes, Scott commits the fallacy of assuming Plutarch's remarks on Hellenistic kings apply without qualification to the imperial cult ("Greek Intellectuals," 187–90).

235. Ittai Gradel, *Emperor Worship and Roman Religion* (Oxford Classical Monographs.; Oxford: Clarendon, 2002), 140–60, argues, for example, that even the aberrant behavior of emperors such as Caligula and Domitian would not necessarily have thrown the entire imperial cult into disrepute.

236. Chesnut, "Ruler and Logos," 1312; Andrew Wallace-Hadrill, "Civilis Princeps: Between Citizen and King," *JRS* 72 (1982): 33–35.

by establishing ὁμόνοια. If a philosopher is to be judged by the life he leads and the lives of others whom he affects, then Alexander outstrips even Socrates and Plato as a philosopher. Indeed, even the barbarians whom he conquered were grateful for his civilizing influence (*Alex. fort.* 328B–E).

Plutarch furthermore believes that it is the charge of the ideal king to establish harmony. The Spartan king, Lycurgus, receives praise because "he thought that the happiness of an entire city, like that of a single individual depended on the prevalence of virtue and concord (ὁμονοίας) within its own borders" (*Lyc.* 31.1–2). Plutarch regards Alexander as having taken this vision of ὁμόνοια, originally limited to the *polis*, and extended it to all of humanity. According to Plutarch, Alexander did not regard foreigners to be inferior on the basis of ethnicity, but rather judged all people on the basis of virtue:

> But, as he believed that he came as a heaven-sent governor to all, and as a mediator for the whole world, those whom he could not persuade to unite with him, he conquered by force of arms, and he brought together into one body all men everywhere, uniting and mixing in one great loving-cup, as it were, men's lives, their characters, their marriages, their very habits of life. He bade them all consider as their fatherland the whole inhabited earth, as their stronghold and protection his camp, as akin to them all good men, and as foreigners only the wicked; they should not distinguish between Grecian and foreigner by Grecian cloak and targe, or scimitar and jacket; but the distinguishing mark of the Grecian should be seen in virtue, and that of the foreigner in iniquity; clothing and food, marriage and manner of life they should regard as common to all, being blended into one by ties of blood and children. (*Alex. fort.* 329C–D)

This was certainly a departure from Aristotle, Alexander's tutor, who regarded the inferior nature of barbarians a suitable pretext for war and slavery.[237] Plutarch also distinguishes Alexander from Xerxes, whom he ridicules for having sought in vain

---

237. See Aristotle, *Frag.* 658, as preserved in Plutarch, *Alex. fort.* 329B (Aristotle, *The Complete Works of Aristotle: The Revised Oxford Translation* [2 vols; ed. Jonathan Barnes; Bollingen Series 71; Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984], 2:2460). Eratosthenes, as preserved by Strabo, claims that Alexander was merely following Aristotle's advice according to his own interpretation of barbarian (i.e., barbarism defined on the basis of virtue rather than ethnicity) (*Geography* 1.4.9[66]).

to unite Asia and Europe with a bridge over the Hellespont (*Alex. fort.* 329E), and from Hannibal, the Treres, and the Scythians, who were intent only on plunder (*Alex. fort.* 330D–E). While all these men were renowned for their successful conquests, Plutarch suggests that Alexander's military prowess was incidental to his effort to establish ὁμόνοια.[238] What was truly remarkable about Alexander in Plutarch's eyes was his vision to unite humanity through intermarriage and cultural integration. Had it succeeded, "one law would govern all mankind, and they all would look toward one rule of justice as though toward a common source of light" (*Alex. fort.* 330E). Alexander's idealistic vision of the unity of mankind portrayed in *De Alexandri magni fortuna aut virtute* stands in stark contrast to Plutarch's account of Alexander's accomplishments in *Alexander*. Alexander's men sorely resented his adoption of Persian customs (*Alex.* 45.1–3)[239] and his policy of ethnic fusion (*Alex.* 47.2–4; 50–51; 74.1–3).[240] Plutarch's unflinching realism suggests that he understood the establishment of ὁμόνοια to be a profoundly difficult task, and that he distinguished between what the ideal king *should* do, and what he *was able* to do. To the extent that Plutarch may be seen to represent a wider swathe of public opinion, his portrayal of Alexander's grand vision suggests receptivity to the ideal of ὁμόνοια as well as skepticism towards the possibility of its achievement in the ancient world.[241]

---

238. In fact, Plutarch sharply criticizes Alexander for his massacre of Indians, which he considers "a stain to his military career; in all other instances he waged war according to usage and like a king" (*Alex.* 59.4).

239. See further, Diodorus, 17.77.7; Curtius, 3.3.24; 6.6.1-11; Justin, 12.3.8-12.

240. See further, Diodorus, 17.107.6; 108.1–3; 109.3; 110.2.

241. Diodorus writes that among Alexander's written instructions to Craterus following his death are plans "to establish cities and to transplant populations from Asia to Europe and in the opposite direction from Europe to Asia, in order to bring the largest continents to common unity and to friendly kinship by means of intermarriages and family ties" (18.4.4). When Craterus brings these wishes before the assembly, all applaud the name of Alexander but decline to carry out the

Plutarch's ideal king imitates divine virtue, making himself virtuous that he may inculcate virtue among his subjects, which he does not only through the virtuous example he sets, but even more so through his luminous presence. The king rules over himself through the law or *logos* that resides in him; he thus rules as a "living law." He cares for his people, and conveys to them divine benefits; hence he is seen as a shepherd and benefactor. He rules with divine justice, and establishes divine harmony among all the peoples of the earth.

3.3.3. *Pliny the Younger.* Modelled on the Hellenistic kingship treatises,[242] the *Panegyricus* of Pliny the Younger (ca. 61/62–113 C.E.) shares much in common with the kingship orations of Dio Chrysostom. These correspondences are best understood not as conscious borrowing, but rather as expressions of the prevalent ideology of their time.[243] The *Panegyricus* is at least in part a plea for Trajan not to return to the tyranny of Domitian.[244] As was the case generally of imperial panegyric, it also functioned to persuade its subject to conform himself to the standard of the ideal *princeps*.[245]

Although not divine, Trajan nevertheless enjoys a unique relationship with the gods.[246] Despite having been adopted by Nerva, Trajan's adoption was divinely

---

projects because of their extravagance (18.4.6). Diodorus thus understands Alexander's policy of ethnic fusion to have been aimed at promoting unity between people groups. The policy, although admired by his successors, does not appear to have been carried out.

242. Dvornik, *Political Philosophy*, 2:526.

243. Jones, *Roman World of Dio*, 118.

244. Keith R. Bradley, "The Imperial Ideal in Suetonius' 'Caesares'," *ANRW* 2.33.5 (1991): 3719; Kenneth Scott, "The Elder and Younger Pliny on Emperor Worship," *TAPA* 63 (1932): 159; Mark P. O. Morford, "Iubes Esse Liberos: Pliny's Panegyricus and Liberty," *AJP* 113 (1992): 575.

245. Mause, *Darstellung*, 61.

246. Pliny clearly does not believe the living emperor Trajan to be a god (*Pan.* 2.3–4; 78.2);

ordained (*Pan.* 5.1), and thus it is in fact the gods who are responsible for Trajan's rule (*Pan.* 8.2). Indeed Trajan is the gods' gift, and was chosen publicly by Jupiter (*Pan.* 1.3, 5).[247] Trajan rules therefore as the vicegerent of Jupiter: he hears the prayers of the people; dispenses justice fairly with strictness and mercy; reconciles rival cities; pacifies the nations by his reason rather than by his power; and is present wherever his help is needed (*Pan.* 79.6–80.4).[248] So perfect is his rule that the "father of the universe" no longer needs to be concerned with human affairs,

> since he has given you to us to fill his rôle with regard to the entire human race. And you are filling it, worthy of his trust in you: since every passing day brings every advantage for us and the greatest glory for you. (*Pan.* 80.5)

The ideal king did "for humanity what Jupiter himself would have done. In other words, the earthly *basileia* was to be the replica of the heavenly *basileia* of Zeus."[249]

The emperor is eminently worthy of his divine election because of his virtue (*Pan.* 1.3–6; 5.1–6; 8.1–5; 67.5–8; 72.1–5; 80.4–5; 94.1–5).[250] Paramount among the

---

the emperor should rightly be celebrated for his virtuous humanity, not his divinity (*Pan.* 2.7). Pliny further criticizes Domitian for having claimed to be a god (*Pan.* 49.1; cf. 52.4), but regards Trajan's establishment of the cult of *divus Nerva* as appropriate (*Pan.* 11.3–4; cf. 82.7), and believes that Trajan will be granted divine honors posthumously (*Pan.* 35.4; 89.2). See further, Daniel N. Schowalter, *The Emperor and the Gods: Images from the Time of Trajan* (HDR 28; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 71–80; Dvornik, *Political Philosophy*, 2:530–35; Kenneth Scott, "Pliny on Emperor Worship," 161–65.

247. Fears, Princeps, 153, contends that the emphasis on Trajan's divine election is proof that the *Panegyricus* is official imperial propaganda reflecting a theology of Jovian election. See, however, the critique of Fears' thesis in Schowalter, *Emperor*, 16–27.

248. Adam, *Clementia Principis*, 110–13.

249. Dvornik, *Political Philosophy*, 2:503. Because Jupiter's reign is universal and eternal, Dvornik argues, these attributes are predicated of the emperor's reign as well. The universality of Trajan's reign is reflected in *Pan.* 80.5. Pliny frequently attributes immortality (*aeternitas*) to the emperor as well (*Ep. Tra.* 10.41, 59, 83, 112) (2:506–13).

250. Nock, "A Diis Electa," 264–65; Born, "Perfect Prince," 22 The first three chapters of the *Panegyricus* contain a deluge of more than twenty different virtues, many of which are repeated as leitmotifs throughout the work. Pliny does not, however, appear to be using a fixed canon of virtues Wallace-Hadrill, "Virtues," 300–307; *Suetonius* (2d ed.; Bristol Classical Paperbacks; London: Bristol Classical, 1995), 147, 154–55.

emperor's virtues is his moderation (*Pan.* 10.3; 24.5; 55.1, 5).[251] In his love for his people, however, the emperor is decidedly immoderate, a virtue that even the gods would do well to copy (*Pan.* 74.5). Trajan moreover provides the example of virtue for his people to copy. He has no need to assume the censorship, for his very life inculcates virtue:

> We are easily led wherever he takes us, following (as it were) in his steps; now we see before us one whose affection and approval we all seek to win, in a way those unlike him can never hope to do; so that by the firmness of our allegiance we are reaching the point when we shall all conform with the ways of a single man. . . . You need only continue as you are, Caesar, and the principles of your conduct will have the same effective power as a censorship. Indeed, an emperor's life *is* a censorship, and a true and perpetual one. (*Pan.* 45.5–6, translator's emphasis; cf. 46.6; 47.1; 83.1–2)

The ideal ruler is not a tyrant, but rather a father to his people (*Pan.* 2.3), and a generous benefactor (*Pan.* 28-31, 37, 50).[252] Pliny furthermore suggests that Trajan must continue to reign solicitously and for the benefit of all if he hopes to retain the gods' support and favor.[253]

Trajan has brought Rome harmony from without and from within. Peace with Rome's enemies he "won on seas stained with the bloodshed of victory and on battlefields piled high with the bodies of the dead" (*Pan.* 12.1). One way in which

---

251. Schowalter, *Emperor*, 78–80, believes that the emphasis on Trajan's moderation as the basis for his election is an attempt to encourage the emperor's good relations with the senate. So also Morford, "Iubes Esse Liberos," 585. Wallace-Hadrill, "Virtues," 314–17, further observes the contrast between Pliny's praise for the emperor's self-restraint, and the emperor's charismatic virtues praised on coinage.

252. Trajan is praised for his benefactions (*Pan.* 26.6 [gifts to poor children]; 51.4–5 [adding seats to the Circus Maximus]); these gifts, Pliny takes care to point out, are from the emperor's personal wealth, not from state coffers (*Pan.* 27.3–4). The emperor's beneficence even exceeds that of the gods (*Pan.* 32.2 [emergency shipments of grain to Egypt]; 40.4 [canceling of debt]; cf. 65.2). Schowalter, *Emperor*, 69, points out that these benefactions promote social stability. So also Klaus Wengst, *Pax Romana and the Peace of Jesus Christ* (trans. John Bowden; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987), 33–34.

253. Schowalter, *Emperor*, 79; Wengst, *Pax Romana*, 191–92 n. 284. This is suggested by Trajan's addition of the phrase, "if he has ruled the State well and in the interests of all" (*Pan.* 67.4) to the prayer for the emperor's well-being. The phrase is repeated with some variation (*Pan.* 67.6, 7, 8; 68.1, 3, 4; 72.1).

Pliny regards Trajan as having established harmony within Rome is through the ordering of various communities in proper relationship to each other.[254] Trajan limited the power of freedmen and restored the appropriate submission of slaves to masters (*Pan.* 42.2–3); and returned senators to the status of *principis amici* (friends of the emperor; *Pan.* 85.2). Rome's harmony thus depends upon Trajan's good ordering of society, but even more so upon the emperor himself. Pliny tells the emperor that it is appropriate to pray for "yourself alone, on whom the State and ourselves alike depend" (*Pan.* 72.1). Trajan is the essence and embodiment of the empire, and the intermediary who is the source of divine benefits for his people.[255] The emperor and the anticipated golden age are so inextricably intertwined that Pliny can say, "we do not pray for peace, concord, and serenity, nor for wealth and honours: our desire is simple, all-embracing, and unanimous: the safety of our prince" (*Pan.* 94.2).[256]

In Pliny's view, Trajan is unequivocally the ideal *princeps* (*Pan.* 4.4):[257] elected by the gods, he reigns as Jupiter's vicegerent, making his subjects virtuous and effecting on earth the harmony that exists in Jupiter's heavenly kingdom.

3.3.4. *Suetonius.* Suetonius (ca. 70–130 C.E.) was Pliny's protegé, and would have undoubtedly been influenced by the *Panegyricus* of his former *contubernalis*.[258] The often colorful portraits of twelve emperors in succession from

---

254. Schowalter, *Emperor*, 68–70.

255. Wengst, *Pax Romana*, 46–47.

256. Mause, *Darstellung*, 222–25.

257. See, however, the evidence that suggests Pliny's panegyric does not cohere with historical realities (Schowalter, *Emperor*, 82–86).

258. Bradley, "Imperial Ideal," 3709; Wallace-Hadrill, *Suetonius*, 155. Pliny refers to Suetonius as his *contubernalis* ("tent-mate") (*Ep.* 1.24.1; 10.94.1), "a military metaphor commonly applied to the relationship between a master and pupil" (Wallace-Hadrill, *Suetonius*, 4).

Augustus to Domitian found in Suetonius' *Lives of the Caesars* are intended to evaluate the Roman emperors against a code of virtues that would have been easily recognized by its authorial audience. K. R. Bradley demonstrates that Suetonius consistently evaluates the emperors by the same standards throughout his work. He concludes:

> It follows that Suetonius does not leave the readers of his work to make up their own minds about his biographical subjects from the information he gives them, but that he consistently passes judgment from a set of criteria a contemporary audience would readily have recognized, and so communicates his own assessments of the early emperors in this way.[259]

The sympathetic and attentive reader who shares the authorial perspective thus comes away with a favorable evaluation of Augustus, Vespasian, and Titus; is non-committal towards Claudius; is disapproving of Julius Caesar; and bears hostility towards Tiberius, Caligula, Nero, and Domitian.[260] The ideal *princeps* according to Suetonius is pre-eminent in virtue; is a capable guardian of public morals; and maintains the order and stability of the empire.

The good emperors are praised for their virtue, in particular in the areas of clemency, civility, liberality, and the restraint of luxury.[261] Augustus is the model of virtue: Suetonius notes his clemency and moderation (*Aug.* 51); his modesty, as evidenced by his refusal of statues, temples, and divine honors (*Aug.* 52–53); his liberal benefactions (*Aug.* 57, 101); his simple lifestyle (*Aug.* 72); and his temperance (*Aug.* 77). In like manner, Vespasian is presented positively as having curbed unrestrained "licentiousness and extravagance" (*Vesp.* 11). Titus, who is introduced as "the delight and darling of the human race" (*Tit.* 1), is noted for his compassionate concern for his people in response to a series of disasters (79–80

---

259. Bradley, "Imperial Ideal," 3729; so also Wallace-Hadrill, *Suetonius*, 151–58.

260. Bradley, "Imperial Ideal," 3728.

261. Wallace-Hadrill, *Suetonius*, 158–74.

C.E.): "In these many great calamities he showed not merely the concern of an emperor, but even a father's surpassing love, now offering consolation in edicts, and now lending aid so far as his means allowed" (*Tit.* 8.3).

By contrast, the bad emperors are castigated for their vices, and even the good emperors do not escape Suetonius' scathing criticism. Tyrants are the exact opposite of the ideal *princeps*: they are cruel, uncivil, tight-fisted, and intemperate. The savage cruelty of certain emperors approaches the absurd (*Tib.* 50–63; 75; *Cal.* 11; 26; 30; 32; *Claud.* 34; *Nero* 26.1; *Galb.* 12; *Vit.* 13–14; *Dom.* 10–11). Domitian is criticized for holding inappropriate pretensions to deity, calling himself *Dominus et Deus* (*Dom.* 13.2);[262] and Caligula is similarly censured for lack of *civilitas* (*Cal.* 22; 26; 49.1). Galba is characterized as miserly (*Galb.* 12), and even Vespasian is criticized for being covetous (*Vesp.* 19.2). Claudius is portrayed as a glutton (*Claud.* 33). Tiberius' sexually perverse behavior is described in graphic detail (*Tib.* 43–44), and other emperors suffer the author's withering contempt for their unchastity (*Cal.* 36; *Nero* 29), unnatural desire (*Galb.* 22), and utter lack of self-control (*Vit.* 12). Suetonius' editorial comments with regard to Nero's character are particularly illuminating:

> Although at first his acts of wantonness, lust, extravagance, avarice and cruelty were gradual and secret, and might be condoned as follies of youth, yet even then their nature was such that no one doubted that they were defects of his character and not due to his time of life. (*Nero* 26.1)

The manner in which he frames his treatment of this man suggest that he is above all interested in showing the reader that Nero's failings as an emperor stem from his

---

262. Brian Jones and Robert Milns, *Suetonius: The Flavian Emperors: A Historical Commentary* (Classical Studies Series; London: Bristol Classical, 2002), 153, note the scholarly consensus that Domitian indeed insisted on being so addressed. Epigraphical and numismatic evidence do not corroborate Suetonius on this point (Fears, Princeps, 191). Note further Suetonius' approval of the reserve of Augustus and Tiberius (*Aug.* 53.1; *Tib.* 27).

flawed character. Nero is the antithesis of a good emperor because, so far from cultivating virtue, his character is a constellation of vices.

Related to his evaluation of emperors according to their virtues and vices, Suetonius betrays a marked interest in the preservation of public morality, and indeed, regards the emperors as the successors to the republican censors.[263] His concern is not with the punishment of individuals, but with general regulations imposed to stop immoral behavior: the control of luxuries (*Jul.* 43.; *Tib.* 34; *Nero* 16.2); prostitution (*Tib.* 35; *Dom.* 8.3); castration (*Dom.* 7.1); sodomy (*Dom.* 8.3); and the restraint of luxury and lust (*Vesp.* 11).[264] Augustus, in particular is portrayed as having had no tolerance for the vices of his family members, several of whom he banished, including his daughter Julia, subsequently decreeing her divorce from Tiberius (*Aug.* 65; 67; *Tib.* 11). Gaius Caligula, despite being unable to curb his "natural cruelty and viciousness" (*Cal.* 11), is mentioned favorably as having banished from the city the sexual perverts (the so-called *spintriae*) whose behavior had gone unchecked during the reign of Tiberius (*Cal.* 16; cf. *Tib.* 43.1). Even Caligula is given credit for his noble legislation, which "encouraged every kind of noble action" (*Cal.* 16).

Suetonius regards favorably those emperors who restore stability, as Augustus does by securing peace militarily (*Aug.* 22; cf. *Tib.* 37). Stability requires more than peace with Rome's enemies; it further entails the maintenance of the social order within Rome. Augustus fulfills the Suetonian ideal: "to accept, respect,

---

263. Wallace-Hadrill, *Suetonius*, 129–34. He notes that Augustus and Domitian both held the office of *censor*, in which capacity they were responsible for the supervision of public morals (*Aug.* 27.5; *Dom.* 8).

264. Even what seem to be economic matters he regards as moral issues: loans to minors, aimed at stopping luxury (*Vesp.* 11); an edict to control viticulture, since wine is a luxury tempting men away from corn (*Dom.* 7.2).

support, and reinforce the social hierarchy itself."[265] He does this by purging the senate (*Aug.* 35.1); keeping the citizenry pure of foreign blood by limiting citizenship (*Aug.* 40.3); and restoring the seating order at public spectacles according to the social hierarchy (*Aug.* 44). Likewise, Vespasian is praised for having restored order to the state, and discipline to the army (*Vesp.* 8, 9). Upon the occasion of Vespasian's triumph over the Jews in 70 C.E., Suetonius comments:

> he also assumed the censorship and during the whole period of his rule he considered nothing more essential than first to strengthen the State, which was tottering and almost overthrown, and then to embellish it as well. (*Vesp.* 8.1)

Although he regards capable administration favorably (*Aug.* 28–50), Suetonius is not concerned with the details of administering the Roman empire. He is rather keenly interested with the end result, whether or not a given emperor was able to restore dignity and order:

> The vision is of the ideal emperor as a sort of overseer of a vast and complex mechanism, which he must service, keep in efficient working order, improve, adapt and polish until he can hand it over gleaming and resplendent to his successor.[266]

Suetonius' ideal *princeps* is therefore seen to be one who excels in virtue, preserves public morality, and maintains the stability and order of the empire.

4. *Summary and Conclusions*

The literary texts surveyed in this chapter span well over half a millennium and display a diversity of political and philosophical perspective. They would appear, for these reasons, to defy any attempt at summarization and synthesis. Nevertheless, such an attempt must be undertaken, if this data is to serve the greater task of illuminating the portrait of the ideal king in Ephesians. Recognizing

---

265. Wallace-Hadrill, *Suetonius*, 115.

266. Wallace-Hadrill, *Suetonius*, 139.

that the irreducible diversity of sources do not permit us to assemble a composite portrait of the ideal king, the following synthesis lays emphasis on several elements common to many, if not all of the sources surveyed. These elements are highlighted, moreover, because they are particularly useful in illuminating aspects of the ideal king presented in Ephesians. The conception of the ideal king that emerges from this synthesis is one who is pre-eminent in virtue, a benefactor, a "living law," the vicegerent of the gods, and the one who establishes divine harmony on earth.

The ideal king is the "best man" in society—pre-eminent in virtue, and able to inculcate virtue in his subjects. This idea may be traced back to the theoretical political discussions of Plato, whose philosopher-king possesses the τέχνη (art, or skill) of making his subjects virtuous. Like a thread running through virtually every literary witness is the belief that the ideal king possesses the requisite virtues needed to rule, and can effect within society the harmonious state of affairs characterized by such virtues. The emperor's perceived ability to confer such tangible benefits (*utilitates*) received particular emphasis during the Roman period through the cult of Virtues. According to Xenophon, the king effects this change not simply by providing an example to follow, but through his very presence. The ideal king is able to transform his subjects by a vision of himself. Plutarch similarly characterizes Numa's numinous ability to transform his subjects by vision. Isocrates stresses that the king's virtue demands a response of obedience from his people, which will ensure a happy and prosperous state. This idea is seen later in the kingship treatise of the Neopythagorean Ecphantus, and also in Seneca's *De clementia*, which both urges the emperor to be merciful, and admonishes the people to obey the emperor. Obedience to the virtuous emperor is the condition that will bring about a golden age.

The ideal king is the benefactor of humankind. From the fourth century B.C.E. through Trajan, this element remains constant in the ideal king's portrayal. Aristotle claimed that the earliest kings were benefactors, noting that only a truly good man is able to bestow benefits (*Pol.* 1286b9–12). One observes here the close link between the ideal king as pre-eminent in virtue and the ideal king as benefactor. As the Neopythagorean philosophers Diotogenes, Ecphantus and Sthenidas all attest, the ideal king imitates divine virtue, and bestows these virtues magnanimously upon his people. Indeed, the king comes to be seen as the sole source of divine benefits for his people. He is therefore vital for his people's connection to God. This idea is evidenced in the Roman period, particularly in the writing of Musonius Rufus. There is also a shadow side to benefaction, in that it obliged the recipient to reciprocate. It was thus a useful tool in engendering loyalty. As Isocrates remarks of Evagoras: "his friends he made subject to himself by his benefactions, the rest by his magnanimity he enslaved" (*Evag.* 45).

The ideal king is a living law (νόμος ἔμψυχος). The idea that the king should not merely rule in accord with the law, but actually possess the law within himself finds its roots in the importance of the law in Plato and Aristotle's ideal constitutions. Neither one of them knows of this concept, but both acknowledge the conundrum that the rule of law is both indispensable in society, but that laws by themselves are inadequate for the proper ordering of society. Laws must of necessity be to a certain degree general in nature, therefore needing interpretation. The ideal king would not only rule in accordance with the laws, but possess the intelligence to apply them justly. Xenophon suggests that the ideal king possesses the law within him when he writes of Cyrus the Great, that "the good ruler he regarded as a law with eyes for men" (*Cyr.* 8.1.21–22). For the Neopythagorean philosophers, the animate law of the king connotes the organizing principle by

which he organizes, and establishes harmony within, his realm. The king as living law represents divine reason, and by his reign he is able to make his subjects conform to this divine reason and thereby establish on earth the divine harmony of the cosmos. The Neopythagoreans are followed in the Roman period by Musonius, whose characterization of the king as living law encapsulates the sum total of his perfect rule. Plutarch's use of the expression demonstrates the currency of this idea at the turn of the first century C.E.

The ideal king rules as the vicegerent of the gods/Zeus/Jupiter. In Greco-Roman thought, the king always enjoyed a close connection to the divine. Plato compares the king to Cronus, the divine shepherd; Aristotle and Isocrates consider monarchy to be the most divine of all constitutions. Xenophon regards Cyrus as being descended from the gods, a genetic relationship made manifest by the king's virtues, according to Dio Chrysostom. The Hellenistic and Roman ruler cults honored kings and emperors with divine status, at least partially in recognition of the divine virtues they possessed and were able to convey. Within this context, Virgil speaks of Augustus as the son of a god, and Seneca of Nero as the vicegerent of the gods. Martial and Statius attribute the dawning of a golden age to Domitian, who rules as Jove's vicegerent. Dio believes that good kings are appointed to their office by Zeus, and Pliny claims that Trajan has been elected by Jupiter. As a divine intermediary, the ideal king establishes on earth a copy of the heavenly *basileia*.

The ideal king brings peace/establishes harmony within his realm. This final aspect of ideal kingship is a corollary of the previous one. The notion that establishing harmony (ὁμόνοια) is the duty of the ideal king finds expression in Isocrates' plea to Philip II that, motivated by love of humankind (φιλανθρωπία) he should unify the Greeks. The Greek understanding of harmony was limited in scope, extending initially to relations within the *polis*, and later to all Greeks. The

belief that harmony should be enjoyed between Greeks and barbarians came into existence some time after Alexander the Great. The Neopythagoreans conceive of harmony that is cosmic in scope. Their ideal king should establish on earth the harmony believed to exist in the heavens. For Archytas and Diotogenes, the significance of the fact that the king is a living law is precisely that he is thereby able to establish harmony. Augustus credits himself with having restored peace to Rome by quelling civil strife and defeating Rome's enemies. The Augustan poet, Virgil, envisions a golden age of peace inaugurated by the emperor's reign, and his sentiment is shared by later writers such as Seneca, Martial, and Statius. For Dio, there is a link between the abolition of vice and the establishment of harmony. The ideal king imitates, and inculcates in his subjects, divine virtue; when vice is thus abolished, harmony naturally results. Suetonius regards favorably those emperors who bring peace to Rome's borders through military might, but even more so praises those who effect harmony within Rome by restoring or maintaining the social order. Plutarch looks back with admiration upon Alexander, whose policy of ethnic fusion he regards as a divinely inspired attempt to unite all of humanity. Where Alexander nobly failed, the Roman emperors were seen to have gloriously succeeded. The reflections of the fourth century C.E. orator Claudian regarding the unity achieved by Rome may be seen as evidence of this widely held and long enduring sentiment. Praising the legacy of Rome, he writes,

> 'Tis she alone who has received the conquered into her bosom and like a mother, not an empress, protected the human race with a common name, summoning those whom she has defeated to share her citizenship and drawing together distant races with bonds of affection. To her rule of peace we owe it that the world is our home, that we can live where we please . . . thanks to her we are all one people (*De consulatu Stilichonis* 3.150–159).[267]

---

267. The same sentiment had been expressed earlier by Strabo (*Geography* 6.4.2). Weinstock concurs (*Divus Julius*, 266). For numismatic and architectural evidence, see T. Hölscher, "Homonoia/Concordia," in *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae* (Zurich: Artemis, 1981–97), 5.1:476–98.

CHAPTER THREE

The Ideal King in Jewish Thought

The destruction of Jerusalem in 587/6 B.C.E. and the ensuing exile prompted an identity crisis for the Jewish people. After suffering the loss of their land and institutions, how would they reconceive of themselves as God's people? T. S. Laniak has recently shown how the author of Esther contributed to the reframing of Jewish identity in the post-exilic period.[1] His approach suggests the conceptual categories for discussing the Jewish portrayal of the ideal king in antiquity. Laniak discusses the various focal points around which post-exilic Jews fashioned their identity and hope for the future: the restoration of Zion; radical obedience to Torah; hope for a restored nation led by a royal or priestly figure; or the rule by Yahweh alone.[2] The focus of this chapter is analogous to Laniak's discussion of the reframing of Judaism, although narrower in scope. A general observation and two related questions will provide a point of departure. One observes, among certain varieties of Judaism of the first century C.E., that a future ideal figure, acting as God's agent, played a central role.[3] In this study, the term "Messiah" will be used to

---

1. Timothy S. Laniak, "Esther's *Volkcentrism* and the Reframing of Post-Exilic Judaism," in *The Book of Esther in Modern Research* (ed. Sidnie White Crawford and Leonard Greenspoon; JSOTSup 380; London: T&T Clark, 2003), 77–90

2. In contrast to these foci, Laniak demonstrates that Esther is *Volkcentric*, locating "redemption in the acts of the Jewish people" ("Esther's *Volkcentrism*," 79).

3. See the discussion in Geza Vermes, *Jesus the Jew: A Historian's Reading of the Gospels* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981), 130–40; N. Belayche, "Les figures politiques des messies en Palestine de la première moitié du premier siècle de notre ère," in *Politique et religion dans le judaïsme ancien et médiéval* (ed. D. Tollet; Paris: Desclée, 1989), 58–66; Johannes Tromp, "The Davidic Messiah in Jewish Eschatology of the First Century BCE," in *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives* (ed. James M. Scott; JSJSup 72; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 179–201; George W. E. Nickelsburg, *Ancient Judaism and Christian Origins: Diversity, Continuity, and Transformation*

refer to such an eschatological ideal figure appointed by God to carry out a task of leadership within God's people. The related terms, "messianism" and "messianic expectation," therefore denote the hope for the blessed future of Israel under the leadership of such a person.[4] Amongst the Judaisms that displayed messianic expectation, the identity of God's agent varied. Such a figure could be conceived of as a prophet, king, priest, or angelic being. Alternately, some streams of Judaism believed that God would act without an agent. Based on these observations, this chapter asks the following questions: Among Jews who expected a coming *royal* messianic figure, how was such an ideal king conceived? A further line of inquiry concerns the manner in which Israel's historical kings were idealized. The survey

---

(Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003), 89–117.

4. Many New Testament writers claimed Jesus Christ to be the messiah of Davidic lineage in fulfillment of scripture (e.g., Matt 1:1, 21). Throughout the history of Christianity, those seeking to justify this theological claim have sought to find the roots of this distinctive messianic expectation within scripture, thereby demonstrating that such expectation was normative within ancient Israelite religion. In response to what often amounted to eisegesis, many scholars today seek to circumscribe the discussion of "messianic expectation" in the Hebrew Bible by insisting upon a narrowly conceived definition of the term. Thus, M. de Jonge stresses that one may only speak of a passage as being "messianic" if it specifically mentions a messianic figure (Marinus de Jonge, "Messiah," *ABD* 4:777–788). De Jonge's judgment has been widely, if not universally, followed. A minority of scholars counter that such a narrow definition is unhelpful when investigating the historical phenomenon of messianic expectation, since it excludes a number of texts that treat in more subtle ways what was doubtless a common theme, namely the ideal rule of justice and peace by Yahweh's anointed agent. See, e.g., John Barton, "The Messiah in Old Testament Theology," in *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar* (ed. John Day; JSOTSup 270; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 373–374, who is followed by Wolter H. Rose, *Zemah and Zerubbabel: Messianic Expectations in the Early Postexilic Period* (JSOTSup 304; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 22–23. This study will conceive of messianic expectation in the narrower sense argued for by de Jonge. Nevertheless, it will be remembered that the focus of inquiry is not messianic expectation, but rather the concept of the ideal king, a particular iteration of an ideal figure.

that follows will thus consider texts illuminating "both the atemporal ideal manifestation of the Israelite king and its expected future counterpart."[5]

The following discussion begins with an historical overview of the institution of monarchy in ancient Israel. This will provide the historical context out of which grew the hope for the return of an ideal king within the literature of Second Temple Judaism. The remainder of the chapter will sketch the contours of the ideal king's portrait within this corpus. As with the previous chapter, the goal is not to be exhaustive, but rather illustrative. The organization of the texts under investigation is geographic, moving from Palestine (*Psalms of Solomon*, Qumran literature), to Egypt (*Sibylline Oracles*, *Letter of Aristeas*, Philo), to Rome (Josephus), to a text of unknown provenance (*Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*). It will be observed that perhaps the two most relevant Jewish texts are absent from this list: the Old and New Testaments. The former is omitted for two reasons: adequate treatment of the theme of kingship in the OT is worthy of a monograph in itself;[6] and the goal of the present chapter is not to demonstrate the origin of the tradition of ideal kingship, but rather its appropriation in later Jewish texts. The latter is omitted because, although the NT can be described as Jewish, it represents a stream of Judaism that is in the process of becoming something distinct from Judaism. New

---

5. Géza G. Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet: Positive Eschatological Protagonists of the Qumran Library* (STDJ 47; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 211–212

6. See, e.g., Joseph Klausner, *The Messianic Idea in Israel from Its Beginning to the Completion of the Mishnah* (3d ed.; trans. W. F. Stinespring; New York: Macmillan, 1955), 2–243; Dvornik, *Political Philosophy*, 1:278–350; Tryggve N. D. Mettinger, *King and Messiah: The Civil and Sacral Legitimation of the Israelite Kings* (ConBOT 8; Lund: Gleerup, 1976), 19–105; James H. Charlesworth, ed., *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 39–78; Kenneth Pomykala, *The Davidic Dynasty Tradition in Early Judaism Its History and Significance for Messianism* (SBLEJL 7; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 11–126; John Day, ed., *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar* (JSOTSup 270; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 72–400; Adela Yarbro Collins and John J. Collins, *King and Messiah as Son of God: Divine, Human, and Angelic Messianic Figures in Biblical and Related Literature* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2008), 1–47.

Testament texts thus represent the Christian appropriation of both Greco-Roman and Jewish traditions of ideal kingship.

1. *Kingship in Ancient Israel*

In the literature of Second Temple Judaism, the ideal king is frequently depicted as the agent of Yahweh, appointed to carry out God's will on earth, and in some measure partaking in God's nature. The aim of this section is to sketch the political and religious dimensions of the institution of kingship in ancient Israel, in order to better understand the traditions underlying later discussions of ideal kingship. This brief overview will be shaped and limited by the following question: To what extent did Israel's king possess a sacral function similar to that of the kings of other ANE societies? That is, how are we to understand the significance of the king's association with divinity?

There are two basic schools of thought with regard to the monarchy in Israel and its relationship to monarchy in the ancient Near East. The so-called Myth and Ritual school, originating in Scandinavia and spreading to Great Britain, sought to place Israelite kingship within broad patterns of ANE religion.[7] The essential perspective of *Myth and Ritual* (1933), a collection of essays edited by S. H. Hooke, is that Israelite religion was heavily influenced by Babylonian and Canaanite religion.[8] It shares the basic thesis of J. G. Frazer's exhaustive historical study of

---

7. Ivan Engnell's study of divine kingship in the ANE is representative of this school: he contends that the ideologies of kingship in Egyptian, Sumero-Accadian, Hittite and West Semitic society may all be characterized as "messianic" (*Divine Kingship: Studies in Divine Kingship in the Ancient Near East* [2nd ed.; Oxford: Blackwell, 1967], 12–15, 43, 68, 93–94). It is unclear what precisely he means by messianic, but it appears to be a general notion of a future bliss brought about through the king. A more recent proponent of this view is W. G. Lambert, "Kingship in Ancient Mesopotamia," in *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar* (ed. John Day; JSOTSup 270; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 69–70.

8. In 1958 Hooke edited a second volume of essays, which defended the school's position, albeit more cautiously. See his introductory essay, "Myth and Ritual: Past and Present," in *Myth,*

human institutions, *The Golden Bough* (1894), which argues that human societies progress from a magical world view through a religious one to a scientific one. Representative of the school is G. Widengren's contention that kingship was adopted by the Israelite-Jewish tribe as a fully developed political institution first in Canaan.[9]

Against the Myth and Ritual school, H. Frankfort's study concludes that there were three types of kingship in the ANE: the king as god incarnate (Egypt); the king as servant of the gods (Mesopotamia); and the Hebrew king: "a hereditary leader whose authority derived from descent and was originally coextensive with kinship."[10] Frankfort's work has been challenged,[11] yet a number of contemporary

---

Ritual, and Kingship: Essays on the Theory and Practice of Kingship in the Ancient Near East and in Israel (ed. S.H. Hooke; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958), 1–21.

9. Geo Widengren, *Sakrales Königtum im Alten Testament und im Judentum* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1955), 13: "Unter den spezifisch kanaanäischen Institutionen ist das Königtum die für die Geschichte Israels wichtigste Einrichtung, die zwar auch rein israelitische, d. h. vor der Einwanderung existierende Anknüpfungspunkte besaß, aber als voll ausgebildete politische Institution doch erst in Kanaan von den isralitisch-judäischen Stämmen aufgegriffen wurde." A more cautious study in a similar vein is that of John Day, who argues that elements of the Israelite monarchy were influenced by Canaanite culture (e.g., the tradition that relates the king to the priestly order of Melchizedek, the reference to the king as "son of God"), but does not make the sweeping claim that the the institution was imported wholesale (John Day, "The Canaanite Inheritance of the Israelite Monarchy," in *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar* [ed. John Day; JSOTSup 270; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998], 72–75, 80–86).

10. Henri Frankfort, *Kingship and the Gods: A Study of Ancient Near Eastern Religion as the Integration of Society and Nature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948), 337. See further, J. de Fraine, *L'aspect religieux de la royauté israélite: L'institution monarchique dans l'Ancien Testament et dans les textes mésopotamiens* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1954). Frankfort's conclusions are adumbrated by C. R. North, who argues that Hebrew kingship is characterized by an increased emphasis on the military and judicial roles of the king and a decreased emphasis on the religious importance of the office. He concludes, "On the whole we feel justified in concluding that the doctrine of divine-kingship has no very large place in the O.T." (C. R. North, "The Religious Aspects of Hebrew Kingship," *ZAW* 50 [1932]: 36). See further, P. A. H. de Boer, "'Vive le roi!'," *VT* 5 (1955): 225–231, who demonstrates that the refrain יחי המלך ("long live the king") signifies not the divinization of the king, but rather his royal power.

11. Jay J. Kim, "Hierophany and History," *JAAR* 40 (1972): 336, takes Frankfort to mean that Israelite religion falls under the category of religions that are "so unique [*sic*] that they cannot

scholars today recognize the distinctiveness of the Israelite monarchy vis-à-vis its neighbors.[12] Israelite kingship was more primitive, based on a shared nomadic past, and arose on the peripheries of more powerful "autochthonous" civilizations. The king did not descend from heaven, nor did he constitute a necessary bond between people and God. Frankfort concludes, "The relation between the Hebrew monarch and his people was as nearly secular as is possible in a society wherein religion is a living force."[13] J. de Fraine's systematic study of the convergence and

---

be considered under the same methodological premises as other religious phenomena." Whether this is Frankfort's point is debatable; in any case, Kim's disagreement has no bearing upon Frankfort's claim that monarchy in Israel was different than elsewhere in the ANE. Frankfort's point still stands, namely that Hebrew religion rejected the claim that God was immanent in nature and hence the king did not function to establish "the harmonious integration of man's life with the life of nature" (*Kingship and the Gods*, 342).

12. J. G. McConville's conclusion lends support to the overall idea of the uniqueness of Israelite kingship. He regards the idea of a king with limited powers and constrained by being "under Torah" to be "part of the Old Testament's demythologization of oriental ideology" (J. G. McConville, "King and Messiah in Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History," in *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar* [ed. John Day; JSOTSup 270; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998], 293). Gary Knoppers agrees that the belief in sacral kingship, prevalent throughout ANE, is absent in Deuteronomy. Moreover, he observes that "The authors of Deuteronomy emphasize the solidarity of and kinship among Israelites" (Gary N. Knoppers, "The Deuteronomist and the Deuteronomic Law of the King: A Reexamination of a Relationship," *ZAW* 108 [1996]: 329, n. 4).

13. Frankfort, *Kingship and the Gods*, 341. John Baines' recent study finds the roles of the king in Egyptian and Hebrew society to be sharply divergent. In Egypt, religion was "primary," in that it could not be detached from society's social order. Egypt saw itself as the only society, not one among many. In this overall religious and social framework, kings were an integral and unquestioned part of the cosmos, without whom society would descend into chaos. In Hebrew society, religion was "secondary" in that it could be distinguished from the social order. Within this context, the king was not an integral part of the cosmos (John Baines, "Ancient Egyptian Kingship: Official Forms, Rhetoric, Context," in *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar* [ed. John Day; JSOTSup 270; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998], 16–18, 45–50). See further, McConville, "King and Messiah," 294, who observes that in Deut 17:14–20, the king is understood to have limited powers, is not equated with the state, excercises authority in conjunction with others, and is under Torah. This same concept of kingship is found in 1 Sam 8–12. The concept of a king who is not essential to the constitution of Israel (as are priests, judges, prophets) is a unique and striking contribution of Deuteronomic literature, and is part of the OT's demythologization of oriental ideology.

divergence of Hebrew and Mesopotamian kingship similarly concludes that all the divergences lead to an irreducible difference in the concept of the divine.[14]

More recent studies have adopted the more mediating position that Israelite kingship was influenced by the surrounding cultures, yet was not a wholesale adoption of foreign institutions. G. Ahlström contends that monarchy was not an alien institution to Israelite society, and was indeed the only viable form of governance.[15] Scholars using sociological and anthropological methodology have further recognized that a host of political, economic, social and environmental factors were at play in the formation of the early Israelite state.[16] In order to

---

14. Fraine, *L'aspect religieux*, 396: "Toutes les divergences . . . se ramènent donc, en fin de compte, à une altérité irréductible dans la conception du divin. . . . Il ne faut donc nullement s'étonne que l'institution monarchique, elle aussi, ait été complètement pénétrée et illuminée par ce dogme fondamental, voire constitutif, de la religion révélée de l'Ancienne Alliance."

15. Gösta W. Ahlström, "Administration of the State in Canaan and Ancient Israel," in *Civilizations of the Ancient Near East* (4 vols.; ed. Jack M. Sasson; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2000), 1:587–92. He notes that oligarchy tends toward monarchy over time, and theocracy is virtually the same as monarchy, since kings ruled as the deity's vicegerent. Albrecht Alt had earlier argued that pre-monarchic Israel was a "charismatic theocracy" ruled by judges. Charismatic leadership was initially the most decisive organizational factor of Israel's monarchy, and was indeed preserved in the Northern Kingdom ("The Formation of the Israelite State in Palestine," in *Essays on Old Testament History and Religion* [Oxford: Blackwell, 1966], 191, 237; "The Monarchy in the Kingdoms of Israel and Judah," in *Essays on Old Testament History and Religion* [Oxford: Blackwell, 1966], 243–53). Tomoo Ishida, studying monarchies in Egypt, Mesopotamia, Hatti and Syria-Palestine, found evidence that points to monarchy in Israel being hereditary, not "charismatic." Against Alt, he concluded that "monarchy was a political institution based on the dynastic principle, both in Israel and in the neighbouring countries" (Tomoo Ishida, *The Royal Dynasties in Ancient Israel: A Study on the Formation and Development of Royal-Dynastic Ideology* [BZAW 142; Berlin: De Gruyter, 1977],). The history of the debate regarding the formation and development of the Israelite monarchy is helpfully summarized in Keith W. Whitelam, "Israelite Kingship: The Royal Ideology and Its Opponents," in *The World of Ancient Israel: Sociological, Anthropological, and Political Perspectives* (ed. R. E. Clements; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 122–28.

16. Whitelam, "Royal Ideology," 127, contends that states are formed when "social and geographical contraints prevent the natural tendency of pre-state societies to fragment." With regard to the formation of the state of Israel, he cites the advances in highland agricultural techniques, which favored stability and opposed fragmentation. Carol Meyers, "King and Kingship: The Early Monarchy," in *The Oxford History of the Biblical World* (ed. Michael David. Coogan; New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 236–43, gives an overview of the various interpretive models and theories, clearly showing that state formation is a complex process involving a number

understand the monarchy, systemic study that "adequately balance[s] ideological and technoenvironmental factors" is needed.[17] These studies show that the ideological focus that characterized the debate between the Myth and Ritual school and its critics is inadequate to explain the Israelite monarchy in its ANE socio-historical context. In particular, the *religionsgeschichtlich* model does not provide sufficient explanatory power to understand the sacral function of Israel's king.

To understand the sacral nature of Israelite kingship, a basic understanding of the sociological need for royal ideology is needed. K. Whitelam contends that the establishment of the monarchy was presented with two forms of opposition: (1) agrarian chiefs, local notables, and village communities who now faced transfer of arable land to the king; and (2) urban powerful elites seeking to usurp power from the king. In order to legitimate his existence and to meet threats from rural and urban power contenders, the king's position within a well-defined cosmic and political order needed to be firmly established. The monarchy thus developed conceptual, written, pictorial and ceremonial means to this end.[18] Chief among them was the concept of the king as Yahweh's anointed,[19] which meant that the king was sacred and inviolable, functioning as Yahweh's vicegerent in the oversight

---

of causal factors.

17. Marvin L. Chaney, "Systemic Study of the Israelite Monarchy," *Semeia* 37 (1986): 54. He contends that the former factor has been overemphasized to the neglect of the latter. See further, the other articles in *Semeia* 37 by R. B. Coote and K. Whitelam, F. Frick, and N. K. Gottwald for comprehensive discussion on sociological and anthropological approaches to understanding the institution of Israelite monarchy.

18. Whitelam, "Royal Ideology," 121.

19. John Day, "Canaanite Inheritance," 80–81, notes that the anointing custom may also have been of Canaanite origin, but the evidence is not strong. See further, Roland de Vaux, "The King of Israel, Vassal of Yahweh," in *The Bible and the Ancient Near East* (trans. Damian McHugh; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1971), 152–62, 166, who argues that the ritual of anointing made the king Yahweh's vassal, thereby incorporating the kingship of Yahweh into the Davidic dynasty.

of Yahweh's nation and the maintenance of his temple.[20] The uniqueness of the king's position was valuable in the royal ideology against usurpers, since it made usurping the king's power tantamount to challenging Yahweh's authority.[21] It is, however, inadequate to think of the king's sacral nature *purely* as an ideological tool used for maintaining power.

As the biblical witness indicates, the king's association with divinity does not simply denote him as the legitimate ruler of God's people, but also connotes something about how the king should rule. Although space does not permit a thorough investigation of the biblical witnesses here, several important passages reflecting the sacral nature of the king will be highlighted.[22] As might be expected, the is king is characterized as the ideal of piety (Pss 20:3; 18:21-25). He further has a priestly, mediatorial role, as evidenced by Yahweh's oath in Ps 110:4.[23] The king

---

20. Tryggve Mettinger's source-critical study finds that initially, civil legitimation of the king was more important than sacral legitimation in the cases of Saul and David. But with Solomon, who became king without the recognition of the people, the need for sacral legitimation grew. Categories of civil legitimation underwent a process of "theologization": the term *nagîd*, which originally referred to the heir appointed by the reigning monarch, became a term of divine designation, as with David and Solomon; royal anointing (as of David over Judah and Israel) was a civil legitimation of the king that became sacral, carried out by the priest and denoting the king's special relation to God (*King and Messiah*, 295–96).

21. Whitelam, "Royal Ideology," 133–36. Whether or not the Israelite king was understood to be divine is a debated question. The Myth and Ritual school (e.g., Hooke, Engnell, Widengren) believed he was, while Frankfort took the more moderate position that the king was sacred. Ahlström, "Administration," 591–92, clarifies that divinity in this sense would not have denoted the king's physical divinity, but rather a conferred divine status by being chosen by the deity.

22. For further discussion, see Erwin R. Goodenough, "Kingship in Early Israel," *JBL* 48 (1929): 169–205; Dvornik, *Political Philosophy*, 1:305–11; Collins and Collins, *King and Messiah*, 10–47.

23. Deborah W. Rooke, "Kingship as Priesthood: The Relationship Between the High Priesthood and the Monarchy," in *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar* (ed. John Day; JSOTSup 270; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 198–208. Although the king could not properly be called a priest, Ps 110:4 indicates that nevertheless the king was regarded as an *ex officio* priest, one whose mediation between God and people cannot be deprived him as long as he lives.

is anointed and crowned by Yahweh (Pss 2:2; 21:3); he is Yahweh's adopted son (2 Sam 7:14; Ps 2:7); and he sits at the right hand of Yahweh (Ps 110:1). Consequently, Yahweh ensures the king's victory over his enemies (Pss 45:4–6; 72:9; 89:23; 110:5). Because his adoptive father is king of the cosmos, the king may aspire to worldwide dominion (Pss 89:26–27; 2:8; 72:8–11). Indeed, Yahweh will establish a dynasty for his adopted son, King David, and ensure its posterity (2 Sam 7:11-12, 16).

The language of adoptive sonship was not used, however, to connote the king's divine nature. Rather, according to J. J. Collins, "The main implication of the declaration that the king was son of God is the implication that he is empowered to act as God's surrogate on earth."[24] In this capacity, it is imperative that the king rule God's people with justice, as reflected in the opening verses of Psalm 72:

> Give the king your justice, O God,
> and your righteousness to a king's son.
> May he judge your people with righteousness,
> and your poor with justice. (Ps 72:1-2)

The king's role as upholder of divine justice is further on display in Wisdom literature (Prov 8:15; 16:12–13; 20:28; 25:5; 29:4). According to K. J. Dell, the king in the wisdom tradition not only administers, but personifies cultic and civil law:

> He is therefore part of the manifestation of God to humanity, standing at the crossroads of the human and the divine much as, elsewhere in the wisdom literature, divine Wisdom herself mediates between the human and the divine.[25]

---

24. Collins and Collins, *King and Messiah*, 22.

25. Katharine J. Dell, "The King in the Wisdom Literature," in *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar* (ed. John Day; JSOTSup 270; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 185. See further, Ahlström, "Administration," 598.

This appraisal of the king's role in ancient Israel comes strikingly close to the notion of the king as a living law, as seen in a variety of Greco-Roman texts. Indeed, E. R. Goodenough argues that such a notion was in fact operative within the Israelite concept of monarchy. He points to the pre-exilic psalm placed on the lips of a dying King David:

> Now these are the last words of David:
> The oracle of David, son of Jesse,
> the oracle of the man whom God exalted,
> the anointed of the God of Jacob,
> the favorite of the Strong One of Israel:
> The spirit of the Lord speaks through me,
> his word is upon my tongue.
> The God of Israel has spoken,
> the Rock of Israel has said to me:
> One who rules over people justly,
> ruling in the fear of God,
> is like the light of morning,
> like the sun rising on a cloudless morning,
> gleaming from the rain on the grassy land. (2 Sam 23:1–4)

As God's anointed, the king here receives the spirit of God, speaks the words of God, and rules justly as God's vicegerent. Goodenough aptly captures the import of the passage:

> Such a person became the righteous ruler of his people, and at the same time was, like the sun, a source of illumination for the people and the land. So David was the incarnate Spirit of Yahveh to carry out Yahveh's work of justly ruling the people. The νόμος ἔμψυχος motif is unmistakable.[26]

Although the notion of the Jewish ideal king as a living law is perhaps visible here in embryonic form, it would not receive exposition until Philo conceived of Moses in such terms. Although Philo appears to be unique among Second Temple Jews in espousing this concept, he and many of his co-religionists are alike in one important respect. They share the view, expressed in their scriptures, that the ideal king rules justly as God's vicegerent. To these writings of the Second Temple period we now turn.

---

26. Goodenough, "Kingship in Early Israel," 194.

2. *Palestinian Jewish Literature*

2.1. *Psalms of Solomon*

The *Psalms of Solomon* are a mid-first century B.C.E. response through poetry to a foreign invasion of Jerusalem.[27] Preserved only in Greek and Syriac, they were likely composed in Hebrew. Although numerous attempts have been made to identify the community from which these psalms arose with a particular Jewish sect, such as the Pharisees or Essenes, the lack of sufficient historical information regarding such groups makes such identification tentative at best.[28] On the basis of the psalms themselves, one may characterize this community as intensely critical of the Jewish religious and political elites, and even more hostile towards the polluting influence of gentile overlords. The following discussion will focus on the seventeenth psalm in this collection, which is a fervent prayer for God

---

27. The critical edition of the Greek text, and English translation consulted here is that of Robert B. Wright, ed. and trans., *Psalms of Solomon: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text* (Jewish and Christian Texts in Contexts and Related Studies 1; London: T&T Clark, 2007). Wright's translation in this volume is similar to his earlier one in Robert B. Wright, trans., *Psalms of Solomon*, in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (vol. 2; ed. James H. Charlesworth; ABRL; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1983–85), 639–670.

28. Arguing for Pharisaic authorship: Joachim Schüpphaus, *Die Psalmen Salomos: ein Zeugnis Jerusalemer Theologie und Frömmigkeit in der Mitte des vorchristlichen Jahrhunderts* (ALGHJ 7; Leiden: Brill, 1977), 127–137; Essene authorship: Robert R Hann, "The Community of the Pious: The Social Setting of the Psalms of Solomon," *SR* 17 (1988): 169–189. On these introductory issues, see J. Viteau, *Les Psaumes de Salomon: Introduction, texte grec, et traduction* (Documents pour l'étude de la Bible; Paris: Letouzy et Ané, 1911), 1–252; Robert B. Wright, *Psalms of Solomon*, 639–49; Marinus de Jonge, "The Psalms of Solomon," in *Outside the Old Testament* (ed. Marinus de Jonge; Cambridge Commentaries on Writings of the Jewish and Christian World, 200 BC to AD 200 4; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 159–62; Burton L. Mack, "Wisdom Makes a Difference: Alternatives to 'Messianic' Configurations," in *Judaisms and Their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era* (ed. Jacob Neusner, et al.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 32–37; Joseph L. Trafton, "The Psalms of Solomon in Recent Research," *JSP* 12 (1994): 3–19; Rodney Alan Werline, "The Psalms of Solomon and the Ideology of Rule," in *Conflicted Boundaries in Wisdom and Apocalypticism* (ed. Benjamin G. Wright, III and Lawrence M. Wills; SBLSymS 35; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005), 80–81.

to deliver his people through the agency of an anointed king.[29] This portrait of the ideal king draws heavily on biblical material.[30] As a specimen of what is arguably the "least academic, and at the same time most normative, literary form," this prayer may preserve a widespread stream of royal messianic expectation within first century B.C.E. Palestinian Judaism.[31]

The overarching reality that provides the context for the human institution of kingship in *Ps. Sol.* 17 is that God is the supreme king, and the only legitimate human king is the one whom he anoints for this purpose.[32] This is made

---

29. See, however, the stimulating and creative argument of Mack, "Wisdom," 15–48. Mack's thesis is that ideal figures in various Jewish pseudepigraphical texts functioned as a focus for contemplation on the "state" of Israel. They were not used as mimetic ideals, saviors, or heroes. "They were, instead intellectual investments in the hard work of rationalizing social and political structures" (19). On Mack's reading, then, the ideal king in the *Ps. Sol.* 17 does not represent an actual hope for a present political, or eschatological leader, but rather a mode of discourse regarding the discrepancy between the actual and the ideal state of Jewish society. If such a social anthropological function of the king in *Ps. Sol.* 17 were to be accepted, it would not thereby diminish the value of this text as a witness to the understanding of ideal kingship in Second Temple Judaism.

30. See the discussion of biblical allusions in Michael A. Knibb, "Messianism in the Pseudepigrapha in the Light of the Scrolls," *DSD* 2 (1995): 167; Tromp, "Davidic Messiah," 191.

31. Vermes, *Jesus the Jew*, 130–31 On the use of the *Psalms of Solomon* for worship, instruction, and parenesis within the synagogue, see Schüpphaus, *Psalmen Salomos*, 155. See, however, the critique of Vermes' claim implied by Mack, "Wisdom," 40; Werline, "Ideology of Rule," 77–81, who contend that *Ps. Sol.* 17 must be viewed as a response to a particular crisis, rather than as an encapsulation of a broader messianic expectation. It should be added, however, that in responding to a particular political crisis, the author of *Ps. Sol.* 17 may well have drawn upon widely held notions of ideal rule. So Tromp, "Davidic Messiah," 199: "Therefore, it can be said that the image of the ideal ruler in Jewish eschatological scenarios is a reflection of the specifically Jewish idea of what the perfect ruler should look like."

32. James H. Charlesworth, "The Concept of the Messiah in the Pseudepigrapha," *ANRW* 2.19.1 (1979): 199. Brad Embry, "The Psalms of Solomon and the New Testament: Intertextuality and the Need for a Re-Evaluation," *JSP* 13 (2002): 113, is correct to point out that the rule of God is primarily at issue in *Ps. Sol.* 17. His further comment does not seem warranted, however: "In short, the work of the Messiah in Pss. Sol. is to *establish* the kingdom of God on earth, not to *rule* it" (emphasis original). The text is replete with injunctions for the king to rule over both gentiles and Jews. When Embry later stresses that, although a royal and political figure, the king "is primarily a purificatory figure for the author, one who will make the longed for rule of God on the earth a reality" (115), he appears to miss the fact that in *Ps. Sol.* 17, God's rule on earth is effected *through* the rule of his anointed king.

abundantly clear from the first verse: "O Lord, you yourself are our king for ever and ever: because in you, O God, we will take pride."[33] The final verse provides an emphatic echo: "The Lord himself is our king forevermore" (46). God, whose kingdom will last forever (cf. Ps 144:13), is depicted as a savior (σωτήρ), an epithet frequently applied to Hellenistic kings (3).[34] The acute problem from which God's people must be delivered is the misrule of "sinners" (ἁμαρτωλοί), likely a coded reference to the Hasmonean dynasty who have arrogantly (ἐν ὑπερηφανία) usurped David's throne (5–6). Consequently, God will throw them down, showing no mercy as he repays them for their sins by means of "a man alien to our race," likely a reference to Pompey's conquest of Jerusalem in 63 B.C.E. (7–9; cf. 11–12).[35] The

---

33. Cf. 5.18b–19; Exod 15:18. This verse may be directed against the Hasmonean royalty as usurpers; so Viteau, *Les Psaumes de Salomon*, 340.

34. God is also described as savior (ὁ σωτήρ, ὁ σώζων) in the LXX: Ps 106:21; Isa 43:3, 11; 45:15, 21; 60:16. Werline, "Ideology of Rule," 75–77, argues that the application of the epithet to God is a challenge to the legitimacy of Roman rule. According to Greco-Roman ideology of rule, Pompey would have been regarded as a σωτήρ for having rid Jerusalem of the Hasmonean usurpers.

35. On the historical allusions in *Ps. Sol.* 17, see Kenneth Atkinson, *I Cried to the Lord: A Study of the Psalms of Solomon's Historical Background and Social Setting* (JSJSup 84; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 135–139 In claiming that *Ps. Sol.* 17 "recounts the conquest of Jerusalem in 63 B.C.E. by the Roman general Pompey" (135), Atkinson apparently repudiates his earlier work, Kenneth Atkinson, "Herod the Great, Sosius, and the Siege of Jerusalem (37 BCE) in Psalm of Solomon 17," *NovT* 38 (1996): 313–322, in which he argues that the psalm "refers to the events of the Herodian period, and more specifically to the siege of Jerusalem in 37 B.C.E." (322). A date during Herod's reign had been earlier argued by André Caquot, "Les Hasmonéens, les Romains et Hérode: observations sur Ps Sal 17," in *Hellenica et Judaica: hommage à Valentin Nikiprowetzky* (ed. A. Caquot, et al.; Leuven: Peeters, 1986), 213–18. The claim that the Hasmoneans and Pompey are the historical referents behind the allusions is common: see, e.g., Moriz Friedländer, *Geschichte der jüdischen Apologetik als Vorgeschichte des Christentums* (Zurich: Schmidt, 1903), 145–46; Emil Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi* (3 vols.; Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1909), 3:206–8; Schüpphaus, *Psalmen Salomos*, 64–69, 105–7; P. G. R. de Villiers, "The Messiah and Messiahs in Jewish Apocalyptic," *Neot* 12 (1978): 79; Marinus de Jonge, "The Expectation of the Future in the Psalms of Solomon," *Neot* 23 (1989): 99. Cf. Ernest-Marie Laperrousaz, "Hérode le Grand est-il 'l'ennemi (qui) a agi en étranger' des Psaumes de Salomon?" in *Politique et Religion dans le Judaïsme Ancien et Médiéval: Interventions au Colloque Des 8 et 9 Décembre 1987* (ed. D. Tollet; Relais-Desclée; Paris: Desclée, 1989), 29–32; Werline, "Ideology of Rule," 70–71: in the original text, the allusions point to Pompey; later redactors, however, envisioned Herod as the alien. On the difficulty of confidently correlating the allusions with historical persons, see Johannes Tromp, "The Sinners and the Lawless in Psalm of Solomon 17," *NovT* 35 (1993): 344–361.

Romans are unfortunately no better than the Hasmoneans, and the psalmist laments bitterly that "the lawless one (ὁ ἄνομος) devastated our land" (11; cf. 18) and "acted arrogantly (ἐποίησεν ὑπερηφανίαν)" (13). As a result, all of Jerusalem follows the impiety of the Roman overlords: none act with mercy, truth, righteousness, or justice (15, 19), and the pious must flee to the wilderness "to save their lives from evil (σωθῆναι ψυχὰς αὐτῶν ἀπὸ κακοῦ)" (16–17).[36] As the leaders behave, so do the people:

> From their leader to the commonest of the people they committed every kind of sin: the king broke the law, the judges disobeyed, the people sinned. (20)

The psalmist therefore beseeches God: "raise up (ἀνάστησον) for them their king, a son of David, to rule over your servant Israel in the time that you know, O God" (21; cf. Amos 9:11; Jer 23:5; 37:9 [LXX; 30:9 ET]).

God's chosen king acts as God's vicegerent, accomplishing God's purposes on earth. Thus the psalmist says of the king, "The Lord himself is his king (Κύριος αὐτὸς βασιλεὺς αὐτοῦ)" (34). As previously the gentiles had accomplished God's judgment upon sinful Israel (7–10, 12), so now the king judges the gentiles (24–25, 29) and Jews (28, 43) alike.[37] Whereas the Hasmoneans are portrayed as having illegitimately usurped the throne of David (6), the legitimacy of this king is described in terms of God's choice of David as king and his promise of posterity to David's descendants (4; cf. 1 Sam 16:1–13; 2 Sam 7:12–29). In other words, according to the psalmist, only a Davidic king can legitimately fulfill the role of

---

36. Viteau, *Les Psaumes de Salomon*, 348, believes that the escape from moral corruption is in view here: "Au lieu de comprendre le texte de la vie physique, on pourrait tout aussi bien le comprendre de la vie morale de l'âme, et traduire: «pour sauver leurs âmes du mal,» «une âme sauvée de leur corruption»."

37. Viteau, *Les Psaumes de Salomon*, 355–57; Werline, "Ideology of Rule," 79–80, point out that the verb κρίνω, as it is used here, does not connote the resolution of a legal issue. Rather, the connotation is that of the Hebrew verb, שפט, namely the establishment of just rule.

God's anointed because only such a figure represents the fulfillment of God's promise to ensure the perpetuity of the Davidic dynasty.[38] God is entreated to strengthen the king by a holy spirit (ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ) (37, 22), whereby the king will purge Jerusalem from gentiles (22–24), and govern the earth in wisdom and righteousness (26, 29–32).[39] It is in this role that he is known as "the Lord['s] Messiah (χριστὸς κύριος)" (32).[40] On one level, the king's anointing signifies his divine legitimacy, in contrast to the Hasmonean usurpers.[41] Understood theologically, however, it is also "that which enables the king to function in a

---

38. Gene L. Davenport, "The 'Anointed of the Lord' in Psalms of Solomon 17," in *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms* (ed. John J. Collins and George W. E. Nickelsburg; SBLSCS 12; Chico, Ca.: Scholars Press, 1980), 72: "the identify of the king as a descendent of David (vs. 21) is important not because of any inherent validity in David's line, but because it is a sign of God's faithfulness to his promise." Tromp, "Davidic Messiah," 199–200: David represents the Jewish king *par excellence*. See further, Paul Volz, *Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1934), 379; Schüpphaus, *Psalmen Salomos*, 114–15.

39. On the fundamental importance of the king's empowerment by God's spirit, see Volz, *Eschatologie*, 222–23; Davenport, "'Anointed of the Lord'," 81–82; Thoma Clemens, "Entwürfe für messianische Gestalten in frühjüdischer Zeit," in *Messiah and Christos: Studies in the Jewish Origins of Christianity* (ed. Ithamar Gruenwald, et al.; TSAJ 32; Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1992), 25–26.

40. Many commentators emend χριστὸς κύριος to read χριστὸς κύριου, regarding it as a mistranslation of the Hebrew expression, "Yahweh's anointed." There is, however, no manuscript evidence to support such an emendation. Robert R. Hann, "Christos Kyrios in PsSol 17:32: 'the Lord's Anointed' Reconsidered," *NTS* 31 (1985): 620–627; Robert B. Wright, *Psalms of Solomon*, 48–49, argue that the reading χριστὸς κύριος is original. Loren T. Stuckenbruck, "Messianic Ideas in the Apocalyptic and Related Literature of Early Judaism," in *The Messiah in the Old and New Testaments* (ed. Stanley E. Porter; McMaster New Testament Studies; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2007), 96, suggests that the double title may be an early use of Ps 110:1 (109:1 LXX: Εἶπεν ὁ κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου), in which the second κύριος refers to the king. Viteau, *Les Psaumes de Salomon*, 361–62; Volz, *Eschatologie*, 174; Schüpphaus, *Psalmen Salomos*, 71; Davenport, "'Anointed of the Lord'," 77–79; Marinus de Jonge, "Expectation of the Future," 111 n. 25; Knibb, "Messianism in the Pseudepigrapha," 169–70; Atkinson, *I Cried to the Lord*, 131 n. 2, support the emendation. Regardless of the decision one reaches concerning this text, v. 34 makes clear that the king is subordinate to the Yahweh, the divine king.

41. Villiers, "Messiah and Messiahs," 79–80; Mack, "Wisdom," 39; Marian Wittlieb, "Die theologische Bedeutung der Erwähnung von 'Māšîaḥ/Christós' in den Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments palästinischen Ursprungs," *BN* 50 (1989): 33

manner precisely opposite to that of the present regime . . . the means by which God bestows his character upon him."[42]

A number of details pertaining to the king's reign are worthy of mention. First, when the king effects judgment upon gentiles and unrighteous Jews, he is understood to do so not through the coercive use of force, but by the persuasive use of words.[43] Although the king has a political function, the psalmist "describes the King, not in the first place as a fighter or a ruler, but as an ideal scribe, a wise man par excellence."[44] He will "destroy the lawbreaking Gentiles with the word of his mouth" (24), and "condemn (ἐλέγξαι) sinners by their own consciences" (25).[45] In

---

42. Davenport, "'Anointed of the Lord'," 78. According to Mack, "Wisdom," 41, it is the "anointing" or special endowment of divine wisdom, which is essential to the characterization and reign of the king.

43. See further: "His words will be purer than the finest gold. . . . His words will be as the words of the holy ones, among sanctified people" (43).

44. Marinus de Jonge, "Expectation of the Future," 102; so also Schüpphaus, *Psalmen Salomos*, 71–72; James H. Charlesworth, "Concept," 198–99; Davenport, "'Anointed of the Lord'," 72; Mack, "Wisdom," 38–39; Pomykala, *Davidic Dynasty Tradition*, 162; Pablo A. Torijano, *Solomon the Esoteric King: From King to Magus, Development of a Tradition* (JSJSup 73; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 107; Young S. Chae, *Jesus as the Eschatological Davidic Shepherd: Studies in the Old Testament, Second Temple Judaism, and in the Gospel of Matthew* (WUNT 2/216; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 115–126; and with some caution, Joseph L. Trafton, "The Bible, the *Psalms of Solomon*, and Qumran," in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Second Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins* (vol. 2; ed. James H. Charlesworth; Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2006), 440–42. *Contra* Kenneth Atkinson, "On the Use of Scripture in the Development of Militant Davidic Messianism at Qumran: New Light from Psalm of Solomon 17," in *The Interpretation of Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity: Studies in Language and Tradition* (ed. Craig A. Evans; JSPSup 33; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 107–112, who argues that the psalmist reappropriates scripture to emphasize that the king is primarily a violent military figure. So also Knibb, "Messianism in the Pseudepigrapha," 169; Werline, "Ideology of Rule," 78–79. De Jonge notes, however, that the one clear reference to violent action in vv. 23–24 is an echo of Ps 2:9, in which it is clear that divine power is at work. Davenport notes, moreover, that in contrast to Ps 2:9, here it is the arrogance (ὑπερηφανία) of sinners that is destroyed (73). See further Davenport's discussion of the psalmist's use of Isa 11:2–5 and Ps 2:9 (89–90 n. 25). Schüpphaus accounts for the discrepancy in the portrayal of the king by positing a later stage of redaction in which the charismatic, military king is transformed into God's eschatological agent sent to establish God's righteousness on earth (124–26, 138–51). His theory of redaction is plausible, although his detailed conclusions perhaps go beyond the evidence; see the critique by de Jonge (104).

45. See further: "He will expose (ἐλέγξαι) officials and drive out sinners by the strength of

similar fashion the king establishes lasting peace with the gentiles, who will serve him "under his yoke (ὑπὸ τὸν ζυγὸν αὐτοῦ)" (30).[46] To achieve this, the king is not dependent upon military might (33);[47] rather, he "will strike the earth with the word of his mouth forever" (35).

Second, the king is the paragon of righteousness, having been "taught by God" (32).[48] He is described as "faithfully and righteously shepherding the Lord's sheep" (40), an image recalling Ezekiel's Davidic shepherd whose reign enables faithful obedience of God's law.[49] Being free from sin, the king's rule effects a return to righteousness, in stark contrast with the previous rule of the sinners and gentiles.[50] Not only does unrighteous behavior vanish, but the very knowledge of evil disappears: "He will not tolerate unrighteousness to dwell among them again, and no person who knows evil will live with them" (27).[51] Whereas arrogance

---

his word" (36).

46. The connotation of the expression, ὑπὸ τὸν ζυγὸν, may be a positive one here, as it is in Sir 51:26; *Ps. Sol.* 7:9; Jer 34:8, 11 LXX (ET 27:8, 11).

47. Clemens, "Entwürfe," 25, believes the king is here depicted as the antithesis of imperialistic war-mongerers.

48. Note the parallel with LXX Ps 71:1–2 [ET 72:1–2]: "Give the king your justice , O God, and your righteousness (τὴν δικαιοσύνη) to a king's son. May he judge your people with righteousness (ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ), and your poor with justice." Torijano, *Solomon the Esoteric King*, 109, suggests that the author of *Ps. Sol.* 17 hoped for an ideal king "who would be a *Salomo redivivus* without the taint of his errors."

49. Chae, *Eschatological Davidic Shepherd*, 117–21, notes the many allusions in *Ps. Sol.* 17 to the Davidic shepherd of 34 and 37, which evokes a leader who both gathers Gods people and teaches them to follow his laws. See further, Viteau, *Les Psaumes de Salomon*, 356; Marinus de Jonge, "Expectation of the Future," 102–3; Embry, "Re-Evaluation," 134–36.

50. The text makes clear the correlation between the king's sinlessness and his ability to rule: "And he himself will be free from sin, in order to rule (τοῦ ἄρχειν) such a great people" (36).

51. See further: "there will be no unrighteousness among them during his reign, because everyone will be holy" (32). Viteau, *Les Psaumes de Salomon*, 355, remarks: "Non seulement personne ne fera le mal dans le Royaume, mais encore on n'y trouvera aucun homme «sachant le mal», par suite aucun homme qui l'apprenne pour lui ou pour l'enseigner aux autres; la

(ὑπερηφανία) marked the reign of the Hasmoneans (6) and Romans (13), God's chosen king "will lead them all impartially (ἐν ἰσότητι), and there will be no arrogance (ὑπερηφανία) among them" (41).[52] Whereas the leadership of sinful leaders infected the entire population with sin (20), the righteous king "will pronounce Jerusalem clean, consecrating it as it was in the beginning (ὡς καὶ τὸ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς)" (30).[53] This vision of a purified Jerusalem bespeaks a return to a golden age.[54] Although "the stranger and the foreigner will no longer live with them" (28), gentiles will participate in this golden age, in that the king's righteousness will extend to the whole world.[55] Finally, although the king is portrayed as effecting purification and sanctification, he is merely continuing the work initiated by God in the establishment of God's kingdom. Thus, the subjects of the king already "have been made holy by the Lord his God" (26).[56]

---

connaissance du mal disparaîtra."

52. On ἰσότης as a hallmark of ideal government, see the discussion of Ecphantus (Thesleff 83.21-22) in Blumenfeld, *Political Paul*, 228–30; see also Erich Langstadt, "Zu Philos Begriff der Demokratie," in *Occident and Orient* (ed. Bruno Schindler and A. Marmorstein; London: Taylor's Foreign Press, 1936), 349–64.

53. The author's perspective reflects Deuteronomic ideology: as is the king, so are the people. On the author's Deuteronomic critique of illegitimate Hasmonean rule, see Werline, "Ideology of Rule," 72–74.

54. Tromp, "Davidic Messiah," 201, contends that the return to a golden age under the reign of an ideal king envsioned here is not a particularly Jewish notion, but rather a variant of Hellenistic eschatology. Cf. Viteau, *Les Psaumes de Salomon*, 359, who maintains that the reference to ἀπ' ἀρχῆς simply points to the pre-exilic period.

55. Davenport, "'Anointed of the Lord'," 75–76, reads vv. 29–32 as a reaffirmation of the prophecy of Isa 66:18–21; see further, Friedländer, *Geschichte*, 148; Volz, *Eschatologie*, 167–68; Schüpphaus, *Psalmen Salomos*, 115; Chae, *Eschatological Davidic Shepherd*, 124. Note further the king's merciful treatment of God-fearing gentiles: "He will be merciful to all the Gentiles that fearfully stand before him" (34c). See further, Davenport (73–74).

56. Note further the psalmist's plea to God in v. 22: καὶ ὑπόζωσον αὐτὸν ἰσχύν τοῦ θραῦσαι ἄρχοντας ἀδίκους· καθάρισον Ἰερουσαλὴμ ἀπὸ ἐθνῶν. Here, καθάρισον is an imperative in parallel with ὑπόζωσον. God, the referent of imperatives (κύριε, v. 21), undergirds the king with strength and cleanses Jersusalem from gentiles. This is reflected in the translation of Viteau, *Les Psaumes de*

Finally, the king glorifies God, and his appearance reflects divine majesty.[57] Of the Hasmoneans, the author laments before God: "they did not glorify your honorable name" (5c). The king, by contrast, "will glorify the Lord publically in the whole world" (30). As a result,

> He will have nations come from the ends of the earth to see his glory (τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ) . . . and to see the glory of the Lord with which God has glorified her (αὐτὴν). (31)[58]

The king's majesty consists not only in his physical appearance, but also in the execution of his divinely appointed task:

> This is the magnificence (ἡ εὐπρέπεια) of the king of Israel that God acknowledged, to raise (ἀναστῆσαι) him over the House of Israel to discipline (παιδεῦσαι) it. (42)

Although the verb, παιδεύω, connotes discipline, correction, and chastisement, its semantic range also includes teaching and training. Here, it suggests the completion of the entire work initiated by God.[59]

In sum, *Ps. Sol.* 17 portrays the ideal king as God's anointed and empowered agent, a descendent of David who will faithfully accomplish God's purposes on earth:

Salomon, 353. Most, however, translate καθάρισον as though it were an infinitive of purpose in parallel with τοῦ θραῦσαι, implying that the king is the referent (Davenport, "'Anointed of the Lord'," 69; Robert B. Wright, *Psalms of Solomon*, 189).

57. Volz, *Eschatologie*, 168, 358. Marius Reiser, *Die Gerichtspredigt Jesu: Eine Untersuchung zur eschatologicalischen Verkündigung Jesu und ihrem frühjüdischen Hintergrund* (NTAbh NS 23; Münster: Aschendorff, 1990), 34–35, believes that the king's glorification of God is an indication that he acts as God's agent.

58. The antecedent for the feminine singular pronoun, αὐτὴν, is Jerusalem, from the preceding verse; cf. Davenport, "'Anointed of the Lord'," 88 n. 14, who translates τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ as "its glory," referring not to the glory of the king, but of Jerusalem.

59. Viteau, *Les Psaumes de Salomon*, 367–68, comments regarding the meaning of the verb: "l'instruire, le former, le purifier, le discipliner, et le faire marcher dans la droite voie de la justice; en un mot, pour qu'il puisse y accomplir l'oeuvre voulue par Dieu . . . Une partie essentielle de cette oeuvre est l'enseignement." Volz, *Eschatologie*, 178: the task is both political rule, and moral-ethical formation. See further, Schüpphaus, *Psalmen Salomos*, 93–94; Marinus de Jonge, "Expectation of the Future," 102; Davenport, "'Anointed of the Lord'," 70, 81.

> Specifically, he will drive out the aliens, reprove sinners, assemble the people, establish a just system of government, provide for a righteous society, redistribute the land, extend his rule over the entire world, and see that righteousness reigns throughout the entire world.[60]

This ideal king carries out his task not primarily through the power of military strength, but through the persuasive power of his words; effects a return to righteousness; and reflects divine glory.

2.2. *Qumran Literature*

Scholarly treatment abounds on the topic of eschatological ideal figures in the literature of the Qumran Covenanters. The interest of the present chapter, whose aim is to assemble a portrait of the ideal king in Jewish thought, converges and diverges from this stream of research. The convergence lies in the task of deciphering the varied and complex evidence pointing to the hope for ideal eschatological figures at Qumran. This phenomenon has been described by numerous scholars as messianism, or messianic expectation.[61] The question guiding our investigation shall be, how was the royal messiah conceived at Qumran?[62] The present section's aim diverges from this stream of Qumran

---

60. Davenport, "'Anointed of the Lord'," 74; see also Friedländer, *Geschichte*, 147; Volz, *Eschatologie*, 177; Marinus de Jonge, "Psalms of Solomon," 174. Werline, "Ideology of Rule," 80–81, suggests that the king's redistribution of tribal lands (v. 28) is in line with the activity of a benefactor, a commonly ascribed trait of Hellenistic kings.

61. Shemaryahu Talmon, "Waiting for the Messiah: The Spiritual Universe of the Qumran Covenanters," in *Judaisms and Their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era* (ed. Jacob Neusner, et al.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 114–15; Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 8–9, note that the concepts of "messianism" and "messianic expectation" are problematic, and prefer to speak of the varieties of eschatological expectation at Qumran. Johann Maier, "Messias oder Gesalbter? Zu einem Übersetzung- und Deutungsproblem in den Qumrantexten," *RevQ* 17 (1996): 585–586, rightly criticizes the imprecise use of "messianic" to refer to a broad palette of eschatological concepts.

62. A. S. van der Woude, *Die messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumran* (SSN 3; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1957), 6, correctly points out that משיח does not refer exclusively to a *royal* messiah in the Qumran literature; *contra* Sigmund Mowinckel, *He That Cometh* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1956), 99.

research in its interest in the perspective of the Qumran Covenanters on Israel's historical kings. The question here is, how were Israel's historical kings idealized at Qumran? The present discussion also diverges from the widespread efforts to establish a diachronic reading of the Qumran Scrolls. Leaving to the side redaction-critical concerns, the following investigation will attempt a synchronic reading of the final form of the texts in order to gain a snapshot of the variety of messianic expectation at Qumran in the final third of the first century C.E.[63]

2.2.1. *Methodological issues.* Before examining the Qumran literature, two methodological issues must be addressed. One issue has to do with the contours of messianic expectation among the Qumran Covenanters. The other has to do with whether in fact it is even possible to reconstruct a coherent picture of such messianic expectation. Logic requires this issue to be addressed first.

2.2.1.1. A coherent system or irreducible diversity?

J. J. Collins introduces the basic methodological issue at stake in reconstructing Qumran messianism by describing two opposing poles of research.[64] At one end of the spectrum are those who assume that the sectarian literary remains

---

63. For the majority of Qumran texts, the Hebrew and Aramaic text and English translations are those of James H. Charlesworth, ed., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations* (10 vols.; ed. James H. Charlesworth, et al.; PTSDSSP; Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1994). For texts not yet published in this series (4Q246, 4Q285, 1Q11), the following text and translation will be used: Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 2000). In one instance (4Q161), the translation of García Martínez and Tigchelaar will be cited rather than that of the PTSDSSP, due to the former's superior clarity.

64. John J. Collins, "Messiahs in Context: Method in the Study of Messianism in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present Realities and Future Prospects* (ed. Michael O. Wise, et al.; Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences 722; New York: New York Academy of Sciences, 1994), 213–15. The material from this article was later incorporated in John J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature* (ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 1995), 49–73. Much of Collins' work on messianism in the Scrolls can be found in this volume.

of the Qumran community reflect a high level of doctrinal consistency, and attempt to assemble the fragmentary evidence into a coherent system. S. Talmon's cogent socio-historical reconstruction of Qumran messianism takes this approach.[65] He characterizes the Qumran Covenanters as the most millenarian sect in Second Temple Judaism, marked by an "extreme Messianism" that looked forward to the imminent arrival of a New Age within history. This restorationist vision envisaged Israel under the bicephalic leadership of an anointed king and priest. The other pole, according to Collins, is characterized by approaches that seek to avoid the danger of harmonizing disparate sources, and focus instead on isolated texts.[66] L. H. Schiffman's conclusion to his survey of messianic Qumran texts may be seen as representative of this trend. He contends that one does not find a coherent messianic system, but rather "that a variety of motifs and beliefs are distributed in almost random fashion throughout the texts."[67]

Collins himself takes a mediating approach, one that both recognizes the diversity of the sources while at the same time acknowledging that the core of Qumran literature (i.e., rule books and biblical commentaries) contains overlapping terminology and subject matter when dealing with messianic themes. He is furthermore critical of studies of Qumran messianism that limit themselves to the

---

65. Talmon, "Waiting."

66. Morton Smith, "What Is Implied by the Variety of Messianic Figures?" *JBL* 78 (1959): 66–72, represents an early advocate of this approach.

67. Lawrence H. Schiffman, "Messianic Figures and Ideas in the Qumran Scrolls," in *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity* (ed. James H. Charlesworth; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 128; so also James H. Charlesworth, "From Messianology to Christology: Problems and Prospects," in *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity* (ed. James H. Charlesworth; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 28–29; Pomykala, *Davidic Dynasty Tradition*, 171, 212; Philip R. Davies, "Judaisms in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Case of the Messiah," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Their Historical Context* (ed. Timothy H. Lim, et al.; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000), 230–32.

investigation of texts in which the word משיח appears.[68] In Collins' estimation, this "is to fail to distinguish between a word and a concept. A successor to the Davidic throne in an eschatological context is by definition a messiah."[69] Rather, a key task in the interpretation of Qumran messianism involves the correlation of various titles applied to the same figure.[70] The present study takes the approach that, while messianism was not the *raison d'être* of the Qumran Covenanters, and while one cannot assemble all the evidence into a coherent system, at least one strand of evidence points toward the hope for a royal messiah.[71] Since the larger aim of this survey is to describe the Jewish concept of the ideal king, the following investigation will focus on texts which evidence hope for the coming of an eschatological anointed king. A distinction must be made between references to such an eschatological king and those which have an actual historical king in mind. Scholars such as J. A. Fitzmyer have correctly stressed that the latter are not

---

68. See, e.g., Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2000), 82–108.

69. Collins and Collins, *King and Messiah*, 71 Johannes Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran: Königliche, priesterliche und prophetische Messiasvorstellungen in den Schriftfunden von Qumran* (WUNT 2/104; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 18, notes that when speaking of Qumran eschatology, the expression אחרית הימים ("last days") should not be understood purely as reference to the future. It refers to the period of time immediately preceding the end of history, in which the Qumran Covenanters understood themselves to be living. See further Henry W. Morisada Rietz, "The Qumran Concept of Time," in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Second Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins* (vol. 2; ed. James H. Charlesworth; Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2006), 214–22.

70. Collins, "Messiahs in Context," 217. A similar approach is taken by Woude, *Messianischen Vorstellungen*; Émile Puech, "Messianisme, eschatologie et résurrection dans les manuscrits de la mer Morte," *RevQ* 18 (1997): 267–278. See further the tradition-historical approach of Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran*, 16–18, who traces the development of royal, priestly, and prophetic messianic concepts and their employment in Qumran literature.

71. James H. Charlesworth, "From Messianology to Christology," 24–25, claims that messianism was not a major concern at Qumran; so also Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 226. By contrast, A. J. B. Higgins, "The Priestly Messiah," *NTS* 13 (1966–67): 234; Martin G. Abegg, Jr., "The Messiah at Qumran: Are We Still Seeing Double?" *DSD* 2 (1995): 143, judge that messianism was an eminent, if not predominant, concern.

referring to a "Messiah," and hence should not be used to reconstruct a given community's understanding of "messianism."[72] Bearing in mind this necessary distinction, the following investigation will nevertheless find references to historical kings helpful in reconstructing the notion of the ideal king at Qumran.

2.2.1.2. One messiah or two (CD, 1QS, 1QSa)?

There is considerable debate regarding a fairly basic aspect of messianic expectation amongst the Qumran Covenanters: did they expect the coming of a single messianic figure, or both a lay and a priestly messiah? The evidence admits of both conclusions.[73] Four passages in the *Damascus Document* make reference to messianic figures. In all of them, the Hebrew משיח is singular. (1) CD XII, 23–XIII, 1 introduces a section dealing with the organization of the community,

---

72. Fitzmyer, *One Who is to Come*, 1, understands the term "Messiah" in a narrow sense as denoting "an eschatological figure, an *anointed* human agent of God, who was to be sent by Him as a deliverer and was awaited in the end of time" (author's emphasis).

73. J. Starcky, "Les quatres étapes du messianisme à Qumran," *RB* 70 (1963): 481–505, sought to explain the presence of two messiahs through a model of evolutionary development. His conclusions have not been widely received. Note the early critique by Reinhard Deichgraber, "Zur Messiaserwartung der Damaskusschrift," *ZAW* 78 (1966): 337–338 n. 30, of Starcky's tradition-historical conclusions made on the basis of paleography. Gerbern S. Oegema, "Messianic Expectations in the Qumran Writings: Theses on Their Development," in *Qumran-Messianism: Studies on the Messianic Expectations in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. James H. Charlesworth, et al.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 53–82, proposes a historical-critical solution based upon the supposed redactional stages of pertinent texts. Texts dating from the Maccabean/Hasmonean period (150–75 B.C.E.; 1QS, 1QSa, 1QSb, 4Q175, and CD) and earlier (4QpIsa[a]) envisage a pluriformity of liberator figures. Texts written during the Herodian/Roman period (75 B.C.E.–68 C.E.; 1QpHab, 1QM, 4Q252, 4Q174, 4Q246, 1QH, 4Q171) give evidence of a renaissance in royal messianic expectation. According to Oegema, the shift in messianic expectation is a response to the change in the political landscape. Note, however, the alternate redaction-historical theory proposed by Hartmut Stegemann, "Some Remarks to 1QSa, to 1QSb, and to Qumran Messianism," *RevQ* 17 (1996): 479–505. If Stegemann, who dates 1QS VIII, 15b–IX, 11, 4Q175 and CD to a period later than 1QSa and 1QSb, is correct, Oegema's theory founders. Michael A. Knibb, "Eschatology and Messianism in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (ed. Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 389–400, agrees that messianic expectation underwent historical development at Qumran, but doubts that the contours of process can be described with confidence. See also Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 212–13, who contends that throughout the entire existence of the Qumran community, historical-political circumstances existed, which would have been conducive to the rise of royal messianic expectation.

supplying the following temporal reference: "until the arising of the Messiah of Aaron and Israel (משיח אהרן וישראל)." (2) CD XIV, 18–19 may function as an *inclusio* to the section begun with XII, 23, or it may function as an introduction to the penal code that follows: "and this is the explanation of the precepts which [. . .] [the Messia]h of Aaron and Israel (משיח אהרן וישראל)." This figure may have a role in atoning for the iniquity of the Covenanters.[74] (3) CD XIX, 10–11 speaks of the fates of the righteous and apostate: "But those who remain will be handed over to the sword when the Messiah of Aaron and Israel (משיח אהרן וישראל) comes."[75] (4) CD XIX, 33–XX, 1 speaks of the history of the community from its founding "until there arises the Messiah from Aaron and from Israel (משיח מאהרן ומישראל)." Only one text makes clear reference to dual messiahs. A passage in the *Rule of the Community* prescribes the founding of the community and describes its activity until its terminus, "until the coming of the prophet, and the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel (ומשיחי אהרן וישראל)" (1QS IX, 10–11).[76]

How should this evidence be assessed? That depends upon the interpretation and relative significance given to corroborating evidence from other Qumran scrolls and contemporaneous Jewish literature. K. G. Kuhn considered the

---

74. So James H. Charlesworth, "From Messianology to Christology," 27. Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 38, contends that the atoning activity points to the priestly character of this figure. Abegg, "Seeing Double?" 127, translates the verb that follows (ויכפר) as singular active: "he will pardon." Both Michael Wise, et al., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1996), 72, and García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 1:575 translate it as a plural passive. Puech, "Messianisme, eschatologie et résurrection," 270–71, contends that, whether passive or active, the subject of the verb is God, not the messianic figure.

75. James H. Charlesworth, "From Messianology to Christology," 28, raises the question, "does that mean that the Anointed One will use the sword?"

76. It has been alleged that the earliest manuscript of the *Rule of the Community* (4QS^{e} = 4Q259) lacks the equivalent of 1QS VIII, 15b–IX, 11, and the reference to two messiahs. The validity of this claim, however, is dependent upon an accurate redactional history of the text, which as of yet does not exist; see the discussion in Knibb, "Eschatology and Messianism," 385–86; Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 20–21.

evidence of the *Rule of the Congregation* (1QSa), an eschatologically centered appendix to *Rule of the Community*. This text describes a messianic banquet, in which the Messiah of Israel appears to be subordinate to the high priest (1QSa II, 11–22).[77] The description of this eschatological communal meal parallels the one found in 1QS VI, 4–6, leading Kuhn to conclude that these two figures correspond to the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel from 1QS IX.[78] Turning his attention to the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Kuhn believed that here as well one finds the expectation for both a royal messiah from Judah, and a priestly messiah from Levi, with the former subordinated to the latter (*T. Reu.* 6.7–12; *T. Sim.* 7.1–2; *T. Levi* 2.11; *T. Dan* 5.10; *T. Gad* 8.1; *T. Jos.* 19.11). Taking these texts as conclusive evidence of a widespread expectation for dual messiahs, Kuhn concluded that Qumran messianism was likewise characterized by a predominant expectation for dual messiahs.[79] This appears to be the consensus view among scholars today.[80]

---

77. Karl Georg Kuhn, "Die beiden Messias Aarons und Israels," *NTS* 1 (1955): 168–174 so also Puech, "Messianisme, eschatologie et résurrection," 268; Fitzmyer, *One Who is to Come*, 93. Ernst Ludwig Ehrlich, "Ein Beitrag zur Messiaslehre der Qumransekte," *ZAW* 68 (1956): 238–239, argues, however, that the subordination is only apparent and is due to the fact that the high priest's particular function (blessing the meal) requires him to enter in advance of the messiah.

78. Schiffman, "Messianic Figures," 119–20, notes, however, that only one (lay) messiah is *actually* mentioned in this text. Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 25–28, contends that this is moreover a royal messianic figure, whose intimate relationship with God is reflected through a filial metaphor of divine adoption: אם יוליד [אל] אל[ת] המשיח (lines 11–12). Émile Puech, "Préséance sacerdotale et messie-roi dans la règle de la congrégation (1QSa ii 11–22)," *RevQ* 16 (1994): 351–365, argues that the messiah is not "begotten" but "revealed." Otto Michel and Otto Betz, "Nocheinmal: 'Von Gott gezeugt'," *NTS* 9 (1963): 130–131, argue for "begotten" but in the metaphorical sense of "anointed." Knibb, "Eschatology and Messianism," 398–99, warns that these lines cannot be reconstructed with certainty.

79. Kuhn, "Die beiden Messias," 173–74. Ehrlich, "Beitrag," 238, further surmised that the singular occurrences of משיח in the *Damascus Document* were corrections made by medieval copyists in an attempt to make the text conform to Jewish tradition. The singular reading of משיח in CD XIV, 18–19 that is preserved in 4Q266 10 I, 11–12 renders this hypothesis of Kuhn's untenable (Abegg, "Seeing Double?" 129).

80. Woude, *Messianischen Vorstellungen*, 185; Deichgraber, "Zur Messiaserwartung," 333–43; Talmon, "Waiting," 122–26; Collins, "Messiahs in Context," 222–27; James VanderKam,

M. G. Abegg points out, however, that certain passages in the *Testaments* cited as evidence for a dual-messiah theology actually envisage both the priestly and royal office being subsumed in one person (*T. Dan* 5.10; *T. Gad* 8.1; *T. Benj.* 11.2).[81] Abegg's further study of messianic passages in the Scrolls leads him to conclude that "the dual messiah that we have come to accept as dogma in discussions of the DSS must be tempered. . . . the overriding theme is one of royal messianic expectation."[82] L. H. Schiffman accounts for the diversity in messianic expectation by theorizing that Second Temple messianism existed along a continuum from restorationist to utopian. The former looks to the restoration of Israel through a royal messiah, while the latter expects an apocalyptic, catastrophic change. One finds evidence of both trends at Qumran.[83] In agreement with Abegg, this survey finds that while the Scrolls do contain clear references to dual messiahs (1QS IX) and instances in which the royal messiah is subordinated to the authority of the priest (1QSa II), not all the evidence fits neatly into a uniform expectation of two messiahs at Qumran.[84] To this further evidence we now turn.

"Messianism in the Scrolls," in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Eugene Ulrich and James VanderKam; CJAS 10; Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994), 211–234; Puech, "Messianisme, eschatologie et résurrection," 255–98; Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran*, 463–66; Knibb, "Eschatology and Messianism," 388; Fitzmyer, *One Who is to Come*, 91–93. See further the list of scholars in agreement with this position cited by Talmon (135 nn.32–33).

81. Abegg, "Seeing Double?" 128–29. He further contends that references to a single messiah are unlikely to be later Christian interpolations. Too many references to dual messiahs in the text make this kind of redactional hypothesis implausible. See further the discussion of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* below in section 5.

82. Abegg, "Seeing Double?" 143; so also Higgins, "Priestly Messiah," 215–19.

83. Schiffman, "Messianic Figures," 128–29. Caution must be taken in applying this schema to the Qumran literature. 4Q246 envisages a coming king, yet the outlook of this text is decidedly apocalyptic. See the discussion below.

84. So also Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 228; Davies, "Case of the Messiah," 219–32.

The texts under investigation will be organized into three groupings: rule texts, exegetical texts, and other texts that do not fit into those categories. At the outset it must be mentioned that while scripture is used most extensively in exegetical texts, it is found in texts from all three categories. A small number of biblical texts evidence a common exegetical tradition used in connection with a Davidic messiah: Isa 11; Num 24; Gen 49; and 2 Sam 7.[85]

2.2.2. *Rule texts.* Beyond attesting to an expectation of one or two messiahs, the *Rule of the Community* and the *Damascus Document* do not reveal much about the function of the coming messiah.[86] A little more may be gleaned from the texts considered below, but on the whole the portrait is fragmentary.

2.2.2.1. Damascus Document (CD)

This composite Hebrew text, whose final form dates from around 100 B.C.E., was first discovered in a Cairo *genizah*. It consists of a lengthy admonitory introduction (CD I–VIII; XIX–XX) followed by an exposition of the laws of the community (CD XV–XVI; IX–XIV).[87] In addition to the passages cited above, a further passage that makes use of messianic imagery is CD VII, 12b–21, which refers to the sojourn of the community in Damascus through a midrash on Amos 5:26–27 and Num 24:15–19 (Balaam's oracle). The composition of the passage is complex, and its interpretation is debated.[88] Two figures, the "interpreter of the

---

85. Collins, "Messiahs in Context," 220–22; Vermes, *Jesus the Jew*, 132–33.

86. Knibb, "Eschatology and Messianism," 2:382, remarks that the appearances of the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel merely serve to mark the end of the period in which the first rules of the Community were to remain valid; so also Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 37.

87. George W. E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction* (2d ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005), 122–27.

88. Deichgraber, "Zur Messiaserwartung," 338–39, argues that CD A VII is a secondary reworking of CD B XIX, whose doctrine of two messiahs it appropriates. See further, Michael A. Knibb, "The Interpretation of Damascus Document VII, 9b-VIII, 2a and XIX, 5b-14," *Revue de*

law," and the "prince of the whole congregation," are identified as the star and scepter from Num 24:17b:

> And the "star" is the Interpreter of the Torah (דורש התורה) who came to Damascus, as is written: "A star stepped forth out of Jacob, and a staff arose out of Israel." The staff is the prince of all the congregation (נשיא כל העדה), and when he arises, "he will destroy all the sons of Seth." (CD VII, 18b–21a)

The term נשיא comes from the Priestly material of the Pentateuch (Exod 16:22; Num 4:34), where it refers to the tribal leaders. In Ezekiel, נשיא denotes the Davidic royal figure whom Yahweh will appoint as a shepherd over his people (Ezek 34:24; 37:25; cf. 40–48). In CD VII, the term is a sectarian title for the eschatological Davidic ideal king.[89] He appears to have a military role: annihilating Israel's enemies at the eschaton.[90]

C. D. Elledge has recently argued that the Prince of the Congregation in the Qumran Scrolls should not be identified with a Davidic messiah, but is rather the equivalent of "the Qumran latter-day warrior."[91] His cogent argument has obvious implications for the current investigation and merits further discussion. He bases his argument on four observations: (1) The נשיא העדה is never referred to as either משיח or מלך in any extant Qumran text. (2) This figure is not a king and has no abiding reign beyond his military role. (3) The associations between this figure and

---

Qumran 15 (1991): 243–51.

89. Collins, "Messiahs in Context," 218; Puech, "Messianisme, eschatologie et résurrection," 274; Knibb, "Eschatology and Messianism," 387; Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 47; *pace* Schiffman, "Messianic Figures," 118–19, who claims that "The Messiah of Israel, even if he is distinct from the Aaronide Messiah in the Damascus Document, is not singled out to be Davidic." Schiffman discusses the citation of Num 24:17 in CD VII, 19–20, but fails to note the Davidic allusion.

90. Woude, *Messianischen Vorstellungen*, 60; Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran*, 98.

91. C. D. Elledge, "The Prince of the Congregation: Qumran 'Messianism' in the Context of *Milhāmâ," in Qumran Studies: New Approaches, New Questions* (ed. Michael Thomas Davis and Brent A. Strawn; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2007), 182.

David are unclear, and occur only in two texts (4Q161, 4Q285). (4) The title, as used in the Scrolls, adapts the biblical usage as referring to a tribal intermediary between the priests and the congregation of Israel.[92]

Elledge's first observation is correct, but inconclusive. As Collins has noted, this is to confuse a term with a concept. G. G. Xeravits points out, moreover, that in at least one Qumran sectarian text, the מלך of Deut 17:17 is referred to as a נשיא (CD V, 1).[93] Here, then, is evidence that these two terms could be used interchangeably at Qumran. Elledge's second observation does not hold true for all the texts he surveys. It will be seen below that in 1QSb, for example, the נשיא does indeed establish the kingdom of God's people, and rule over the nations (see also 4Q161). As for his third observation, the fact that the נשיא העדה is correlated with Davidic imagery in two texts should count as positive, albeit slender, evidence for the royal conception of the נשיא at Qumran. What Elledge means by calling the associations between the נשיא and David "unclear" is, apparently, that the biblical precedents for the epithet, "branch of David" (Jer 23:5–6; 33:14–16; Ps 132:17–18) do not have the militaristic connotation they possess in 4Q285 and 4Q161. Elledge therefore suggests that "branch of David" is being used in these texts primarily as a militaristic designation (not unlike שבט in CD and 1QSb), rather than as a royal designation.[94] This observation is open to question. Jeremiah 23:5 has this to say of David, the righteous branch: "he shall reign as king and deal wisely, and shall execute justice (ועשה משפט) and righteousness in the land." Note the parallel

---

92. Elledge, "Prince of the Congregation," 183–206.

93. Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 147; see further Xeravits' discussion of the royal characteristics of the נשיא (149–54). Elledge does not discuss CD V, 1; nor does he seem to be aware of Xeravits' monograph. Woude, *Messianischen Vorstellungen*, 116, further suggests that the use of נשיא for מלך may constitute an implicit critique of the Hasmoneans, who illegitimately claimed for themselves the title of king.

94. Elledge, "Prince of the Congregation," 198–200.

concept and terminology in 4Q161 8–10 III, 22: "his sword will judge (תשפוט) [al]l the peoples." Clearly, the latter text envisages the execution of justice in a militaristic manner, but the idea is nevertheless clearly present in the former text as well. Moreover, the inference drawn from this debatable observation is itself questionable. Even if Jer 23 conceives of the Branch of David executing justice peacefully, and 4Q161 presents the Branch of David judging with the sword, it does not follow that the two texts are not therefore referring to the same royal figure. Elledge's final observation is problematic with regard to his treatment of the נשיא in Ezekiel 34–37 and 40–48, the most likely biblical source for the Qumran usage of this title.[95] Pointing out the juxtaposition of prophecies which envisage a Davidic king (Ezek 34:23–24; 37:24–25) and the sober legislation that portrays a Davidic prince who is a mere servant of the Temple cult (Ezek 40–48), Elledge concludes that the נשיא of Ezekiel is "not an absolute monarch, but rather the cultic patron of Ezekiel's restored Temple."[96] But as Collins rightly notes, Ezekiel's vision of the circumscribed authority of the נשיא is similar to the notion of a king subject to Torah found in Deut 17:18–20 and 11QTemple LVI, 12–LIX, 21.[97] Elledge's careful study helpfully cautions against harmonizing the Qumranic נשיא with the "Messiahs" of 1QS, 1QSa, 4Q174, and 4Q252. The characterization of the נשיא warrants greater nuancing, given the redefinition of this figure's role in Ezekiel. Nevertheless, the title may be seen to evoke the expectation of a coming ideal king.

---

95. Elledge, "Prince of the Congregation," 202–6. Pomykala, *Davidic Dynasty Tradition*, 241, and John J. Collins, "The Nature of Messianism in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Their Historical Context* (ed. Timothy H. Lim, et al.; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000), 204–6, both support Ezekiel as the background for the concept of the נשיא at Qumran.

96. Elledge, "Prince of the Congregation," 203.

97. Collins, "Nature of Messianism," 204–6. Collins notes further the chastened view of the king in Ps 132:11–12, and the scathing Deuteronomistic attack of 1 Sam 8 (202–03). See further Pomykala, *Davidic Dynasty Tradition*, 234–37, and the section dealing with 11QTemple below.

2.2.2.2. Rule of Benedictions (1QSb)

Another appendix to the *Rule of the Community*, 1QSb is a fragmentary series of eschatological blessings for various figures.[98] In column V, 20–29 the Prince of the Congregation is blessed. The benediction envisages an eschatological king:

> [20]For the Master, to bless the Prince of the Congregation who [. . .] [21]his [strength] and the covenant of the Community he (God) shall renew (יחדש) for himself, (so as) to raise up the kingdom of his people for eve[r . . .] [22][and to] reprove with fair[ness the h]umble of the [l]and, and to walk before him perfectly in all the way[s of God] [23]and to raise up a covenan[t . . . a re]fuge for those who seek hi[m . . .] [. . .] (May) the Lord (raise you) to eternal heights, and (make you) like a mighty tower on an [24]inaccessible wall *wh* [. . .] with might of your [mouth], with your scepter may you devastate the land, and by the breath of your lips [25]may you kill the wicked [ones . . . counsel] and everlasting strength, spirit [. . .] knowledge, and fear of God. May [26]righteousness (be) the loincloth of [. . .] loincloth of *h*[. . .], [and] may he make your horns iron and your hooves of bronze; [27]may you gore as a young b[ull . . . the peo]ples like mud of the streets. For God raised you up as a rod [28]for the rulers be[fore you. . . . And all the na]tions shall serve you. And he shall strengthen you with his holy Name, [29]and you shall be like a li[on . . .]*kh* prey and without dwel[ling]. And they shall pursue your messengers upon (1QSb V, 21–29)

The blessing is clearly based upon Isa 11:2–5, which envisages an ideal Davidic king. In particular, the themes of righteousness and the subjection of the nations are drawn from the repertoire of Davidic tradition.[99] Although not the case with the majority of Qumran sectarian writings, 1QSb appears to expect an Davidic messiah.[100] Several observations may be made about this figure's role as he appears

---

98. Woude, *Messianischen Vorstellungen*, 106; Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 30–32. Fitzmyer, *Christian Origins*, 100, notes however, that the phrase באחרית הימים, "at the end of days" does not exist in the text, and so considers its eschatological context far from certain.

99. Maier, "Messias oder Gesalbter?" 607.

100. Woude, *Messianischen Vorstellungen*, 114; Schiffman, "Messianic Figures," 122; Abegg, "Seeing Double?" 135–36; Oegema, "Messianic Expectations," 58; Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran*, 59; Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 32; Collins and Collins, *King and Messiah*, 63–64. John J. Collins, "What Was Distinctive About Messianic Expectation at Qumran?" in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Second Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins* (vol. 2; ed. James H. Charlesworth; Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2006), 82–83, further notes the twofold resemblance of this passage to *Ps. Sol.* 17: the reliance on

here: (1) God will renew the covenant on behalf of the king, thereby establishing his kingdom.[101] As a consequence, (2) the king will judge justly, and (3) walk perfectly before Yahweh. (4) He will be empowered by Yahweh to defeat Yahweh's enemies ("the land"; "the wicked ones"; "the peoples"). Finally, (5) his reign over all the nations implies the establishment of peace.[102] God, it should be noted, is the one who establishes and empowers. The king functions as his agent of restoration.[103]

2.2.2.3. War Scroll (1QM); 4QSefer ha-Milḥamah (4Q285)

The *War Scroll* looks forward to an eschatological war between Israel and her enemies. The "prince of the whole congregation" is mentioned only once in passing, in 1QM V, 1, where he appears to be a royal figure, the highest military-political authority of the end times.[104] Column XI attributes the final victory to God, who in the past ensured the victory of David over Goliath, and of Israel's kings (lines 1–3). The text then quotes Num 24:17–19 as evidence of God's promise

---

Isa 11:1–4, and the militant role of the Prince.

101. Woude, *Messianischen Vorstellungen*, 114, takes God to be the subject of יחדש in line 21. Puech, "Messianisme, eschatologie et résurrection," 273, observes that the renewal of the covenant recalls the נשיא of Ezek 40–48.

102. Woude, *Messianischen Vorstellungen*, 115; Odo Camponovo, *Königtum, Königsherrschaft und Reich Gottes in den frühjüdischen Schriften* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984), 269, furthermore claim that this implies a political function.

103. Woude, *Messianischen Vorstellungen*, 115: "Der Messias fungiert als Heils*organ*: er ist das göttliche Mittel zur Wiederherstellung des Königtums" (author's emphasis).

104. So Woude, *Messianischen Vorstellungen*, 135; Maier, "Messias oder Gesalbter?" 611; Puech, "Messianisme, eschatologie et résurrection," 273; Oegema, "Messianic Expectations," 68–69; Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 78–79; Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 144; see further Yigael Yadin, *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light Against the Sons of Darkness* (trans. Chaim Rabin; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962), 278. Knibb, "Eschatology and Messianism," 393, points out that the Prince of the Congregation is implied to be Israel's military leader, yet is not presented in messianic terms.

that Israel's deliverance would come not from their own strength, but by God's strength in the form of his royal agent.[105]

4QSefer ha-Milḥamah (4Q285) is thought to be related to the *War Scroll*, although the precise relationship between them is unclear.[106] Fragments 6 and 4 refer three times to the "Prince of the Congregation"(נשיא העדה), but no further information can be gleaned from the context. A subsequent fragment (4Q285 5) begins with a quotation of Isa 10:34–11:1:

> [1][. . . as] the Prophet Isaiah [said] «And [they] shall cut [the most massive of the] [2][forest with iron and Lebanon, with its magnificence, will] fall. A shoot (חוטר) will emerge from the stump of Jesse [. . .] [3][. . .] the bud of David (צמח דויד). And they will go into battle *blank* with [. . .] [4][. . .] and the Prince of the Congregation will kill him, the bu[d of David . . .] [5][. . .] and with wounds. And [the High] Priest will command [. . .] [6][. . . the s]lai[n of the] Kitti[m . . .] (4Q285 5 1–6)

The syntax of the phrase following the lacuna in line 4 is notoriously difficult to decipher: [. . . דויד ח]צם והמיתו נשיא העדה. This could be translated as, "and the Prince of the Congregation will kill him, the bu[d of David . . .]," which envisages the slaying of the Branch of David by the Prince of the Congregation.[107] Alternately, it could be read, "and the Leader of the nation—the Bra[nch of David]—will have him put to death."[108] The scholarly consensus is that the second alternative is correct.[109] Such a translation understands צמח דויד to be in apposition

---

105. Schiffman, "Messianic Figures," 122–23, contends that the interpretation of Num 24:17–19 here is non-eschatological; but cf. Collins, "Messiahs in Context," 219. Strictly speaking, Schiffman is correct: the passage looks backwards to God's historical deliverance of Israel. Yet the whole point of the remembrance is to assert that as God has always done, so he will do in the final battle against Israel's enemies.

106. Martin G. Abegg, Jr., "Messianic Hope and 4Q285: A Reassessment," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 113 (1994): 82–83; cf. Elledge, "Prince of the Congregation," 191, who contends that 4Q285 is an independent text, although heavily influenced by 1QM.

107. García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 2:643.

108. Wise, et al., *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 293.

109. Collins, "Messiahs in Context," 215; VanderKam, "Messianism," 217–18; Abegg,

to נשיא העדה, thus identifying the Prince of the Congregation with the Branch of David, who is the subject of the verb to kill. H. Stegemann understands the fragment to be referring to the Prince of the Congregation as a Davidic Messiah, whose execution of a judicial sentence is evidence of his juridical role.[110] The end of the fragment mentions "[. . . the s]lai[n of the] Kitti[m . . .]" (line 6). Several scholars have hypothesized that 4Q285 belongs to a tradition concerning the end of the eschatological war, and perhaps envisages the slaying of the King of the Kittim (who is mentioned in 1QM XV, 2) by a messianic figure. If so, then 4Q285 is of value in that it correlates two messianic titles (Branch of David, Prince of the Congregation) with a single figure to whom it attributes an eschatological warrior function, seen as the fulfillment of prophecy in Isa 11:1–5.[111]

2.2.3. *Exegetical texts.* Several exegetical texts refer to an expected ideal royal figure. Although its allusion to just such a figure is too fleeting to warrant its consideration below, 4QTestimonia (4Q175) should be mentioned. This collection of messianic proof texts quotes without comment Deut 18:18–19, Num 24:15–17, and Deut 33:8–11, three Scripture passages which appear to envision a coming prophet, king, and priest, respectively.[112]

"Reassessment," 87–91; Puech, "Messianisme, eschatologie et résurrection," 275; Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran*, 83–86–87; Fitzmyer, *Christian Origins*, 101–3; Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 66.

110. Hartmut Stegemann, *The Library of Qumran: On the Essenes, Qumran, John the Baptist, and Jesus* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1998), 103; so also Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran*, 93–96.

111. Collins, "Messiahs in Context," 215–17; Abegg, "Reassessment," 81–91; Puech, "Messianisme, eschatologie et résurrection," 275.

112. Maier, "Messias oder Gesalbter?" 599–600; Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 59; Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 132.

2.2.3.1. 4QpIsaiah[a] (4Q161)

The messianic terminology and scripture used here evinces a parallel to 1QSb and 4Q285. Fragments 2–6 interpret Isa 10:22–28 to refer to the Prince of the Congregation's participation in an eschatological battle (lines 13–25).[113] Lines 11–16 of the subsequent fragments 8–10 quote Isa 11:1–5, which is interpreted to refer to a Davidic messiah:

> [18][The interpretation of the word concerns the shoot] of David (דיוד [צמח]) which will sprout in the fi[nal days, since] [19][with the breath of his lips he will execute] his [ene]my and God will support him with [the spirit of c]ourage [. . .] [20][. . . thro]ne of glory, h[oly] crown and multi-colour[ed] vestments [21][. . .] in his hand. He will rule over all the pe[ople]s and Magog [22][. . .] his sword will judge [al]l the peoples. And as for what he says: «He will not [23][judge by appearances] or give verdicts on hearsay», its interpretation: which [24][. . .] and according to what they teach him, he will judge, and upon their authority [25][. . .] with him will go out one of the priests of renown, holding in his hand clothes (of) (4Q161 frags. 8–10 III,18–25)

This ideal king will arise in the last days to execute the enemy of God and rule over the nations, possibly judging according to the rulings of the high priest.[114] This figure is filled with the divine spirit, which is manifested in the "throne of glory" (סא כבוד[כ], line 20). This image may connote the royal power given by God (cf. Isa 22:23).[115] Noting that both the Prince of the Congregation and the shoot of David both participate in an eschatological battle, Collins identifies the two figures with each other. Three texts (1QSb; 4Q285; 4Q161) have now been seen to use the same scriptural base (Isa 11), the same terminology (Prince of the Congregation;

---

113. נשיא העדה appears clearly in line 15, and possibly again in line 22, according to the reconstruction of Wise, et al., *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 210.

114. Schiffman, "Messianic Figures," 124. Maier, "Messias oder Gesalbter?" 608, claims that he is subject to priestly instruction.

115. Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 54.

Shoot/Branch of David), and the same vision of a royal warrior messiah whose rule over the nations implies the establishment of peace.[116]

2.2.3.2. 4QFlorilegium (4Q174)

This fragmentary text employs midrashic,[117] or perhaps *pesher*-like[118] exegesis to a handful of biblical texts centered around the theme of house or place: the Temple, the Community, and the house of David. The beginning of the passage cites Exod 15:17–18, which speaks of the establishment of the temple, and concludes with the affirmation, "Yahweh will reign for ever and ever" (4Q174 1–2 I, 3). Yahweh is thus portrayed as ruling as king.[119] Yahweh's promise to give David rest in 2 Sam 7:11 is interpreted to mean destruction of the army of Belial:

> And (that) which he said to David, "And I [shall give] you [rest] from all your enemies," that (is) he will give them rest from a[ll] the sons of Belial (4Q174 1–2 I, 7–8)

Yahweh's promise in 2 Sam 7:12–14 to establish the kingdom for David is interpreted with the help of Amos 9:11:

> And Yahweh [decl]ares to you that he will build you a house. "And I will raise up your offspring after you, and I will establish his royal throne [for e]ver. I will be a father to him, and he shall be a son to me." He (is) the Shoot of David (צמח דויד) who will arise with the Interpreter of the Torah who [. . .] in Zi[on in the] latter days, as it is written, And I will raise up the booth of David that is fallen. He (is) the booth of David that is falle[n who will arise to save Israel (4Q174 frags 1–2 I, 10–13)

---

116. Collins, "Messiahs in Context," 216–17; so also Puech, "Messianisme, eschatologie et résurrection," 275; Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran*, 70–71; cf. Abegg, "Seeing Double?" 136–37.

117. Puech, "Messianisme, eschatologie et résurrection," 277; Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran*, 99.

118. Maier, "Messias oder Gesalbter?" 601.

119. Camponovo, *Königtum*, 284.

The צמח דויד is clearly a reference to a future Davidic king, who will appear with his eschatological counterpart, the דורש תורה.[120] The exegesis of *Florilegium* thus sees God's promises to David as the basis of hope for a coming ideal king whose relationship to God the king is characterized by the metaphor of sonship, and who will save Israel by defeating her enemies.[121]

2.2.3.3. 4QCommentary on Genesis A (4Q252)

Column V of this text is either a midrash or pesher of Gen 49:10, a text which receives a distinctly messianic interpretation. The text reads,

> A ruler[122] shall [not] depart from the tribe of Judah when there is dominion for Israel; [there will not] be cut off one sitting (on) the throne for David. For "the staff" is the covenant of the kingdom; [and the thou]sands of Israel are "the standards" (VACAT) until the righteousness messiah (משיח הצדך) comes, the Branch of David (משיח הצדק צמח דיוד). For to him and to his seed has been given the covenant of the kingdm (over) his people for everlasting generations, who kept [. . .] the Torah with the men of the Community (4Q252 V, 1–5)

Here, the branch or scion of David is clearly identified with the messiah of righteousness. The term משיח is being used in a titular sense here to refer to an eschatological king.[123] In giving a messianic interpretation to Gen 49:10 (in which no mention of a messiah is made), this text thus makes explicit "the implicit thrust

---

120. Schiffman, "Messianic Figures," 125; Fitzmyer, *Christian Origins*, 88; Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 56. Puech, "Messianisme, eschatologie et résurrection," 278, takes this to be a critique of the Hasmonean dynasty, who appropriated both royal and priestly power, while possessing the lineage for neither; cf. Ehrlich, "Beitrag," 241.

121. Collins and Collins, *King and Messiah*, 63–64; Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran*, 111. Oegema, "Messianic Expectations," 77, further adds that within the framework of 4Q174, "the liberator of the latter day is portrayed as the Davidic king messiah, whose task it is to erect the Torah in Israel." The text does not appear to support a connection between the king and Torah, however.

122. Gen 49:10 reads שבט (scepter), but 4Q252 reads שליט (ruler). Fitzmyer, *Christian Origins*, 87, rightly notes that this is a significant modification. It is brought out in the translation of Wise, et al., *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 277.

123. Woude, *Messianischen Vorstellungen*, 171; Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran*, 124; Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 63.

of the Old Testament."[124] One also notes that the king is to keep the Torah along with the Community.[125]

2.2.4. *Other texts.* A number of texts could be adduced as further evidence of messianic expectation at Qumran. The treatment of a royal ideal figure in certain of these texts has been refuted.[126] Other texts do speak of such a figure, but the evidence they present is merely corroborative.[127] Among these, the following texts provide the most significant data needed for assembling the portrait of the ideal king at Qumran.

2.2.4.1. 4QAramaic Apocalypse (4Q246)

This Aramaic fragment consisting of two columns is often referred to as the "Son of God" text because of its noteworthy mention of a figure who is known both

---

124. Fitzmyer, *Christian Origins*, 88. Abegg, "Seeing Double?" 134, further notes that the connection between messiah and branch of David is made with reference to Jer 23:5; 33:15. Puech, "Messianisme, eschatologie et résurrection," 277, further contends that the emphasis upon the righteousness and legitimacy of the Davidic messiah is an implicit critique of the Hasmoneans.

125. Oegema, "Messianic Expectations," 73 Maier, "Messias oder Gesalbter?" 600, contends that the use of the term "righteousness" to describe the messiah emphasizes the messiah's subjection to Torah, and corresponds to his function as the model of correct Torah piety, and the one who ensures observance of Torah (*Torah-Erteiler*); see further his discussion of the king in relation to Torah in the OT (591–94)..

126. Lidija Novakovic, "4Q521: The Works of the Messiah or the Signs of the Messianic Time?" in *Qumran Studies: New Approaches, New Questions* (ed. Michael Thomas Davis and Brent A. Strawn; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2007), 214–15, shows that the case for a Davidic messiah in 4Q521, for example, is based upon an erroneous transcription and translation; so also Maier, "Messias oder Gesalbter?" 611–12. Michael Becker, "4Q521 und die Gesalbten," *RevQ* 18 (1997): 73–96, argues that it is a prophet who is anointed. Cf. Émile Puech, "Messianisme, eschatologie et résurrection dans les manuscrits de la mer Morte," *RevQ* 18 (1997): 271–272; André Caquot, "Deux textes messianiques de Qumrân," *RHPR* 79 (1999): 163–171, who argue for a messianic reading.

127. See, e.g., the treatment of non-sectarian Qumran texts in Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 82–128. Pomykala, *Davidic Dynasty Tradition*, 172–80, argues that 4QWords of the Luminaries (4Q504) 1–2 IV, 6–8, merely rehearse the establishment of the Davidic covenant, but do not look forward to a messianic figure. Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran*, 170–203, makes the case that the "elect of God" in 4Q534 is an *Enoch redivivus* who shares a connection with royal messianic traditions in the OT.

as "son of God" and "son of the Most High." The first column is torn down the middle, so that only the second half of each line survives. Bearing in mind that any reconstruction of a such a text must be regarded tentatively, it will be helpful to quote here Fitzmyer's reconstruction, as it will provide a context for the second column:

> [1][When great awe] settled [u]pon him, he fell down before the throne [2][and said to him, "Live,] O King, forever! You are distressed, and changed is [3][your complexion. I shall interpret, O Ki]ng, your vision, and all that is coming in the future. [4][For by the hand of m]ighty [kings] shall distress come upon the land; [5][there shall be war among the peoples] and great carnage in the provinces. [6][At the end of days] the king of Assyria [and E]gypt [will perish]. [7][Then shall arise a king, and he shall be] great upon the earth. [8][All peoples sh]all make [peace with him]; they shall all serve [9][him. For] he shall be called [the holy one of] the [G]reat [God], and by His name shall he be named. (4Q246 I, 1–9)[128]

In Fitzmyer's reconstruction, the text speaks of a seer who interprets a king's troubling dream in which his land is attacked by foreign kings. At the end of days, a king will arise. This figure is further identified in the second column, which is fully preserved:

> [1]He will be called son of God, and they will call him son of the Most High. Like the sparks [2]that you saw, so will their kingdom be; they will rule several year[s] over [3]the earth and crush everything; a people will crush another people, and a province another provi[n]ce. [4]*Blank* Until the people of God arises and makes everyone rest from the sword. *Blank* [5]His[129] kingdom will be an eternal kingdom, and all his paths in truth. He will jud[ge] [6]the earth in truth and all will make peace. The sword will cease from the earth, [7]and all the provinces will pay him homage. The great God is his strength, [8]he will wage war for him; he will place the peoples in his hand and [9]cast them all away before him. His rule will be an eternal rule, and all the abysses (4Q246 II, 1–9)

---

128. Fitzmyer, *Christian Origins*, 44–45; see further his notes (46–49); and the translation and notes of Caquot, "Deux textes messianiques," 156–58.

129. Wise, et al., *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 270, translate all the possessive suffixes in lines 5–9 as third person plurals, taking the referent to be "the people of God." Fitzmyer's translation is to be preferred, since the actions of this agent are characteristic of the rule of a king (e.g., "he shall judge the land with truth"; cf. *Ps. Sol.* 17:29; Ps 72:1-2); so also Collins and Collins, *King and Messiah*, 67; Knibb, "Eschatology and Messianism," 394; Caquot, "Deux textes messianiques," 156–57.

There is general agreement that "their kingdom" in line 2 refers back to the enemy kings of the king's vision from column I. There is substantial disagreement, however, regarding the identity of the figure referred to as the "son of God" and "son of the Most High," and the relationship between this person and the entity referred to by third person masculine pronouns in lines 5–9. Two interpretive possibilities will be considered here.[130] Fitzmyer argues that the Son of God refers positively to a coming, *non*-eschatological, Jewish ruler.[131] Collins contends that the person so designated is a messianic figure.[132] Fitzmyer's rejection of a messianic reading is based upon: (1) the absence of the term משיח; (2) the fact that in the OT, the titles "son of God" and "son of the Most High" are neither synonymous nor refer to the Messiah; and (3) such an interpretation depends upon messianic reading of OT passages (2 Sam 7:12–16; 23:5; Gen 49:10–12; Pss 2; 89; 110; Isa 9–11; Zech 3:8; 6:12), which would not have been so read in pre-Christian Jewish tradition. At most, Fitzmyer allows that certain OT passages (1 Sam 2:10, 35; Ps 132:17) envisage what has been called "restorative monarchism," but do not directly reflect the notion of messianism.[133] He thus concludes that this text is

---

130. Fitzmyer, *Christian Origins*, 55–58, notes in addition four other interpretations that attempt to identify this person: (1) negatively, as an historical king of Syria; (2) negatively, as a coming Antichrist; (3) positively, as a heavenly or angelic savior; (4) collectively, as the Jewish people. These options are persuasively refuted by Fitzmyer, and also by Collins and Collins, *King and Messiah*, 67–71; see further Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran*, 153–58. Caquot, "Deux textes messianiques," 161, regards the figure in lines 5–9 to be messianic, but not to be identified with the "son of God" in line 1.

131. Fitzmyer, *Christian Origins*, 41–61.

132. Collins and Collins, *King and Messiah*, 65–74; cf. Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 88–89, who regards the presence of Davidic allusions to be probable, but only goes so far as to label this person as a "positive eschatological protagonist."

133. See further Joachim Becker, *Messianic Expectation in the Old Testament* (trans. David E. Green; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980), 54–57.

> speaking positively of a coming Jewish ruler, who may be a successor to the Davidic throne, but who is not envisaged as a Messiah. The text should be understood as a sectarian affirmation of belief in God's provision and guarantee of a royal dynasty for Israel.[134]

Collins defends his interpretation by maintaining that: the use of the title "son of God" to denote an anointed king indeed finds its basis in OT passages such as Ps 2 and 2 Sam 7; the passage is apocalyptic and speaks of a coming king; and the absence of the term משיח is not decisive. The insistence on the presence of this term as the *sine qua non* of a messianic text is a failure to recognize that a variety of terms were used to denote a messianic figure.[135]

While it appears that Collins has the upper hand in this debate, it is not necessary to decide in favor of either interpretation. One may infer from Fitzmyer's conclusion that if the text looks forward positively to a non-eschatological Jewish king, such a person would embody all the best traits of Israel's kings, both historical and ideal. Whether or not this king is understood as a Messiah, he surely is conceived of as an ideal king. The following observations distill the portrait of this figure: (1) he enjoys a position of extraordinary intimacy with God, as the metaphorical sonship imagery connotes; (2) he will reign over an eternal kingdom; (3) he will rule justly;[136] (4) his reign will bring peace; and (5) his victory in war is achieved through the strength of God.

---

134. Fitzmyer, *Christian Origins*, 60.

135. See further Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran*, 159–70, who argues extensively for a messianic interpretation on the basis of parallel usage of the phrase "son of God," structural and syntactical elements within the passage, and tradition-historical connections to Jewish royal ideology.

136. Fitzmyer, *Christian Origins*, 52, notes that the phrase "in truth" (lines 5, 6) can also be translated "in righteousness"; cf. *Ps. Sol* 17:29.

2.2.4.2. 11QTemple[a] (11Q19)

The *Temple Scroll* presents itself as a rewriting of Torah. The fact that it is written in the first person singular strongly suggests that it was intended to be read as Torah received from the lips of Yahweh, and thus the definitive interpretation of Torah for the Qumran Covenanters.[137] The final section consists of a rewriting of Deut 12–23, and includes the so-called Law of the King, an expansion of Deut 17:14–20 (11Q19 LVI, 12–LIX, 21). This text is not looking forward to a royal messiah, but is rather a revisionist text, which prescribes the requirements for a current political leader in terms of an ideal Jewish king.[138] The passage opens with a modified quotation of Deut 17:14–20, which it uses as a springboard to address the following topics: the command to appoint a king and the prerequisites for a king; the king's role vis-à-vis the army, royal guard, and the prosecution of war; the king's council; marriage requirements; and the avoidance of corruption. A Deuteronomistic rehearsal of curses and blessings provides the conclusion. Several observations can be made about the role of the ideal king.[139] (1) As Schiffman

---

137. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 154–59.

138. Lawrence H. Schiffman, *The Courtyards of the House of the Lord: Studies on the Temple Scroll* (ed. Florentino García Martínez; Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 75; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 490. (This chapter was originally published as "The King, His Guard, and the Royal Council in the *Temple Scroll*," *PAAJR* 54 [1987]: 237-59.) John J. Collins, "Teacher and Messiah? The One Who Will Teach Righteousness at the End of Days," in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Eugene Ulrich and James VanderKam; CJAS 10; Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994), 200–202, observes a qualitative difference between the fallible king in this text and the perfect king in messianic texts such as 1QSb and *Ps. Sol.* 17. C. D. Elledge, *The Statutes of the King: The Temple Scroll's Legislation on Kingship, 11Q19 LVI 12-LIX 21* (CahRB 56; Paris: Gabalda, 2004), 42, 227, considers the constitution governing the king to be "both utopian and practical;" the prevailing *ethos* is anti-Hellenistic, and the reformist polemic is likely directed towards the abuses of the early Hasmonean dynasty.

139. These are culled from the discussion in Yigael Yadin, *The Temple Scroll: The Hidden Law of the Dead Sea Sect* (New York: Random House, 1985), 192–204; Johann Maier, *The Temple Scroll: An Introduction, Translation & Commentary* (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 34; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985), 123–28; Pomykala, *Davidic Dynasty*

notes, the Law of the King considers the appointment of the king to be a *requirement* for the present order (LVI, 14).[140] (2) The sole prerequisite for the king is that he must be an Israelite, although Davidic descent is not stipulated (LVI, 15). He must also take a single Israelite wife (LVII, 15–18). (3)The king's powers are circumscribed. His acquisition of horses, wives and wealth is to be limited (LVI, 15–19). He is, moreover, subordinate to the priests: the priests, not the king, are to write out the Torah for the king (LVI, 20–LVII, 1);[141] the king may not act without consulting a council consisting of twelve priests, twelve Levites, and twelve lay leaders (LVII, 11–15); and he must consult with the High Priest on military affairs (LVIII, 18–20). These stipulations ensure that the king rules in accordance with the Torah as it is presented in the *Temple Scroll.*[142] (4) The king's royal guard are charged not only with protection, but also with ensuring the moral rectitude of the king (LVII, 5–11).[143] (5) The king must avoid corruption, here understood as the perversion of justice and the confiscation of private property (LVII, 19–21). (6) Finally, dynastic preservation is conditional upon the king keeping God's

---

Tradition, 234–37; Schiffman, *Courtyards*, 489–517. See further the conceptual parallels drawn between the Temple Scroll and *Letter of Aristeas* by Doron Mendels, "'On Kingship' in the 'Temple Scroll' and the Ideological *Vorlage* of the Seven Banquets in the 'Letter of Aristeas to Philocrates'," *Aegyptus* 59 (1979): 131–36.

140. Schiffman, *Courtyards*, 490.

141. This is a change from Deut 17:18, in which the king himself is commanded to write a copy of the Torah. Yadin, *Hidden Law*, 193–94, contends that the "Torah" in question is that which follows in the text of the *Temple Scroll.*

142. Schiffman, *Courtyards*, 499 Elledge, *Statutes of the King*, 51–53, 127–41, contends that the depiction of the king as subservient to the priests is a polemic against the Hasmonean amalgamation of the offices of king and priest.

143. Elledge, *Statutes of the King*, 119–26; implied as well may be a polemic against the Hasmonean practice of hiring mercenaries.

commandments. If he does so, God will grant him peace and maintain his kingdom for his sons. If he fails to do so, he will be cut off (LIX, 13–21).[144]

2.2.5. *Summary and conclusions.* In contrast to *Ps. Sol.* 17, the Qumran Scrolls do not evidence a consistent hope for a coming Davidic messiah.[145] Gleaning both from texts that clearly envisage a royal messiah, and from those that idealize Israel's historical kings, the following appear to be the salient characteristics of the ideal king as conceived at Qumran.[146] (1) This person's authority and functions are limited in scope, and often subordinated to the High Priest (1QSa; 11Q19). (2) This king is to be righteous, and subject to Torah (4Q252; 11Q19). (3) Although allusion to Davidic descent is often made (4Q161; 4Q174; 4Q285), lineage is not the primary accent (11Q19). (4) Rather, the king's juridical (1QSb; 4Q161; 4Q285) and martial (1QSb; 1QM; 4Q161; 4Q285) roles are predominant. (5) His victory in battle is ensured by Yahweh (4Q246). (6) His intimate relationship to God is reflected by use of the ancient Near Eastern tradition of divine adoption (also found in the OT) (4Q174; 4Q246). (7) His just rule will bring peace (1QSb; 4Q161; 4Q246; 11Q19). (8) He establishes his rule by restoring the Covenant, and he maintains his rule by keeping the Covenant and walking in righteousness (1QSb; 11Q19).

---

144. Elledge, *Statutes of the King*, 233–34.

145. This does not negate the fact that the ideal king in *Ps. Sol.* 17 shares much in common with certain depictions of the ideal king at Qumran (e.g., as in 1QSb); see Collins, "Distinctive," 81–87.

146. See the summaries in Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 205–13, 226–28.

3. *Egyptian Jewish Literature*

3.1. *Sibylline Oracles*

Book 3 of the Sibylline Oracles is a compilation of prophetic oracles composed between the second and first centuries B.C.E., most likely in Egypt.[147] Although extensive redaction is commonly theorized, the following survey will deal with the final form of the text, as it represents the constellation of thought available to a reader from the first century C.E.[148] Of the fourteen extant Sibylline Oracles, book 3 exhibits what may be termed "royal eschatology—the expectation of radical and decisive change to be brought about by a king or kingdom."[149] In the following passages, scholars have argued for the existence of one or more of the following three types of ideal king: (1) an historical Jewish or gentile king; (2) a future gentile

---

147. The critical edition consulted here is that of Johannes Geffcken, *Die Oracula sibyllina* (Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller; Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1902), compared with the Greek-German edition of Jorg-Dieter Gauger, *Sibyllinische Weissagungen: Griechisch-Deutsch* (Sammlung Tusculum; Dusseldorf: Artemis, 1998). The English translation is by John J. Collins, "Sibylline Oracles," in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. James H. Charlesworth; ABRL; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1983–85), 1:317–472.

148. John J. Collins, *The Sibylline Oracles of Egyptian Judaism* (SBLDS 13; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars' Press, 1974), 24–28, dates what he terms the "core corpus" (vss. 97–349, 489–829) to the mid 2nd c. B.C.E., while vss. 350–488 constitute a 1st c. B.C.E. addition, and vss. 1–96 comprise the ending to the mostly lost book 2. So also Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 194; John R. Bartlett, *Jews in the Hellenistic World: Josephus, Aristeas, the Sibylline Oracles, Eupolemus* (Cambridge Commentaries on Writings of the Jewish and Christian World, 200 BC to AD 200 1.1; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 38–39. By contrast, Valentin Nikiprowetzky, *La troisième Sibylle* (Études juives 9; Paris: Mouton, 1970), 60–70, 195–225, argues that book 3 is a literary unity composed ca. 42 B.C.E.. Rieuwerd Buitenwerf, *Book III of the Sibylline Oracles and Its Social Setting: With an Introduction, Translation, and Commentary* (SVTP 17; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 124–134: a literary unity of Asian provenance, dating from between 80–40 B.C.E. See also, Erich S. Gruen, *Heritage and Hellenism: The Reinvention of Jewish Tradition* (Hellenistic Culture and Society 30; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), 269–85, who critiques all attempts to locate this text in a specific historical and geographical context. See further the recent critique of Buitenwerf and Gruen in John J. Collins, "The Third Sibyl Revisited," in *Jewish Cult and Hellenistic Culture: Essays on the Jewish Encounter with Hellenism and Roman Rule* (JSJSup 100; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 82–98.

149. Collins, *Sibylline Oracles*, 35.

king who will have some role in the eschaton; and (3) a future Jewish king who will act as Yahweh's agent in the eschaton. The first two cannot be called a "Messiah" in the narrow sense of the term. All three provide insight into the diverse understanding of what constituted an ideal king in Jewish thought.

The beginning section of book three may be read as an introduction to world history, starting with the fall of the tower of Babylon, proceeding through a euhemeristic account of the battle between Cronus and the Titans, and concluding with a list of world kingdoms (97–161).[150] Of significance for the present discussion, this passage "introduces the theme of world kingship and shows that it was a cause of strife from the beginning."[151] Kingship is not viewed as entirely negative, however. Four oracles in the main body of the work demonstrate a perceptible pattern: (1) transgression, usually idolatry, (2) leads to disaster, (3) which is resolved through the agency of a king: (a) 162–195, (b) 196–294, (c) 545–656, and (d) 657–808.[152] Although it does not fit this pattern, another oracle (350–80) merits discussion, as it envisages the *homonoia* that will result when Asia defeats Rome.

(a) The first of these passages (162–195) gives an overview of world history, conceived of as a succession of kingdoms, beginning with Solomon and ending with Rome, which is denounced both for immorality and impiety.[153] The reign of Rome

---

150. Nikiprowetzky, *La troisième Sibylle*, 87–88, maintains that the author does not recount history so much as employ a religio-philosophical system (*une gnose historique*) as a vehicle for illustrating parenetic themes.

151. John J. Collins, *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora* (2d ed.; The Biblical Resource Series; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2000), 87.

152. Collins, *Sibylline Oracles*, 35–37.

153. According to Elemer Kocsis, "Ost-West Gegensatz in den jüdischen Sibyllinen," *NovT* 5 (1962): 105–110, the depiction of Rome ("a vast barbarian people," 520) and Greece as the source of untold suffering reflects the east-west conflict schema, which provides the framework for the entire book. Erich S. Gruen, *Heritage and Hellenism*, 285–87, maintains that Rome alone is the

will continue, it is predicted, "until the seventh reign, when a king of Egypt, who will be of the Greeks by race, will rule. And then the people of the great God will again be strong who will be guides in life for all mortals" (192–95). The role of this king, evidently a non-Jew, is to bring to an end the evil empire of Rome.[154] Coincident with his reign, God's people will return to a position of world leadership. The precise nature of the correlation between these two events is not clarified, however. In addition to this "seventh king" (mentioned twice more in 318 and 608), savior kings appear in the three successive oracles noted above. The identity and role of these kings is a matter of some debate.

(b) The second oracle (196–294) provides details to the account of world history, focusing on the exile and restoration of the Jews. Using the future tense to relate a past event, the author writes,

> And then the heavenly God will send a king and will judge each man (καὶ τότε δὴ θεὸς οὐράνιος πέμψει βασιλῆα, κρινεῖ δ' ἄνδρα ἕκαστον) in blood and the gleam of fire. There is a certain royal tribe whose race will never stumble. This too, as time pursues its cyclic course, will reign, and it will begin to raise up a new temple of God. (286–90)

The king envisaged here is Cyrus the Great of Persia, seen through the lens of Isa 45. It is a *vaticinium ex eventu*, not a prediction of a coming messiah.[155] The

---

target of the polemic. Karl-Wilhelm Niebuhr, *Gesetz und Paranese: Katechismusartige Weisungsreihen in der fruhjudischen Literatur* (WUNT 2/28; Tübingen: Mohr, 1987), 170–171, argues that the depiction of pagan nations as reprobate has a parenetic intent: to exhort the Diaspora readership to cleave to Torah and to abandon the idolatrous ways of their neighbors, whose fate is destruction.

154. Buitenwerf, *Book III of the Sibylline Oracles*, 184–90, argues that the "seventh king" refers to an unidentified Ptolemaic king, taking "seventh" as a symbolic indicator of predetermined completion. Bartlett, *Jews in the Hellenistic World*, 48; Collins, *Athens and Jerusalem*, 848–87, claim that it refers most likely to the second reign of Ptolemy VI Philometer (180–164, 163–145) or (less likely) his son Ptolemy VII Neos Philopator (145–144). Camponovo, *Königtum*, 338, takes the "seventh reign" merely as a figurative temporal marker of the apex of the Jewish people. Camponovo further suggests that the placement of Solomon and Rome and the beginning and end of the oracle is intended to idealize the former as it demonizes the latter.

155. Contra John Nolland, "Sib Or III. 265–94: An Early Maccabean Messianic Oracle," *JTS* 30 (1979): 158–167, who reads this passage as reflecting an early Maccabean era hope that the

"royal tribe" should be understood simply as the Jewish people, not as a reference to a specific royal figure, much less a Davidic scion.[156] Much in the same way as in the previous passage, the future reign of God's people is correlated to the activity of a pagan king. Although it is clear that this person acts as God's agent,[157] neither his activity nor its correlation with the reign of God's people is specified.[158]

(c) The third oracle (545–656) speaks of divine judgment effected through the agency of a king. This time, the king is from Asia, and the judgment falls upon Egypt. During the reign of "the young seventh king of Egypt" (608), "a great king will come from Asia, a blazing eagle, who will cover the whole land with infantry and cavalry" (611–12). The effects of this invasion are twofold. The first is the conversion of the Egyptians: "Then they will bend a white knee on the fertile ground to God the great immortal king" (616–17). The second is the beginning of a seemingly temporary golden age:

> And then God will give great joy to men, for earth and trees and countless flocks of sheep will give to men the true fruit of wine, sweet honey and white milk and corn, which is best of all for mortals. (619–23)[159]

---

messiah would rebuild the Temple; cf. the qualified acceptance of Nolland's general thesis by John M. G. Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora from Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE - 117 CE)* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996), 220. Camponovo, *Königtum*, 339, allows that the pattern of idolatry leading to misfortune, and repentance leading to deliverance may be taken as a general pattern for the eschaton, however.

156. Contra Nikiprowetzky, *La troisième Sibylle*, 134–35.

157. Buitenwerf, *Book III of the Sibylline Oracles*, 207,reads θεὸς οὐρανόθεν instead of θεὸς οὐράνιος. His translation, "and then God will send a king from heaven," would suggest the divine status of this royal agent.

158. Nolland, "Early Maccabean Messianic Oracle," 160, regards the king as the subject of the judging. As Collins, *Sibylline Oracles*, 38, points out, however, the syntax of the sentence indicates that God is the subject.

159. Niebuhr, *Gesetz und Paranese*, 182–83, argues that the golden age is intended for the pious, which is implied by the contrast between the righteous and impious in lines 562–623.

Following this period of harmony, war and chaos will again hold sway until the advent of yet another savior king:

> And then God will send a King from the sun (καὶ τότ᾽ ἀπ᾽ ἠελίοιο θεὸς πέμψει βασιλῆα) who will stop the entire earth from evil war, killing some, imposing oaths of loyalty on others; and he will not do all these things by his private plans but in obedience to the noble teachings of the great God. (652–56)

It is unclear whether the king from Asia is to be regarded negatively or positively. If, with Collins, the reference is to be read in the light of a succession of Asian kings who invaded Egypt (the most recent being the Seleucid king, Antiochus Epiphanes), then the figure appears as more of an anti-Christ than a messiah. His destructive role is merely a precursor to a messianic king.[160] R. Buitenwerf notes, however, that in contrast to the evil kings of Rome, the Asian king is not denounced for immorality or impiety.[161] In either case, the Asian king's destruction is correlated with the advent of a golden age, although he has no apparent role in it. The identity of the "king from the sun" is similarly disputed. The imagery most likely is derived from Egyptian pharaonic ideology, which was later appropriated by the Ptolemies. If so, this figure is to be seen as a Ptolemaic king who, acting as God's agent, brings peace to the entire earth.[162] Both pagan kings, it should be noted,

---

160. Collins, *Sibylline Oracles*, 39–40.

161. Buitenwerf, *Book III of the Sibylline Oracles*, 265–67, who regards this as further evidence of Asian provenance. Taking an overall framework of an east-west conflict as his interpretive key, Kocsis, "Ost-West Gegensatz," 109, regards the Asian king positively, since he conquers a Ptolemaic (i.e., of Macedonian, or western extraction) kingdom.

162. Collins, *Sibylline Oracles*, 40–44; Anders Hultgård, "Figures messianiques d'Orient comme sauveurs universels dans le monde greco-romain," in *Soteriologia dei culti orientali nell'Imperio Romano* (ed. Ugo Bianchi and M. J. Vermaseren; Leiden: Brill, 1982), 738; Camponovo, *Königtum*, 344; Bartlett, *Jews in the Hellenistic World*, 38; Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 164; cf. the critique of Collins by Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora*, 222–23; Erich S. Gruen, *Heritage and Hellenism*, 277. Finding no compelling reason for Egyptian provenance, Buitenwerf, *Book III of the Sibylline Oracles*, 272–75, likewise finds unconvincing the background of Egyptian royal ideology. Rather, he claims that "from the sun" denotes the place of the sun's rising, the east; he thus identifies this "king from the east" with the king from Asia (611); so also Kocsis, "Ost-West Gegensatz," 106; Nikiprowetzky, *La troisième Sibylle*, 136, conjectures that the reference is to John Hyrcanus, returning from his expedition against the Parthians. Erich S.

have a preparatory role for the messianic kingdom, but do not participate in it. Moreover, the passage makes the claim that there is one king worthy of worship: "God the great immortal king" (617; cf. 48, 56, 499, 560, 717, 808). All others kings merely function as his instruments.

(d) The fourth oracle (657–808) describes a final assault on the Jerusalem temple by "abominable kings" (667), resulting in cosmic judgment and the salvation of the elect. At this time, "the Immortal himself" will fight for his people (708–09). Witnessing this demonstration of God's love for his people, all will sing hymns and pray to "the immortal king, the great eternal God," declaring that "he alone is sovereign" (710–18). Following this, the final day of judgment ushers in a golden age characterized by agricultural abundance (744–50) and peace throughout the world (750–55). Strikingly, all humanity will be ruled by universal law: "The Immortal in the starry heaven will put in effect a common law for men throughout the whole earth for all that is done among wretched mortals" (757–59).[163] God will then establish an eternal eschatological kingdom in which all nations worship God in the temple (772–75), and prophet-kings rule peacefully: "Prophets of the great God will take away the sword for they themselves are judges of men and righteous kings" (781–82). Another description of the golden age (785–95) and the signs of the end of the age (796–807) follow. A concluding admonition again speaks of God in royal imagery: "But all must sacrifice to the great king" (808).

Finally, an oracle dating from the 2nd c. C.E. speaks of the defeat of Rome by Asia (350–80). This passage most likely makes reference to the campaign of Antony and Cleopatra VII against Rome. Following this conflict, Rome will find itself

---

Gruen, *Heritage and Hellenism*, 278: an emissary of God described in the imagery of Isa 41:25.

163. Nikiprowetzky, *La troisième Sibylle*, 168–72, argues that this natural law is none other than Torah.

under the rule of a "mistress" (δέσποινα), understood to be Queen Cleopatra.[164] Under the rule of this Egyptian queen, a golden age ensues:

> Serene peace will return to the Asian land, and Europe will then be blessed. The air will be good for pasture for many years, bracing, free from storms and hail, producing everything—including birds and creeping beast of the earth. O most blessed, whatever man or woman will live to what (*sic*: that) time! There will be report of the blessed ones, as among countryfolk. For all good order and righteous dealing will come upon men from starry heaven and with it temperate concord, best of all things for men and love, faithfulness and friendship even from strangers. Bad government, blame, envy, anger, folly, poverty will flee from men, and constraint will flee, and murder, accursed strife, and grievous quarrels, night robberies, and every evil in those days. (367–80)

This golden age, ushered in through the agency of a royal figure, is characterized by agricultural fecundity, concord, and the complete absence of immoral behavior.[165] Like the earlier oracles (192–95, 652–56), this one is pro-Ptolemaic; unlike the earlier ones, which had pinned Jewish hopes on Egyptian national destiny, this one looks forward to Egypt's domination of the international political scene as well.[166]

How does the author of book 3 of the *Sibylline Oracles* view the function of the ideal king within God's plan to establish an eschatological kingdom? Several observations may be made from the above survey. (1) God is the great king who is sovereign over all, and who will ultimately ensure the establishment of his eschatological kingdom. (2) Gentile kings, from Cyrus to the Ptolemies, have had and will have a precursory role to the establishment of God's kingdom. They are viewed favorably through the lens of Isa 45 as agents or instruments of God.[167]

---

164. Collins, *Sibylline Oracles*, 57–64. Buitenwerf, *Book III of the Sibylline Oracles*, 221–27, argues that the oracle envisages the Mithridatic war (88–85 B.C.E.), and that the "mistress" is a personifcation of Asia.

165. Niebuhr, *Gesetz und Paranese*, 178–79.

166. Collins, *Sibylline Oracles*, 62–63.

167. This would suggest that Barclay's use of the phrase "cultural antagonism" to describe the perspective of *Sib. Or.* 3 is not entirely adequate (*Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora*, 181, 221–25). To be preferred is the estimation of Erich S. Gruen, *Heritage and Hellenism*, 288–91;

(3) Such kings have primarily military roles: the conquering of unjust empires.[168] They thereby usher in a golden age, characterized by agricultural abundance, universal peace and universal law.[169] They do not, however, appear to have any role in that golden age. (4) Brief mention is made of prophet-kings, who are said to reign in God's eschatological kingdom. Although the ideal king has a role to play in the eschaton, it is not a central one.[170] The focus on this text is on the kingship of God[171] and on the worldwide rule of the people of God.[172]

3.2. *Letter of Aristeas*

Perhaps the most illuminating extant source on Hellenistic kingship is the pseudonymous *Letter of Aristeas*,[173] which synthesizes Jewish and Greek notions of

---

Buitenwerf, *Book III of the Sibylline Oracles*, 365–69, 382–85, who maintain that the book's perspective is one of Jewish precedence over, but not antagonism towards Greek culture.

168. Kocsis, "Ost-West Gegensatz," 107, notes that kings of Greek origin are "overbearing and impious" (171), proud (732), tyrannical and war-loving (202–05). They are the ignominious offspring of Rhea, through whom war came into the world. Although God's royal agents have a military role, they are not like the war-mongers whom they conquer.

169. Nikiprowetzky, *La troisième Sibylle*, 172–73, contends that the vision is not one of empire, but of all the nations of the earth united by the observance of Torah: "les nations continueront, tout en professant le judaïsme, à exister en groupes ethniques et linquistiques, en corps politiques séparés, mais également membres, par leur observance de la Loi, du Royaume de Dieu, don't l'organisation est ainsi moins celle d'un empire que d'une église universelle."

170. Hultgård, "Figures Messianiques," 737.

171. Camponovo, *Königtum*, 350–52.

172. Buitenwerf, *Book III of the Sibylline Oracles*, 289; see further Volz, *Eschatologie*, 379–81. Nikiprowetzky, *La troisième Sibylle*, 136–37, correctly notes this emphasis, but takes the point too far in conceiving of the community of the righteous as a "collective messiah" (*une messie collectif*).

173. The English translation quoted here is R. J. H. Shutt, trans., *Letter of Aristeas*, in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (vol. 2; ed. James H. Charlesworth; ABRL; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1983–85), 7–34; the Greek edition consulted is André Pelletier, ed. and trans., *Lettre d'Aristée à Philocrate* (SC 89; Paris: Cerf, 1962).

kingship.[174] It was most likely written towards the end of the second century B.C.E. by an unknown Egyptian Jew purporting to be a Ptolemaic courtier by the name of Aristeas.[175] As it stands, it is not a treatise on kingship; nor can it properly be considered a letter. Rather, it is an account (διήγησις) of the translation of the Pentateuch into Greek.[176] The purpose of the narrative is, broadly speaking, apologetic; the audience to whom the apology is directed is, however, unclear. It may have been intended as a defense of Hellenism in the eyes of Jews, of Judaism in the eyes of Greeks, or of the Septuagint as a legitimate translation of scripture.[177]

---

174. Oswyn Murray, "Aristeas and Ptolemaic Kingship," *JTS* 18 (1967): 360–361; Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora*, 140. Note, e.g., that the author has no difficulty in identifying Yahweh with Zeus (*Let. Arist.* 16); see further Marcel Simon, "Jupiter-Yahvé: Sur un essai de théologie pagano-juive," *Numen* 23 (1976): 43–44. Mendels, "Ideological *Vorlage*," 127–36, suggests that "most of the questions and answers in the seven banquets which are directly concerned with kingship could have been derived from a Jewish ideological *Vorlage*" (here, 136). This may be taking the evidence too far, however.

175. Estimates range between the beginning of the second century B.C.E. and the first century C.E. I. Abrahams, "Recent Criticism of the Letter of Aristeas," *JQR* 14 (1902): 330; Schürer, *Geschichte*, 3:611–12; Pelletier, *Lettre d'Aristée*, 57–58, date the text prior to, or shortly after the Seleucid domination of Judea in 198 B.C.E. E. J. Bickerman, "Zur Datierung des Pseudo-Aristeas," *ZNW* 29 (1930): 293; Moses Hadas, ed. and trans., *Aristeas to Philocrates (Letter of Aristeas)* (Jewish Apocryphal Literature; New York: Harper, 1951), 3–54; Norbert Meisner, "Untersuchungen zum Aristeasbrief," PhD diss., 2 vols. (Berlin: Kirchliche Hochschule, 1972), 1:211–15—between 145–117 B.C.E. Murray, "Aristeas and Ptolemaic Kingship," 338–39—in the last years of the second century B.C.E. Léon Herrmann, "La Lettre d'Aristée à Philocrate et l'empereur Titus," *Latomus* 25 (1966): 58–65, argues unconvincingly for a date in the second half of the first century C.E. based on parallels with Philo and Annaeus Cornutus.

176. *Contra* Gottfried Schimanowski, "Der Aristeasbrief zwischen Abgrenzung und Selbstdarstellung," in *Persuasion and Dissuasion in Early Christianity, Ancient Judaism, and Hellenism* (ed. Pieter Willem van der Horst; Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 45, *Letter of Aristeas* is not *sui generis*. As Moses Hadas, "Aristeas and III Maccabees," *HTR* 42 (1949): 175, notes, the *progymnasmata* of Theon (78–96) give ample instructions for the composition of a διήγησις.

177. Friedländer, *Geschichte*, 95–104; H. St. J. Thackeray, "Translation of the Letter of Aristeas," *JQR* 15 (1903): 337–338; Schürer, *Geschichte*, 3:610; Sterling Tracy, "III Maccabees and Pseudo-Aristeas: A Study," *YCS* 1 (1928): 241–252, represent the consensus of an earlier generation of scholars, which saw the *Letter of Aristeas* as an apologetic work directed towards Greeks, pleading for religious understanding and toleration. V. Tcherikover, "The Ideology of the Letter of Aristeas," *HTR* 51 (1958): 59–85, argued against this consensus, contending rather that the narrative addressed the needs of Jewish readers. The same view was adumbrated earlier by Moses Hadas, "Aristeas and III Maccabees," 176, 182–83, and followed by Gabriele Boccaccini, *Middle*

Even if the latter cannot be maintained as the sole purpose of the work, this translation activity is nevertheless the "scaffolding" upon which the entire narrative is constructed.[178] It is in connection with this translation that the importance of King Ptolemy Philadelphus becomes evident: he both commissions (38) and approves of the translation (312). The concern of the present investigation is not with the translation of the Pentateuch, but with Ptolemy's lavish banquet given in honor of the esteemed translators. Over the course of this seven-day feast, the king questions the seventy-two translators concerning the subject of kingship. The importance of this portion of the narrative is suggested by its considerable length—nearly a third of the entire narrative (*Let. Arist.* 187–300).[179] The week-long

---

Judaism: Jewish Thought, 300 B.C.E. to 200 C.E. (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), 184–85; Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 198–99. Several recent studies have acknowledged (to varying degrees) the duality of the work's intended audience and purpose: it sought to gain acceptance of élite gentile culture on the part of fellow Jews, and tolerance and understanding of Judaism on the part of gentiles. See, e.g., Meisner, "Untersuchungen," 1:215; Bartlett, *Jews in the Hellenistic World*, 11–16; Mary Ann L Beavis, "Anti-Egyptian Polemic in the Letter of Aristeas 130–165 (the High Priest's Discourse)," *JSJ* 18 (1987): ; Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora*, 148–49; John J. Collins, "Hellenistic Judaism in Recent Scholarship," in *Jewish Cult and Hellenistic Culture: Essays on the Jewish Encounter with Hellenism and Roman Rule* (JSJSup 100; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 11–18; Abraham Wasserstein and David J. Wasserstein, *The Legend of the Septuagint: From Classical Antiquity to Today* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 25. Sylvie Honigman, "The Narrative Function of the King and the Library in the Letter of Aristeas," in *Jewish Perspectives on Hellenistic Rulers* (ed. Tessa Rajak; Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007), 128–42, reads the text rather as a legitimation of the LXX, contending that the king's credentials were necessary to establish the LXX as both a perfect and sacred text; so also Schimanowski, "Zwischen Abgrenzung und Selbstdarstellung," 47–48, who additionally notes the text's dual audience. See further George E. Howard, "The Letter of Aristeas and Diaspora Judaism," *JTS* 22 (1971): 340, 348; Mendels, "Ideological *Vorlage*," 130; Erich S. Gruen, *Heritage and Hellenism*, 212–21; Collins, *Athens and Jerusalem*, 101–3; Noah Hacham, "The *Letter of Aristeas*: A New Exodus Story?" *JSJ* 36 (2005): 1–20, who suggest that the *Letter of Aristeas* may have functioned to legitimate Diaspora Judaism vis-à-vis Palestinian Judaism. Cf. Pelletier, *Lettre d'Aristée*, 72–77, on the relationship between Alexandrian and Palestinian Jews.

178. Wasserstein and Wasserstein, *Legend*, 23, aptly remark that a disproportionate amount of scholarship on the *Letter of Aristeas* has been concerned chiefly with this "scaffolding."

179. Günther Zuntz, "Aristeas Studies I: 'The Seven Banquets'," *JSS* 4 (1959): 21, further notes the variety of techniques the author uses to highlight the importance of this event (e.g., the king's constant praise for his guests).

symposium is characterized by a seeming lack of order in its composition.[180] The narrative here consists of seventy-two questions and responses, which traverse a wide range of concerns rooted either in Hellenistic philosophy and kingship literature, or in Hellenistic Judaism.[181] Given the author's organizational shortcomings, some extrinsic order will need to be imposed on the text to glean from it the author's notion of the ideal king.

Beginning at the end, Ptolemy's final question to the Jewish elders sums up the whole discussion and serves as a rough guide for its interpretation:[182]

> (The king) asked the last guest of all 'What is the most important feature in a kingdom?' To this he replied, 'To establish the subjects continually at peace (ἐν εἰρήνῃ καθεστάναι), and guarantee that they obtain justice (τὸ δίκαιον) quickly in verdicts. The sovereign brings about these aims when he hates evil and loves good and holds in high esteem the saving of a human life. In the same way that you consider injustice the greatest evil, and by your just government in all things (δικαίως δὲ πάντα κυβερνῶν)[183] have won

---

180. Efforts to determine a source behind this section of the letter have been considerable, motivated in part by the apparent lack of literary coherence of this section. This labor has not been successful. Although stylistically, the symposium on kingship does not cohere with the rest of the letter, conceptually it is all of a piece. If the author used sources, he used them freely and inventively. The muddled style is best explained not by slavish use of an underlying source. In the words of Murray, "Aristeas and Ptolemaic Kingship," 351: "rather the illogical, vague, and repetitious whole is the work of one mind, itself illogical, vague, and repetitious." So also Meisner, "Untersuchungen," 1:183. *Contra* Zuntz, "'Seven Banquets'," 21–31; Dvornik, *Political Philosophy*, 1:261–63.

181. Murray, "Aristeas and Ptolemaic Kingship," 337–46, notes that often the answer is in two parts, the first part reflecting typical Greek philosophy, the second being a Jewish monotheizing of it. This is not always the case, as some answers are purely Jewish. Not all the questions are concerned with kingship; some simply reflect the concerns of popular Hellenistic philosophy.

182. Note how the superlative nature of the question itself provides a clue to that which is considered an essential component of kingship. Such questions are sprinkled throughout the symposium: e.g., "What is the most needful characteristic of kingship?" (209) "What is the definition of kingship?" (211) See further the discussion below.

183. The verb, κυβερνάω, literally means to steer a ship, or act as a helmsman. Its metaphorical appropriation here connotes the central idea of guidance in the task of governance. The same idea is brought out in Diotogenes description of the duties of a king, who is likened to a pilot saving a ship (Stob. 4.7.61; Thesleff 72.3-6) (Goodenough, "Political Philosophy," 66).

> glory for yourself which is imperishable—God granting you to have a pure mind untainted by any evil' (*Let. Arist.* 291–92).[184]

As O. Murray observes, the main themes are threefold: "peace (understood to include prosperity), the exercise of justice, and the character of the ruler which guarantees the presence of the other two."[185] Certainly, the author's portrait of the ideal king cannot be reduced to these three themes.[186] One observes, for instance, the emphasis on the king's piety (εὐσέβεια) (210, 229, 234),[187] noting his high regard for the theocentric responses of the Jewish elders (200–01, 235).[188] Nevertheless, the portrait of a virtuous king who thereby establishes peace and justice does cohere well with the text. How are these three aspects of ideal kingship emphasized in the text?

The ideal king achieves peace not by dint of his own military prowess, but through divine assistance. He is to be prepared for war (πολεμικός), but not a war-

---

184. The thought is adumbrated earlier in the letter: "'What is the most needful characteristic of kingship?' 'That (the king) should keep himself incorruptible, practice moderation throughout all his life, respect justice beond all else, and cultivate such men as friends, because God himself loves justice'" (*Let. Arist.* 209).

185. Murray, "Aristeas and Ptolemaic Kingship," 353; so also Moses Hadas, *Aristeas*, 241.

186. Zuntz, "'Seven Banquets'," 26–28, for example considers the themes of clemency, justice, and benefaction, which surface at the beginning of the banquet (188–90), to be basic to Aristeas' notion of the ideal king. See further Zuntz's nearly comprehensive outline of the portrait of the ideal king, culled from the questions and answers in the *Letter of Aristeas* (28–29). Zuntz regards as extraneous a number of questions having to do with the personal life of the king. These questions are adequately treated by Meisner, "Untersuchungen," 1:153–60, who argues that concern with the king's personal life reflects the ethical demands placed on the king.

187. Zuntz, "'Seven Banquets'," 23, regards this as essentially Jewish.

188. Schimanowski, "Zwischen Abgrenzung und Selbstdarstellung," 58–59, suggests that the entire symposium functions as an apology for the value of a Torahcentric ethic, as validated in the eyes of Greeks. Terence L. Donaldson, "Royal Sympathizers in Jewish Narrative," *JSP* 16 (2006): 49–53, argues that the narrator presents Ptolemy himself as pious. It is his pre-existing piety that enables the king to recognize and venerate the piety of the Jewish religion. Ian W. Scott, "Epistemology and Social Conflict in *Jubilees* and *Aristeas*," in *Common Judaism: Explorations in Second-Temple Judaism* (ed. Wayne O. McCready and Adele Reinhartz; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2008), 209, notes that the author presents Jewish and gentile piety as identical in essence.

monger (φιλοπόλεμος).[189] Ptolemy asks, "'How then can one be undefeated in the necessities of war (ἐν ταῖς πολεμικαῖς)?'" In response, he is told "'If he did not place his confidence in his numbers and his forces, but continually invoked God to direct his enterprises aright as he dealt justly in everything'" (193). The following question (how to gain the respect of one's enemies) elicits a similar response. The king should not trust in arms to achieve a lasting outcome: "'For God by granting a truce and thus demonstrating the fear of his power[190] implants it in every breast'" (194).[191] Aristeas thus acknowledges that, in military affairs, the king's power is apportioned by God. Indeed, the king's glory and greatness are received as a divine gift. He thus frees himself from envy,

> 'First of all, by realizing that God assigns glory and greatness of wealth to kings, each and every one, and that no king is independent. All of them wish to share this glory, but they cannot—it is a gift of God (θεοῦ γάρ ἐστι δόμα).' (224)

The particular emphasis in the *Letter of Aristeas* upon the ideal king's subordinate relationship to God and his need for God's help is one of the clear indicators of the influence of Hellenistic Judaism upon its author.[192]

---

189. Meisner, "Untersuchungen," 1:185.

190. Thackeray, "Translation," 374, renders τὰ τῆς δυναστείας as "his sovereignty," a felicitous translation that brings out the emphasis on God's ultimate sovereignty. Cf. Pelletier, *Lettre d'Aristée*, 193: "sa puissance"; Moses Hadas, *Aristeas*, 177: "His sovereign power."

191. Murray, "Aristeas and Ptolemaic Kingship," 355, contends that a king who is πολεμικός yet not φιλοπόλεμος conforms to the Greek view in general. The notion that the king should place his hope for military success in God is distinctly Jewish. So also Zuntz, "'Seven Banquets'," 23, who notes the parallels in Ps 19:8 (LXX); *Ps. Sol.* 17:33; 1 Macc 3:19. See further Murray's note on Philodemus, *Hom.* 9.14 ("Philodemus," 169); Dio, *Or.* 1.27.

192. Zuntz, "'Seven Banquets'," 22; *contra* Dvornik, *Political Philosophy*, 261–63. Moses Hadas, *Aristeas*, 187, makes a suggestive comparison between the Jewish notion of the king as divinely elected (cf. Sir. 10.4; Wis. 6.3) and the Hellenistic conception of the king as νόμος ἔμψυχος. Both seek to justify (or explain) the divine right of royal rule.

The ideal king must also act justly.[193] Early in the symposium, the king poses a general question to an elder aimed at eliciting a general principle for royal conduct. He is told that he must practice "just dealing (τὸ δίκαιον) toward all" (189). The king's subsequent inquiry into the most needful characteristic of kingship elicits a similar response:

> 'That (the king) should keep himself incorruptible, practice moderation throughout all his life, respect justice (δικαιοσύνην) beyond all else, and cultivate such men as friends, because God himself loves justice (φιλοδίκαιός ἐστιν).' (209)

Again, the king is told that he will think the finest thoughts "by setting justice (τὸ δίκαιον) before him continually in everything" (212). He will avoid sorrow "by pursuing righteousness (τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ)" (232). The notion of just rule appears to be behind a further question: "'How can one avoid doing anything contrary to the Law?'"[194] The response connects the notions of the king as conformed to the law and the king as savior: "'By realizing that God has given to legislators the purpose

---

193. See Meisner, "Untersuchungen," 1:183–84. The author is keen to demonstrate this throughout not only the symposium but also the entire narrative. Moses Hadas, "Aristeas and III Maccabees," 176–79, notes that Aristeas modifies Ptolemy Philadelphus' decree to liberate Jewish slaves (22–26) to emphasize the king's just and humane dealings. Hacham, "New Exodus Story?" 4–7, regards the liberation of slaves to be a central motif in the *Letter of Aristeas*, one with deliberate overtones of the liberation of the Hebrews from Egypt in the biblical narrative. It further functions to show that the king acts with the support of God (24, 27) and enjoys God's protection (15–16).

194. The king's question likely has in view a universal understanding of law. The overall thrust of the narrative, however, showcases the superiority of the Jewish divine lawgiver and his divine law, while nevertheless maintaining that its contents can be understood through Greek philosophical reasoning (Friedländer, *Geschichte*, 87; Moses Hadas, *Aristeas*, 62–63; Meisner, "Untersuchungen," 190–91; Collins, "Hellenistic Judaism," 12–14, 17–18; Ian W. Scott, "Epistemology and Social Conflict," 203–4). Note that at the beginning of Eleazar's discourse to Aristeas (130–71), the Torah is described as "commands relating to religious observance and *justice*" (131; emphasis added). Eleazar concludes with this summary statement regarding the purpose of the law: "that through the whole of our lives we may also practice justice to all mankind in our acts, remembering the all-sovereign God" (168). For the author, adherence to Torah produces a life of virtue marked by justice (Donaldson, "Royal Sympathizers," 150). See further, Howard, "Diaspora Judaism," 346–47; Beavis, "Anti-Egyptian Polemic," 145–46, who note that Eleazar's explanation of Jewish dietary regulations has as its goal the cultivation of justice (144, 163–66).

of saving men's lives, you would follow them'" (240).[195] In a similar vein, the king is enjoined to follow the guidance of the laws, "'so that by practicing justice they may improve (ἀνακτῶνται)[196] the lives of men'" (279). Moreover, the principle of justice enables the king to rule peacefully over an ethnically heterogeneous population. The king asks,

> 'In view of the heterogeneous multitudes in the kingdom, how can one be in harmony with them?' 'By adopting the role appropriate to each one, with justice as your guiding principle—as indeed is now your practice, God granting you sound reasoning.' (267)[197]

Finally, the king's righteousness is understood to be a divine gift. He is told that he must appoint ministers who will imitate the king in their practice of justice (τὰ δίκαια), "'just as you, O mighty King . . . achieve this aim, God having granted you a crown of righteousness (στέφανον δικαιοσύνης)'" (280).[198]

The ideal king's ability to preserve peace and act justly is predicated upon his superior virtue. According to the author, justice and virtue are intrinsically correlated. When the king inquires why virtue is not recognized by the masses, he is told that all men

> 'have become naturally intemperate, and inclined to pleasures, as a result of which injustice came about and the mass of greed. The virtuous disposition, on the other hand, restrains those who are attracted to the rule of pleasure, and commands them to respect self-control and justice more highly.' (277–78)

---

195. Meisner, "Untersuchungen," 1:185–86.

196. Moses Hadas, *Aristeas*, 209; Dvornik, *Political Philosophy*, 1:261–63, translate: "repair the lives of men" suggesting moral transformation. Thackeray, "Translation," 385: "restore the happiness of men's lives." ἀνακτάομαι has the sense of "repair, regain, recover" (*LSJ*).

197. Tracy, "III Maccabees and Pseudo-Aristeas," 250–51, regards this response, as well as several others (208, 227) as the author's appeal to the king's intelligence and sensibility for the just treatment of Jews in the author's own day.

198. Cf. Ps 71:1–2 LXX (ET 72:1–2), in which the king asks for God's righteousness in order that he may judge God's people in righteousness. Here, God's righteousness appears to be that which enables the king's own righteousness. Cf. the usage of the phrase, "crown of righteousness" in *T. Levi* 8.2.

It naturally follows that the ideal king, in order to rule over others, must first rule over himself. When the king inquires, "'What is the definition of kingship?" the response is: "'Real self-mastery, not being carried away by wealth and glamour, nor having, as a result, overweening or unworthy ambitions'" (211). The question and response are repeated shortly in different words, seemingly for emphasis.[199] Taken together, the idea seems to be that justice is ensured by the virtuous disposition of the king, who is able to rule others because he rules first himself.

The divine gift of virtue is furthermore that which maintains the king's favor and respect among his people (272). The king attains virtue by imitating the character of God, in particular his clemency. He is reminded that "'God governs the whole universe with kindliness (εὐμενείας) and without any anger, and you, O king, . . . must follow him'" (254; cf. 208, 290). Indeed, he preserves his kingdom

> 'by imitating the eternal goodness (ἐπιεικές) [200] of God. By using longsuffering and treatment of those who merit (punishment) more leniently than they deserve, you will convert them from evil and bring them to repentance.' (188)

By imitating divine clemency, the ideal king both governs and effects a transformation in the character of his subjects.

As the "best man," pre-eminent in virtue, the king also provides the example for his subjects to follow. When the king asks how he may avoid doing anything unworthy of his station, he is told:

> 'Always have an eye to your glory and prominence, so that you may say and think what is consistent with it, knowing that all your subjects have you in mind and speak of you. You must really be not the least among the actors! They observe the character which they have to portray and do all their actions consistently with it (τὸ γὰρ πρόσωπον, ὃ δέον αὐτούς ἐστιν ὑποκρίνεσθαι, τοῦτο συνθεωροῦντες ἀκόλουθα πάντα πράσσουσι). Yours however is no acting

---

199. "'What is the highest form of sovereignty?' He replied, 'Control of oneself, and not being carried away by one's impulses'" (222).

200. ἐπιείκεια can also be translated as "mercy, clemency" (*LSJ*); so Pelletier, *Lettre d'Aristée*, 191: "miséricorde"; Moses Hadas, *Aristeas*, 175: "gentleness."

> role, you are really a king, God having granted you authority as your manner (τῶν τρόπων)[201] deserves.' (*Let. Arist.* 218–19)

The king's character is both the basis of his divinely bestowed authority, and the model for virtuous behavior.

The king also imitates divine benefaction: "'As God showers blessings (εὖ ἐργάζεται) upon all, you too in imitation of him are a benefactor (σὺ τοῦτον μιμούμενος εὐεργετεῖς) to your subjects'" (*Let. Arist.* 281; cf. 205, 210, 259).[202] He is told that in order to make his friends well-inclined towards himself,[203] he must let them see that he shows "intense concern (πρόνοιαν) for the people whom you rule. This you will do by observing how God blesses (εὐεργετεῖ) the human race, giving them health and food and all other gifts in their season" (*Let. Arist.* 190). The king is told that he would remain rich

> 'If he . . . did not by his spending contribute to vain and pointless objectives, while at the same time by well-doing attracting the goodwill of his subjects toward him. For the source of blessings to everyone is God himself, who must be followed.' (205)

In order to be a patriot (φιλόπατρις), the king is told that "By doing good to all (εὐεργετῶν οὖν ἅπαντας) . . . you will undoubtedly be a patriot, God giving you favor in the sight of all'" (249). By the king's benefaction, he creates a reciprocal bond of goodwill. His most important possession is: "'The love and affection of his subjects

---

201. Thackeray, "Translation," 377; Moses Hadas, *Aristeas*, 187, translate τῶν τρόπων as "character."

202. Meisner, "Untersuchungen," 1:184, 195, believes that the entire symposium functions as propaganda for the Ptolemaic kings' benefaction. Donaldson, "Royal Sympathizers," 51–52, further notes Ptolemy's benefaction of the Jews, as seen in his liberating the slaves (22–25), and his lavish gifts to the Jerusalem temple (33, 42), which are described at length (51–82).

203. Reading Πῶς ἂν εὐνόους ἑαυτῷ ἔχοι τοὺς φίλους with Günther Zuntz, "Zum Aristeas-Text," *Phil* 102 (1958): 243–244, rather than Πῶς ἂν ὁμοίους ἑαυτῷ ἔχοι τοὺς φίλους, the reading preferred by Moses Hadas, *Aristeas*, 174; followed apparently by Shutt, *Letter of Aristeas*, 25.

(Τῶν ὑποτεταγμένων φιλανθρωπία καὶ ἀγάπησις). . . . By these means the bond of goodwill (εὐνοίας δεσμὸς) is unbreakable'" (265; cf. 225–26).[204]

The portrait of the ideal king held by the author of the *Letter of Aristeas* coheres well with the contours of the ideal king in Greco-Roman thought.[205] In contrast with other Hellenistic Jewish texts that regard gentile kings with suspicion, this work rather positively appropriates Greek kingship ideology for its own purposes.[206] Nevertheless, because it is a kingship treatise in Jewish clothing, certain aspects of the ideal Greek king, such as his divinization, are absent.[207] To draw together the scattered elements of the ideal king in this narrative is to arrive at a portrait of a king who, by imitating God's clemency and benefaction, is himself pre-eminent in virtue, and the model of virtue for his subjects to copy. Chief among the king's virtues is his righteousness, or justice, by which he maintains a heterogeneous population in peace. The king's righteousness, and indeed his entire reign, is a gift from God.

---

204. O. Murray's discussion of this text is illuminating: "φιλανθρωπία and ἀγάπησις have usually been taken as synonymous; but it seems better to understand φιλανθρωπία as the love of the king *for* his subjects, ἀγάπησις as the reciprocal love of his subjects for him. . . . the result of possessing both φιλανθρωπία and ἀγάπησις is a *bond* of goodwill, a reciprocal relationship" ("Aristeas and Ptolemaic Kingship," 353–54, author's emphasis).

205. Herrmann, "La Lettre d'Aristée," 65–73 notes numerous parallels between the *Letter of Aristeas* and Suetonius' portrait of Titus. This correspondence demonstrates that both Aristeas and Suetonius were evaluating their subject matter according to widely-held conventions regarding ideal kingship. It does not support Herrmann's conclusion, namely that the *Letter of Aristeas* is "une oeuvre de propagande à clef" in which an idealized portrait of Titus is to be found within the symposium on kingship.

206. Meisner, "Untersuchungen," 1:162–78, surveys the treatment of gentile kings in Esther, 2 Maccabees, and 3 Maccabees, arriving at the conclusion that these texts perceive Greek kingship ideology as so much hyppocrisy.

207. Note for example the following advice to the king on avoiding arrogance: "'by reminding himself in the case of each individual that he is a ruler of men and still a man himself'" (263). See further, Pelletier, *Lettre d'Aristée*, 250, crtitical note on *Let. Arist.* 226.

3.3. *Philo*

Philo's most extensive and sustained treatment of kingship may be found in three treatises: *Legatio ad Gaium*, *De Iosepho*, and *De vita Mosis*.[208] The most helpful treatment of this theme in English is still the seminal study of E. R. Goodenough, which considers a wider array of Philo's writings than will be discussed here.[209] Goodenough's portrayal of Philo stresses that the mystical philosopher was also a consummate statesman committed to monarchy as the only viable form of government.[210] Paradoxically, however, Philo spends a good deal of effort praising democracy and maligning monarchs, or rather one monarch in particular—Gaius. It must be understood that when he speaks of democracy, he is thinking of Plato's ideal *politeia*, in which the equal rights (ἰσότης) of individuals are safeguarded by laws propagated by the ideal philosopher-king. Democracy for Philo was manifestly not the rule by the people; this he would have disdainfully regarded as ochlocracy, the rule of the mob (*Mut.* 28, 151). Furthermore, it will be remembered that the Greek term for the Latin *res publica* was δημοκρατία. Philo must be seen as referring to the Roman idea of democracy, that is to say, the

---

208. All citations of Philo are from *Philo* (12 vols.; trans. F. H. Colson; LCL; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1929).

209. Erwin R. Goodenough, *The Politics of Philo Judaeus: Practice and Theory* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1938) See further, Izaak Heinemann, *Philons griechische und jüdische Bildung: Kulturvergleichende Untersuchungen zu Philons Darstellung der jüdischen Gesetze* (Hildesheim: Olms, 1962), 184–202; Dvornik, *Political Philosophy*, 2:558–65; Chesnut, "Ruler and Logos," 1326–29.

210. *Contra* Émile Bréhier, *Les idées philosophiques et religieuses de Philon d'Alexandrie* (Études de Philosophie Médiévale; Paris: Vrin, 1925), 13, 32, who contended that Philo flatly rejected political aspirations in favor of the pursuit of the philosophical life. The related question of how to characterize Philo's philosophical perspective—Platonic, Stoic, (Neo)Pythagorean, or eclectic—is beyond the scope of this study. A useful, if somehat dated, survey of scholarship on this question may be found in Valentin Nikiprowetzky, "L'exégèse de Philon d'Alexandrie," *RHPR* 53 (1973): 313–316. For a presentation of Philo as a Middle Platonist, based on his portrayal of Moses, see Gregory E. Sterling, "Platonizing Moses: Philo and Middle Platonism," *SPhilo* 5 (1993): 96–111.

descendant of a Hellenistic monarchy clothed in the institutions of a republic.[211] As for Philo's vitriol poured upon the emperor Gaius, this cannot be seen as contempt for the office of king, but rather the sternest invective against the abuse of this sacred office.[212] To this philippic we now turn.

3.3.1. *Legatio ad Gaium.* Philo's fragmentary *Legatio ad Gaium* describes the diplomatic mission led by the author in 39–40 to plead with the emperor Gaius (37–41 C.E.) for the religious and civil rights of the Jews in Alexandria, which had been severely degraded as a result of a violent pogrom instigated by the Greeks in that city in the summer of 38.[213] Once in Rome, Philo reports that the legation further learned of the emperor's plan to convert the Jerusalem temple into a temple of the imperial cult. The main concerns of the embassy—the Jews' civil status within the city of Alexandria, the desecration of Jewish synagogues, and the Jews' exemption from participation in the imperial cult—were not resolved until after Gaius' assassination in 41.[214] Written after Claudius' accession, the *Legatio ad*

---

211. Langstadt, "Philos Begriff," 349–64; Goodenough, *Politics*, 86–87; Harry Austryn Wolfson, *Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam* (2d rev. ed.; 2 vols.; Structure and Growth of Philosophic Systems from Plato to Spinoza; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1948), 2:329–30; Heinemann, *Philons Bildung*, 185–87, 192.

212. Hans Leisegang, "Philons Schrift über die Gesandtschaft der alexandrinischen Juden an den Kaiser Gaius Caligula," *JBL* 57 (1938): 395; Joachim Kügler, "Spüren ägyptisch-hellenistischer Königstheologie bei Philo von Alexandria," in *Ägypten und der Östliche Mittelmeerraum Im 1. Jahrtausend v. Chr.* (ed. Manfred Görg and Günther Hölbl; Ägypten und Altes Testament 44; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2000), 233.

213. The Greek text and English translation are those of *Philo* (12 vols.; trans. F. H. Colson; LCL; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1929). Also consulted was the Greek edition and French translation of André Pelletier, ed. and trans., *Legatio ad Caium* (vol. 32 of *Les oeuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie*; Paris: Cerf, 1972).

214. The already tense relations between Jews and Greeks in Alexandria appear to have worsened as a result of the visit of the Jewish king Agrippa I, the ostensible cause of the conflagration. To what extent the prefect, Aulus Avillius Flaccus, was complicit in the disturbances is unclear; at the very least, he did nothing to restrain them. The details of Philo's account of the pogrom and Gaius' attack on the Jerusalem temple cannot always be reconciled internally (i.e.,

Gaium may have sought to persuade the new emperor that if he did not desire a Jewish rebellion on his hands, he would do well to rule justly, and treat the Jews with respect.[215] The emperor Gaius is herein depicted in no uncertain terms as an arch-tyrant.[216] In presenting his readers with the antithesis of the ideal king, Philo reflects widely held ideas among hellenized Egyptian Jews regarding the appropriate conduct of gentile rulers.[217]

Philo holds the practice of good governance in high esteem, referring to it as the "best and greatest art" (47), the fruit of which is peace (68). He is clearly able to distinguish between emperors who govern well and those who fail to do so. The pre-eminent example of the former is Augustus. In an encomium to Rome's most illustrious emperor, he is presented as having "in all the virtues transcended human nature" (143). For establishing peace by bringing an end to civil wars that threatened to destroy the human race, Philo avows that we may justly call him "the averter of evil (*ἀλεξίκακον*)" (144). Caesar is further praised for having "calmed the

---

between *In Flaccum* and *Legatio ad Gaium*) or with Josephus' accounts. See the introductory essay of E. Mary Smallwood, ed. and trans., *Philonis Alexandrini Legatio ad Gaium* (Leiden: Brill, 1970), 3–36; and E. Mary Smallwood, "Philo and Josephus as Historians of the Same Events," in *Josephus, Judaism, and Christianity* (ed. Louis H. Feldman and Gohei Hata; Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1987), 114–29.

215. So Goodenough, *Politics*, 12–20. By contrast, Leisegang, "Gesandtschaft," 402–5, contends that the missing palinode, or recantation at the end of the treatise (373) rehabilitated Gaius as an instrument of God designed to arouse the virtues of the Jews. This is perhaps an "over-ingenious" reconstruction (E. Mary Smallwood, *Legatio*, 325). The subject of the palinode may well have been Gaius' reversal of fortune, which culminated in his assassination; so Schürer, *Geschichte*, 3:494, 678–79.

216. Jean Daniélou, *Philon d'Alexandrie* (Les Temps et les destins; Paris: Fayard, 1958), 77–83; Wayne A. Meeks, "The Divine Agent and His Counterfeit in Philo and the Fourth Gospel," in *Aspects of Religious Propaganda in Judaism and Early Christianity* (ed. Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza; SJCA 2; Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1976), 45–54, contends that Gaius is the parody of Philo's divine king, Moses. See further Philo's passing comments on the nature of tyrants in *De vita Mosis*: arrogant (1.88); cruel, angry (1.89); the source of their people's misery (1.138–39); concerned with outward appearance (1.275); mastered by their passions (1.292).

217. See, e.g., the discussion of *Letter of Aristeas* above (3.2).

torrential storms," "healed the pestilences common to Greeks and barbarians," "cleared the sea of pirate ships," "reclaimed every state to liberty," and "led disorder into order and brought gentle manners and harmony to all unsociable and brutish nations" (145–47; cf. 309). In short, he is

> the guardian of the peace, who dispensed their dues to each and all, who did not hoard his favours but gave them to be common property, who kept nothing good and excellent hidden throughout his life. . . . the first and the greatest and the common benefactor. (147, 149)[218]

Finally, and of critical importance from Philo's point of view, Augustus is to be recognized for "his carefulness and that he showed it in maintaining firmly the native customs of each particular nation no less than of the Romans" (153; cf. 240, 313). As a result of Augustus' piety[219] displayed towards the Jewish people, Philo observes that everyone "was afraid to engage in destroying any of our institutions" (159).

Augustus' successor, Tiberius, likewise conforms to the ideal of the good emperor in Philo's view. Upon his accession, Gaius inherits the fruits of Tiberius' beneficent rule, described by Philo in terms recalling the golden age described by the likes of Virgil. Tiberius' legacy is described in the following manner:

> the sovereignty of the whole earth and sea, gained not by faction but established by law, with all parts, east, west, south, north, harmoniously adjusted, the Greek in full agreement with the barbarian, the civil with the military, to enjoy and participate in peace. (8; cf. 141)

Within this reign of universal peace, the laws and customs of subjugated peoples are respected (240, 301, 313, 315), evidenced by the honor which pious emperors such as Augustus and Tiberius pay to the Jerusalem temple (316). Gaius' family, "the

---

218. Although Philo does not say so in as many words, he may have in mind that Augustus here imitates God, "the Benefactor of the whole world who through His power bestows blessings poured in unstinted abundance on every part of the All" (118).

219. Elsewhere, Philo alleges that it is because Augustus has "feasted on" the precepts of philosophy that he displays the appropriate piety towards the Jewish temple (310, 318).

truly Augustan," rules without envy (48), bringing to light the good and banishing the evil (49). Rome rules supreme over the entire world (10), and it is a rule of harmony and peace.

Indeed, the first seven months of Gaius' own reign bespeak a new golden age.[220] He is regarded by the people as a "saviour and benefactor"[221] who will endow the world with "new streams of blessings" and "happiness indestructible" (22). Philo goes as far as to imply that the health of the world is dependent upon the health of the emperor. When Gaius falls ill,

> every part of the habitable world shared his sickness, and theirs was a sickness more grievous than that which overcame him. His was of the body only, theirs was felt by all and everywhere, affecting the well-being of the soul, their peace, their hopes and participation and enjoyment of every good thing. Thoughts of the many great evils which spring from anarchy occupied their mind: famine, war, . . . and the only remedy lay in the recovery of Gaius. (16–17; cf. 18)

But his true nature—"deceptive and cunning" (59)—comes to the surface, and the calumnies engendered by his poor governance progress from bad to worse.

Despite the fact that Gaius knows how a good king should behave, he persists in the opposite. He is told by his adviser, for example, that an emperor should conduct himself "as a shepherd and master of a flock" (44; cf. 20), "rejoicing and delighting in nothing so much as in benefiting your subjects" (50). He is urged by King Agrippa to display the same pious regard for Jewish laws and customs that marked the reigns of his predecessors (321–22). These exhortations to virtue fall on deaf ears. A "quarrelsome and contentious" person, Gaius ignores the counsel of his friends (52). He believes that he, "even while in the womb, that workshop of

---

220. "Indeed, the life under Saturn, pictured by the poets, no longer appeared to be a fabled story, so great was the prosperity and well-being, the freedom from grief and fear, the joy which pervaded households and people, night and day" (13). Leisegang, "Gesandtschaft," 391–92, observes that Philo's portrayal here reads as though drawn from an imperial encomium.

221. Agrippa similarly characterizes Gaius as a benefactor: 323, 328.

nature, was modelled as an emperor," and thus above the need for instruction (54–56; cf. 64). Nothing could be further from the truth: "he rained miseries untold one after the other as from perennial fountains on every part of the inhabited world" (101). Whereas his predecessors established and maintained peace, Gaius "filled every house and city throughout Greece and the outside world with intestine wars" (102; cf. 108, 113, 335). Whereas Augustus "healed the pestilences common to Greeks and barbarians" (145), Gaius "brought disease to the healthy" (107). Whereas previous emperors "ruled with moderation and observance of the law, . . . Gaius . . . zealously practiced lawlessness. For considering that he himself was a law (νόμον γὰρ ἡγουμενος ἑαυτὸν), he abrogated those laid down by legislators in the several states, treating them as empty talk" (119). Philo thus regards Gaius as the antithesis of the νόμος ἔμψυχος, the embodiment of divine law for his people.[222] His character is one of wrath and vindictiveness (218, 254, 261, 268, 303), vengeance (330), vice (98), and impiety (346). Eschewing justice, he conducts himself as "a ruthless tyrant" (349–50; cf. 359, 366). So far from being a benefactor, when he gave a gift, "he did not treat it as a loan and exact interest and compound interest, but as stolen property entailing very heavy loss for those who took it" (343). In Philo's estimation, no good thing was achieved by this man's reign. Indeed, "if he did commit any kind action, he immediately repented of it" (339).

Philo regards Gaius' divine pretensions to be his chief abomination. In Philo's estimation, God alone is sovereign (3, 6), the benefactor of the whole world (118); human rulers receive their power from God (50) and are God's representatives on earth (56).[223] In his craving for divine honors, Gaius fails to

---

222. Wayne A. Meeks, "Divine Agent," 50–51; Peder Borgen, "Moses, Jesus, and the Roman Emperor: Observations in Philo's Writings and the Revelation of John," *NovT* 38 (1996): 153.

223. Jean Laporte, ed. and trans., *De Iosepho* (vol. 21 of *Les oeuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie*; Paris: Cerf, 1964), 27.

acknowledge the limits of human kingship.[224] Initially, the emperor loved nothing more than to dress up as Bacchus, Heracles, Mercury, Apollo, or Mars (78–79, 93). Whereas he sought purely to deceive spectators with his disguises (111), he ought rather to have imitated divine virtues,[225] which confer benefits on humankind (81, 86–87). In reality, however, he is no imitator of the gods (111), sharing neither their nature, essence, or intentions (114). Nevertheless, "Gaius grew beside himself with vanity, not only saying but thinking that he was a god" (162; cf. 75; 164, 218, 367–68), compelling the multitudes to so acknowledge him (77, 198, 201, 338). The Jews alone refuse to esteem him as a god (265, 332), for which they have earned his undying hatred (268).[226] Philo makes clear, however, that the issue is not a lack of loyalty towards the emperor on the part of Jews, but rather a refusal to ascribe

---

224. Wayne A. Meeks, "Divine Agent," 52.

225. One of the Greek titles of this treatise, Περὶ ἀρετῶν καὶ πρεσβείας πρὸς Γάϊον, prompted Eusebius to wonder whether Philo was being ironic, mocking Gaius' impiety (*Hist. eccl.* 2.18.8). Schürer, *Geschichte*, 3:682, doubts that this was Philo's intent. Rather, he believes the title reflects the victory of Jewish virtue over pagan impiety. Cf. Siegfried Reiter, "APETH und der Titel von Philos 'Legatio'," in Epitymbion, *Heinrich Swoboda Dargebracht* (Reichenberg: Stiepel, 1927), 230, who suggests the title refers to the virtue of God.

226. Leisegang, "Gesandtschaft," 396, further observes that according to Philo (115), Gaius' hatred (or at least suspicion) in fact stems from the fact that the Jews are monotheists. Goodenough, *Politics*, 110–15; Daniélou, *Philon d'Alexandrie*, 79–80, contends, however, that the issue at stake in the Jews' refusal to ascribe Gaius divine honors is not monotheism, but rather the hatred of an oppressive pagan ruler whose reign was a mockery of the notion of the imitation of divine virtue. Cf. Laporte, *De Iosepho*, 26, who maintains that Philo considered adoration of the emperor as tantamount to idolatry.

divine status to him.[227] Yet the emperor's thirst for divine honors and his disregard for Jewish customs lead him to insist that his statue be erected within the temple (232).

Legatio ad Gaium is like a diptych portraying the ideal king in one panel and the tyrant in the other. Augustus and Tiberius exemplify the former: such a king establishes peace and maintains harmony between Greeks and barbarians; is a benefactor; is pious; rules in accordance with the law; and respects the laws and customs of the Jews. Gaius is the exemplar of the latter: he is the source, not of peace and blessing, but of civil war and evil for his people; he rules not in accordance with,but in flagrant disregard of the law; and he does not imitate divine virtue, but rather parodies it by imitating the external trappings of divine majesty, and claiming to be divine himself.

3.3.2. *De Iosepho.* Philo conceives of Joseph as the quintessential *politicus*, or statesman. His two portrayals of Joseph are so divergent that it is difficult to believe they were composed by the same author. In *De Somniis*, Joseph represents the "empty opinion" (κενὴ δόξα) and "arrogance" (τῦφος) of the Roman statesman. In *De Iosepho*, he embodies the characteristics of the Hellenistic ideal king.[228] A difference in authorial audience may account for the discrepancy. Goodenough argues persuasively that *De Somniis* is a cryptic denunciation of Roman rule intended for Jewish ears, while *De Iosepho* is written to persuade gentile proselytes

---

227. He remarks that the Jewish temple was "the first to accept sacrifices in behalf of Gaius's reign" (232). The Jews wish to maintain, however, "respectful fear of the emperor and loyalty to the consecrated laws" (236; cf. 356). See further, Leisegang, "Gesandtschaft," 392–94.

228. Technically, Joseph is not a king, although Philo makes clear to the reader that he is the *de facto* king. Pharaoh makes him his viceroy, "or rather, if the truth be said, king, reserving indeed to himself the name of the office, but resigning to him the actual sovereignty and doing everything else that might give the young man honor" (*Ios.* 119; cf. 242). Moreover, the portrayal of Joseph conforms to the Hellenistic ideal king (Laporte, *De Iosepho*, 30–31).

that the highest political ideals are embodied in a Jewish statesman, who moreover formerly ruled Egypt with justice.[229] Setting aside the picture of Joseph in *De Somniis*, the following will focus on *De Iosepho.*

At the end of the treatise, Philo describes Joseph as possessing the quintessential attributes of ideal statesman: he "enjoyed the greatest perfection of beauty, and wisdom, and eloquence of speech" (268). This summary statement does not capture the breadth of Philo's portrayal of Joseph, but provides some broad categories for analysis. The first and third of these attributes—beauty and eloquence—appear related in that they both affect the moral transformation of the beholder. Joseph's physical appearance bespeaks royal majesty. Philo is thinking of more than his handsome features that caught the attention of Potiphar's wife. Joseph's external appearance reflects his virtues. His father, Jacob, recognizes the boy's virtue, and takes care to foster this disposition, "in order that it might not only not be smothered, but might shine forth more brilliantly" (4). The brilliance of the king's appearance is an important part of the Hellenistic presentation of the ideal king, especially that of the Neopythagoreans.[230] There, as in Philo, the king is the animate law, a faithful copy of divine law. It is in this sense that the king is understood to be ἐπιφανής, God manifest. His resplendent appearance reflects his divine nature, which has a transformative effect on those who behold him.

---

229. Goodenough, *Politics*, 21–63; followed by Laporte, *De Iosepho*, 14–16. See, however, Jouette M Bassler, "Philo on Joseph: The Basic Coherence of De Iosepho and De Somniis II," *JSJ* 16 (1985): 240–255, who argues that the contrast between Philo's presentations of Joseph has been overstated.

230. See above, ch. 2, and also Bréhier, *Les Idées*, 18–23; Goodenough, "Political Philosophy". A concise summary of Goodenough's earlier work can be found in his *Politics*, 46–47. Goodenough and Bréhier contend that the Neopythagorean fragments constitute a significant source for Philo's royal ideology, while Delatte, *Les Traités*, 184–288, argues that the Neopythagoreans were influenced by Philo. The question of influence cannot be decisively determined as long as the dating of these fragments is unresolved.

The transformative effect of Joseph's person is brought out in Philo's account of Joseph's imprisonment. The author begins with a summary statement of the change that takes place amongst Joseph's fellow prisoners:

> And while he was in prison he displayed such exceeding virtue that even the most abandoned persons there marvelled and were amazed, and looked upon it as an alleviation of their calamities to have found such a man as the averter of evil (ἀλεξίκακον) from them. (80)

It is noteworthy that Philo describes Joseph as ἀλεξίκακος, the same adjective used to characterize Augustus (see above, p. 186).[231] The jailer, whose character is the very absence of virtue, "was propitiated by the virtue of this young man" (85), turning over the administration of the jail to Joseph.[232] Under his leadership, the prisoners observe a remarkable change taking place:

> Thus even the place, as they felt, could not rightly be called a prison, but a house of correction. For instead of the tortures and punishments which they used to endure night and day under the lash or in manacles or in every possible affliction, they were rebuked by his wise words (λόγοι) and doctrines of philosophy, while the conduct of their teacher effected more than any words. For by setting before them his life of temperance and every virtue, like an original picture of skilled workmanship (οἷα γραφὴν ἀρχέτυπον εὖ δεδημιουργηένην), he converted even those who seemed to be quite incurable, who as the long-standing distempers of the soul abated reproached themselves for their past and repented with such utterances as these: 'Ah, where in old days was this great blessing which at first we failed to find? See, when it shines on us we behold as in a mirror our misbehaviour (ἀκοσμίαν) and are ashamed.' (*Ios.* 86–87)

Note that this salutary effect is accomplished not only by Joseph's appearance and conduct, but by his words. This effect is what Philo has in mind when he recalls at the end of the treatise that it was Joseph's eloquence "which secured him the

---

231. Goodenough, *Politics*, 53–54, notes that this is an unusual term, and suspects that it was used in nonextant kingship literature. W. Richardson, "The Philonic Patriarchs as Νόμος Ἔμψυχος," in *Studia Patristica: Papers Presented to the Second International Conference on Patristic Studies Held at Christ Church, Oxford, 1955* (ed. Kurt Aland and Frank L. Cross; TUGAL 63; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1957), 525, believes that the term connotes a protective and apotropaic function.

232. Note the subtle change Philo has applied to the biblical account, which says that the jailer gave Joseph charge of the prison "because the Lord was with him" (Gen 39:23). For Philo, Joseph is appointed to this position because of his virtue.

obedience, not forced but voluntary, of every one of his subjects" (*Ios.* 269). Through Joseph's words and appearance, he re-orders disordered souls.[233] The same cathartic effect may be in view in Philo's description of the reception Joseph receives as he travels throughout Egypt as Pharaoh's viceroy. He

> made his presence very welcome to those who saw him, not only through the benefits (ὠφελαίαις) which they received from him, but through the remarkable and exceptional charm of his appearance and his general deportment (ἀλλὰ καὶ ταῖς περὶ τὴν ὄψιν τε καὶ τὴ ἄλλην ὁμιλίν ἀλέκτοις και ἐξαιρέτοις χάρισιν). (*Ios.* 157; cf. 164)

Finally, Joseph's wisdom enables him to rule in accordance with divine law, thereby effecting harmony. Philo remarks that Joseph's wisdom is displayed

> by the evenness of his conduct in the indescribable variety of circumstances that attended the whole of his life, by which he wrought regularity among things that were irregular, and harmony among things that were discordant. (269)

One such example of bringing harmony out of discord is Joseph's reunion with his brothers, during which he conducts himself "with self-restraint, and governed his own soul, and with great prudence" (166), rather than giving way to anger and vengeance. His brothers come to recognize that they are receiving the just desserts for their impiety, but remark that "'he who requires it is not man, but either God, or reason, or the law of God (οὐκ ἄνθρωπος, ἄλλ᾽ ἤ θεὸς ἤ λόγος ἤ νόμος θεῖος)'" (174). Joseph is thus characterized as the incarnation of divine law.[234]

Also noteworthy in this regard are Philo's allegorical reflections on the etymology of Joseph's Hebrew name, which translated into Greek means "addition of the Lord" (κυρίου πρόσθεσις), according to Philo. The world, Philo explains, is a

---

233. Although "misbehavior" is an acceptable translation for ἀκοσμία, it is more literally rendered, "disorder." So Goodenough, *Politics*, 53–54; Laporte, *De Iosepho*, 79: "dérèglement." See further, Chesnut, "Ruler and Logos," 1327–28.

234. Richardson, "Philonic Patriarchs," 520–21.

large state governed by a single constitution, the law of nature.[235] The source of disunity (τὸ ἄμικτον καὶ ἀκοινώνητον) in the world is that every city, seeking its own advantage rather than the common good of humanity, establishes its own constitution over against the constitution of nature. The translation of Joseph's name is thus felicitous because, as the laws of individual cities are an addition to nature, so the politician (πολιτικὸς ἀνὴρ) is an addition to the man who lives in accord with nature (28–31). The true statesman (πολιτικὸς ὄντως), however, is enrolled as a free citizen of the greatest and most admirable state in the world (ἐφιέμενος ἐγγραφῆς τῆς ἐν τῷ μεγίστῳ καὶ ἀρίστῳ πολιτεύματι τοῦδε τοῦ κόσμου) (67–69). He therefore is not beholden to the interests of individuals, but rather seeks what is to the general advantage of the whole state (τὰ συνοίσοντα πᾶσι κοινῇ) (77).[236]

Joseph is thus seen to be the ideal statesman who, through his appearance and eloquence, transforms ruined lives and enables obedience, and through his wisdom establishes harmony.

3.3.3. *De vita Mosis.* Although in Scripture it is nowhere explicitly stated that Moses is a king,[237] Philo's treatise on the life of Moses presents him as the ideal philosopher-king (2.2). The "absolutely perfect governor" possesses "royal power, the legislative disposition, and the priesthood, and the prophetic office" (2.187; cf.

---

235. See Bréhier, *Les Idées*, 11–13, on Philo's appropriation of the Stoic idea of the divinely administered world state.

236. Bassler, "Philo on Joseph," 246–47. One cannot help but think that this characterization of Joseph falls short of the ideal king. According to Valentin Nikiprowetzky, "ΚΥΡΙΟΥ ΠΡΟΣΘΕΣΙΣ: note critique sur Philon d'Alexandrie, *De Iosepho*, 28," *REJ* 127 (1968): 392, this is because for Philo, Joseph is merely a statesman serving the Egyptian king, whose realm is but "une pâle préfiguration de la République parfaite selon Moïse."

237. A possible exception is Deut 33:5. See further, the argument by Joshua Roy Porter, *Moses and Monarchy: A Study in the Biblical Tradition of Moses* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1963), that Moses is depicted in the Pentateuch as a Davidic monarch. Porter's use of ancient Near Eastern parallels appears to follow the trajectory of the "myth and ritual" school. While his analysis of Moses traditions is often insightful, his conclusions perhaps extend beyond the evidence.

2.3). The first book of *De vita Mosis* gives an account of Moses' deeds as king; the second explicates his legislative, priestly, and prophetic roles. Philo explains the necessity for the confluence of these faculties in the person of the king as follows. The king must command what is right and forbid what is wrong; this capacity "belongs especially to the law, so that the king is at once a living law (νόμος ἔμψυχος), and the law is a just king" (2.4; cf. 1.162). He furthermore needs divine providence for ordering the affairs of state; he must therefore be a priest, in order that he may, "with a perfect knowledge of the proper way to serve God, entreat for a deliverance from evil and for a participation in good" (2.5).[238] Finally, the king must be a prophet, "in order that he might through the providence of God learn all those things which he was unable to comprehend by his own reason" (2.6).[239] The following discussion will focus on Philo's treatment of Moses as ideal king, but it is important to remember that he considers Moses to be the synthesis of these four faculties.[240]

Philo's *De vita Mosis* may have been written to persuade a gentile readership that Moses conforms to the Hellenistic ideal of kingship, while at the same time

---

238. For which the king must furthermore be virtuous (2.133–34). Philo also notes the high-priestly function of mediation and reconciliation (2.166). Laporte, *De Iosepho*, 32, remarks that it is Joseph's lack of sacerdotal function that makes him inferior to Moses in terms of the royal ideal. Joseph is but a temporal sovereign.

239. Mariette Canevet, "Remarques sur l'utilisation du genre littéraire historique par Philon dans Vita Moysis, ou Moise général en chef-prophète," *RevScRel* 60 (1986): 198–203, believes Moses' prophetic function to be linked with his role as military commander: Moses as prophet announces events that confirm his right to command.

240. Wayne A. Meeks, *The Prophet-King: Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology* (NovTSup 14; Leiden: Brill, 1967), 108, notes that of these four faculties, kingship is the only one whose attribution to Moses Philo feels no need to explain. This suggests that Moses' kingship was widely accepted in Philo's circle. See further, Meeks' discussion of Moses' offices of legislator, high priest, and prophet (112–31). He argues that the first two are common to the Hellenistic portrait of the ideal king, yet have strong analogues in Jewish tradition. The conception of the ideal king as prophet does not appear to be based upon pagan models, but rather stems from traditional Jewish views.

demonstrating the highest ideals of Judaism.[241] Moses is possessed of innate genius (1.21), and is the beneficiary of a royal education whereby he learns philosophy (1.20, 23;cf. 2.212, 215).[242] He thereby learns to master his passions (1.25–26, 29), and his feet are set on the path toward virtue, "having a teacher within himself, virtuous reason" (1.48; cf. 2.66). Despising material wealth, he greatly desires the true wealth of virtue.[243] Moses' life thus exhibits "perfect harmony . . . like people who are playing together in tune on a musical instrument" (1.29). As a reward for his virtue and benevolence towards his people, God grants him authority to rule (1.148, 155). In response, Moses does not seek to establish a dynasty for himself (1.150), but rather endeavors to become the people's benefactor, "never omitting any opportunity of doing anything that might tend to their prosperity" (1.151).[244] In his solicitude for his people, he is like a good physician (1.42), a shepherd (1.60–65), and a kindly disposed father (1.328).

As the person pre-eminent in virtue, Moses provides the model of virtue for his people to imitate, who take "a faithful copy of this excellence in their own souls" (1.159). Yet this ability is intrinsically linked to his capacity as legislator, since it is fundamentally the law that enables virtue (cf. 2.36, 43, 189). Philo explains that a

---

241. Erwin R. Goodenough, "Philo's Exposition of the Law and His De Vita Mosis," *Harvard Theological Review* 26 (1933): 109–25; Wayne A. Meeks, *Prophet-King*, 102–3; Louis H. Feldman, *Philo's Portrayal of Moses in the Context of Ancient Judaism* (Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity Series 15; Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 2007), 11–16.

242. Although brought up in the court of the Egyptian king, Moses nevertheless feels a "desire for and admiration of the education of his kinsmen and ancestors" (1.32).

243. Philo elaborates: "and these things are, temperance, and fortitude, and continence, and presence of mind, and acuteness, and knowledge, and industry, and patience under evil, and contempt of pleasure, and justice, and exhortations to virtue and blame, and lawful punishment of offenders, and, on the contrary, praise and honor to those who did well in accordance with law" (1.154). See further the expansive discussion of Moses' virtues in Louis H. Feldman, *Philo's Portrayal of Moses in the Context of Ancient Judaism* (CJAS 15; Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 2007), 235–357.

244. Philo further notes that God is Moses' benefactor (2.256).

perfect lawgiver must exercise the virtues perfectly, and in particular these four: "humanity (τὸ φιλάνθρωπον), the love of justice (τὸ φιλοδίκαιον), the love of virtue (τὸ φιλάγαθον), and the hatred of iniquity (τὸ μισοπόνηρον)" (2.9).[245] It would be no small thing to possess even one of these virtues, but Moses was gifted with all four. This innate and extraordinary capacity for virtue enabled him to compile, at God's prompting, the sacred books of the law:

> likenesses and copies of the patterns enshrined in the soul (τῶν ἀγαλματοφορουμένων ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ παραδειγμάτων ἀπεικονίσματα καὶ μιμήγματα), which became the laws which he revealed and established, displaying in the clearest manner the virtues which I have enumerated and described above. (2.11; cf. 1.158; 2.45)[246]

What Philo appears to be saying here is that the law resided innately within Moses, and that the written law is but a copy of the "living law" within him. It would thus follow that if the purpose of the law is to inculcate virtue, the king who is also a perfect legislator is best equipped to carry out this task, because the law resides within him. This is precisely what Philo, in fact, says. In concluding his comments on the king's ability to provide the perfect example of virtue for the people to imitate, he offers the following suggestion as to how it was that Moses enabled the people to copy his virtue: "but, perhaps, since Moses was also destined to be the lawgiver of his nation, he was himself long previously, through the providence of God, a living and reasonable law (νόμος ἔμψυχός τε καὶ λογικὸς)" (1.162; cf. *Abr.* 5).

---

245. On φιλανθρωπία as the quintessential Hellenistic royal virtue, see Ceslas Spicq, "La philanthropie hellénistique, vertu divine et royale (à propos de Tit 3:4)," *ST* 12 (1958): 168–191; Milo van Veldhuizen, "Moses: A Model of Hellenistic Philanthropia," *RefR* 38 (1985): 215–224. Heinemann, *Philons Bildung*, 196–97, finds this virtue to be emphasized within both Jewish and Greek thought. See further, on justice: 1.50, 56; gentleness, mildness: 1.331; moderation, temperance: 1.40, 161; mercy: 1.173; prudence: 1.249; piety: 1.307; peace-loving (although prepared for war): 1.243; courage: 1.252.

246. Note further Philo's concluding appraisal of Abraham: "Such was the life of the first, the founder of the nation, one who obeyed the law, some will say, but rather, as our discourse has shown, himself a law and an unwritten statute (νόμος αὐτὸς ὢν καὶ θεσμὸς ἄγραφος)" (*Abr.* 275-276).

If in Philo's thought, divine law is to be equated with the law of nature (2.48),[247] then Moses as living law is able to "lead people into harmony with the universe and the principles of nature."[248] Philo here appears to reflect the same understanding of the ideal king as living law seen in Greco-Roman political thinkers such Musonius Rufus.[249]

Moses is the recipient of divine blessing and participates in divine governance, and is the means by which humankind imitates divine virtue. Consistent with Jewish monotheism, Philo believes that God alone is sovereign over the whole all things (1.318; 2.99–100). God therefore has no need of human agents to carry out his will, although as in the case of the plagues God visits upon Egypt, he uses the agency of both humans and animals alike (1.111, 1300). Furthermore, as mentioned above, God gives Moses a share in his sovereignty: "for having judged him deserving of being made a partaker (κοινωνὸν) with himself in the portion which he had reserved for himself, he gave him the whole world as a possession suitable for his heir" (1.155). That God and Moses share the rule of the world in common is evidence of their mutual friendship (1.156).[250] Because Moses enjoys "an even greater communion with the Father and Creator of the universe," he is

---

247. Erwin R. Goodenough, "Philo's Exposition of the Law and His De Vita Mosis," *HTR* 26 (1933): 112; Wolfson, *Philo*, 1:356–57; Nikiprowetzky, "L'exégèse," 324; Richard A. Horsley, "The Law of Nature in Philo and Cicero," *HTR* 71 (1978): 50–57.

248. Harold Remus, "Moses and the *Thaumaturges*: Philo's *De Vita Mosis* as a Rescue Operation," *LTP* 52 (1996): 677; see further Wayne A. Meeks, *Prophet-King*, 110–11; Veldhuizen, "Moses: A Model of Hellenistic Philanthropia," 218–19.

249. Richardson, "Philonic Patriarchs," 519–20; Heinemann, *Philons Bildung*, 199; Feldman, *Philo's Portrayal*, 282–83. On Moses' ability to inculcate virtue, see further: 1.328; 2.50.

250. Borgen, "Moses, Jesus, and the Roman Emperor," 150, remarks that the term, κοινονός, is used to denote a person who is a partner of the emperor (e.g., Tiberius Gemellus, in *Legat.* 23; 25; 28; cf. *Flacc.* 10). Kügler, "Spüren," 233, further observes that φίλος is a Hellenistic term denoting one who shares in the king's power. Note, however, that Philo nevertheless understands God to be "the regulator and approver of all his actions" (1.163).

"called the god and king of the whole nation, and he is said to have entered into the darkness where God was." In so doing, he beheld God's invisible nature, and thereby "established himself as a most beautiful and Godlike work, to be a model for all those who were inclined to imitate him" (1.158; cf. *Sac.* 9; Exod 7:1). According to W. A. Meeks, this mystical ascent whereby Moses is enthroned constitutes a unique element in Philo's portrait of the ideal king:

> Thus Moses' enthronement in heaven, accompanied by his receiving the name "god" and God's crown of light, meant that the lost glory of Adam, the image of God, was restored to him and that Moses henceforth was to serve on earth as God's representative, both as revealer (prophet) and as vicegerent (king).[251]

Furthermore, the mode by which God's image is transferred to Moses and ultimately to those who imitate him is vision. In the following passage, Philo remarks that a virtuous man, city or nation will quickly rise to a position of pre-eminence,

> as the head is to the body occupying the pre-eminence of situation, not more for the sake of glory than for that of advancing the interests of those that see (τῶν ὁρώντων). For continual appearances of good models stamp impressions closely resembling themselves on all souls which are not utterly obdurate and intractable. (*Praem.* 114)

Philo is here referring to "those who wish to imitate models of excellent and admirable beauty . . . so that they may be able to effect a return to virtue and wisdom" (*Praem.* 115). B. L. Mack concludes that, "the visual moment itself, the imaging of the γραφή, the reception of the impressions of the paradigm, is the moment of transition itself for Philo."[252]

---

251. Wayne A. Meeks, "Moses as God and King," in *Religions in Antiquity* (FS E. R. Goodenough; ed. J. Neusner; Leiden: Brill, 1968), 371; followed by Borgen, "Moses, Jesus, and the Roman Emperor," 151–52; Kügler, "Spüren," 234. See further, Wayne A. Meeks, *Prophet-King*, 122–25, 130.

252. Burton L. Mack, "Imitatio Mosis: Patterns of Cosmology and Soteriology in the Hellenistic Synagogue," *SPhilo* 1 (1972): 39 Similarly, Walther Völker, *Fortschritt und Vollendung bei Philo von Alexandrien: Eine Studie zur Geschichte der Frömmigkeit* (TUGAL 49.1; Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1938), 283: "Diese Schau Gottes erreicht der Vollkommene, sie ist das Ziel all seines Strebens" (*Det.* 89, 158; *Conf.* 97; *Contempl.* 11). Völker further observes that Philo vacillates in

So, according to Philo, Moses shares in God's reign, and can even be called a visible, human copy of God's invisible, divine nature.[253] But Philo appears to vacillate on the question of whether, or to what extent, Moses himself is divine.[254] Meeks claims that Philo's Moses is a type of "divine man" (θεῖος ἄνηρ), but the use of such terminology is problematic.[255] One may rather say that Philo views Moses as divine only insofar as he imitates divine virtue.[256] In any case, Philo does not appear to regard Moses as sharing the same essence as the God of Israel.[257]

In sum, Philo conceives of the ideal king as one who: (1) effects peace and harmony; (2) is a benefactor; (3) may be called a living law (νόμος ἔμψυχός), denoting that he is both a supreme legislator, and that he rules in accordance with

---

his belief that the vision of God is the goal of the virtuous life for all. At times Philo appears to say that such an experience is mediated only through Moses: "eine Schau des göttlichen Wesens dem Menschen nicht erreichbar wäre, selbst dem Moses hätte Gott diese Bitte nicht erfüllen wollen."

253. It is in this sense that Philo's comments about Moses' divine intellect should be understood, for example (1.27). Philo also regards Moses' prophetic ability as evidence of divine power at work within him (2.253, 258, 263, 275).

254. Erwin R. Goodenough, *By Light, Light: The Mystic Gospel of Hellenistic Judaism* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1935), 223–29; Wayne A. Meeks, *Prophet-King*, 105.

255. Wayne A. Meeks, *Prophet-King*, 103–6. The methodological problems besetting research into ancient Mediterranean θεῖος ἄνηρ typology are insightfully discussed by Eugene V. Gallagher, *Divine Man or Magician?: Celsus and Origen on Jesus* (SBLDS 64; Chico, Ca.: Scholars Press, 1982), 1–33.

256. Thus, Carl R. Holladay, *Theios Aner in Hellenistic-Judaism: A Critique of the Use of This Category in New Testament Christology* (SBLDS 40; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1977), 108–129, 152–155, concludes that Moses' cosmic kingship is purely ethical; Moses is not a "divine man" but rather a "friend of God."

257. Wolfson, *Philo*, 2:331; David T. Runia, "God and Man in Philo of Alexandria," *JTS* 39 (1988): 53–74; Wendy E Helleman, "Philo of Alexandria on Deification and Assimilation to God," *SPhilo* 2 (1990): 67–70; Feldman, *Philo's Portrayal*, 339–48. That Philo did not regard Moses as immortal is strongly suggested by his reference to Moses' death and burial (2.291); so Charles H. Talbert, "Concept of Immortals in Mediterranean Antiquity," *JBL* 94 (1975): 423–425, 430. For the reading that Moses' death constitutes a translation to the divine for Philo, see the discussion in Goodenough, *By Light, Light*, 195–98; Wayne A. Meeks, *Prophet-King*, 124.

the law; (4) is also a priest and prophet; (5) is the model of virtue, and effects the moral transformation of his people through his words and appearance; (6) is God's vicegerent on earth.

4. *Roman Jewish Literature: Flavius Josephus*

Flavius Josephus (37/38–ca. 100 C.E.) presents us with a Jewish portrait of the ideal king that owes much to Hellenistic political philosophy. It is a portrait, moreover, painted by a man whose loyalties were divided between his ancestral people and religion on the one hand, and his newfound Roman patrons on the other.[258] A representative sampling of Josephus' comments on kingship may be culled from the first part of his *Jewish Antiquities*, essentially a "rewritten Bible," whose central aim is to validate Jewish culture and history to a non-Jewish audience.[259] The author's sensitivity to the tastes of his Greek readers accounts for the degree to which Israel's kings are described in terms redolent with the features of the ideal king of Hellenistic thought. His care not to offend his Roman patrons, chief among them Vespasian, with talk of Jewish nationalism accounts for the lack of interest in an eschatological Jewish ideal king, that is, a messiah.[260] In this

---

258. It is debated whether or not Josephus' writings betray a radical shift in loyalty away from the Jews and towards the Romans. Per Bilde, *Flavius Josephus Between Jerusalem and Rome: His Life, His Works and Their Importance* (JSPSup 2; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988), 173–181, surveys the arguments for and against, and decides that Josephus maintained a consistent, moderate, aristocratic perspective throughout his career, namely that Jews should cooperate with Rome.

259. Peter Höffken, "Überlegungen zum Leserkreis der 'Antiquitates' des Josephus," *JSJ* 38 (2007): 328–341. Steve Mason, *Josephus and the New Testament* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2003), 94–99, makes a convincing case that Josephus is writing specifically for a Roman audience, which is not to say, however, that he caters exclusively to Roman sensibilities.

260. Note, e.g., his refusal to comment upon the messianic implications of the stone that destroys the statue in Dan 2:34 (*Ant.* 10.210): "And Daniel also revealed to the king the meaning of the stone, but I have not thought it proper to relate this, since I am expected to write of what is past and done and not of what is to be." Ferdinand Dexinger, "Ein 'messianisches Szenarium' als Gemeingut des Judentums in nachherodianischer Zeit," *Kairos* 17 (1975): 255, contends that this reticence is due to Josephus' deference to his Roman audience, who would have been shocked at the

regard, Josephus appears to be almost the foil to biblical interpreters at Qumran, assiduously downplaying, and in some cases expurgating, messianic elements from Scripture.[261] He does not intend to fill Jewish readers with hope of a future king who will rule over a restored Israel.[262] Rather, his goal is to demonstrate that Israel has produced leaders who are equal in eminence, if not superior to the greatest leaders of the Greco-Roman world.[263] The prime example of Jewish excellence in leadership for Josephus is Solomon, "the most illustrious of all kings and most beloved by God" (*Ant.* 8.190). A sampling of his treatment of Solomon reveals his estimation of the ideal king.

As L. H. Feldman has demonstrated at length, Josephus portrays Israel's first three kings as Hellenized heroes: they are well-born, handsome, wealthy and

---

obvious implication of their own impending destruction.

261. Paul Spilsbury, *The Image of the Jew in Flavius Josephus' Paraphrase of the Bible* (TSAJ 69; Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1998), 124–125, suggests that Josephus (*Ant.* 4.125) may have applied the prophecy of Balaam in Num 24:17 (interpreted messianically at Qumran) to events in the past, possibly to the reign of David or the Hasmoneans. Spilsbury nevertheless claims that Josephus hoped for the future military vindication of the Jews, but allows that the way in which Josephus inscribed these hopes in his writings would not have been evident to all of his readers (126, 146). See further, Christopher Begg, *Josephus' Story of the Later Monarchy: (AJ 9,1–10,185)* (BETL 145; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2000), 115–116, 634, on Josephus' muting of the Davidic promise in 2 Kings 8:19 || 2 Chron 21:7 (*Ant.* 9.96). Dexinger, "'Messianisches Szenarium'," 258–65, maintains, however, that Josephus was not critical of messianic expectation *per se* so much as he was critical of numerous messianic pretenders (see, e.g., *J.W.* 2.57; *Ant.* 17.273–74 [Simon of Peraea]; *J.W.* 2.60–62; *Ant.* 17.278 [Athronges]; *Ant.* 17.285 [the situation in Judea in general]). See further Christophe Mézange, "Josèphe et la fin des temps," in *Le Temps et les Temps: dans les litteratures juives et chretiennes au tournant de notre ere* (ed. Jean-Claude Ingelaere and Grappe Christian; JSJSup 112; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 219–220.

262. Josephus' apparent lack of interest in the restoration of Israel's political sovereignty is further reflected in his treatment of the exilic and post-exilic periods (*Ant.* 10–11). Louis H. Feldman, "Restoration in Josephus," in *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives* (ed. James M. Scott; JSJSup 72; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 223–261, demonstrates that Josephus consistently emphasizes the restoration of the Temple as opposed to the restoration of Jerusalem.

263. Mireille Hadas-Lebel, *Flavius Josèphe: Le Juif de Rome* (Paris: Fayard, 1989), 251–52.

virtuous.[264] Josephus' editorializing with regard to Solomon's virtues is found throughout his work. In particular, he is keen to show that this king possesses the four cardinal virtues: wisdom, courage, temperance, and justice. He thus describes the reaction of the people after Solomon adjudicates the dispute by two women over a newborn child (1 Kings 3:16–28):

> This the multitude considered a great sign and proof of the king's prudence and wisdom (φρονήσεως καὶ σοφίας), and from that day on hearkened to him as to one possessed of a godlike understanding. (*Ant.* 8.34; cf. 7.381; 8.190; 15.398)

Solomon's wisdom is furthermore understood to surpass that of the ancients (*Ant.* 8.42), and in his understanding of the natural world, he is called a philosopher (*Ant.* 8.44). In addition to wisdom, Solomon also possesses temperance, as demonstrated by his response to the sedition of Adonijah. In the biblical account, Solomon is initially disposed to forgive Adonijah on the basis of the latter's ability to henceforth show himself worthy: "So Solomon responded, 'If he proves to be a worthy man, not one of his hairs shall fall to the ground'" (1 Kings 1:51–52). By contrast, in Josephus' retelling, Solomon's virtue is the basis for forgiveness: "Solomon with great mildness and moderation let him off this time without punishment for his offense" (*Ant.* 7.362). In addition to the other two cardinal

---

264. Feldman's earlier publications treating Josephus' portrayal of Saul, David and Solomon can now be found in Louis H. Feldman, *Josephus's Interpretation of the Bible* (Hellenistic Culture and Society; Berkeley ; London: University of California Press, 1998), 509–629. See further, Louis H. Feldman, *Studies in Josephus' Rewritten Bible* (JSJSup 58; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 546–551, in which the author brings together his conclusions regarding Josephus' hellenizing portraits of biblical heroes.

virtues—justice[265] and courage[266]—Solomon also possesses piety. According to his father, David, it is these virtues that render him worthy of God's continued favor:

> "Therefore," he said, "since, even before your birth, you were chosen by God to be king, endeavor to be worthy of His providence by being pious, just and brave; keep commandments and the laws which he gave us through Moses, and do not permit others to transgress them." (*Ant.* 7.338; cf. 7.356, 374, 384)

Solomon is furthermore portrayed as a benefactor, the source of divine benefits for his people.[267] One notes, for example, the subtle manner in which Josephus rewrites the biblical account of Solomon's dedication of the temple, in which it is recorded that the people depart,

> joyful and in good spirits because of all the goodness that the Lord had shown to his servant David and to his people Israel. (1 Kings 8:66)

Josephus writes that the people depart,

> giving thanks to the king for his care of them and for the display he had made, and praying to God to grant them Solomon as king for a long time. (*Ant.* 8.124)

---

265. Note further Josephus' comment that one of the primary functions of Solomon's palace and attached temple was as a court of justice (*Ant.* 8.133–34).

266. On the courage of Solomon, note Josephus' addition to 1 Kings 3:5–9: he adds that God will grant Solomon victory over his enemies (*Ant.* 8.24). Aside from brief mention (e.g., *Ant.* 8.160), Josephus has little else to say about Solomon as a warrior. The accent on courage is more pronounced in Josephus' portrait of David. It is the one virtue singled out in his eulogy: "He was a most excellent man and possessed of every virtue which should be found in a king entrusted with the safety of so many nations; there was none like him for bravery" (*Ant.* 7.390). See further, Feldman, *Josephus's Interpretation of the Bible*, 544–50. Christopher Begg, *Josephus' Account of the Early Divided Monarchy: (AJ 8,212–420): Rewriting the Bible* (BETL 108; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1993), 147–149, 284, further notes a Josephan addition to the biblical account of the end of Asa's reign (1 Kings 15:24): he "imitated his great-grandfather David in courage and piety" (*Ant.* 8.315).

267. Note further Josephus' portrayal of Antiochus III as an exemplar of virtue and the benefactor of the Jews (*Ant.* 12.137–46). Jörg-Dieter Gauger, "Antiochos III. und Artaxerxes: Der Fremdherrscher als Wohltäter," *JSJ* 38 (2007): 201–207, demonstrates that this positive evaluation was out of step with the majority of contemporary Jewish tradition. Mireille Hadas-Lebel, "L'évolution de l'image de Rome auprès des juifs en deux siècles de relations judéo-romaines, -164 à +70," *ANRW* 2.20.2 (1987): 798–800, further points out that Josephus conceives of Rome as the universal benefactor of humanity in his present day: "Is there any people or city or national community for which the protection of your empire and the power of the Romans have not come to be the greatest of blessings?" (*Ant.* 16.38)

The biblical writer attributes the benefits received by the people directly to God. Josephus attributes the benefits to the king, a familiar notion to an audience acquainted with the Hellenistic philosophy and practice of monarchy. The greatest benefit derived by his subjects, however, is the peace that ensued from Solomon's reign:

> Solomon, having now firm possession of the kingdom, and his enemies having been chastised, . . . and thereafter governed the state in perfect peace, nor was he hindered by his youth from dealing justice and observing the laws and remembering the injunctions of his dying father, but performed all tasks with as great scrupulousness as do those of advanced age and mature wisdom. (*Ant.* 8.21; cf. 8.52)

This peace is not simply the cessation of hostility with enemies, but also the end of internal factions and dissension.[268] According to David, God has promised with respect to Solomon that he would

> bring prosperity to the country of the Hebrews in his reign, with, among other things, the greatest of all blessings, namely peace and freedom from war and civil dissension. (*Ant.* 7.337; cf. 7.372)[269]

Indeed, it is because Solomon is a man of peace that God permits him to build the temple. Thus, in a letter to the king of the Tyrians, Solomon writes:

> Know that my father wished to build a temple to God but was prevented by wars and continual expeditions, for he did not leave off subduing his enemies until he had forced all of them to pay tribute. But I give thanks to God for the peace I now enjoy, and as on that account I am at leisure, I wish to build a house to God, for He indeed foretold to my father that this would be made by me. (*Ant.* 8.51–52; cf. 7.337)

In connection with the portrayal of Solomon as a peacemaker, it is worth noting the way in which Solomon's attitude toward gentiles is depicted. In the biblical account

---

268. Spilsbury, *Image of the Jew*, 93, notes that Josephus, in his treatment of the patriarchs, sought to portray the Jews as a people who "strive for and achieve the kind of harmony that other nations long for as well."

269. Daniel R. Schwartz, "Josephus on Hyrcanus II," in *Josephus and the History of the Greco-Roman Period: Essays in Memory of Morton Smith* (ed. Fausto Parente and Joseph Sievers; StPB 41; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 217–220, 227, notes that Josephus blames the attributes the subjugation of the Jews by the Romans to the στάσις of Aristobulus and Hyrcanus (*Ant.* 14.77–78; cf. *J.W.* 1.10, 19, 20; *Life* 100).

of his prayer of dedication for the temple, Solomon beseeches God to hear the prayer of foreigners who come to the temple, "so that all the peoples of the earth may know your name and fear you, as do your people Israel" (1 Kings 8:43). Josephus makes no mention of foreigners fearing God, but adds that as a result of God listening to their prayers, they will come to know the following:

> that we are not inhumane by nature nor unfriendly to those who are not of our country, but we wish that all men equally should receive aid from Thee and enjoy Thy blessings. (*Ant.* 8.117)

In Josephus' eyes, Solomon is the answer to the oft-repeated charge that Jews were misanthropic.[270]

In addition to his portrayal of the ideal historical Jewish king, Josephus' treatment of gentile kings is also instructive. As E. Gruen has cogently argued, Josephus's accounts of various interactions between Jews and foreign monarchs are designed to highlight the constancy and faithfulness of Jews to their ancestral religion, and the favor they thereby win in the eyes of their political overlords.[271] The fictional encounter between Alexander the Great and the Jewish high priest Jaddous provides a prime example of a famous Greek king who recognizes the superiority of Israel's god (*Ant.* 11.313–47).[272] A brief summary will set the stage for the climactic encounter. Upon laying siege to Tyre, Alexander sends word to the high priest in Jerusalem that he must now recognize his sovereignty. When the

---

270. Feldman, *Josephus's Interpretation of the Bible*, 613–15 That Josephus need to answer the charge of Jewish misanthropy is often noted in the scholarly literature; see, e.g., Spilsbury, *Image of the Jew*, 92–93.

271. Erich S. Gruen, *Heritage and Hellenism*, 189–245; similarly, Spilsbury, *Image of the Jew*, 216. See further, Shaye J. D. Cohen, "Respect for Judaism by Gentiles According to Josephus," *HTR* 80 (1987): 413: "In sum, Gentile monarchs and dignitaries guarantee Jewish rights and privileges, sacrifice to God, worship in his temple, recognize that God protects and punishes his people, and believe that God appoints and removes the kings of both the Jews and the Gentiles."

272. Étienne Nodet, "Après l'Exil," in *L'Ancien Testament: cent ans d'exegese a l'école biblique* (ed. Jean-Luc Vesco; CahRB 28; Paris: Gabalda, 1990), 73, suggests that the legendary account functioned originally to anchor the existence of Judaism in the Persian period.

high priest refuses, Alexander resolves to pay him a visit in person, "and through him teach all men what people it was to whom they must keep their oaths" (*Ant.* 11.319). This causes the priest tremendous anxiety, yet in a vision, God instructs him to meet the king, along with the priests, clad in white vestments. When Alexander sees the venerable procession, he falls down in worship. His aids are puzzled, but Alexander explains that he had previously had a vision of precisely this procession when he was deliberating whether he should invade Persia. In this vision, Alexander recounts, God

> 'urged me not to hesitate but to cross over confidently, for he himself would lead my army and give over to me the empire of the Persians. . . . now I am reminded of the vision and the exhortation, I believe that I have made this expedition under divine guidance and that I shall defeat Darius and destroy the power of the Persians and succeed in carrying out all the things which I have in mind.' (*Ant.* 11.334–35)

Alexander's success can now be attributed to Yahweh. Throughout the episode, it is clear that Alexander possesses absolute power. In a remarkable twist, his words demonstrate, however,

> that power itself derives from the God of the Hebrew patriarchs whose authority Alexander openly and publicly recognizes. . . . They are the beneficiaries of the king—but he is himself a beneficiary of their Lord.[273]

In accord with both the philosophy of Hellenistic kingship and the witness of the OT, Josephus understands the king to rule at the pleasure of God.[274]

The idea that gentile rulers act in conformity with the will of Israel's god is further reflected in Josephus' narration of his surrender to Vespasian at Jotapata. The Roman general's intention is to send his prisoner to Nero in short order, but Josephus convinces him otherwise when he tells him that he has been sent as a

---

273. Erich S. Gruen, *Heritage and Hellenism*, 198.

274. Josephus has gentile kings acknowledge that both gentile and Jewish kings are appointed and deposed by God: *Ant.* 10.139 (Nebuchadnezzar); 11.3–4 (Cyrus); 11.279 (Artaxerxes); 12.25, 47 (Ptolemy Philadephus); see Cohen, "Respect," 413 n. 14.

divine messenger to inform Vespasian that he will soon be Caesar: "'for you, Caesar, are master not of me only, but of land and sea the whole human race" (*J.W.* 3.402).[275] Although Vespasian is at first inclined to dismiss Josephus' words as little more than an ingenious ruse to save himself, he soon becomes convinced, "for God was already rousing in him thoughts of empire and by other tokens foreshowing the throne"(*J.W.* 3.404). Vespasian's imminent world-wide rule is thus attributed to God's plan.[276]

Finally, Josephus' comments with regard to both Jewish and gentile kings must be viewed within the context of his conception of the ideal polity: theocracy. His clearest statement of this ideal constitution is found in his apologetic work, *Against Apion*. There he contrasts the polity of Israel with Aristotle's three legitimate constitutions—monarchy, aristocracy and democracy:

> but our legislator had no regard to any of these forms, but he ordained our government to be what, by a strained expression, may be termed a theocracy, by ascribing the authority and the power to God (*Ag. Ap.* 2.165).[277]

---

275. See further Josephus' comment to the effect that the Jews undertook the war based on the erroneous interpretation of prophecy, to wit that "'one from their country should become governor of the habitable earth.'" This prophecy, Josephus explains, referred to Vespasian (*J.W.* 6.312–13). Dexinger, "'Messianisches Szenarium'," 257, again claims that Josephus is here motivated by deference to Rome. Others go so far as to suggest that he is here merely repeating a conventional piece of Flavian propaganda; so Christiane Saulnier, "Flavius Josèphe et la propagande flavienne," *RB* 96 (1989): 560–562; Mézange, "Josèphe et la fin des temps," 211.

276. So Marinus de Jonge, "Josephus und die Zukunftserwartungen seines Volkes," in *Josephus-Studien: Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament* (ed. Otto Betz, et al.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1974), 206; Mason, *Josephus and the New Testament*, 47. De Jonge makes clear, however, that Josephus did not view Vespasian as a messianic figure (210–15). Rather, Josephus simply acknowledged that God had given Rome dominion throughout the world (*J.W.* 5.366–67). Furthermore, the destruction visited on the Jews by the Romans should be seen as God's judgment (*J.W.* 7.332–33). Cf. Dexinger, "'Messianisches Szenarium'," 257–58, who claims that Josephus has applied the messianically understood text of Dan 2:34 to Vespasian, whom Josephus nevertheless confines to the realm of *pre*-messianic activity (see n. 260 above).

277. Elsewhere, Josephus has Moses declare that aristocracy is the preferred constitution. Yet it is clear in this passage that aristocracy is the rule of the Torah, which is further explained to be the rule of God: "for God sufficeth for your ruler" (*Ant.* 4.223). Spilsbury, *Image of the Jew*, 163–

As is made clear further on in the treatise, the ideal theocracy is one in which God's authority is delegated not to a monarch, but to a high priest (*Ag. Ap.* 2.185).[278] Josephus' uneasy relationship with the institution of monarchy is elsewhere reflected in the response of Samuel to the people's request for a king: "what great impiety ye have shown towards God in asking for a king" (*Ant.* 6.88; cf. 1 Sam 8:7). Despite God's provision for them, Israel has asked for a king and in so doing has been "traitors to His worship and His religion" (*Ant.* 6.90). The substance of this impiety and betrayal "is that it replaces God with a human king."[279] Nevertheless, Josephus does not categorically reject kingship as illegitimate. Echoing Deuteronomy's law of the king (Deut 17:14–20), Josephus has Moses make allowance for a king submitted to Torah, who acts only in accord with the will of the high priest and council (*Ant.* 4.224).[280] In sum, Josephus propounds the vision of a commonwealth in which God is king, and in which a human king may have an appropriate place in submission to God's Torah and God's priest. Such a king is: pre-eminent in virtue, the benefactor to his people, the bringer of peace and creator of harmony, and a friend to gentiles. Gentile kings, moreover, are seen to act in accord with the will of the God of Israel.

67, demonstrates that "aristocracy" is something of an elastic term for Josephus.

278. Höffken, "Überlegungen," 591–92, argues that it is Josephus' preference for a priestly aristocracy, rather than any consideration for his Roman audience or his putative Hasmonean descent, which lies behind his relativization of the biblical promises concerning the Davidic dynasty; *contra* Feldman, *Josephus's Interpretation of the Bible*, 566–67. See further, Klaus Stefan Krieger, "War Flavius Josephus ein Verwandter des hasmonäischen Königshauses?" *BN* 73 (1994): 58–65, on the questionable reliability of Josephus' assertion of Hasmonean ancestry.

279. Spilsbury, *Image of the Jew*, 168.

280. See further the suggestion by William Horbury, *Messianism Among Jews and Christians: Twelve Biblical and Historical Studies* (London: T&T Clark, 2003), 170, that Josephus characterizes Joshua as a constitutional monarch who presides over a sacerdotal aristocracy (*Ant.* 5.55, 103).

5. *Literature of Disputed Provenance:* Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs

A number of passages in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* mention future ideal figures, both priests and kings. It is unclear however, to what extent these passages shed light on pre-Christian Jewish thought.[281] Despite over a century of critical inquiry, there is yet little scholarly consensus regarding the provenance of the *Testaments*.[282] In its present form, this text is undeniably Christian. Equally apparent is its wealth of traditional material mined from Hellenistic Judaism. The question, therefore, is whether the *Testaments* should be understood as having originated within a Jewish community and later redacted by Christians, or whether it is to be regarded as a thoroughly Christian composition. Numerous attempts have been made to separate a Jewish core from later Christian interpolations using the tools of textual and literary criticism.[283] In a related vein, some have argued that the *Testaments* originated within the Qumran community; what therefore appear to be Christian interpolations derive in fact from the text's

---

281. Note the recent plea for methodological caution in this regard voiced by Robert A. Kraft, "Setting the Stage and Framing Some Central Questions," *JSJ* 32 (2001): 371–395.

282. See the reviews of the history of research in Marinus de Jonge, "The Interpretation of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs in Recent Years," in *Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Text and Interpretation* (ed. Marinus de Jonge; SVTP 3; Leiden: Brill, 1975), ; H. Dixon Slingerland, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical History of Research* (SBLMS 21; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1977), ; Robert A. Kugler, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (GAP; Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 31–38.

283. See, e.g., F.-C. Braun, "Les Testaments des XII Partrairches et le problème de leur origine," *RB* 67 (1960): 533–543; Jacob Jervell, "Ein Interpolator interpretiert: Zu der christlichen Bearbeitung der Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen," in *Studien zu den Testamenten der Zwölf Patriarchen* (ed. Walther Eltester; BZNW 36; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1969), 30–61; Jürgen Becker, *Untersuchungen zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen* (AGJU 8; Leiden: Brill, 1970); Anders Hultgård, *Composition de l'ouvrage; textes et traductions* (vol. 2 of *L'eschatologie des Testaments des Douze Patriarches*; 2 vols.; AUUHR 7; Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1982); Jarl Henning Ulrichsen, *Die Grundschrift der Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen: eine Untersuchung zu Umfang, Inhalt und Eigenart der ursprünglichen Schrift* (AUUHR 10; Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1991).

Essene authors.[284] The lack of consensus represented by this variety of differing conclusions perhaps tells against the very possibility of arriving with certainty at a pre-Christian Jewish *Vorlage*. The present discussion will follow the research perspective refined over the past fifty years by M. de Jonge, namely that the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* is most profitably viewed as a witness to early Jewish Christianity.[285] As de Jonge and others have pointed out, to claim that the *Testaments* is a thoroughly Christian text does not negate the obvious fact that it incorporates Jewish elements, or preclude the possibility of either a Jewish precursor or later Christian additions. It merely insists that one cannot with confidence separate elements from the final form of the text that indisputably reflect some form of non-Christian Judaism.[286] In what follows, the final form of the *Testaments* will be viewed as the product of a Hellenistic Jewish Christian community in the latter half of the second century C.E., the aim of which was to

---

284. André Dupont-Sommer, *Nouveaux aperçus sur les manuscrits de la mer Morte* (L'Orient ancien illustré 5; Paris: Maisonneuve, 1953); J. Liver, "The Doctrine of the Two Messiahs in Sectarian Literature in the Time of the Second Commonwealth," *HTR* 52 (1959): 149–185; Marc Philonenko, *Les interpolations chrétiennes des Testaments des Douze Patriarches et les manuscrits de Qoumrân* (CahRHPR 35; Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1960), . See the critiques by Marinus de Jonge, "Christian Influence in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," *NovT* 4 (1960): 182–235; Higgins, "Priestly Messiah," 221.

285. De Jonge first challenged the previous scholarly consensus of the Jewish provenance of the *Testaments* in his dissertation, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Study of Their Text, Composition and Origin* (Van Gorcum's theologische bibliotheek 25; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1953). The culmination of his scholarship in this area and refinement of his perspective is presented in his recent monograph, Marinus de Jonge, *Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament as Part of Christian Literature: The Case of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and the Greek Life of Adam and Eve* (SVTP 18; Leiden: Brill, 2003), .

286. Marinus de Jonge, "The Main Issues in the Study of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," *NTS* 26 (1980): 524; John J. Collins, "The Testamentary Literature in Recent Scholarship," in *Early Judaism and Its Modern Interpreters* (ed. Robert A. Kraft and George W. E. Nickelsburg; SBLBMI 2; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), 268–276; Kugler, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, 35–39; Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 314–15; Torleif Elgvin, "Jewish Christian Editing of the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha," in *Jewish Believers in Jesus: The Early Centuries* (ed. Oskar Skarsaune and Reidar Hvalvik; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2007), 286–92.

persuade Jews to accept the message of Jesus Christ by means of a parenetical tract that presents the Patriarchs not only as moral exemplars, but as having presaged the advent of Jesus.[287] Given this rhetorical objective, the portrayal of Jesus Christ as a Jewish ideal king would resonate with the cultural repertoire of the authorial audience. To the degree that this portrayal reflects the Jewish concept of the ideal king as seen elsewhere in the literature of Second Temple Judaism, the *Testaments* may be seen as corroborative witness to this concept. How does the text effect this portrayal?[288]

Prior to describing the ideal king of the *Testaments*, it must first be asked: How many types of ideal figures are envisioned in this text? At first glance, it would appear that there are three different expectations: for a prophet; for a single priestly-royal figure descended from both Levi and Judah; and for two figures, a priest from Levi, and a king from Judah.[289] The prophetic figure plays a minor role,

---

287. Marinus de Jonge, *Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, 105–6; Kugler, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, 38–39; cf. J. T. Milik, "Le Testament de Lévi en araméen: Fragment de la Grotte 4 de Qumrân," *RB* 62 (1955): 402. R. H. Charles, *The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1908), argues for a Hebrew original of the *Testaments*, which was written towards the end of John Hyrcanus' reign (135–104 B.C.E.), but contains much later material that dates ca. 70–40 B.C.E. Robert Eppel, *Le piétisme juif dans les testaments des douze patriarches* (EHPR 22; Paris: Alcan, 1930), 7–33; Elias J. Bickerman, "The Date of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," *JBL* 69 (1950): 245–260, accept Charles's theory of a Hebrew original, but argue for a date around the first quarter of the second century B.C.E.

288. The Greek text consulted is the critical edition of Marinus de Jonge, in collaboration with H. W. Hollander, et al., *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text* (PVTG 1.2; Leiden: Brill, 1978), . De Jonge's edition is based on a larger number of manuscripts and is more judicious in its use of the Armenian version than the critical editions of both Charles, *Greek Versions* and Hultgård, *Composition*. The English translation follows H. W. Hollander and Marinus de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary* (SVTP 8; Leiden: Brill, 1985), . Based on de Jonge's edition, this translation is to be preferred over that of Howard C. Kee, "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. James H. Charlesworth; ABRL; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1983–85), 1:775–828, which was based on the edition of Charles.

289. (6)An "only-begotten prophet" is mentioned in *T. Benj.* 9.2. Although *T. Levi* 8.15 speaks of a figure whose "presence will be marvellous as that of a high prophet," it is clear from context that this person is identified with the king from Judah mentioned in the previous verse. (7) A single figure from Levi and Judah is mentioned in *T. Jos.* 19.6–7 (although the Armenian version

and is never associated with the other figures. Given that the present investigation is focused on the portrait of the ideal king, the prophetic figure may be set aside. The main question is whether the references to the priestly and royal figures should be taken as referring to two distinct messianic persons, or whether they point to the same person. The following passage amply illustrates that there are two ways to assess the evidence:

> And now, my children, obey Levi, and through Judah you will be redeemed. And do not exalt yourselves against those two tribes, *because from them the salvation of God will arise for you (ἀνατελεῖ ὑμῖν τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ).* For the Lord will raise up from Levi someone as a high priest and from Judah someone as a king, *God and man.* This one will save (οὗτος σώσει) all the Gentiles and the race of Israel. (*T. Sim.* 7.1–2, emphasis added; cf. *T. Levi* 2.11; *T. Dan* 5.10; *T. Naph.* 8.2–3; *T. Gad* 8.1; *T. Jos.* 19.11)

If one sees the *Testaments* as essentially Jewish, then this passage reflects a similar stream of Jewish thought at Qumran that hoped for both a priestly and a royal messiah.[290] Reading this passage as a witness to Jewish thought is problematic, however, as it requires one to assume against the textual evidence that the italicized portions are Christian interpolations.[291] Read as a witness to Christian thought, the

---

is ambiguous, allowing for an interpretaion of two figures); and *T. Benj.* 11:2 (following the reading of MS *c*: ἐκ σπέρματος Ἰουδὰ καὶ Λευί; the majority of other MSS read: ἐκ τοῦ σπέρματος μου). (6) Two figures are mentioned in *T. Jud.* 21:2–5 and *T. Iss.* 5:7 (although neither in an eschatological context); Reub 6:7 (although in v. 10–11, kingship is clearly ascribed to Levi alone); Naph 8:2 (although both Levi and Judah are mentioned, salvation is understood to come through Judah alone); and Sim 7:1–2 (treated below) .

290. George Raymond Beasley-Murray, "The Two Messiahs in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," *JTS* 48 (1947): 1–12; Kuhn, "Die beiden Messias," 173–74; Liver, "Two Messiahs," 163–78, 183; Villiers, "Messiah and Messiahs," 82–87; Vermes, *Jesus the Jew*, 135–36; cf. the critique of A. J. B. Higgins, "Priest and Messiah," *VT* 3 (1953): 326–331; F.-C. Braun, "Les Testaments des XII Partrairches et le problème de leur origine," *RB* 67 (1960): 544–549. Alternately, Johannes Thomas, "Aktuelles im Zeugnis der zwölf Väter," in *Studien zu den Testamenten der Zwölf Patriarchen* (ed. Walther Eltester; BZNW 36; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1969), 120, regards the Levi and Judah material as Qumranic and Christian interpolations, respectively. Philonenko, *Interpolations chrétiennes*, 43: an earlier stage of the text envisioned two messiahs; the present redacted text envisions one.

291. On the difficulty of distinguishing between Christian and Jewish elements in the *Testaments*, see Marinus de Jonge, "Christian Influence," 182–235; Higgins, "Priestly Messiah," 221–31; R. S. Stewart, "The Sinless High Priest," *NTS* 14 (1967–68): 129; Kraft, "Setting

same passage would appear equally problematic. On the face of it, a Christian text that speaks of two messiahs and connects Christ to the tribe of Levi is surely an oddity.[292] It will be noticed, however, that the above passage only speaks of *one person*, who is associated with both the tribe of Levi and Judah. The nouns and verbs referring to this figure are in the singular: ἀνατελεῖ . . . τὸ σωτήριον, οὗτος σώσει. In fact, whenever the *Testaments* refers to an eschatological figure in a Levi-Judah passage, this person is always a singular figure.[293] Although unusual, the association of Christ with Levi in a Christian text is not unheard of. In his commentary on Gen 49 and Deut 33, "The Benedictions of Isaac, Jacob and Moses," Hippolytus of Rome (3rd c. C.E.) ingeniously demonstrates Jesus' descent from both Judah and Levi, a notion with which he likely believed his readers would have been familiar.[294] It may therefore be concluded, with M. de Jonge, that

> There are no clear traces of two 'agents of divine deliverance,' one from Levi and one from Judah. Every time a 'messianic' figure appears, there is one, clearly Jesus Christ, who is connected with Judah, or with Judah and Levi.[295]

---

the Stage," 381.

292. Cf. Heb 7:11–28, which stresses that Jesus is descended from the tribe of Judah, and makes a sharp distinction between Jesus' priesthood and the levitical priesthood.

293. Marinus de Jonge, "Two Messiahs in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs?" in *Tradition and Re-Interpretation in Jewish and Early Christian Literature* (ed. Jan W. van Henten, et al.; StPB 36; Leiden: Brill, 1986), 153–157; Marinus de Jonge, "The Future of Israel in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," *JSJ* 17 (1986): 196–211; Kugler, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, 41–87.

294. Anders Hultgård, *Interprétation des textes* (vol. 1 of *L'eschatologie des Testaments des Douze Patriarches*; 2 vols.; AUUHR 6; Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1977), 78; Marinus de Jonge, "Hippolytus' 'Benedictions of Isaac, Jacob and Moses' and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," *Bijdragen* 46 (1985): 245–60 See further, *T. Dan* 5.10, in which Judah and Levi are referred to as a single tribe from which the savior will arise: καὶ ἀνατελεῖ ὑμῖν ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς Ἰουδὰ καὶ Λευὶ τὸ σωτήριον κυρίου. According to George W.E. Nickelsburg and Michael E. Stone, *Faith and Piety in Early Judaism: Texts and Documents* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983), 171; Kugler, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, 69, this is further evidence of a single messianic figure in the *Testaments*.

295. Marinus de Jonge, "Two Messiahs," 161. Pomykala, *Davidic Dynasty Tradition*, 255, regards de Jonge's conclusion as "quite probable."

That this ideal figure is said to possess both royal and priestly traits should come as no surprise: both Greeks (Diotogenes) and Jews (Philo) believed that the ideal king should also be a priest.[296]

The features of this ideal royal and priestly figure are expressed most clearly in the following two passages: *T. Levi* 18 and *T. Jud. 24*. *Testament of Levi* 17 describes the decline of priesthood into corruption: sin leads to exile and eventual return (*T. Levi* 17.8–10). The following chapter describes the new priest whom the Lord will raise up (*T. Levi* 18.1). In similar fashion, *T. Jud.* 23 recounts the "lewdness and witchcrafts and idolatries" that Judah's descendants practice "against the kingdom" (*T. Jud.* 23.1). This is followed by the advent of an ideal king.[297] The similarities between these two figures are noteworthy. Both are described by means of royal imagery that echoes Num 24:17:[298]

---

296. Eppel, *Piétisme Juif*, 103–4, believes that the *Testaments* speak of one messiah who, in conformity with oriental royal ideology, has related priestly and royal functions: "Le roi est appelé à servir d'intermédiare entre les dieux nationaux et les hommes, et le sacerdoce apparâit comme une de ses attributions essentielles."

297. Although in *T. Jud* 24, this ideal figure is not explicitly denoted as a king, the association of Judah with kingship throughout the *Testament of Judah* and throughout the entirety of the larger work warrant this association here. Thus Judah begins his speech: "my father declared to me, 'You shall be king'" (*T. Jud.* 1.6); later he declares: "'And Abraham, my father's father, blessed me as destined to be the king in Israel" (*T. Jud.* 17.6); "'To me God has given the kingship'" (*T. Jud.* 21.2). See further: *T. Reu.* 6.11–12; *T. Sim.* 7.2; *T. Iss.* 5.7; *T. Naph.* 8.2–3.

298. Max-Alain Chevallier, *L'Esprit et le Messie dans le Bas-judaïsme et le Nouveau Testament* (EHPR 49; Paris: Presses Universitaire de France, 1958), 126–128, notes the many scriptural allusions in *T. Levi* 18 and *T. Jud.* 24, in particular to Num 24:17 and Isa 11:1–10. Jürgen Becker, *Untersuchungen*, 296, observes that nowhere else in the *Testaments* is the ideal priest described with royal attributes.

And his star will arise in heaven, as a king . . . He will shine as the sun on the earth. (*T. Levi* 18.3, 4)	And after these things a star will arise to you from Jacob in peace and a man will arise from my seed like the sun of righteousness (*T. Jud.* 24.1).

The *Testament of Levi* says nothing of the priest's cultic duties. Rather, his function appears to be analogous to the righteous rule envisioned in the *Testament of Judah*:

and he will execute a judgment (κρίσιν) of truth upon the earth in course of time. (*T. Levi* 18.2b)	Then the sceptre of my kingdom will shine, and from your root a stem will arise; and in it a rod of righteousness will arise to the nations to judge (κρῖναι) and to save all who call upon the Lord (*T. Jud.* 24.5–6)

Elsewhere, Levi's rule is spoken of in more explicit terms:

> And approach Levi in humbleness of heart, that you may receive a blessing from his mouth. For he will bless Israel and Judah. Because him the Lord has chosen to be king over all the nations. . . . and [he] will be among you a king forever. (*T. Reu.* 6.10–12)

The notion, prevalent in Hellenistic royal ideology, that the king transmits divine blessing to the people, further suggests that Levi is here portrayed as an ideal king.[299]

The focus of *T. Levi* 18 is the return to paradise inaugurated by the ideal priest :

> And he will open the gates of paradise and will stop the threatening sword against Adam. And he will give to the saints to eat from the tree of life and the spirit of holiness will be upon them. (*T. Levi* 18.10–11)

The return to a golden age in *T. Levi* 18 is marked by wisdom, peace, and participation in divine glory. To this priest "all the words of the Lord will be revealed" (*T. Levi* 18.2b); consequently, he is said to be "lighting up the light of knowledge as by the sun of the day" (*T. Levi* 18.3b; cf. Hos 10:12 LXX); "the

---

299. See further, Eppel, *Piétisme Juif*, 49–50 n. 6.

knowledge of the Lord will be poured out upon the earth as the water of the seas" (*T. Levi* 18.5b; cf. Isa 11:9), and "the Gentiles will be multiplied in knowledge upon the earth and will be enlightened through the grace of the Lord" (*T. Levi* 18.9a).[300] This last verse further implies that righteous gentiles will participate in the return to a golden age.[301] In his priesthood, "there will be peace on all the earth" (*T. Levi* 18.4c; note that the ideal king is said to arise "in peace" in *T. Jud.* 24.1; cf. 22.2). Through this priest, the righteous will partake of divine glory: "He will give the majesty of the Lord to his sons in truth forever" (*T. Levi* 18.8a). Although *T. Jud.* 24 does not speak of a return to a golden age in such explicit terms, it does describe the eschatological king as a life-giving source for all: "This (is) the branch (ὁ βλαστὸς) of God Most High and this (is) the fountain unto life for all flesh" (*T. Jud.* 24.4; cf. Isa 11:1, 3, 5).

In both testaments, one finds a return to righteousness effected by the messiah:

---

300. On the importance of the priest as the disseminator of divine knowledge, see P. G. R. de Villiers, "The Messiah and Messiahs in Jewish Apocalyptic," *Neot* 12 (1978): 84, 88; Howard Clark Kee, "The Ethical Dimensions of the Testaments of the XII as a Clue to Provenance," *NTS* 24 (1978): 261. Kee further discusses the potential connection of this function with wisdom traditions.

301. Eppel, *Piétisme Juif*, 104–5; Chevallier, *L'Esprit et le Messie*, 128; Jervell, "Interpolator interpretiert," 41–43; Elgvin, "Jewish Christian Editing," 289. The theme of the salvation of gentiles is widespread in the *Testaments*; see further: *T. Sim.* 6.5; 7.2; *T. Levi* 2.11; 4.4; *T. Jud.* 25.5; *T. Zeb.* 9.8; *T. Dan* 6.7; *T. Naph.* 8.3; *T. Ash* 7.3; *T. Jos* 19.11; *T. Ben.* 9.2; 10.5.

all sin will fail,[302] and the lawless will rest in evil,[303] but the righteous will rest in him. (*T. Levi* 18.9c) all the saints will put on joy[304] (*T. Levi* 18.14b).	and a man will arise . . . walking with the sons of men in meekness and righteousness, and no sin whatever will be found in him. . . . and he will pour out the spirit of grace on you; and you will be sons to him in truth and you will walk in his commandments from first to last. (*T. Jud.* 24.1–3)

To grasp the importance of the fact that righteousness is effected by the rule of the priest-king, one must remember that moral transformation stands at the very core of this parenetical tract's purpose. Throughout the *Testaments*, one sees that ethical behavior is achieved by imitation of the patriarchs and observance of the law. Jesus himself is the one "who renews the Law in the power of the Most High" (*T. Lev.* 16.3), "teaching the Law of God through his works" (*T. Dan* 6.9). Although this may be construed as "a remarkably Jewish view of Torah,"[305] the law is nevertheless presented in universal fashion, given "to enlighten every man" (*T. Levi* 14.4).[306] Thus, the ideal priest-king effects a return to righteousness in

---

302. R. S. Stewart, "The Sinless High Priest," 129, believes that the sinlessness of the messiah is implied here. If so, it would parallel the claim made explicitly in *T. Jud.* 24.1. Stewart further notes that with the exception of Philo, the sinlessness of the high priest is elsewhere unattested in both the Hebrew Bible and the literature of Second Temple Judaism (131, 135).

303. *οἱ ἄνομοι καταπαύσουσιν εἰς κακά*. Hollander and Jonge, *Commentary*, 181, take this to mean that the lawless will be overtaken by disaster. Cf. Kee's translation: "lawless men shall rest *from* their evil deeds."

304. *πάντες οἱ ἅγιοι ἐνδύσονται εὐφροσύνην*. MS *d* reads: *εὐφρανθήσονται ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ*; MSS *a f c h i j* read: *ἐνδύσονται δικαιοσύνην*, yielding the translation of Kee: "shall be clothed in righteousness."

305. Elgvin, "Jewish Christian Editing," 291.

306. Howard Clark Kee, "Ethical Dimensions," 259–70, makes a case that the understanding of the law as the law of nature is dependent upon the influence of Middle Stoicism. By contrast, H. Dixon Slingerland, "The Nature of Nomos (Law) Within the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," *JBL* 105 (1986): 39–48, insists that specific Jewish cultic and ritual elements of the law can be distinguished. See however, the critique of Slingerland by Marinus de Jonge, "Die Paränese in den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und in den Testamenten der Zwölf Patrarchen," in *Neues Testament und Ethik* (ed. Helmut Merklein; Freiburg: Herder, 1989), 549–50. See further, Kugler,

conformity with the law, yet the law is to be understood as "nothing less than the law of nature by which the order of the universe is sustained."[307]

Both testaments indicate that this ideal figure will be endowed with God's spirit. One notes that the description resembles Jesus' baptism in Mark's Gospel:[308]

And just as he was coming up out of the water, he saw the heavens torn apart and the Spirit descending like a dove on him. And a voice came from heaven, "You are my Son, the Beloved; with you I am well pleased. (Mark 1:10–11)	The heavens will be opened, and from the temple of the glory there will come on him holiness by a voice of a father as from Abraham, Isaac's father. And the glory of the Most High will be uttered over him, and the spirit of understanding (συνέσεως) and sanctification will rest upon him in the water (ἐν τῷ ὕδατι). (*T. Levi* 18.6–7; cf. Isa 11:2; Ps 2:7)	And the heavens will be opened to him to pour out the blessing of the spirit of the Holy Father. (*T. Jud.* 24.2)

The many similarities between the ideal eschatological figures of *T. Levi* 18 and *T. Jud.* 24 can be accounted for when they are taken to refer to the same person. As the clearly Christian tone of these last verses make clear, this ideal figure is none other than Jesus Christ.[309] Although the *Testament of Levi* speaks of an ideal eschatological priest, the description of his priesthood resembles the return to a

---

The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, 88–100, whose demonstration of the many points of contact with the LXX and Greco-Roman concepts of virtue suggest that the ethical argumentation of the *Testaments* would have appealed to both hellenized Jews and Christians.

307. Howard Clark Kee, "Ethical Dimensions," 262.

308. Jürgen Becker, *Untersuchungen*, 294; cf. Villiers, "Messiah and Messiahs," 84–85, who notes that the bestowal of the spirit on the messiah also stands in continuity with Jewish expectations, citing *Ps. Sol.* 17.37.

309. Chevallier, *L'Esprit et le Messie*, 129–30, stresses that the Christian stamp is not removed by simply bracketing ἐν τῷ ὕδατι as an interpolation. The effusion of the spirit to believers by the Messiah is also distinctly Christian: "Mais jamais dans le Judaïsme l'effusion de l'Esprit n'a été rapportée au Messie; ce point précis est strictement chrétien." So also Marinus de Jonge, "Christian Influence," 204–5; Higgins, "Priestly Messiah," 225; Jürgen Becker, *Untersuchungen*, 292–95.

golden age, which was often associated in antiquity with the reign of an ideal king. Reading the *Testament of Levi* and the *Testament of Judah* as parts of a unified composition yields a portrait of an eschatological priest-king who ushers in a golden age of wisdom, peace, a return to righteousness, and participation in divine glory.

6. *Summary and Conclusions*

Considerable diversity marks the portrait of the ideal king in Second Temple Jewish literature. Some texts envision a king who will rule over a restored Israel in the eschaton, while other texts assign only a preparatory role to such a figure. Of the latter, some speculate that a gentile king or kings will fill these roles. Then again, some texts look forward to a theocracy, or a monarchy subordinated to a hierocracy. At least one text fuses together the figures of priest and king. Finally, some texts look backwards rather than forwards, praising the virtues of historical kings, but offering no hope that such a person will arise in the future. As was noted above with regard to the Greco-Roman comparative material (see p. 115), these irreducibly diverse Jewish sources do not yield a common evaluative conception of the ideal king. Nevertheless, one may observe many common features of kingship shared between texts, such as those derived from the wealth of shared biblical traditions. Yet again, many texts bear evidence of traditions shared with Greco-Roman literature. Such correspondence should come as little surprise when one remembers the Hellenistic influence on many of these Jewish texts. With the exception of the Qumran Scrolls, for example, all of the texts were either composed in, or translated into Greek, and were written for audiences that had some level of investment in Hellenistic culture. In at least one significant respect, however, these Jewish texts differ from their Greco-Roman analogues: they are loathe to ascribe divinity to the king. While such reticence was also seen among certain Greco-

Roman writers such as Ecphantus, Jewish writers are on the whole more circumspect in conceptualizing the relationship between the king and God. Bearing in mind the impossibility of satisfactorily describing the Jewish ideal king of the Second Temple period, the following synthesis draws together a number of elements which appear throughout the surveyed texts. These elements are highlighted, moreover, for their additional utility in illuminating the portrayal of the ideal king in Ephesians. Such a synthesis yields a picture of an ideal king who rules as Yahweh's vicegerent, reflects and transmits God's glory, effects a return to righteousness, and inaugurates a golden age of peace and harmony.

The ideal king is the vicegerent of Yahweh, the cosmic king. It was common among Greek and Roman writers to maintain that the ideal king served as the deputy of Zeus or Jupiter on earth. When Jewish writers claim that the king was similarly appointed to rule by Yahweh, the absolute kingship of God appears to possess greater theological freight. One notes, for example, the emphasis placed on Yahweh's kingship by the author of *Ps. Sol.* 17, for whom it functions as an *inclusio* to the entire psalm. Yahweh anoints and empowers this king by his spirit to carry out his will on earth. The king's restorative leadership is seen as partnership in the work already initiated by God. In the Qumran literature, the king's authority is markedly curtailed: he is subject to Torah, and he frequently appears in a subordinate position to the high priest. In certain Qumran texts, however, the king's intimate relationship to God is signified through a filial metaphor. Josephus similarly views the king as having a limited role, subordinate to that of the priest. His ideal government is not monarchy, but rather theocracy. Again, the kingship of God is emphasized over human kingship. The author of *Sib. Or.* 3 emphasizes the absolute kingship of God, who has the primary responsibility of establishing the eschatological kingdom. The relatively minor role of the king is to usher in this

kingdom by defeating Israel's enemies. Strikingly, this role is assigned to gentile kings. Josephus similarly views gentile kings as acting in accordance with God's will. In the *Letter of Aristeas*, the ideal king receives his dominion as a gift from God. Philo views Moses as an ideal king who shares in God's reign and may even be called a visible copy of God's invisible nature. The endowment of God's spirit on the eschatological priest-king in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* may function to designate this figure as the Lord's anointed agent.

The ideal king reflects divine glory. In *Ps. Sol.* 17, the king both glorifies God and reflects God's glory, which is conceived not simply as his physical appearance but as the execution of his divinely appointed task of leadership. In the *Letter of Aristeas,* the king's piety is emphasized. He is said to imitate divine behavior, such as benefaction and clemency, but unlike the Hellenistic tradition from which it borrows, the king is not divinized. Philo stresses that Moses is a living copy of divine law, and claims that divine law speaks through Joseph. Nevertheless, Philo stops short of actually claiming that God's ideal king partakes of divine essence. In the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, the eschatological priest-king transmits God's majesty to the "true sons" of the Lord. The idea that the king transmits divine glory seems related to the widespread notion that king is a benefactor, in that both ideas concern the transmission of divine blessing through a human agent. Philo, Josephus, and the author of the *Letter of Aristeas* are explicit in characterizing the ideal king as a benefactor who transmits divine blessings to humanity.

The ideal king rules righteously, and effects a return to righteousness. In *Ps. Sol.* 17, the righteous king purifies the land, effecting a return to righteousness that includes gentiles as well as Jews. In his reign the very knowledge of evil disappears. At Qumran, the king's righteous rule is seen as the re-establishment of God's

covenant. His righteous, or just, character is further emphasized in that he is understood to have a juridical role. Nowhere is it claimed, however, that the king's righteousness is imparted to the people. In the *Letter of Aristeas*, the king is a paragon of virtue; chief among his virtues is righteousness. Justice for the people is ensured by his virtuous character. Philo portrays Moses and Joseph as a living law. By this he is referring not only to the king's just rule and supreme legislative ability, but also to his ability to inculcate virtue in his subjects. Philo also speaks of Joseph effecting moral transformation through his words and appearance. Josephus, on the other hand, does not view the king as a living law, although he does view the king as subject to Torah. In typical Hellenistic fashion, Josephus speaks of the ideal king' pre-eminence in the four cardinal virtues—courage, righteousness, wisdom, and temperance—and additionally, piety. The ideal priest-king of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* is empowered by God's spirit and enables God's people to walk in righteousness by clothing them in righteousness, and bestowing God's spirit and grace upon them.

The ideal king establishes a golden age of peace. In *Ps. Sol.* 17, this peace extends to righteous gentiles as well as Jews; moreover, the king's persuasive rather than coercive ability is emphasized as the means by which he achieves this. By contrast, the Qumran Covenanters assigned to the ideal king a far greater military role; in certain texts, this warrior messiah was envisioned to achieve a resounding victory over the gentiles.[310] Here too, however, the king's just rule results in peace. In *Sib. Or.* 3, gentile warrior kings establish a golden age of peace, which will be ruled not by them, but by Jewish prophet-kings. In the *Letter of Aristeas*, it is the king's virtuous character that ensures peace. Philo maintains that through wisdom,

---

310. 1QM, in which it appears that certain parts of Israel will be among the defeated nations, illustrates the diversity perspective at Qumran regarding this issue.

Joseph rules in accordance with divine law, the result of which is peace and harmony. Moses, as living law, also leads people into harmony with the universe. Josephus' ideal king likewise effects peace and harmony. Finally, the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* speak of an ideal priest-king who will re-open the doors to paradise and inaugurate a golden age suffused with divine knowledge and peace.

CHAPTER FOUR

Ephesians: Is There a King in this Text?

We have now reached the point in this study at which we may turn our attention to Ephesians and ask whether the text portrays Christ as a type of ideal king, as understood in Greco-Roman and Jewish antiquity. Conceptually, this task will be divided into two. The first part of this chapter (section 1.1) presents the evidence that in Ephesians, Christ functions as God's vicegerent, the one authorized to rule in God's place. This constitutes the primary grounds for asserting that Christ is characterized as an ideal king. The subsequent sections (1.2–1.5) explore the implications of this characterization for understanding the argument of the letter and its rhetorical impact in forming the identity of its audience.

Before sketching the character of Christ in Ephesians, we must raise an important methodological question: What constitutes evidence of characterization in this non-narrative text? Two insights from F. W. Burnett's article cited above (p. 19) will prove helpful. First, Burnett points out that characterization in classical literature often depended upon the reader's ability to recognize a character from previous literary experiences. Thus, the audience might be expected to view a character in a tragedy in light of that character's portrayal in previous tragedies. Second, Burnett (following Seymour Chatman), claims that the paradigm of traits that make up a character "may not exist in the text as actual verbal adjectives," but rather at the level of story.[1] The implication from both of these observations is that characterization, when not explicit within the text, may yet exist as a reader's construct. How might this insight help our investigation? First, one may assume

---

1. Burnett, "Reader Construction," 13, 16. See further, Seymour Chatman, *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1978).

that since the characterization of Christ is not discernible at the textual level, the authorial audience of the Ephesians may have had to infer the character of Christ from his role in the story of Ephesians. Second, one may assume that *if* the audience-constructed character of Christ bore resemblance to the character of an ideal king *as encountered by the audience elsewhere*, the audience would have been able to identify Christ as king without receiving explicit textual indicators. In sum, what we are looking for is a discernible pattern in Christ's role that accords with the pattern of ideal kingship in antiquity.

1. *The Christ is the Vicegerent of God*

In both Greco-Roman and Jewish thought, the ideal king functioned as the vicegerent of the High God. Virgil viewed Augustus as inheriting the reign of Saturn (*Aen.* 7.202–04). Seneca hailed Nero as the chosen vicar of the gods, by whose favor the world would prosper (*Clem.* 1.1.2). Domitian was thought to rule as Jove's vicegerent by Martial (*Epig.* 9.20.9–10; 9.36.9) and Statius (*Sylv.* 4.3.124–129, 134). Dio Chrysostom believed that the king ruled at the pleasure of Zeus: he was chosen by Zeus and could be deposed by him (*Or.* 2.75–76). According to Pliny, Trajan is elected by Jove and rules with such perfection that the gods no longer need concern themselves with human affairs (*Pan.* 80.5). The Jewish belief that Israel's king was chosen by Yahweh is reflected in the account of Yahweh choosing David to shepherd his people (2 Sam 7). The king's divinely sanctioned authority finds expression most notably in Pss 2:2, 6–7 and 110:1. This element of monarchic ideology is carried forward into the literature of the Second Temple period. The author of the *Psalms of Solomon* 17, for example, beseeches God to raise up a king who is subordinate to Yahweh, the divine sovereign (21, 32, 34). This king is empowered by God's spirit to carry out God's purposes on earth

(22, 37; cf. *T. Jud.* 24.2). Among the images of the ideal king at Qumran is that of Yahweh's empowered agent of restoration (1QSb). According to the *Sibylline Oracles*, even pagan kings may function as God's agents, appointed to bring peace to the entire earth (3.652–56; cf. Isa 45). Philo's ideal king, Moses, is given the entire world to rule, evidence of his unique friendship with God (*Mos.* 1.155–56).

The ideal king's function as God's vicegerent is thus seen to be pervasive in the relevant literature, and may be seen as something of a common denominator among the varied traditions of ideal kingship. The fundamental importance of this function across traditions is asserted not only because of its ubiquity. It is furthermore a necessary prerequisite for many of his other functions that the king be the High God's vicegerent. The ideal state of humanity is to be ruled by God, the supreme sovereign. This ideal state of peace, harmony, and virtue is enjoyed when God rules through his human agent, the king. That is to say, sharing in God's rule places the king in the position of distributing to humanity the benefits of God's rule. In Ephesians, the Christ functions as the agent of God's blessing to the church, the ultimate aim of which is nothing less than the restoration of divine harmony to the cosmos. In antiquity, such a figure would have been recognized as the ideal king. The burden of this section is to make clear Ephesians' portrayal of the Christ as God's vicegerent, appointed to reign over the church and over the cosmos.

What is the story of Ephesians, who is telling it, and to whom is it being told? As noted briefly in the introductory chapter (see p. 12), this study adopts the perspective that Ephesians was written by a later disciple of Paul to a community or communities of mostly gentile Christians located in Asia Minor. Of what significance for the story of Ephesians is the fact that the letter purports to be from Paul? Petersen points out that while narrative is commonly regarded as story,

history is also a story, even a fiction, since it requires the selection, ordering, and plotting of events, which prior to their being (subjectively) recounted according to the point of view of a narrator, did not possess a predetermined unity of cause and effect. In this letter, there are three types of fictions in view: the one created from the letter (the author's fiction); the one created about the historical context (our own fiction); and the one created about the world of Paul's larger narrative world.[2] This study will deal primarily with the fiction of the letter itself. When discussing the narrative world of Ephesians, therefore, we accept the letter's identification of its author as "Paul, an apostle of Christ Jesus." Nevertheless, to avoid potential confusion between the implied author of Ephesians and the historical Paul, the implied author of Ephesians will be referred to throughout this study as simply "the author." When it is necessary to further identify the implied author by his fictional name, it will be enclosed within quotation marks: "Paul." When the name, Paul, occurs without quotation marks, it refers to the historical figure.

As Petersen correctly observes, the story one finds in a letter depends in large measure upon the point of view from which the story is told. It makes a difference, for example, whether one regards the story in Philemon to be that of Paul, Philemon, or Onesimus. Each of these characters may be seen to have his own distinct story line; whose story line is determinative for the correct understanding of the story? In Philemon, the story is Paul's; he is the story's central actor, without whom the story would disintegrate.[3] In Ephesians, the situation is different: both author and recipients of the letter play subordinate roles in the story's action. The central actors of Ephesians are God and Christ, and the

---

2. Petersen, *Rediscovering Paul*, 10–14.

3. Petersen, *Rediscovering Paul*, 65–66.

letter may be seen as an attempt to incorporate its audience into the larger story of God's redemptive activity through Christ.

This section is divided into six subsections. The first two subsections clear the ground for the following discussion by addressing two peculiar lexical and syntactical features of the letter. (1) Does the repeated use of the definite article when referring to Christ (ὁ Χριστός) serve to actualize the reservoir of potential meaning contained in the Jewish use of the word משיח to denote Yahweh's anointed ideal king? (2) Does the force of the prepositional phrase ἐν Χριστῷ serve to denote instrumentality with respect to Christ, thus laying emphasis on Christ's function as Yahweh's agent, the one through whom he acts? The heart of this section's argument unfolds in the next three subsections, each of which raises an interpretive question. (3) What does the letter's argument reveal about the actions of the Christ? This question will be answered by analyzing the role of the Christ throughout the poetic sequence of actions. (4) What does the narrative world behind the letter's argument reveal about the Christ? The actions of the Christ will be set in the context of the actions of the other main participants in the letter's story: God, "Paul," and the letter's audience. The actions of all these actors will be plotted by analyzing the referential sequence of action in the letter. (5) What emphasis, if any, does the letter lay on any particular function(s) of the Christ? This question will be answered by comparing the letter's referential and poetic sequences of action. (6) The final subsection offers a summary and conclusion.

1.1. *ὁ Χριστός: Messianic Title or Proper Name?*

A number of scholars assert that in Ephesians, the unusually frequent use of the articular ὁ Χριστός denotes Christ as the Messiah, the Jewish ideal king anointed

by Yahweh.[4] If this could be demonstrated, it would provide substantial evidence for our thesis. Proving this assertion is fraught with difficulties, not least of which is that the data within the letter is confusing: in places where one would expect the use of the title it is absent, and it appears in places where seemingly no good explanation can be found. But this is to get ahead of ourselves. We begin with the question of whether ὁ Χριστός is used as a messianic title in the undisputed Pauline letters.

It is commonly asserted that in the genuine Pauline epistles, Χριστός is used not as a title, but rather as a proper name. This claim can be traced back at least as far as J. Weiss, who contends that the recipients of the gentile mission, who had not known the historical Jesus of Nazareth, gradually forgot the Jewish eschatological significance of the title Χριστός. The similarity between the name given to the disciples in Antioch (Χριστιανοί, Acts 11:26) and the names of groups taken from the names of their leaders (e.g., Ἡρῳδιανοί) suggest that Χριστός was viewed similarly as a proper name. Weiss further surmised that, because the common adjective, χριστός, which meant "smeared with oil," or "greasy" would have been incomprehensible as a title, it inevitably came to be viewed as a name.[5] L. Cerfaux has argued against this view that Χριστός has not completely lost its appellative

---

4. Most clearly by Markus Barth, *Ephesians* (2 vols.; AB 34–34A; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1974). He is followed in varying degrees by O'Brien, *Ephesians*; Best, *Ephesians*; P. J. Hartin, "ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι τὰ πάντα ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ (Eph 1,10)," in *A South African Perspective on the New Testament* (ed. J. H. Petzer and P. J. Hartin; Leiden: Brill, 1986), 228–37; Talbert, *Ephesians and Colossians*.

5. Johannes Weiss, *Earliest Christianity: A History of the Period A.D. 30–150* (2 vols.; ed. and trans. Frederick C. Grant; Harper Torchbooks; New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959), 1:175–76. (Weiss' book, *Das Urchristentum*, was originally published in 1914.) Interestingly, although Ferdinand Hahn, *The Titles of Jesus in Christology: Their History in Early Christianity* (trans. Harold Knight and George Ogg; London: Lutterworth, 1969), 189–93, agrees that the messianic title, Χριστός, eventually congealed into a proper name, he takes Acts 11:26 as evidence of the early widespread use of the *title*.

function in Paul's letters.[6] More recently, L. Hurtado takes the similarly nuanced position that although "in Paul's letters the term 'Christ' has clearly become so closely associated with Jesus that it functions *almost* like an alternate name for him," nevertheless "*Christos* had not simply been reduced to a name (e.g., Jesus' *cognomen*) but instead retained something of its function as a title."[7] The judgments of Cerfaux and Hurtado notwithstanding, it would appear that the majority of scholars today agree that Χριστός is used in the genuine Pauline letters as a name rather than as a title.[8]

Two potential exceptions to this general perspective are worthy of further investigation: the use of Χριστός when it immediately precedes Ἰησοῦς (that is, Χριστός Ἰησοῦς), and the articular use of Χριστός. O. Cullmann asserts that when Paul uses the combination Χριστός Ἰησοῦς, he is aware that Χριστός is not simply a proper name.[9] W. Kramer attempts to refute Cullmann's claim on grammatical grounds, but his argument is inconclusive at best. Comparing the sixty instances of the double title (Χριστός Ἰησοῦς and Ἰησοῦς Χριστός) in the undisputed Paulines, he concludes that the order Ἰησοῦς Χριστός is normative, and that Χριστός Ἰησοῦς is only used in dative ἐν- phrases in order to resolve any potential ambiguity over the case

---

6. Lucien Cerfaux, *Le Christ dans la Théologie de Saint Paul* (2nd ed.; LD; Paris: Cerf, 1954), 361–374.

7. Larry W. Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2003), 99–100 (emphasis added).

8. Martin Hengel, "'Christos' in Paul," in *Between Jesus and Paul: Studies in the Earliest History of Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983), 65–77; Marinus de Jonge, "The Earliest Christian Use of Christos: Some Suggestions," *NTS* 32 (1986): 321–322; Andrew Chester, "The Christ of Paul," in *Redemption and Resistance: The Messianic Hopes of Jews and Christians in Antiquity* (ed. Markus Bockmuehl and James Carleton Paget; London: T&T Clark, 2007), 110. See Chester for other scholars supporting this position.

9. Oscar Cullmann, *The Christology of the New Testament* (trans. Shirley C. Guthrie and Charles A. M. Hall; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1959), 133–34; followed by Nils Alstrup Dahl, "The Messiahship of Jesus in Paul," in *Jesus the Christ: The Historical Origins of Christological Doctrine* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), 16.

of Ἰησοῦς, the form of which does not change in oblique cases.[10] But surely this argument is specious. To begin with, the preposition ἐν, which always takes the dative, would provide a sufficient indicator of the case of Ἰησοῦς. Secondly, the case of Ἰησοῦ is indicated unambiguously by the dative Χριστῷ, regardless of whether it precedes or follows. It is difficult to imagine a reader being troubled by this supposed ambiguity.[11] Whatever is the explanation for the variation in usage between these double titles, it is not the stylistic one that Kramer supposes.

As for the second exception, H. Conzelmann asserts that, whereas Χριστός functions as a proper name, the articular Χριστός is a title: the Messiah.[12] Kramer again takes on the claim head-on, with somewhat greater success. His first point concerns the use of Χριστός in the genitive case. He correctly observes that when the noun governing the genitive Χριστοῦ has the article, so does Χριστοῦ; likewise, when the governing noun is anarthrous, so is Χριστοῦ.[13] The use of the article in these constructions is due to a purely formal consideration. Kramer similarly contends that the articular occurrences of Χριστός in the dative case are purely formal.[14] His reasoning is plausible, but in at least one case the context suggests that Christ is being portrayed as a royal figure.[15] Examples in which the articular

---

10. Werner R. Kramer, *Christos, Kyrios, Gottessohn: Untersuchungen zu Gebrauch und Bedeutung der Christologischen Bezeichnungen bei Paulus und den Vorpaulinischen Gemeinden* (ATANT 44; Zurich: Zwingli, 1963), 203–206.

11. Presumably, readers were not troubled by the appearance of Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ in 1 Thess 1:1; 2 Thess 1:1; 3:12; 1 John 5:20; Jude 1.

12. Hans Conzelmann, "Was glaubte die frühe Christenheit?" in *Theologie als Schriftauslegung: Aufsätze zum Neuen Testament* (BEvT 65; Munich: Kaiser, 1974), 65: "«Christus» hat da titularen Sinn, wo der bestimmte Artikel steht."

13. Kramer, *Christos*, 207–8.

14. Kramer, *Christos*, 208–9.

15. In 2 Cor 2:14, Paul thanks God for always leading us in a triumphal procession in Christ (θριαμβεύοντι ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ). Such an image evokes the Triumphs of the Roman emperors.

form is followed by the anarthrous form, or vice-versa, suggest that there is no difference in meaning. There are no formal considerations which preclude a titular sense in the remaining cases; here, Kramer simply reasons that nothing in the context demands that Χριστός be read as a messianic title.[16] Since his claim is not founded on any exegesis to speak of, it is perhaps open to question, however. Finally, Kramer observes that the article is sometimes found with Ἰησοῦς, which is clearly a proper name. This is further corroborative evidence that the articular Χριστός may have functioned as a proper name as well.[17] N. A. Dahl lends support to Kramer's argument, adding to the evidence a handful of further philological observations.[18] Although some of their arguments are inconclusive, Kramer and Dahl effectively challenge the claim that the presence of the definite article, or word order, in and of themselves, are indisputable markers of christological titles. This study is not interested in whether these terms should be construed as titles *per se*, however, but rather with what they connote within the context of Ephesians.[19]

When it comes to this letter, M. Barth asserts the opposite of Kramer and Dahl, namely that the articular usage of Χριστός, as well as both the articular and anarthrous usage of Χριστός Ἰησοῦς are titles that denote Jesus as the Messiah. His translation policy is explicit:

> In this translation of Ephesians the Greek word *christos*, commonly translated as "Christ," is always rendered as "the Messiah" when either one of the following conditions is fulfilled: (a) whenever in the Greek text the

---

16. Kramer, *Christos*, 209–10: he allows that 1 Cor 11:3 and Rom 9:5 are possible exceptions.

17. Kramer, *Christos*, 211.

18. Dahl, "Messiahship," 15–25.

19. The importance of using literary context to determine the use of the word "anointed" is stressed by Marinus de Jonge, "Use of the Word 'anointed' in the Time of Jesus," *NovT* 8 (1966): 147–148.

> article (*ho*) is found before *christos*; (b) when *christos* is placed before the proper name "Jesus."[20]

G. Sellin insists, however, that there is no difference in meaning between the articular and anarthrous usage of Χριστός. Assertions to the contrary, he points out, are simply that.[21] E. Best regards Barth's second point to be unsustainable, in view of the regular variation in order of Ἰησοῦς and Χριστὸς.[22] These points are well taken: any such royal messianic connotation must be demonstrated rather than merely asserted. Before examining Barth's assertion, let us first survey the data.[23]

The term, Χριστός, occurs forty-six times in Ephesians: twenty-four times with the article, twenty-two times without.[24] Of the twenty-two anarthrous occurrences of Χριστός, six are combined with the word, κύριος, to form what may be considered a royal title, κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς.[25] Here, Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς clearly

---

20. Barth, *Ephesians*, 1:66 In a similar vein, see J. Armitage Robinson, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians* (2d ed; London: James Clarke, 1922), 32; Hartin, "ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι," 231–32; O'Brien, *Ephesians*, 111; Hoehner, *Ephesians*, 221–22; Ralph P. Martin, "The Christology of the Prison Epistles," in *Contours of Christology in the New Testament* (ed. Richard N. Longenecker; McMaster New Testament Studies; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2005), 213–14. Best, *Ephesians*, 143, ventures that the author may be aware of a Jewish titular connotation to χριστός, but concludes that his usage of the articular form is haphazard.

21. Sellin, *Epheser*, 108 n. 216; so also Schnackenburg, *Epheser*, 37 n. 53, 62–63.

22. Best, *Ephesians*, 97. He notes that not only is the word order changed between 1:1 (Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς) 1:2 (Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς), but a number of variant readings attest to a transposition of terms in 1:1 itself.

23. See also Ernst Percy, *Die Probleme der Kolosser- und Epheserbriefe* (Lund: Gleerup, 1946), 187–88, who assembles the evidence, and compares the articular usage with its usage elsewhere in the NT. He does not, however, attempt to give an account of its high occurrence in Ephesians.

24. Articular usage: 1:10, 12, 20; 2:5, 13; 3:1, 4, 8, 11, 17, 19; 4:7, 12, 13, 15, 20; 5:2, 5, 14, 23, 24, 25, 29; 6:5. Anarthrous usage: 1:1 [2x], 2, 3 [2x], 5, 17; 2:6, 7, 10, 12, 13, 20; 3:6, 21; 4:32; 5:20, 21, 32, 6:6, 23, 24.

25. 1:2, 3, 17; 5:20; 6:23, 24. κύριος by itself appears frequently in Ephesians: 1:2, 3, 15, 17; 2:21; 3:11; 4:1, 5, 17; 5:8, 10, 17, 19, 20, 22; 6:1, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 21, 23, 24. Lucien Cerfaux, "Le titre Kyrios et la dignité royale de Jésus," in *Recueil Lucien Cerfaux* (BETL 6–7; Gembloux: Duculot, 1954), 1:3–34, demonstrates that the term, κύριος functioned as a royal appellative in the

functions as a proper name. The consistently used formula is: title (κύριος), proper name (Ἰησοῦς), *cognomen* (Χριστὸς). The non-titular usage of Χριστός is easily explained here by the fact that the occurrence of a double title would be unnecessary and awkward. For the purpose of the current investigation, these six occurrences may be therefore set aside. This leaves us with forty occurrences of Χριστός: twenty-four with the article, sixteen without. The term, Χριστός Ἰησοῦς, occurs eleven times, two of which are articular.[26] Together, Χριστός Ἰησοῦς and the articular Χριστός occur thirty-three times (discounting the overlap of the two occurrences of the articular Χριστός Ἰησοῦς). This leaves seven occurrences of the anarthrous Χριστός that do not appear to have a titular function. Let us consider, for the sake of argument, Barth's assertion to be correct. This would lead to the striking result that in Ephesians, Χριστός is used thirty-three times with a titular function, and only seven times without.[27]

Barth's attempt to find consistency in Ephesians' use of these terms founders on three counts. The first is that, in two instances, he violates his own rule. The first example, 2:12, is one which Barth includes among those passages that "call distinctly for a translation of *christos* which surprises, perhaps hurts, the reader with its Hebrew or Jewish-apocalyptic bite."[28] Barth translates, "at that time you were apart from the Messiah (χωρὶς Χριστοῦ)." He gives no warrant for rendering the anarthrous Χριστός as "Messiah," but presumably he does so because the

---

Roman Empire. This tradition had its roots in the customs of oriental monarchies, mediated by Hellenism. Beskow, *Rex Gloriae*, 47–55, contends that κύριος is used as a royal title in the NT, whose origins lay in the messianic exposition of Ps 110.

26. Articular usage: 3:1, 11. Anarthrous usage: 1:1 [2x]; 2:6, 7, 10, 13, 20; 3:6, 21.

27. A variant reading of 5:21 has ἐν φόβῳ κυρίου for ἐν φόβῳ Χριστοῦ. If accepted, this would change the ration to 34:6. There is not much external support for this reading, however.

28. Barth, *Ephesians*, 66.

articular Χριστός is found in the next verse.[29] The second instance is 3:19, which he translates: "and to know the love of Christ (γνῶναί τε τὴν . . . ἀγάπην τοῦ Χριστοῦ)." Here, again without explanation, where one would expect the translation, "Messiah," one finds "Christ" instead.[30] The second problem with Barth's proposal is that he does not give a satisfactory account of the instances in which the anarthrous Χριστός is used. If the author of Ephesians wants to emphasize that Jesus is the Messiah, why would he switch back and forth between titular and non-titular references? More to the point, why is he seemingly inconsistent not only within the letter as a whole, but also within individual passages? The instructions to wives and husbands provides a suitable illustration (5:22–33). The exhortation is introduced with a general injunction, which lacks the definite article: all are to submit to one another in fear of Christ (Ὑποτασσόμενοι ἀλλήλοις ἐν φόβῳ Χριστοῦ) (5:21).[31] Throughout the passage, the articular Χριστός is used exclusively (5:23, 24, 25, 29). Yet in concluding, the author omits the article when he explains that he is speaking of Christ and the church (εἰς Χριστὸν καὶ εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν) (5:32). There appears to be no substantial difference in meaning between the articular and anarthrous usages of Χριστός in this passage. What possible reason, the reader may wonder, would the author have for switching back and forth? Barth does not ask this question, much less answer it.[32] Finally, Barth never establishes in the first

---

29. Barth, *Ephesians*, 256.

30. Barth, *Ephesians*, 373.

31. It is debated whether this verse concludes the preceding section, or introduces the following. There are good arguments for both. Even if one is persuaded by the former, the theme of submission clearly links it with what follows.

32. Barth, *Ephesians*, 608, 662–68. Another example in Barth's translation that confounds the reader's wish for consistency: slaves are to obey their earthly masters "as [you obey] the Messiah (ὡς τῷ Χριστῷ)" (6:5), yet in the very next breath they are understood to do so "as slaves of Christ (ὡς δοῦλοι Χριστοῦ)" (6:6).

place the basis upon which he asserts that ὁ Χριστός and Χριστός Ἰησοῦς should be regarded as titles. Given Kramer's objections as noted above, this assumption is problematic.[33]

Although the author of Ephesians does not appear to have been as consistent in his use of terminology as Barth would suppose, nevertheless the sheer preponderance of Χριστός Ἰησοῦς and the articular Χριστός in this letter should give one pause. While the prevalence of such terms does not in itself prove anything, it does suggest the author's keen awareness of the fact that the origins of the term, χριστός, lie in the traditions of the Jewish ideal king anointed by Yahweh. If, as this study will demonstrate, Ephesians presents Christ as a type of ideal king, such an awareness is not surprising. In the following discussion, therefore, the appearance of Χριστός Ἰησοῦς or the articular Χριστός will not be adduced as evidence for the characterization of Christ as ideal king. The primary evidence for this is the actions of Christ, or of God through Christ. In certain portions of the letter, however, the significance of this activity does appear to be underscored by choice of terminology. Thus, although Barth's claims on this matter cannot be accepted *in toto*, his intuition that Ephesians' terminology belies something more profound than mere stylistic variation is indeed correct.

1.2. *God Acts ἐν Χριστῷ: the Force of the Preposition*

In Ephesians, when God acts, he does so ἐν Χριστῷ. But what is the force of the preposition in this phrase? The discussion may be traced back to A. Deissmann, whose doctoral dissertation at Marburg argued that Paul used the phrase, ἐν Χριστῷ, in a locative sense, denoting a mystical, pneumatic sphere,

---

33. Barth, *Ephesians*, 1:66, cites Kramer's monograph, but does not engage with any of his arguments.

analogous to ἐν πνεύματι and ἐν τῷ θεῷ.[34] Following Deissmann, metaphysical (E. Lohmeyer) and mystical-eschatological (A. Schweitzer) interpretations of the phrase have also been proposed.[35] By contrast, R. Bultmann contended that the locative phrase was an ecclesiological formula signifying incorporation into the corporate body of Christ, the church.[36] F. Büchsel's posthumously published article decisively laid to rest Deissmann's thesis that ἐν Χριστῷ had a monolithic mystical connotation for Paul: its meaning may be instrumental, causal, modal, and in a derived sense, local.[37] F. Neugebauer contended that the phrase cannot be understood either as a purely temporal or spatial sense; he argued for an "historical" meaning that encompasses both these dimensions.[38] In the same vein as Büchsel's article, M.

---

34. Adolf Deissmann, *Die neutestamentliche Formel "in Christo Jesu"* (Marburg: Elwert, 1892), 97–98. He considers mostly the undisputed Pauline letters, but gives a slight nod to deuteropauline letters, finding them in continuity with the central Pauline ideas (126-28). Deissmann's mature reflections on his original thesis can be found in *Paul: A Study in Social and Religious History* (trans. William E. Wilson; Harper Torchbooks; New York: Harper, 1957), 135–57. Discussions of the history of scholarship may be found in Ernest Best, *One Body in Christ: A Study in the Relationship of the Church to Christ in the Epistles of the Apostle Paul* (London: SPCK, 1955), 8–19; Michel Bouttier, *En Christ: Étude d'exégèse et de théologie pauliniennes* (EHPR 54; Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1962), 5–22. This discussion is brought up to date by Talbert, *Ephesians and Colossians*, 39–46.

35. Ernst Lohmeyer, *Grundlagen paulinischer Theologie* (BHT; Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1929), 139; Albert Schweitzer, *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle* (trans. W. Montgomery; London: A&C Black, 1931).

36. Rudolf Karl Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament* (2 vols; trans. Kendrick Grobel; 1948–53; repr., New York: Scribners, 1951–55), 1:311. Bultmann is here speaking only of the undisputed Paulines. Sellin, *Epheser*, 297, agrees that in Ephesians, when the locative meaning is in view, the primary emphasis is ecclesiological; cf. Gerhard Sellin, "Die religionsgeschichtlichen Hintergründe der paulinischen 'Christusmystik'," *TQ* 176 (1996): 19–24.

37. Friedrich Büchsel, "'In Christus' bei Paulus," *ZNW* 42 (1949): 156–157.

38. Fritz Neugebauer, "Das paulinische 'in Christo'," *NTS* 4 (1957–58): 138: "Es liegt bei Paulus vielmehr eine eigenartige Einheit von Raum und Zeit vor, die uns sprachlich vielleicht noch in dem Wort Geschichte griefbar wird, eine Einheit von Räumlichkeit und Zeitlichkeit, von Leiblichkeit und Geschehen."

Bouttier's monograph argued that the meaning of ἐν Χριστῷ is primarily instrumental.[39]

The monograph of E. Best provides a convenient transition to Ephesians, since both this letter and Colossians are included in his analysis.[40] Best believes that the phrase has a predominantly local flavor for Paul. He divides the evidence into nine groups of texts. The first group of texts, characterized by the pattern "*A* is in Christ," exemplify this locative usage. In this group, Best finds only one text from Ephesians (πιστοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ) (1:1). The expression here is commonly taken to denote the idea of incorporation.[41] The fifth group of texts contains fourteen examples from Ephesians (1:3, 4, 6, 7, 11, 13a, 13b; 2:6, 7, 10, 13; 3:6, 12; 4:32). These texts fall into the pattern "God gives us (does to us) something in Christ." Best raises the question whether this phrase might mean "no more than 'by Christ Jesus.'" He does not give his own suggestion serious consideration however, preferring instead to use 1 Cor 15:22 as the interpretive key, a text from this group that does have a local meaning.

J. A. Allan correctly criticizes Best for "rescuing" the local meaning in these fourteen Ephesians texts on the basis of an inference from another Pauline text.[42] Allan's own analysis of Ephesians reaches the same conclusion as Bouttier:

> The epistle is marked by a very extensive use of the formula, but its use is predominantly, if not exclusively, in the instrumental sense. It indicates

---

39. Bouttier, *En Christ*, 85–86. However, ἐν Χριστῷ is still to be distinguished from διὰ Χριστοῦ: "*par le Christ* révèle en lui l'agent unique de Dieu; *en Christ* manifeste que ce médiateur ne demeure jamais seul, mais comprend et s'incorpore les siens" (85). Note that Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, 2:177, allows for instrumental meaning in Eph 1:20; 2:15.

40. Best, *One Body*, x-xi, with caveats regarding their authenticity.

41. Best, *One Body*, 1; Heinrich Schlier, *Der Brief an die Epheser* (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1963); Barth, *Ephesians*, 70; Hoehner, *Ephesians*, 143. Talbert, *Ephesians and Colossians*, 40, argues for instrumentality: "faithful by means of Christ Jesus," or "faithful in dependence on (by the power of) Jesus."

42. John A. Allan, "The 'In Christ' Formula in Ephesians," *NTS* 5 (1958): 60.

> Christ as the channel through whom God works his will, elects, redeems, forgives, blesses, imparts new life, builds up his Church. 'In Christ' is no longer for this Writer the formula of incorporation into Christ, but has become the formula of God's activity through Christ.[43]

Allan's proposal has not won universal support amongst recent scholars of Ephesians. H. W. Hoehner argues for a pervasive locative meaning throughout Ephesians.[44] A. T. Lincoln takes a more balanced view, agreeing that the phrase in Ephesians possesses a "predominantly instrumental force," yet critiques Allan for failing to see instances in which a locative sense is preserved.[45] Even Best himself, in his recent commentary, acknowledges that the phrase resonates with both an instrumental and local meaning.[46] Talbert's recent contribution to the discussion is his observation that an overlooked meaning of ἐν Χριστῷ is "under the power of Christ," "in dependence on Christ," or "in Christ's hands."[47] One is perhaps wise to conclude that "Ephesians is not consistent on this matter."[48] Admitting the

---

43. Allan, "'In Christ'," 59 His conclusion that the author of Ephesians uses the phrase in a manner wholly other than Paul is not novel. See, e.g., Werner Schmauch, *In Christus: eine Untersuchung zur Sprache und Theologie des Paulus* (NTF 1.9; Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1935), 176: "So bietet der Epheserbrief zwar noch ein reiches Vorkommen der Formel, jedoch losgelöst von dem Sachverhalt, der sie bei Paulus bestimmt."

44. Hoehner, *Ephesians*, 170–74. See especially his chart on p. 173 listing all the instances of ἐν Χριστῷ and its parallels in Ephesians. He makes a distinction between "location" and "sphere", although Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan, 1996), 153, subsumes them under the same grammatical category.

45. Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 21–22. He cites 2:6 as a prime example.

46. Best, *Ephesians*, 153–54. A number of commentaries take this position: Joachim Gnilka, *Der Epheserbrief* (HTKNT 10.2; Freiburg: Herder, 1971), 66–69; O'Brien, *Ephesians*, 97–98 n.49; Margaret Y. MacDonald, *Colossians and Ephesians* (SP 17; Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical, 2000), 198, 232; Gerhard Sellin, *Der Brief an die Epheser* (9th ed.; KEK 8; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008), 90.

47. Talbert, *Ephesians and Colossians*, 35–40. Additionally, he sees three other meanings for ἐν Χριστῷ present in Ephesians: (1) Christian; (2) Christ as the object of faith or hope; (3) Christ as means. Talbert believes the instrumental meaning is the dominant one.

48. Muddiman, *Ephesians*, 67.

probability of such inconsistency, the following discussion nevertheless takes as its point of departure the perspective that in many instances ἐν Χριστῷ primarily carries an instrumental force in Ephesians. Although the locative force may also be in view, this is in some instances secondary, and dependent upon the instrumental force. The comments of J. P. Heil are apropos:

> as believers they are "*in* Christ Jesus," that is, they have been incorporated to live in union with Christ Jesus within a new sphere, realm, or domain of existence *determined by what God has done in raising Christ Jesus from the dead and exalting him to the heavenly regions* (emphasis added).[49]

Heil in effect says that the believers' new existence depends on God's action. His insight may be taken one step further: their new existence is dependent on God's action undertaken *through* the Christ. This is, in many cases, what the prepositional phrase, ἐν Χριστῷ, conveys. In order to evaluate this assertion, we must determine whether or not the resultant portrayal of the Christ as God's vicegerent is a cogent reading of the text. To this task we now turn.

1.3. *What is the Argument of Ephesians? The Poetic Sequence of Action*

This subsection will trace the actions of the Christ as they are presented in the course of the letter's argument.[50] The final thought unit of the letter, 6:10–20, as well as the postscript, 6:21–24, will not be discussed, as they do not contain material that adds to the understanding of the Christ as God's vicegerent. The Christ's enablement of victory over the powers in 6:10–20 will be discussed below (section 6). The goal will be to demonstrate that in the majority of cases, when God acts, he does so through the Christ. This will constitute the primary evidence

---

49. Heil, *Ephesians*, 50.

50. The units of analysis correspond to broadly agreed upon structural elements within the letter. No two commentators agree on all points. My own outline most closely resembles that of MacDonald, *Colossians and Ephesians*; Jean-Noël Aletti, *Saint Paul, Epître aux Ephésiens* (EBib NS 42; Paris: Gabalda, 2001), ; Talbert, *Ephesians and Colossians*; Sellin, *Epheser*.

that the Christ is herein presented as God's vicegerent. Instances of the articular Χριστός and Χριστός Ἰησοῦς, alleged to denote a royal messianic title, as well as the prepositional phrase ἐν Χριστῷ will be discussed as warranted.

1.3.1. *1:1–2, 3–14, 15–23.* The opening eulogy, or *berakah*, and the prayer that follows present a dense concentration of God's actions undertaken through the Christ. The eulogy presents and develops one of the letter's central themes, that "the eternal universal purpose of God is realized in Christ."[51] God is blessed for having blessed the audience with every spiritual blessing in the heavenly places through Christ (ὁ εὐλογήσας ἡμᾶς . . . ἐν Χριστῷ) (1:3). God chose them through him (Christ) (ἐξελέξατο ἡμᾶς ἐν αὐτῷ) (1:4). God pre-ordained them for adoption through Jesus Christ unto himself (προορίσας ἡμᾶς εἰς υἱοθεσίαν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς αὐτόν) (1:5). God graciously bestowed his grace upon them through the beloved (ἐχαρίτωσεν ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ ἠγαπημένῳ) (1:6). Through him (the beloved), they have redemption through his blood (τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ) (1:7). God set forth his good pleasure (planned to effect his purpose) through him (κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν αὐτοῦ ἣν προέθετο ἐν αὐτῷ) (1:9).[52] God's plan for the fullness of time is to sum up all things through the Christ (ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι τὰ πάντα ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ) (1:10). Hoehner contends that all of the ἐν- prepositional phrases mentioned above denote sphere or location.[53] By contrast, Allan argues that nearly all of them can be

---

51. Nils Alstrup Dahl, "Christ, Creation and the Church," in *The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology* (ed. W. D. Davies and David Daube; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956), 432; see further, his Nils Alstrup Dahl, *Studies in Ephesians: Introductory Questions, Text- & Edition-Critical Issues, Interpretation of Texts and Themes* (ed. David Hellholm, et al.; WUNT 131; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 314–334.

52. Hoehner, *Ephesians*, 216: connected to the mystery of his will.

53. Hoehner, *Ephesians*, 173–74. He allows for the possibility of a relational or instrumental force in 1:4.

sufficiently accounted for by a simple instrumental sense.[54] Instrumentality is clearly indicated in 1:5 and 7 through the preposition διά. The parallelism between the διά- phrases and the ἐν- phrases suggest that the latter should be read as possessing an instrumental force as well.[55]

In the prayer that follows, Christ is the object of God's action, which demonstrates God's power. The author beseeches God for a spirit of wisdom and revelation on behalf of his audience, praying that they will know God's tremendous power, which he exercised "in" the Christ, when he raised him and seated him at his right hand in the heavenlies (Ἣν ἐνήργησεν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ . . . καθίσας ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις) (1:20). Here, the preposition ἐν denotes the Christ as the object of God's power.[56] God exalted him, subjected all things to him, and made him head over all things (1:21–22). The context is that of cosmic enthronement, made clear through the allusion to Ps 110:1 (LXX Ps 109:1) in 1:20, and to Ps 8:6 (LXX Ps 8:7) in 1:22.[57] Psalm 110 may have originated as an enthronement psalm for an Israelite king, reflecting ancient Near Eastern symbolism in which the session of the king at the right hand of God signified that the king exercised his power in the name of, or under the authority of, God.[58] This no doubt contributed to its

---

54. Allan, "'In Christ'," 57–58. He does not comment on 1:6, and believes that ἐν αὐτῷ in 1:9 possibly refers to God.

55. So Talbert, *Ephesians and Colossians*, 42–47; cf. Sellin, *Epheser*, 83–110.

56. Talbert, *Ephesians and Colossians*, 40, 57. Hoehner, *Ephesians*, 274, however, takes the force of the preposition in 1:20 to denote sphere or place, contending that "God's power was exercised 'in connection with Christ,' 'in the case of Christ,' or 'in the person of Christ'"; so also Sellin, *Epheser*, 137.

57. See the discussion in Andrew T. Lincoln, "The Use of the OT in Ephesians," *JSNT* 14 (1982): 40–42; Sellin, *Epheser*, 137–38, 144 n. 146. Lincoln believes the collocation of Ps 110:1 and Ps 8:6 is likely dependent upon an already established Christian exegetical tradition.

58. David M. Hay, *Glory at the Right Hand: Psalm 110 in Early Christianity* (SBLMS 18; Nashville: Abingdon, 1973), 19–33. Hay notes, however, that in pre-Christian Jewish interpretation, the king's session at God's right hand did not imply a particular function; sometimes

frequent citation in the NT and Apostolic Fathers to emphasize the significance of Christ's resurrection.[59] Thus, depicting heavenly enthronement here is a means of symbolically representing the Christ's shared divine rule.[60] The movement in this eulogy and prayer is from God blessing the auditors through the Christ, to God exercising his tremendous power when he enthroned the Christ in the heavens in order to share in his rule. The opening sentences of the letter provide the necessary context for understanding the characterization of the Christ in what follows. He is God's vicegerent, the cosmically enthroned king through whom God blesses his people. This context thus supports the reading of Christ as king.[61] The particularly dense concentration of Χριστός Ἰησοῦς and the articular Χριστός possibly serves to evoke for the auditor the image of the Jewish ideal king. It is perhaps significant that only once during the *berakah* and thanksgiving is Christ referred to without the definite article (1:3), and once as Jesus Christ (1:5).

1.3.2. *2:1–10, 11–22.* In the first of these two digressions, the author contrasts for his audience their former state of alienation from God with their present state of cosmic enthronement with Christ. This transition has been effected by God's action through Christ. God made the audience alive together by means of

---

it was understood to indicate the king's inactivity.

59. Matt 22:44; 26:64; Mark 12:36; 14:62; 16:19; Luke 20:42; 22:69; Rom 8:34; 1 Cor 15:25; Col 3:1; Heb 1:3; 8:1; 10:13; 1 Pet 3:22; Acts 2:34; 5:31; 7:55; Rev 3:21; *1 Clem.* 36:5; *Barn.* 12:10. See further, Hay, *Glory at the Right Hand*, 34–50.

60. The comments of J. Calvin, commenting on Col 3:1, are apropos: "ce passage démonstre apertement autant que nul autre que signifie la Dextre de Dieu: asçavoir non pas quelque lieu, mas la puissance que le Père a donnée à Christ, asçavoir qu'en son nom il administre l'empire du ciel et de la terre." (This passage demonstrates more clearly than any other that which is signified by the right hand of God: it denotes not a place, but the power which the Father has given to Christ, that in his name he administers the kingdom of heaven and of earth.) Cited in Charles Masson, *L'Épitre de Saint Paul aux Éphésiens* (CNT 9; Paris: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1953), 154.

61. So Frank J. Matera, *New Testament Christology* (Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 1999), 150.

the Christ (*συνεζωοποίησεν τῷ Χριστῷ*) (2:5).[62] God also raised them with him, and enthroned them with him in the heavenlies through the power of Christ Jesus (*συνήγειρεν καὶ συνεκάθισεν ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*) (2:6).[63] Commentators as early as Chrysostom have noted that heavenly enthronement "in Christ" implies the future sharing of Christ's cosmic rule.[64] All this God does in order to demonstrate his grace upon them through Christ Jesus (*ἵνα ἐνδείξηται . . . τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ . . . ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*) (2:7).[65] Finally, believers are said to have been created through Christ Jesus for good works (*κτισθέντες ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ἐπὶ ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς*) (2:10). Here again, the force of the preposition is debated.[66] The context of 2:4–10 suggests instrumentality. Because of his great mercy, God makes alive with Christ those formerly dead in sins. This reversal is achieved "through (*διά*) his great love with which he loved us" (2:5). What can this refer to but the

---

62. Hoehner, *Ephesians*, 330; Sellin, *Epheser*, 176, both contend that here, the dative is governed by the verb's prepositional prefix, *συν-*, and has an associative force (cf. Col 2:13). Note the variant reading, *ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ*, found in P^{46} B 33 a (g) vg^{cl}; MVict Ambst Chr. As Hoehner notes (329 n. 4), this reading lacks sufficient geographical distribution to be considered original. However, the fact that this reading accords well with the author's thought in the following verse trumps all other arguments. If it is not judged to be original, it nevertheless suggests an early scribal attempt to harmonize this phrase with the other *ἐν-* phrases in this passage.

63. Talbert, *Ephesians and Colossians*, 60; see the examples he cites from Greco-Roman and Jewish sources as evidence for the force of preposition being read in this way (36–37).

64. Commenting on Eph 2:7, Chrysostom writes: "Wouldest thou understand too, how He hath made us sit together with Him? Hear what Christ Himself saith to the disciples, "Ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel" (*Hom. Eph.* 4 [*NPNF*[1] 13:67]). He is followed by Martin Dibelius and D. Heinrich Greeven, *An die Kolosser, Epheser, an Philemon* (3d ed.; HNT; Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1953), 67; Masson, *Éphésiens*, 160–61 n. 8.

65. The force of the prepositional phrases relating to Christ in vv. 6–7 is contested. Hoehner takes them both to be locative; the prepositional phrase in v. 6 underscores the reason believers are seated in the heavenlies, because of their union with Christ; the one in v. 7 denotes "the location of the action of kindness" (*Ephesians*, 334–35, 339). Sellin contends that the meaning of the prepositional phrase in 2:7 is local and instrumental. He implies that both meanings apply to the prepositional phrase in 2:6 as well (*Epheser*, 183).

66. Hoehner, *Ephesians*, 348: sphere or location. Sellin, *Epheser*, 187: instrumentality ("durch Christus Jesus").

Christ event?[67] That Christ's self-giving love is to be identified with God's love is made clear later in the letter. In 5:1–2, the audience is enjoined to imitate God and walk in love, just as the Christ loved "us" and gave himself for "us." If God effects this movement from death to life through the Christ event, then believers may be justifiably understood to be a new creation effected through the agency of Christ.[68] As a result of God's merciful initiative realized through the Christ, therefore, believers have been brought from a state of spiritual death, sin and domination by hostile powers into a new creation characterized by good works and partnership in the Christ's cosmic reign. This is not to deny that some kind of mystical union with the Christ may also be implied. It is merely to highlight the importance of the Christ's agency. Again one notes that, as in 1:20–22, these putative titular references to Christ all occur in the context of cosmic enthronement—a fitting one for an ideal king.

At the beginning of the second digression, the audience is enjoined to remember their former state: they were without Christ (χωρὶς Χριστοῦ) and alienated from the commonwealth of God's people (2:12). Now, however, through Christ Jesus (ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ), they have been brought near through the blood of the Christ (ἐν τῷ αἵματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ) (2:13). Hoehner contends the preposition in the first expression denotes location and relationship, contrasting present reality with

---

67. So Aletti, *Ephésiens*, 126 on v. 4: "les lettres pauliniennes sont les premiers documents du NT à caractériser l'événement Christ comme manifestation de la miséricorde et/ou de l'amour de Dieu . . . L'insistance du verset est donc typiquement *paulinienne*" (author's emphasis). See further, Gnilka, *Epheserbrief*, 142, who maintains that since the work of salvation is initiated by Christ, ἵνα τοὺς δύο κτίσῃ ἐν αὐτῷ (2:15) possesses an instrumental nuance. Creation "in him" must be understood as creation by mneas of the peace that Christ has brought.

68. Even if one takes the force of the prepositional phrases in this passage to be locative, denoting incorporation into Christ, the notion of Christ as agent hovers in the background. As Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 117 writes, "This rescue act is not simply parallel to the events of Christ's t riumph, however, It takes place *through* them. For what God accomplished for Christ in those events, he accomplished for him as representative of a new humanity, seen as included in him."

the past; in the second instance, the preposition denotes instrumentality.[69] This has merit, because in 2:1–10, the audience is under the rule of the powers, and in 2:11–12, it is stressed that formerly, they had no relationship with God. Sellin, however, contends that the first preposition is both locative and instrumental; the second, purely instrumental.[70] The parallelism of these two expressions, the second of which is clearly instrumental, is a further indication of instrumentality in the first one.[71] As a result of the Christ's reconciling work they are now fellow-members with the saints[72] in God's household, built upon the foundation of apostles and prophets, of whom Christ Jesus is the cornerstone (ἀκρογωνιαίου αὐτοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ) (2:20). Again, the agency of the Christ is of signal importance here. It is through his death that Jews and gentiles are reconciled to God and to one another. It should be noted here that nothing in the context of these twelve verses suggests unambiguously that the articular use of Χριστός or parallel expressions are used in titular fashion. One would be hard pressed to make a convincing case that the anarthrous use of χριστός in 2:12 is not a title, while the two occurrences of χριστός in 2:13 are titular.[73] As suggested earlier, it would appear that the author is not entirely consistent on this matter. It is not simply the appearance of a lexical peculiarity that pushes one to the conclusion that the Christ of Ephesians functions

---

69. Hoehner, *Ephesians*, 362–63.

70. Sellin, *Epheser*, 200–201.

71. Allan, "'In Christ'," 58.

72. *Pace* Yee, *Ethnic Reconciliation*, this is best taken to refer to all Christians, not Jewish Christians in particular.

73. It is telling that Barth, *Ephesians*, 256, translates tha anarthrous χριστός in 2:12 as "the Messiah," thus violating the rule of translation he had earlier established (66).

as a king, but more so the fact that the Christ functions as God's agent, as he clearly does in this passage.[74]

1.3.3. *3:1–13, 14–21.* At the beginning of this digression dealing with God's work through his apostle, "Paul," the author describes himself as the slave of the Christ (ὁ δέσμιος τοῦ Χριστοῦ [Ἰησοῦ])[75] (3:1), to whom has been given insight into the mystery of the Christ (ἐν τῷ μυστηρίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ) (3:4).[76] The mystery, previously hidden but now revealed, is that through the gospel (διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου), gentiles are now co-heirs (συγκληρονόμα), members of the same body (σύσσωμα), and fellow participants of the promise (συμμέτοχα τῆς ἐπαγγελίας) by means of Christ Jesus (ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ) (3:6).[77] The author became a servant of this gospel in order to proclaim the riches of the Christ (τὸ . . . πλοῦτος τοῦ Χριστοῦ) (3:8),[78] and to illuminate the (plan of the) once-hidden mystery, in order to make known God's wisdom, according to his eternal purpose which he accomplished through the

---

74. It will furthermore be argued below (section 2.2) later on that this reconciling activity would have been expected of an ideal king.

75. This reading is to be preferred on the basis of external evidence over the variant that lacks Ἰησοῦ; so Hoehner, *Ephesians*, 420; Sellin, *Epheser*, 248.

76. The genitive may indicate that the Christ is the content of the mystery; so Masson, *Éphésiens*, 173; Hoehner, *Ephesians*, 436–37: objective genitive; Sellin, *Epheser*, 253: genitive of content. Alternately, the genitive could function attributively, yielding the meaning "Christian mystery"; so Talbert, *Ephesians and Colossians*, 97–98; cf. Aletti, *Ephésiens*, 178–81: "le mystère concernant le Christ." The second option is the more likely, given that the content of the mystery, as described in v. 6, is ecclesiological rather than christological; so Schlier, *Epheser*, 151; Schnackenburg, *Epheser*, 133–36.

77. Allan, "'In Christ'," 58, contends that instrumentality is strongly suggested by the parallel phrase, διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου; so also Talbert, *Ephesians and Colossians*, 98. Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 181; Hoehner, *Ephesians*, 448, take the force of the preposition to be locative, denoting the locale in which these three attributes may be said to apply to gentiles. Sellin, *Epheser*, 259: both locative and instrumental.

78. Best, *Ephesians*, 318; Hoehner, *Ephesians*, 454: possessive genitive (the wealth that Christ possesses, or the wealth that consists in Christ himself); Sellin, *Epheser*, 262: epexegetical genitive (Christ is the content of the proclamation).

Christ, Jesus our Lord (ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν) (3:11).[79] Through him (ἐν ᾧ), the audience has boldness and access to the father (3:12; cf. 2:18). One thing to note in this digression is the hidden-revealed motif, a staple of Jewish apocalyptic literature. At Qumran, one of the things revealed was the identity and role of the eschatological king (e.g., 1QSb).[80]

In the intercession and doxology which follow (3:14–19, 20–21), the author prays to the Father that the audience would be inwardly strengthened, that the Christ would dwell in their hearts (κατοικῆσαι τὸν Χριστὸν . . . ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν) (3:17), in order that they could grasp the love of the Christ (γνῶναί τε τὴν . . . ἀγάπην τοῦ Χριστοῦ) (3:19).[81] This love which Christ possesses is both the vivid portrayal of God's love, as well as the pattern for love between humans.[82] The author concludes the first part of the letter with a ringing doxology: to God is the glory, through the church, and through Christ Jesus (ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ καὶ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ) (3:21).[83] That the church and the Christ are the means by which God

---

79. Hoehner, *Ephesians*, 464, asserts that the preposition denotes sphere or locale. He further discusses the meaning of the verb ποιεῖν when used with πρόθεσιν, concluding that in its immediate context it refers to that which God has accomplished historically by Christ's death (cf. Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 189). Hoehner thus claims that the prepositional phrase is used "to enhance the idea that God's purpose was accomplished in the historical Jesus when he died on the cross." It would appear that Hoehner's insistence on the locative force of the preposition is nevertheless closely related to the instrumentality of Christ's death in the economy of God's eternal plan.

80. See the discussion in Schnackenburg, *Epheser*, 138–41.

81. Hoehner, *Ephesians*, 489: the genitive is likely subjective, or possessive.

82. Sellin, *Epheser*, 290: "das anschauliche Abbild der ontologischen Liebe Gottes und zugleich das Vorbild mitmenschlicher Liebe."

83. Following Talbert, *Ephesians and Colossians*, 103, both ἐν phrases are taken instrumentally. For the same idea expressed with the preposition διά, see Rom 16:26–27; Jude 24–25. Hoehner, *Ephesians*, 494–95; Sellin, *Epheser*, 297, posit a locative reading for both prepositional phrases. According to Hoehner, this indicates the two places where God is to be glorified. Sellin, however, contends the relationship between the locative expressions is epexegetical: "in the church" is further described as "in Christ."

receives honor has already been seen. The church, by its very existence, bears witness to God's wisdom, and is thus a means by which God is glorified among the powers (3:10). The Christ, the agent through whom God will sum up the cosmos, similarly brings God honor (1:10). As, for example, in the *Psalms of Solomon*, the ideal king reflects divine majesty and brings God glory not only through his appearance, but in the execution of his divinely appointed task (30–31, 42). The notion that the king brings God glory through his action is consistent with what Lincoln has called the theocentric character and christological focus of Ephesians.[84] Throughout the digression, intercession and doxology, the consistent pattern is that God acts through the Christ, who thereby glorifies God. The fact that, as in 2:1–10, Christ is referred to here exclusively as ὁ Χριστός or Χριστός Ἰησοῦς is perhaps not accidental.

1.3.4. *4:1–16.* The author begins what is commonly seen as the parenetical section of the letter by urging unity in the body, which is possible because the Christ has given the church gifts to build up its unity (4:1–16). To each one, the author claims, grace has been given according to the measure of the Christ's gift (κατὰ τὸ μέτρον τῆς δωρεᾶς τοῦ Χριστοῦ) (4:7). The second genitive construction denotes the Christ as the source of the gift, or the agent who gives it.[85] From his exalted position of cosmic rule (4:10), the Christ bestowed gifts upon the church in the form of people with a variety of leadership abilities, for the ultimate purpose of the building up of the body of the Christ (εἰς οἰκοδομὴν τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ) (4:12).[86] This is further described as attaining a measure of the stature of the

---

84. Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 44.

85. Hoehner, *Ephesians*, 523; similarly, Sellin, *Epheser*, 330.

86. Hoehner, *Ephesians*, 551: the first genitive is objective; the second genitive is possessive.

Christ's fullness (εἰς μέτρον ἡλικίας τοῦ πληρώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ) (4:13).[87] They will in this manner not be like infants (4:14); rather, they will grow up in all things into the Christ, who is the head (εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα, ὅς ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλή, [ὁ] Χριστός) (4:15).[88] It will be argued below (section 3) that in bestowing God's gifts to the church, the Christ is portrayed as the ideal king who functions as the universal benefactor of humankind. Of further possible significance is that in this section, Christ is referred to exclusively as ὁ Χριστός.

1.3.5. *4:17–5:21.* This lengthy "Two Ways" form of ethical exhortation can be subdivided into four sections: 4:17–32; 5:1–6; 5:7–14; and 5:15–21. The beginnings of these subsections are marked by the repeated use of the conjunction, οὖν.[89] In the first of these, the author sternly warns the audience not to live as the depraved gentiles, because, as he reminds them, they did not so learn the Christ (ὑμεῖς δὲ οὐχ οὕτως ἐμάθετε τὸν Χριστόν) (4:20). They are to forgive one another, just as God forgave them through Christ (ὁ θεὸς ἐν Χριστῷ ἐχαρίσατο ὑμῖν) (4:32). Christ's action provides the transition to the second thought unit, in which the author enjoins the audience to become imitators of God and to walk in love, just as the Christ loved them (καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ἠγάπησεν ἡμᾶς) (5:2). Here, the Christ's action is the paradigm for imitation: if the audience wishes to imitate God, they will find in Christ's love the example to follow. The ideal king was commonly thought of as imitating divine virtue, and providing the example for his subjects to follow. The audience is to shun immoral behavior, knowing that those who pursue such a

---

87. The relationship of the genitives is difficult to decipher. Hoehner, *Ephesians*, 557: apposition, epexegetical, subjective or better, possessive. Sellin, *Epheser*, 345–46: quality, apposition, quality.

88. The variant reading with the article is accepted by Barth, *Ephesians*, 2:445; Hoehner, *Ephesians*, 567 n. 2. Best, *Ephesians*, 408–9, is ambivalent.

89. Hoehner, *Ephesians*, 581; Talbert, *Ephesians and Colossians*, 122.

lifestyle will have no share in the kingdom of the Christ and of God (ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ) (5:5).[90] As a number of variant readings attest, early readers may have been perplexed by the wording of this expression, a *hapax* in both the OT and NT. One of these variants, ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ, suggests a possible scribal correction reflecting the Jewish expectation of an eschatological kingdom ruled by God's Messiah. Thus Barth translates, "in the kingdom of God's Messiah."[91] The scanty external attestation provides little warrant for this reading as original, however. Nevertheless, it provides some evidence that early readers found such a reading to be in harmony with the overall portrayal of Christ in the letter. That is to say, although Barth goes too far in claiming that the author consistently portrays Christ as the Jewish Messiah by means of various titles, apparently some early readers would have agreed with him on this point. In the reading of NA[27], the possessive genitives indicate that the kingdom belongs to both God and to the Christ. This is best understood as a vicegerency: God rules through the agency of the Christ.[92] In the third subsection, the author again exhorts his audience not to participate in immorality: now that they are light, they must shun darkness. A verse from a song or poem provides a fitting conclusion: "Awake O sleeper, and rise from the dead, and the Christ will shine on you (καὶ ἐπιφαύσει σοι ὁ Χριστός) (5:14). The significance of the Christ's role in moral transformation is the subject of further discussion (section 4). Suffice it to note that even in this section,

---

90. Beskow, *Rex Gloriae*, 39–45, observes that βασιλεύς and βασιλεύειν were not often used by NT writers to denote Jesus's royal power because of the political and secular overtones of these terms. This reticence was not applied to the use of βασιλεία, however. Beskow suggests that this may have been due to the fact that in the majority of cases (e.g., the Gospels), the kingdom of God is being referred to.

91. This reading is found in a tenth century minuscule (1739) and in some Vulgate manuscripts. The other variants are: P^{46}: τοῦ θεοῦ; F G bo^{ms}; Ambrosiaster: τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ. See the discussion in Barth, *Ephesians*, 2:564; Hoehner, *Ephesians*, 661.

92. Masson, *Éphésiens*, 207 n. 2; Conzelmann, "Epheser," 84; Sellin, *Epheser*, 399.

which has little to do directly with the cosmic reign of Christ, nevertheless his partnership in divine rule is mentioned.

1.3.6. *5:22–6:9.* Following the Two Ways form is a household code consisting of three parts: instructions to wives and husbands (5:22–33), to children and fathers (6:1–4), and to slaves and masters (6:5–9). In the first of these, wives are commanded to submit to their husbands as to the Lord. The reason given is that the husband is head of the wife as the Christ is head of the church, the savior of the body (ὁ Χριστὸς κεφαλὴ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, αὐτὸς σωτὴρ τοῦ σώματος) (5:23).[93] The author continues: as the church submits to the Christ (ὡς ἡ ἐκκλησία ὑποτάσσεται τῷ Χριστῷ), so also the wives are to submit in everything to their husbands (5:24). He then turns his focus to the husbands, echoing an earlier comment: they are to love their wives just as the Christ also loved the church (καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ἠγάπησεν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν) (5:25; cf. 5:2). They are to love their wives as their own bodies: no one ever hated his own flesh, but feeds and takes care of it, just as the Christ does to the church (καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν) (5:29). After issuing instructions to children and parents, the author addresses slaves: they are to obey their masters as unto the Christ (ὡς τῷ Χριστῷ) (6:5). The theme of submission to the Christ, prevalent within the household code, is consistent with the relationship expected between subject and monarch.

1.3.7. *Summary and conclusions.* The preceding overview of the poetic sequence of action in Ephesians has demonstrated that *God acts through Christ.* This coheres well with the concept of the ideal king in antiquity, who served as the vicegerent of the High God. The purpose of this overview is to provide a baseline of data upon which further arguments will be made concerning the significance of

---

93. On the significance of the Hellenistic royal epithet, σωτὴρ, see below, p. 275.

kingship for understanding the argument and emphases of the letter. As a further preparatory step towards this end, the next section of this chapter will provide an overview of the referential sequence of action. This is essentially a chronological re-plotting of the actions stated or implied within the letter. The goal of this re-plotting is twofold: to gain a clearer sense of the narrative world comprised of the relationships between the letter's primary actors (God, Christ, "Paul," and the recipients of the letter); and by comparison of the poetic and referential sequences, to detect potential emphases of certain actions.

1.4. *What is the Narrative World of Ephesians? The Referential Sequence of Action*

Any attempt to determine the referential sequence of action in Ephesians must recognize at the outset that the letter does not furnish us with the necessary data to accomplish this task with precision and certainty.[94] R. A. Culpepper notes that the narrative of the Fourth Gospel is similarly dotted with chronological gaps, which must be filled in by the reader.[95] Our analysis of Ephesians will thus be well served by Culpepper's insightful treatment of order, duration, and frequency in narrative time.

Culpepper divides the narrative time of the Fourth Gospel into five periods: pre-historical past, historical past, present, historical future, and eschatological future.[96] This analysis of Ephesians will use these categories, but some modification is needed. When Culpepper speaks of the past and future, he is referring to events that are outside the time period of the narrative (for example,

---

94. Theon's *progymnasmata* instructs the student to practice varying the order of a narrative, presumably to hold the interest of the reader (Theon, *Prog.* 86-87; Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, 35). The non-linear ordering of the story of Ephesians betrays such training.

95. Culpepper, *Anatomy*, 56.

96. Culpepper, *Anatomy*, 70.

from John's testimony to post-resurrection appearances). What is the "narrative present" of Ephesians? One could argue that it extends from the writing of the letter to its public reading, but this is not a useful conception, because nothing actually "happens" during this period. It will be more useful to extend the narrative present of the letter to include everything from the point at which "Paul" established relationship with the recipients of the letter through the anticipated response of this community to his letter.

Conceiving of the narrative present in this fashion finds additional support from Petersen's five theses regarding the sociology of letters.[97] These theses form a theoretical foundation for the analysis of the social relationships envisioned by the letter and how they reflect the symbolic universe of the author. The first three of these theses concern a span of time that includes the initiation of a relationship, the development in that relationship represented by the reception of a letter, and the anticipated response to that letter. This arc we will refer to as the narrative present of the letter.

Borrowing terminology from narratologist G. Genette, Culpepper explains that the narrator of the Fourth Gospel uses analepses and prolepses to refer respectively to previous and future action in the narrative. Internal analepses and prolepses refer to action that occurs within the narrative present. External analepses and prolepses refer to action before and after the narrative present.

---

97. Petersen, *Rediscovering Paul*, 63–65: (1) Every letter presupposes a previous relationship; even when there is none, the letter must take this absence of relationship as its premise. (2) The reception of the letter constitutes a new communication event in the relationship between addresser and addressee. (3) Every letter implies at least the response of the addressee to the letter, whether an action or attitude, positive or negative. (4) Addresser, addressee, and other actors mentioned in the letter are related to each other through typified social categories, which may be reduced to inferior/superior/equal. (5) The rhetoric, tone, and style of the letter corresponds to the addresser's perception of his relation to the sender. Petersen's discussion of the sociology of letters is derived in large part from the theory of the sociology of knowledge expounded by Berger and Luckmann, *Social Construction*.

Mixed analepses and prolepses refer to action that begins prior to, and is completed within the narrative present, or begins within, and ends after the narrative present.[98] While the details of his discussion need not concern us here, Culpepper's understanding of the function of mixed analepses and prolepses is important. These function in the Fourth Gospel to tie the audience into the larger sweep of biblical history that has preceded them, as well as into the final events of Jesus' ministry.[99] It will be shown that mixed analepses and prolepses have a similar—and vitally important—function in Ephesians.

Culpepper classifies the duration of narrated events in the Fourth Gospel as scenes, summaries, or ellipses, with possibly a fourth category, "descriptive pauses" (borrowing a term from Genette). Not all of these categories are well suited to epistolary genre. It is dubious, for example, whether anything in Ephesians could properly be described as a "scene." However, the author's doxologies might aptly be described as "descriptive pauses." Terminology aside, the value of Culpepper's classification is that it allows one to notice where the narrative slows down for emphasis. For example, he notes that miracle stories are "exploded" into major episodes in John.[100] Culpepper's categories for the frequency of narration are also helpful: singular (single event narrated once), repetitious (single event narrated multiple times), repetitive (repeated event narrated multiple times), and iterative (repeated event narrated once). Paying attention to this narrative technique also allows one to spot the narrator's emphases in the story.[101] Throughout the following analysis of the referential sequence of actions in Ephesians, attention will

---

98. Culpepper, *Anatomy*, 56–70.

99. Culpepper, *Anatomy*, 60–61, 63.

100. Culpepper, *Anatomy*, 70–73.

101. Culpepper, *Anatomy*, 73–75.

be given to the author's ordering of the story through analepses and prolepses, as well the duration and frequency with which he recounts certain events.

1.4.1. *God's creational activity.* The *first action* is actually a constellation of actions occurring in what may be understood as the pre-historical past, emanating from God's creation of all things (3:9b). Associated with this act of creation are a number of other actions to which "Paul" makes reference: God created Christians for good works (2:10); through Christ, God chose them (1:4), and predestined them for adoption (1:5). This may also be the time when believers received an inheritance through Christ (1:11). Presumably in the pre-historical past, God also set forth his eternal purpose (3:11), the summing up of all things through Christ (1:9-10; 3:4-6, 9-11). This plan to sum up (ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι) all things through Christ is the quintessential metaphor for God's redeeming activity in Ephesians. The verb originally referred to the Greek practice of adding a sum of numbers. Addition was performed from bottom to top, hence "summing up," or "bringing to a head." It later became used as a rhetorical term referring to the summary of an argument, then more generally to denote the gathering of scattered items. Here it refers to God's plan to unite the entirety of the cosmos through Christ.[102] Consequently, virtually all of God's activity portrayed in the letter may be seen as an aspect of this comprehensive plan: the mystery (once hidden but now revealed) of the incorporation of Jews and gentiles into the same body, the church (2:11-22; 3:3-9; 6:19); God's triumph over hostile spiritual powers (1:20-23; 6:10-20); the

---

102. Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 33; Martin Kitchen, *Ephesians* (New Testament Readings; London: Routledge, 1994), 36–42; Talbert, *Ephesians and Colossians*, 47–48. The metaphor likely also conveys the sense of restoration; so John McHugh, "A Reconsideration of Ephesians 1.10b in the Light of Irenaeus," in *Paul and Paulinism* (FS C. K. Barrett; ed. M. D. Hooker and S. G. Wilson; London: SPCK, 1982), 307–8. See further, H. Schlier, "ἀνακεφαλαιόομαι," TDNT 3:681; H. Merklein, "ἀνακεφαλαιόω," EDNT 1:82.

enlightenment and empowerment of believers (3:14-19); and the unity of church (4:11-13) and household (5:22-6:9).

Some of this pre-historical activity is communicated through pre-historical (external) analepses. God's creation of all things, and specifically his creation, choosing and predestination of Christians, is an action begun and completed in the past. Reference to the summing up of all things, however, is a mixed analepse: it is a plan conceived of by God in the pre-historical past (3:11), and set into motion through Christ in the present through his exaltation (1:20-23). As in the Fourth Gospel, this mixed analepse functions to tie the story of Ephesians into the broad sweep of biblical history, connecting Christ to creation. As will be seen below (twelfth action), this summing up is also communicated through a mixed prolepse, since it will not be completed until the eschaton (1:10; cf. 1:21; 2:7). The function of this mixed prolepse is to incorporate the audience into God's plan to sum up the cosmos through Christ. Thus, mixed analepses and prolepses function to link Christ and auditor to creation and to the eschaton. As the central metaphor for God's redeeming activity, it should come as no surprise that this restoration of the cosmos is narrated repetitiously, that is, a single event narrated multiple times. The duration of narration ranges from summary statements to longer "descriptive pauses." In the poetic sequence, the referential sequence of activity is often interrupted by the intrusion of this important theme. God's creational activity is the focus of the opening *berakah*, or blessing (1:3-14).

1.4.2. *The Christ event.* The *second action* may be summarized as the "Christ event": Christ's incarnation (4:9-10),[103] crucifixion (2:16a; cf. 5:2),

---

103. See the discussion in Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 244–48; Talbert, *Ephesians and Colossians*, 154–55. Rainer Schwindt, *Das Weltbild des Epheserbriefes: Eine religionsgeschichtlich-exegetische Studie* (WUNT 148; Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002), 428–430, considers the Incarnation as well as descent into Hell as possible interpretations of these verses.

resurrection, and exaltation (1:20-21). The Christ event is communicated through a combination of analepses and mixed prolepses. Incarnation, crucifixion, and resurrection all take place in the historical past, and are conveyed in the text through historical analepses. Christ's exaltation began in the historical past, but continues into the present and extends into the future, since Christ is understood to be enthroned in the heavenlies, from whence he reigns over the powers (1:22-23) and gives gifts for the unification of the church (4:7, 11-13). Like God's plan to restore the cosmos through Christ, God's exaltation of Christ can only be communicated through a combination of mixed analepses and mixed prolepses. The Christ event comes into focus in the poetic sequence in 2:1–10 and in 2:11–22, a two part digression dealing with Christians' having been raised and reconciled through Christ (1:20; 2:5-6, 8, 13, 16a). Various elements of the Christ event are woven into 4:1-16, a section on Christian unity (4:9-10), and in the Two Ways form of 4:17-5:21 (5:2).

1.4.3. *Recipients' state of spiritual death.* The *third action* occurs in the historical past, and refers to the gentile audience's state of being: they were dead in trespasses and sins (2:1-3, 5a).[104] This state is also characterized as being without Christ and alienated from the commonwealth of Israel (2:12), or more bluntly, as being darkness (5:8a). The relative sequence of the second and third actions overlap: if any of the gentile audience can be imagined to have been alive prior to the Christ event, they would have been in a state of spiritual death at that time. All of them would have been in this state between the Christ event and their conversion (fifth action). The letter refers to this state in an historical analepse,

---

104. The authorial audience is generally understood as gentile Christians: Ulrich Betz, *Einssein in Christus: Eine Einführung in den Epheserbrief* (Kassel: Oncken, 1969), 7; Schnackenburg, *Epheser*, 32; Lincoln, *Ephesians*, lxxvi; O'Brien, *Ephesians*, 50; Yee, *Ethnic Reconciliation*, 33; Talbert, *Ephesians and Colossians*, 61.

since their conversion was prior to the beginning of their relationship with "Paul" (ninth action). It is primarily narrated in the same place as the second action, although mentioned again briefly in the Two Ways Form (5:8a).

1.4.4. *"Paul" becomes an apostle.* The *fourth action* referred to in the letter is "Paul's" becoming an apostle by means of the activity of Christ (1:1).[105] There is no indication when this happened, but logically it must have taken place after the Christ event. When he became an apostle, the mystery of Christ was made known to him by revelation, namely that Jews and gentiles would become members of the same body, the church (3:3a, 6). "Paul" then became a servant of this mystery, in order that God's wisdom might be made known through the church to the rulers and authorities in the heavenlies (3:7-10). Paul's apostleship is communicated through an historical analepse in a section dealing with God's working through "Paul" (3:1-13).

1.4.5. *Recipients' conversion.* Presumably after "Paul" became an apostle, the gentile audience of the letter heard and believed in the gospel, the *fifth action* (1:13; 2:4-8, 13). This conversion experience is also understood as their calling (4:1, 4), and as being saved by grace (2:5c, 8). Their conversion is likely associated with being sealed with the Holy Spirit through Christ (1:13b; cf. 4:30), and receiving forgiveness through Christ (4:32). When the audience believed in the gospel, they became the recipients of a whole host of blessings, which are mediated by Christ (1:3–14).[106] Their conversion also marks the convergence of three stories embedded

---

105. Talbert, *Ephesians and Colossians*, 45, translates Παῦλος ἀπόστολος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ (1:1) as "Paul, an apostle by means of the activity of Christ Jesus." I do not take his translation to reflect either the genitive of means, or the genitive of agency, both of which are fairly rare (Wallace, *Exegetical Syntax*, 125–26). Rather, I read Talbert as periphrastically emphasizing the activity of Christ's sending out, by which Paul became his apostle.

106. Schnackenburg, *Epheser*, 52, notes the significance of Christ's mediatorial function in

in the letter. The story being told of God and Christ is that of a mystery, the reconciliation of the cosmos through Christ (1:9–10). "Paul's" story joins this larger story when he is entrusted as a steward of the mystery, further elaborated as the gentiles becoming fellow heirs, fellow members, and fellow participants (with the Jews) of the promise, through Christ (3:4–6).[107] When the gentile audience believes in the gospel, they join both "Paul's" story, and the larger story of God's reconciliation of the cosmos through Christ, a reconciliation of which they are now a part.

It is unclear whether there is a direct connection between "Paul's" apostleship and the audience's conversion.[108] It would appear that "Paul" has no direct connection with the recipients, since he apparently can only assume that they have heard of his apostleship (3:2-3a). It may be that "Paul" previously wrote to them (3:3b), but this oblique reference most likely points to what "Paul" has previously communicated in this letter.[109] The recipients' conversion is conveyed through historical analepses primarily in the opening *berakah* (1:3-14) and in the digression dealing with believers' exaltation and reconciliation (1:20-2:22). It is further mentioned in the call to unity in the church (4:1-16) and in the Two Ways form (4:17-5:21).

---

the adoption of the audience into God's family in 1:5: "Dadurch erklärt sich am besten die nur hier in Eph auftauchende Formel »*durch* (διά) Jesus Christus«. Die mittlerische Funktion Jesu christi ist wesentlich: durch den Sohn sind wir Söhne Gottes geworden."

107. Schnackenburg, *Epheser*, 136 maintains that τῆς ἐπαγγελίας ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ (3:6) refers to the former promise of the Messiah to Israel, now fulfilled in Christ: "Jetzt ist die einstige Verheißung (des Messias) in Christus erfüllt, und diese Erfüllung bringt zugleich die neue Verheißung des vollen Heilserwerbs mit sich (vgl. 1,13f)."

108. I am not asking an historical question, but rather a literary one: What does the narrative world of the letter tell us about its author's previous relationship with its recipients?

109. So Dibelius and Greeven, *Epheser*, 73–74; Masson, *Éphésiens*, 173; Schlier, *Epheser*, 149; Schnackenburg, *Epheser*, 132–33; Aletti, *Ephésiens*, 176.

1.4.6. *Recipients' enthronement by means of the Christ.* The *sixth action* is closely related to the recipients' conversion: God made them alive by means of the Christ, raising them and enthroning them by means of the Christ in the heavenlies (2:5b, 6; cf. 1:3, 6, 8). This action pertains to all believers, however, not only the letter's recipients. It is thus difficult to accurately place it within the referential sequence of events. It is a correlate of the Christ event (second action), and may even be understood as a part of it. Yet, it is helpful to place this in the sequence after the recipients' conversion, since they cannot be understood to share in Christ's exaltation prior to conversion. Reconciliation of Jew and gentile and their incorporation into one body (2:13-16) may be seen as an effect of the Christ event generally, since it is effected "by the blood of Christ" (2:13) and "through the cross" (2:16). In the present, however, this reconciliation is still something of a spiritual reality; its completion appears to be part of the summing up of all things in Christ to be achieved in the fullness of time, the eschaton (1:10). As a spiritual reality, then, it may be helpful to imagine it as part of the believers' heavenly session with Christ. Too much should not be made of the relative sequence of actions five and six, nor should one rigidly associate the reconciliation of Jew and gentile with either action. Reference to this action is probably best understood as both a mixed analepse and a mixed prolepse, beginning before the relationship with "Paul," and extending through the eschaton.

1.4.7. *Recipients "learn Christ".* In connection with their conversion and session with Christ, the recipients of the letter also "learned Christ," the *seventh action* (4:20). As "Paul" makes clear, this refers to their moral transformation into the likeness of Christ (4:21-24). This action began in the historical past, but continues into the present; in fact, "Paul's" letter may be seen as contributing in the

present to their moral transformation. It is narrated as an historical analepse, something that occurred in the past. Yet, as "Paul's" exhortation in chapters 4–6 makes plain, moral transformation is an ongoing process.

1.4.8. *"Paul" is imprisoned.* The *eighth action*, "Paul's" becoming a prisoner for Christ, is related somehow to his apostleship to the gentiles (3:1; 4:1; 6:20). This historical analepse is narrated repetitiously and summarily. It is woven into three different thought blocks that deal with God's working through "Paul" (3:1-13), unity in the church (4:1-16), and a call to stand firm against spiritual powers (6:10-20).

1.4.9. *"Paul" hears of the recipients' faith.* "Paul" also briefly mentions hearing about the faith of the letter's recipients, the *ninth action* (1:15). No other mention is made of this action, which initiates the relationship between "Paul" and his audience. Since he does not make clear the circumstances, or the time at which his imprisonment occurred, it is impossible to accurately place these actions in sequence relative to each other. If "Paul" is imagined as having first-hand contact with the letter's recipients, his imprisonment (coterminous with his writing of the letter) must have occurred after hearing of their faith. If "Paul" has *only* heard of them (but not visited them), he may have done so in prison, but this is mere speculation. Although these two actions are not elaborated upon in the letter, they are crucial events for understanding "Paul's" relationship with the community to whom he writes. They make clear that "Paul" has some kind of relationship with the letter's recipients (although to what degree he knows them is unclear), and that his current status as a prisoner is due to that relationship.

1.4.10. *"Paul" writes the letter, which is delivered and read by "Tychicus".* The *tenth* action is actually a constellation of several related actions. In the

immediate historical past, "Paul" wrote the letter and sent it with "Tychicus" (6:22). In the present, "Paul's" letter is read aloud by "Tychicus" to the recipients (6:21). These actions are conveyed through internal analepses at the very end of the letter, referring back to the letter's composition, delivery, and public reading.

1.4.11. *Recipients respond to the letter.* The *eleventh* action occurs in the historical future: the recipients respond to the letter. This response is only implied in the letter itself, but there are clear indications of the manner in which "Paul" *hopes* they will respond. The desired response may be characterized by changed thinking, and changed action. In the first category, "Paul" prays for his audience's enlightenment and empowerment (1:16b-19; 3:14-19). In the second category, he exhorts them to unity (4:1-16), and to reject their former way of life, instead becoming imitators of God (4:17-5:21). They are to maintain their households in accordance with cultural expectations (5:22-6:9), and to stand firm against the evil spiritual powers (6:10-20). Whether or not they will respond positively to the letter is of course impossible to determine from the letter itself. This constellation of actions is conveyed as a completing prolepse,[110] taking place *within* the narrative present, defined above to include the response to the letter.

1.4.12. *The cosmos is restored through Christ.* The *twelfth and final action* is the summing up of all things through the Christ: ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι τὰ πάντα ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ (1:10, 14; 2:7; 3:10). This is a rich and far-reaching metaphor referring to the reunification of a disjointed cosmos through the reign of the Christ.[111] It

---

110. A completing prolepse supplies information about future event to be completed within the narrative present (Culpepper, *Anatomy*, 62).

111. Schnackenburg, *Epheser*, 59, contends that the author is not primarily thinking in a temporal sense, but rather a spatial-cosmic one. Masson, *Éphésiens*, 145, 160–61, however, believes these two dimensions should be held together.

encompasses the ultimate redemption of God's people, of which the Holy Spirit has been given as the down payment (1:13-14). A central element comprises the restoration of harmony through the reconciliation of Jewish and gentile Christians in the church (2:11–22; 3:5–6).[112] It also involves the judgment of the disobedient: such will "not have a share in the kingdom of the Christ and of God (ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ)"; upon them rather will come the wrath of God (5:5–6). As noted above (first action), the summing up of all things is communicated as a mixed analepse—it has its roots in the pre-historical past (3:11),[113] yet has been inaugurated in the historical past with Christ's exaltation and continues in the present (1:20-21). It is also presented as a mixed prolepse, since it is a plan whose completion is destined for the fullness of time.[114] This summing up of all things in Christ is thus the action that continues throughout the entire referential sequence of events.

1.5. *Where is the Emphasis? Referential and Poetic Sequences Compared*

The overview of the poetic and referential sequences of action may be summarized in the following two tables. The first table lists, in the left column, the

---

112. Note the comment of Sellin, *Epheser*, 107:"Ἀποκαταλλάσσειν (Kol 1,20,22; Eph 2,16) und εἰρηνοποιεῖν (Kol 1,20; vgl. Eph 2,14.17) sin in ἀνακεφαλαιοῦσθαι als Asdruck *zusammengefast*" (original emphasis).

113. Cf. 3:15, where God the father is described as the one ἐξ οὗ πᾶσα πατριὰ ἐν οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς ὀνομάζεται. πᾶσα πατριὰ means every "family, race, clan, folk." The idea suggested here every ethnic group finds its genesis in God the father (see Schnackenburg, *Epheser*, 149–50). The notion of reconciliation between Jews and gentiles can therefore be seen as a return to the harmony of God's creation.

114. On the past and future elements of the unification of the cosmos, see Schnackenburg, *Epheser*, 59–60.

poetic sequence of the text, broken down into sections conforming to the major structural elements of the letter. Elements in the poetic sequence are further designated by the letters (a)–(l). In the middle column is a description of each of these sections. The right column lists the actions in the referential sequence to which the section of the poetic sequence refers. Elements in the referential sequence are further designated by the numerals (1)–(12). Actions in curly brackets are only implied in the poetic sequence. One notes that the eleventh action (the audience's response to the letter) is implied every time it is listed. This is because the way in which the audience will respond is not known to the writer of the letter (or the audience, for that matter). The second table lists, in the left column, the referential sequence of actions, and in the middle column, its principal location(s) in the text. In the right column is listed the place in the poetic sequence where the action is narrated. For example, God's creational activity, the first referential action, falls second in the poetic sequence, after the prescript.

Table 1: Poetic Sequence Prioritized

Poetic Sequence	*Description*	*Referential Action*
(a) 1:1–2	Prescript	10
(b) 1:3–14	Berakah: blessing God for saving acts	1, 12
(c) 1:15–23	Thanksgiving and intercession	9 {11}
(d) 2:1–10	Digression 1a: raised through Christ	2, 3, 6/5, 12, 1
(e) 2:11–22	Digression 1b: reconciled through Christ	2, 6, 3, {12}
(f) 3:1–13	Digression 2: God's power at work through "Paul"	8, {1}, 6, 4, 12
(g) 3:14–19, 20–21	Asking God for audience's empowering; doxology	{11}
(h) 4:1–16	Call to maintain Christian unity	{11}, 2, 8
(i) 4:17–5:21	Two ways form	{11}, 2
(j) 5:22–6:9	Household code	{11}
(k) 6:10–20	Call to stand firm	{11}, 8
(l) 6:21–24	Postscript	10

Table 2: Referential Sequence Prioritized

Referential sequence	*Location in Text*	*Poetic Action*
(1) God's creational activity	(1:3–14; 2:10; 3:4–11)	b, d, f
(2) The Christ event	(1:20; 2:5–6, 8, 13, 16a; 4:9–10; 5:2)	c–e, h–i
(3) Recipients' state of spiritual death	(2:1–3, 5a, 12; 5:8a)	d–e, i
(4) "Paul" becomes an apostle	(1:1; 3:3a, 6–10)	a, f
(5) Recipients' conversion	(1:13; 2:4–8, 13; 4:1, 4, 32)	b, d–e, h–i
(6) Recipients' enthronement with Christ	(2:5–6; cf. 1:3–8; 2:13–16)	d
(7) Ephesians "learn Christ"	(4:20–24)	i
(8) "Paul" is imprisoned	(3:1; 4:1; 6:20)	f, h, k
(9) "Paul" hears of the recipients' faith	(1:15)	c
(10) "Paul" writes the letter, which is delivered and read by "Tychicus"	(6:22, 21)	l
(11) Ephesians respond to the letter	(1:16b–19; 3:14–19; 4:1–6:20)	c, g, h–k
(12)The cosmos is restored through Christ	(1:10–21; 2:7, 11–22; 3:5–11)	b–c, e–g

Several observations may be made from the above analysis. First, there is little correspondence between the referential and poetic sequences of action. A comparison with Petersen's treatment of Philemon is instructive here. Petersen finds that in Philemon, the referential and poetic sequences share seven out of the ten actions in common. This is in part due to the fact that the story embedded in Paul's letter to Philemon is much simpler than the story in Ephesians. In Philemon, Paul's story begins with the debt Philemon incurs to him, and ends with Paul's projected visit to the house church that meets in Philemon's home. While the network of social relationships is complex, they all exist within the sphere of normal human activity (within the culture at large, or in the church). Christ and God, though mentioned in the letter, and crucial to Paul's symbolic universe, are in the background of the letter's narrative.[115] By comparing the referential and poetic sequences in Philemon, Petersen is able to detect the emphasis that Paul lays upon both Philemon's indebtedness to Paul for his conversion, and Onesimus' debt to

115. On the social roles in Philemon, see Petersen, *Rediscovering Paul*, 83–199.

Philemon when he ran away. This emphasis on indebtedness leads Petersen to suggest that the central question of the letter is whether Philemon will forgive Onesimus' debt by freeing him, thereby paying his debt to Paul and maintaining his status within the church.[116]

By contrast, the story "Paul" tells in Ephesians is of an entirely different character. It is not a story about a problem in a local Christian community, but rather its concern is the unity of the church, the new humanity which has come into being as the inauguration of God's plan to restore the fractured cosmos. As noted above briefly, the story in Ephesians is not so much the story of "Paul" as it is the story of God and Christ, into which "Paul" aims to incorporate himself and the audience of his letter. This is suggested by the abundance of mixed analepses and prolepses, which function to tie the reader into the broader narrative of biblical history, from creation to the eschaton. Furthermore, as Petersen makes clear, God and Christ act in a different sphere than that of normal human activity. They operate in the heavenly sphere, and events such as Christ's incarnation, or the gift of the Holy Spirit "represent exceptional transit between the heavenly sphere and the earthly."[117] In Ephesians, however, these events are not so exceptional. In a story in which God and Christ are the principal actors, it should come as no surprise to find such complexity with regard to the referential sequence of actions. Several times in the above analysis it has been noted that the relative sequence of certain actions cannot be determined with certainty; nor can the causal relationships be explained with satisfaction. For example, is the reconciliation of Jews and gentiles within the church a result of the recipients' conversion, or their session with Christ? Thus, while Petersen's comparison of the referential and

---

116. Petersen, *Rediscovering Paul*, 71–78.

117. Petersen, *Rediscovering Paul*, 27.

poetic sequences yields some interesting insights, such a comparison would appear to be a dead end in Ephesians.

Second, the above analysis shows that two events in particular pervade the narration of Ephesians' story. Aside from the implied response to the letter (11), the Christ event (2) and the restoration of the cosmos through Christ (12) are the two actions most frequently repeated in the letter's poetic sequence. Although "Paul" does not specifically say so, the audience's response to the letter may also be seen as part of this restoration. If the reconciliation of Jew and gentile within the new corporate humanity of the church is understood as a major plank in the restoration of the cosmos, then it follows that the transformation of the church through Christ is an essential element of this restoration. Given that the desired responses in chapters 4–6 have to do with the identity of the church, broadly speaking, the recipients' response to "Paul's" letter is crucial to the restoration of the cosmos. As Talbert writes, and as this analysis confirms, the summing up of all things in Christ is the overarching theme of the letter:

> The theme is that the cosmic, redemptive purpose of God, predestined from eternity and executed through the instrumentality of Christ, is to overcome hostility and divisions in the universe by bringing all things together under the headship of Christ. This task includes not only overcoming racial (Jew-Gentile) and household divisions on the earth, but also an ultimate restoration of harmony in the heavenlies as well. . . . The accomplishment of the reordering is through Christ . . . the Christ is God's instrument to restore order to the fractured cosmos.[118]

1.6. *Summary and Conclusion: Christ is the Ideal King Through Whom God Acts*

One of the author's background assumptions appears to be that God's kingdom can also be identified with the kingdom of the Christ (4:5–6; see above, p. 253). The political scenario that fits this state of affairs is that of a vicegerency, in

---

118. Talbert, *Ephesians and Colossians*, 60. The centrality of this theme is frequently observed, e.g., by Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 43–44.

which a king delegates the rule of his kingdom to a subordinate, who possesses all the authority and power of the king. In both Greco-Roman and Jewish thought, the ideal king was conceived of as the vicegerent of Zeus, Jupiter, or Yahweh, respectively.

The preceding discussion has sought to demonstrate the following with regard to the characterization of the Christ in Ephesians. (1) The author's usage of the articular Χριστός as well as Χριστός Ἰησοῦς to refer to Christ cannot be thought of as titles denoting the Jewish Messiah purely on grammatical or lexical grounds. The primary evidence for the letter's portrayal of Christ as an ideal king is to be found in the fact that he functions as God's vicegerent. In portions of the letter where this function is clearly in view, one sometimes also notes a denser concentration of the articular Χριστός and Χριστός Ἰησοῦς. In such cases, the choice of terminology may serve to *reinforce* the portrayal of Christ as God's vicegerent by evoking the memory of Jewish royal messianic imagery that lies behind the term, χριστός. (2) The characterization of Christ as God's vicegerent is further reinforced by the frequent appearance of the prepositional phrase ἐν Χριστῷ (and parallels), which often denotes Christ as the agent through whom God acts.[119] (3) The comparison of the poetic and referential sequences of action in the letter brings to light that the reconciliation of the cosmos is the primary activity or theme of the letter. The Christ's primary role is the agent through whom God effects this goal. Taken together, these three points demonstrate that in Ephesians, the Christ is portrayed as God's uniquely appointed agent, tasked with the eschatological leadership of God's people, which is itself part of God's larger plan to reconcile the cosmos. This portrait coheres with the picture of the ideal king in both Greco-Roman and Jewish literature, who rules as God's vicegerent.

---

119. This point is variously noted, e.g., by Matera, *New Testament Christology*, 155.

If, as proposed above (see p. 20), a person's character is revealed through his or her social roles within the narrative world of a text, it follows that the Christ may be characterized by *what he does* in Ephesians. Given that the primary theme of the letter is the reconciliation of the cosmos, the activities of the Christ related with this primary theme should be given greater weight in determining what is constitutive of his characterization. The remaining sections of this chapter will demonstrate that the Christ contributes to the reconciliation of the cosmos in Ephesians in the following: reconciling humanity to God (2.1); reconciling humanity to itself (2.2); giving gifts for the edification and unification of the church (3); enabling the moral transformation of the church (4); enabling harmony within the household (5); and enabling victory over the powers (6). When these actions are set within the context of the expectations surrounding the reign of an ideal king in antiquity, what emerges is a portrait of the Christ as an ideal king who acts as God's agent to reconcile the cosmos.

2. *The Christ Reconciles the Cosmos*

Within Ephesians, the reconciliation of the cosmos effected by Christ is manifested in several ways: humanity is reconciled to God (2:1–10), and gentiles and Jews are reconciled within the church (2:11–22). These two closely related textual units reflect the idea, widespread in antiquity, that the ideal king effected on earth the harmony that was believed to exist in the heavens.

2.1. *The Christ Reconciles Humanity to God (2:1-10)*

In Eph 1:16b, the author begins to intercede for the enlightenment of his audience, but interrupts himself, and does not pick up the thread of the intercession until 3:14. The intervening digression consists of two parts: a rehearsal of what God has done in Christ and in Christians (2:1–22), and of what God has done in

Christ's apostle, "Paul" (3:1–13). The first part may be further divided in two: because they have been raised through Christ, believers now have victory over sin and cosmic powers (2:1–10); because they have been reconciled to God through Christ, believers now have victory over alienation (2:11–22).[120] This subsection and the next will focus on the characterization of the Christ in this two-part digression (2:1–10 and 11–22), and how it would have resonated with the portrait of the ideal king who brings peace, reconciling humanity to God and to itself. A word of explanation is perhaps necessary with regard to the title of the current section, "The Christ reconciles humanity to God" (2:1–10). The use of the term "reconcile" may appear imprecise, since it nowhere appears in 2:1–10. Indeed, the statement that Christ has reconciled humanity to God is found not in 2:1–10, but in the following unit (2:16). To clarify, reconciliation is envisaged here in broad strokes as the restoration of a broken relationship. The movement from spiritual death under the dominion of hostile powers to life in Christ can thus fittingly be characterized as a movement from alienation to reconciliation.[121]

The flow of the argument in 2:1–10 may be summarized as follows. Formerly, the gentile audience was spiritually dead, held in thrall by malevolent powers, as were formerly the author and his fellow Christians. Now, as a result of God's mercy and love, author and audience alike have been made alive with Christ and enthroned with him in the heavenlies, as an enduring demonstration of God's favor. The result of God's gracious salvation is that their lives are no longer characterized by domination by the powers, but rather by the good works for which

---

120. Following Talbert, *Ephesians and Colossians*, 53–101, in reading this lengthy section of text as a digression from the author's intercession. Talbert, however, maintains that the first digression begins at 1:20.

121. On the parallelism between 2:1-10 and 2:11-22, see Andrew T. Lincoln, "The Church and Israel in Ephesians 2," *CBQ* 49 (1987): 608.

God created them. This transaction from sinful death to virtuous life was effected by means of the Christ (see above, p. 246). This portrayal of the Christ as the agent of divine reconciliation would have likely resonated with widely held notions of the ideal king in the following two ways.

The Neopythagoreans believed that the ideal king reconciles humanity to God by "taking care of the sin problem."[122] Thus Ecphantus believes, "in the case of ordinary men, if they sin (αἴκα ἁμαρτάνωντι), their most holy purification is to make themselves like the rulers, whether it be law or king" (Stob. 4.7.64; Delatte 29.13–30.2 [Goodenough, 77]). The king, it will be remembered, effects this transformation by his very presence.[123] Similarly, Virgil put his hope in the emperor as the means of abolishing *scelus*, human guilt arising from an offense to the gods (*Ecl.* 4.11–14). *Scelus*, it will be recalled, was not only the source of alienation between humanity and the gods, but also of the civil wars that plagued Rome (*Georg.* 1.463–68). The solution to the problem of sin envisioned in *Ps. Sol.* 17 is slightly different. Israel is there understood to be ruled by sinners (17.5–6), who have a contaminating effect even upon the righteous (17.15–20). God's sinless king will purge Israel from sinners (17.22–24), and by his righteous rule will root out sin from Israel (17.27). The same idea of the abolition of sin effected by the messiah's sinless rule is reflected in *T. Lev.* 18.9c and *T. Jud.* 24.1. Thus it was widely believed that the ideal king would reconcile humankind both to God and with itself by effectively dealing with the root cause of alienation, sin. This reconciling function of the king resembles the role that Christ plays in this passage.

---

122. See Blumenfeld, *Political Paul*, 191–264. He discusses Ecphantus' solution for sin (211, 226): "the intervention of the *Logos* to rout oppressive worldly powers" (225).

123. That the king was thought to be integral to restoring what was lost by sin has implications for the enablement of ethical behavior as well (see below, p. 305).

The epithet, Σωτὴρ, was commonly applied to Hellenistic kings in recognition for having liberated a city from foreign oppression, or for offering his protection to a city.[124] In at least one Second Temple Jewish text, *Psalms of Solomon* 17, the ideal king is portrayed as giving glory to God after having liberated Jerusalem from foreign oppression. These two concepts—liberation from oppression and subsequent glorification of God—are reflected in Eph 2:1–10. In this passage, as a consequence of having been made alive with, and enthroned with Christ, the audience is understood to have been saved by grace (χάριτί ἐστε σεσῳσμένοι) (2:5, 8). In the context of this passage, this is to be understood as having been freed from the thraldom of malevolent powers (cf. 2:2). Later in the letter, the author recalls this thought, referring to Christ as the savior of the church (σωτὴρ τοῦ σώματος) (5:23). The purpose of the salvation effected in 2:5, 8 is that God's grace would be demonstrated in the coming ages through Christ Jesus.[125] God is thereby glorified by the salvation effected through the Christ. Although Christ is not identified here with the epithet, Σωτὴρ, the portrayal of Christ's activity resonates with that of the Hellenistic savior-king.[126]

To summarize, one may say that in Eph 2:1–10, the Christ is understood to have reconciled the audience with God by overcoming the alienation created by human sin. This work of reconciliation is furthermore depicted as salvation from domination by malevolent powers, an act that brings glory to God. This activity is consonant with the reign of the ideal king in antiquity.

---

124. Isocrates, *Evag.* 51–57; Musonius Rufus 60.8–12; Martial, *Epig.* 5.1.7–8; Dio Chrysostom, *Or.* 1.84; 3.5–6; *Ps. Sol.* 17.3; *Sib. Or.* 3.652–56; Philo, *Legat.* 22; *T. Sim.* 7.1–2.

125. Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 109, takes the ἵνα in 2:7 to be an indicator of purpose.

126. Cf. Beskow, *Rex Gloriae*, 64–67, who claims, however, that the usage of σωτήρ in the NT does not retain the overtones of the Hellenistic royal title.

2.2. *The Christ Reconciles Jew and Gentile in the Church (2:11–22)*

In this portion of the letter, the author emphasizes the cosmic significance of the historical work of reconciliation achieved by the Christ.[127] The author begins this section by addressing his audience, bringing to their attention their former status as non-Christian gentiles:[128] they were without Christ, alienated from the commonwealth of Israel, strangers to the covenants of promise, having neither hope nor God (2:12). Their lamentable former situation was remedied when, through the blood of the Christ (ἐν τῷ αἵματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ) those who were once far off (μακρὰν) had been brought near (ἐγγὺς) (2:13; cf. 2:17).[129] The following verses further characterize this state of affairs: the former state of enmity between the two groups has been destroyed by means of Christ's flesh (ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ) (2:14, 16); the law has been nullified (2:15);[130] the two have been joined into one body (2:14, 15, 16). This entity—the church—is something qualitatively different than either of the two groups from which it was formed—Jews and gentiles. They have become one new person (ἕνα καινὸν ἄνθρωπον) (2:15).[131] The word that best characterizes the new relationship between gentiles and Jews within the church is peace (2:14,

---

127. Especially in 2:14-18; so Hugolinus Langkammer, "Jesus in der Sprache der neutestamentlichen Christuslieder," in *Vom Urchristentum zu Jesus* (ed. Karl Kertelge and Hubert Frankemölle; Freiburg: Herder, 1989), 482.

128. Benjamin Dunning, "Strangers and Aliens no Longer: Negotiating Identity and Difference in Ephesians 2," *HTR* 99 (2006): 1–16, argues cogently that the direct second person form of address (ὑμεῖς τὰ ἔθνη) functions to constitute the culturally diverse audience as a unity.

129. This pairing of μακρὰν and ἐγγὺς appears both in Isa 57:19 and *T. Naph.* 4.5 to represent the world-wide dimension of God's eschatological restoration. The use of the terms to refer to the reconciliation of gentiles and Jews appears unique to this passage, however.

130. Langkammer, "Jesus in der Sprache," 475, supposes that the abrogation of the law was not part of a pre-existing hymn adapted by the author. Whether of not such a hymn existed is debated, however.

131. William R. Long, "Ephesians 2:11–22," *Int* 45 (1991): 281–282, points to the difference between the adjectives καινός and νέος. The former connotes something that is distinctively, or qualitatively new, while the latter connotes temporal newness. See also "καινός" in *TDNT*, 3:447.

17). That this state of peace is brought about by Christ is plain: he not only proclaims peace (2:17), he *is* peace—Αὐτὸς γάρ ἐστιν ἡ εἰρήνη ἡμῶν (2:14). With what aspect of the audience's cultural repertoire would such a description have resonated? The previous chapters of this study suggest that the picture of an ideal king, one who was expected to destroy enmity and create peace, would have come quickly to mind.[132]

The tradition of the ideal king as a peacemaker stretches back at least as far as Classical Greece. Isocrates believed that the king, out of the abundance of his devotion to humanity (φιλανθρωπία) should be responsible for the preservation of harmony (*Nic.* 41). Indeed, Isocrates pinned his hope for the unification of Greece on Philip of Macedon (*Phil.* 114). The Neopythagorean political philosophers believed that the ideal king bridged the chasm between the divine and the human, and in this way brought down divine harmony to earth. Diotogenes, for example, believed that because he is a living law, the king rules justly, and this justice is the basis for harmony in the state. The king makes the state harmonious by conforming it to himself (Stob. 4.7.61–62; Thesleff 71.15–23). The Neopythagoreans were followed in their understanding of the king as living law by Musonius Rufus (64.10–15) and Plutarch (*Princ. iner.* 780C). Plutarch further believed that such a king would be able to bring harmony between ethnic groups. This is clear in his valorizing portrait of Alexander the Great (*Alex. fort.* 329C–D). Augustus praised himself for having established peace (*Res. gest.* 13), as did his

132. Derwood Smith, "The Two Made One: Some Observations on Eph 2:14–18," *OJRS* 1 (1973): 36–41, argues for the Greek philosophical tradition of the overcoming of duality and establishment of unity as the key background concept. The establishment of harmony by the king may be seen as a concrete iteration of this larger tradition.

numerous admirers.[133] Panegyricists lauded any number of Roman emperors for having established a golden age of peace.[134]

In Jewish thought as well, the ideal king was viewed as a peacemaker. In Isaiah, the eschatological Davidic king is called a "prince of peace" (Isa 9:6), and through his reign, the harmony of Creation is restored (Isa 11:1-9).[135] Isaianic imagery is alluded to in the *Psalms of Solomon* (17:24, 35) and in the Qumran Scrolls (1QSb, 4Q285, 4Q161), which associated the establishment of peace with the reign of the ideal king. The *Sibylline Oracles* envision a golden age of peace ushered in by a pagan king functioning as God's agent (3.367–80), in which prophet-kings rule peacefully (3.781–82). In the *Letter of Aristeas*, chief among the king's prerogatives is the establishment and maintenance of peace (291–92), an aspect of which is harmony within a heterogeneous population (267). Philo eulogizes Augustus for his legacy of peace (*Legat.* 143–47), and praises Joseph for creating harmony out of discord (*Ios.* 269). Philo's ideal king, Moses, exhibits perfect harmony (*Mos.* 1.29), and as a living law, leads people into divine harmony (*Mos.* 1.162). The notion that the ideal king creates peace and harmony was so widespread in both Greco-Roman and Jewish literature that one may safely assume the authorial audience of Ephesians would have been familiar with it.

In particular, the legacy of King Solomon may have resonated with those auditors of Ephesians who were familiar with this storied king of Israel. King

---

133. Virgil, *Aen.* 1.286–94; 6.791–97; Seneca, *Apoc.* 10; cf. *Clem.* 2.1.3–2.2 on his hope for a golden age to be ushered in by Nero

134. Martial, *Epig.* 5.19.1–2, 6; Statius, *Sylv.* 1.6.39–50; Pliny, *Pan.* 94.2; Suetonius, *Aug.* 22; cf. *Tib.* 37. Faust, *Pax Christi*, 164–81, 280–324, has drawn attention to the similarities between 2:14-18 and Hellenistic encomiums to the Emperor.

135. Peter Stuhlmacher, *Reconciliation, Law, & Righteousness: Essays in Biblical Theology* (trans. Everett R. Kalin; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986), 187–91, argues that 2:14–18 is a christological (messianic) exegesis of Isa 9:5–6; 52:7; and 57:19; similarly, Dahl, "Christ, Creation and the Church," 436–37.

Solomon is characterized by the Chronicler as a "man of peace/rest" (איש מנוחה) (1 Chron 22:9a), and Josephus highlights the peace enjoyed during Solomon's reign (*Ant.* 8.21; cf. 8.52). L. J. Kreitzer argues that Eph 2:14–18 adopts traditional imagery associated with Solomon to portray Christ as a new Solomon. The primary OT text lying behind this passage, Kreitzer acknowledges, is Isa 57:19, in which peace is proclaimed to Jews in exile ("the far") as well as Jews residing in Israel ("the near"). The allusion to the Isaiah passage in 2:17 thus evokes the memory of a united Israel. Solomon is remembered both for having reigned over a united kingdom (2 Chron 30:26), and for having built the Temple in which foreigners were welcome to worship (1 Kings 8:41–43 || 2 Chron 6:32–33). Kreitzer therefore suggests that the author of Ephesians develops the peace motif in 2:13–22 by inserting Solomonic imagery into an Isaianic "frame."[136] He further observes the important parallel between Solomon's construction of the Temple and the claim in 2:21–22 that as a result of Christ's reconciling work, Jewish and gentile believers are being built together through the Lord (ἐν κυρίῳ)[137] into a holy temple, a dwelling place of God.[138] Solomon thus provides us with a specific example of the type of ideal king found more broadly in Jewish and Greco-Roman kingship literature in

---

136. L. Joseph Kreitzer, "The Messianic Man of Peace as Temple Builder: Solomonic Imagery in Ephesians 2:13–22," in *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel* (ed. John Day; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2005), 497–502. Philo (*Congr.* 177) picks up on the word play between Solomon's name (שלמה) and the Hebrew word for peace (שלום). Kreitzer believes that Eph 2:14 echoes this word play, and that the image of Solomon therefore illuminates the claim that Christ is "our peace." Less convincing is Kreitzer's suggestion that *Testament of Solomon* 22.7 provides a possible parallel to Eph 2:20, both of which make mention of a cornerstone (ἀκρογωνιαῖος) (503–05).

137. Taken instrumentally, with Talbert, *Ephesians and Colossians*, 84. Similarly, Rudolf Schnackenburg, "Die Kirche als Bau: Epheser 2.19–22 unter ökumenischen Aspekt," in *Paul and Paulinism* (FS C. K. Barrett; ed. M. D. Hooker and S. G. Wilson; London: SPCK, 1982), 262, takes Christ to be the means by which gentile Christians are incorporated into this divine structure: "Sie werden es durch Jesus Christus, der für die Zusammenfügung und das Wachstum des ganzen Baues sorgt."

138. Kreitzer, "Messianic Man of Peace," 506–7.

antiquity. Such a king makes peace and establishes harmony. Whether or not the authorial audience may be assumed to have been familiar with Solomon as an ideal king, the wider concept of king as peacemaker would doubtless have been part of its cultural repertoire.

What is one to make of the author's claim that Christ "abolished the law with its commandments and ordinances" (2:15)? Such a claim lays the author open to the charge of antinomianism, and in the views of some, to a breach with the attitude towards the law found in the undisputed Paulines (e.g., Rom 3:31). In an attempt to resolve this problem, some have suggested that the law which is abolished is merely the cultic or ceremonial, as opposed to the moral law, or that only casuistic abuse of the law is being addressed.[139] Others contend that such distinctions cannot be maintained; rather, the entirety of the Torah is in view.[140] M. Barth counters that the law itself has not been abrogated; rather, "only its divisiveness was terminated when Jesus Christ died on the cross."[141] The following discussion will seek to illuminate the significance of the claim that the law has been rendered inoperative within the argument of Ephesians by asking whether such an act can be understood within the expected functions of an ideal king. Two streams of evidence suggest an affirmative answer.

First, both Greco-Roman and Jewish literature testifies to the widespread belief that the ideal king should rule justly, in accordance with divine law. Because

---

139. So Schlier, *Epheser*, 125–26. See further, the discussion in Barth, *Ephesians*, 1:287–90.

140. Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 142–43; Best, *Ephesians*, 259–60; Hoehner, *Ephesians*, 375. Elsewhere, however, Best concedes that "the matter was apparently not important enough for the author to spell out ("Ephesians 2: A Christian View of Judaism," in *Text as Pretext* [Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992], 60). Cf. Muddiman, *Ephesians*, 133, who takes the phrase τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασιν as intended to tone down the extent to which the law is abolished.

141. Barth, *Ephesians*, 1:291. Similarly, J. Joosten, "Christ a-t-il aboli la loi pour réconcilier juifs et païens?" *ETR* 80 (2005): 95–102, argues that only laws regulating commensality, which would have constituted a social division between Jews and gentiles, are here abrogated.

the ideal king embodies divine law in his person, his rule would be perfectly just and righteous. Although not universally so, a number of Greek, Roman and Jewish writers understood the ideal king therefore to be a living law (νόμος ἔμψυχος), an embodied copy of the divine law that governed the cosmos. Certain Neopythagoreans, Musonius Rufus, Plutarch, and Philo all espoused the view of the king as living law. To speak of the king as a living law is to speak not only of his just rule, but also of his ability to thereby effect harmony in his realm.[142] Because the king was a living law, he ruled above the law.[143] It did not follow, of course, that he could therefore rule unjustly. On the contrary, Philo castigates the emperor Gaius for ruling in flagrant disregard of the law, while he praises Augustus for his lawful rule (*Legat.* 119). Philo presents something of a paradox, in that he viewed Moses both as a living law, and also an ideal legislator. This would suggest that for Philo, laws were necessary, even for the ideal king who ruled as a living law. It must be remembered, however, that Moses *gave* divine law to the people; he did not *follow* pre-existing law.[144] Thus, among those who viewed the ideal king as living law, none regarded it necessary that the king obey laws already in existence. Nevertheless, these writers do not go so far as to say that the king should, or even may, abolish the law. The idea was not that the ideal king did away with the law, but rather that he obviated the need for the law, since he was able to govern perfectly without it. Thus, Virgil envisioned a return to the golden age under

---

142. See, e.g., Archytas (Stob. 4.1.135; Thesleff 33.4–10); Diotogenes (Stob. 4.7.61; Thesleff 72.19–23); Musonius Rufus (64.10–15).

143. For the Neopythagorean view of the king ruling above the law, see especially Blumenfeld, *Political Paul*, 236–37.

144. Philo, *Leg.* 1.94, discussing the command to Adam not to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil (Gen 2:17), contends such prohibitions and laws are only needed by bad men and children. The perfect man has no need of laws. See the discussion in Calvin J. Roetzel, "Jewish Christian – Gentile Christian Relationships: A Discussion of Ephesians 2.15a," *ZNW* 74 (1983): 87.

Augustus' reign as akin to life under the reign of Saturn, in which laws were not needed to make people righteous (*Aen.* 7.202-04).

A possible analogue for the king abolishing the law may be adduced from the second piece of evidence: Philo's discussion of the law of nature vis-à-vis the competing laws of individual cities. In *De Iosepho* 28–31, Philo professes the Stoic view that the world is governed by a single constitution, namely the law of nature.[145] Philo, of course, equated the law of nature with the divine law given to Moses.[146] The source of disunity in the world is that individual cities promulgate their own laws in their own interests.[147] The true statesman, according to Philo, is one who is not beholden to the interests of individuals, but as a member of the greatest and most admirable state in the world (ἐν τῷ μεγίστῳ καὶ ἀρίστῳ πολιτεύματι), serves the interests of the entire state (*Ios.* 67–69, 77).[148] That the author of Ephesians may be thinking in socio-political terms is suggested by his mode of expression: previously the gentiles were alienated from the commonwealth of Israel (τῆς πολιτείας τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ, 2:12); now they are fellow-citizens (συμπολῖται) with the saints (2:19).[149] The source of this alienation (and enmity) is the law.[150]

---

145. Bréhier, *Les Idées*, 11–13.

146. Philo, *Mos.* 2.48. The *Letter of Aristeas* similarly conceives of Torah as natural law. See above, chapter 3, footnote 194. Cf. the portrayal of the Torah in *Ps. Sol.* 17.

147. Goodenough, "Political Philosophy," 67–68, discusses the distinction within Hellenistic monarchies between νόμος κοινός (or νόμος ξυνός) and νόμος ἴδιος. The former was the law of the land, as promulgated by the king, while the latter referred to local traditions which were permitted, provided they were subservient to the royal constitution. See further, Blumenfeld, *Political Paul*, 239.

148. Note also that Moses is described as κοσμοπολίτης, a "citizen of the world" (*Mos.* 1.157).

149. Another possible indication of this is that in 2:18, the author claims that as a result of Christ's reconciling activity, both Jews and gentiles have access (τὴν προσαγωγὴν) to the father. It is debated whether this term reflects a political, or a cultic background. G. B. Caird, *Paul's Letters from Prison: Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Philemon, in the Revised Standard Version* (The New Clarendon Bible; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976), 60: political. Lincoln,

In his singular mention of the law, it is perhaps significant that the author characterizes it as τὸν νόμον τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασιν, laying emphasis on the unique ordinances, the observation of which separated Jews from their neighbors. This way of thinking about the law appears analogous to Philo's conception of the laws that separate cities and are the source of disunity in the world. When Christ is said to abolish the law in order to create a new humanity from Jews and gentiles, he would seem to function like Philo's ideal statesman. Such a notion, one hastens to add, is strikingly different from what one finds in Philo, who never advocates that the Law of Moses should be abrogated. Rather, the author seems to have taken this thought in a different direction. Whereas Philo equated the Law of Moses with divine, universal law, the author characterizes it as the type of particularistic laws that create disunity in the world.[151]

By rendering the law invalid, Christ also destroys the enmity between Jews and gentiles (2:14).[152] Josephus was aware that the Jews were perceived as misanthropic by Greeks and Romans because of their law observance.[153] As noted

---

Ephesians, 149: cultic (although he acknowledges that political overtones are also present). See further, Millar, *Emperor*, 6, for the claim that an essential concept of monarchy in the Roman period was answering of petitions, which involved the issue of access to the emperor.

150. Gnilka, *Epheserbrief*, 141; Stuhlmacher, *Reconciliation*, 189; Ralph P. Martin, "Reconciliation and Unity in Ephesians," *RevExp* 93 (1996): 216; Pheme Perkins, *Ephesians* (ANTC; Nashville: Abingdon, 1997), 71; Sellin, *Epheser*, 212–13, 216, reading τὸ μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ (2:14) as synonymous with the law in 2:15; *pace* Craig McMahan, "The Wall Is Gone!" *RevExp* 93 (1996): 261–262; MacDonald, *Colossians and Ephesians*, 244–45. Although the gnostic myth of a dividing wall between earth and heaven is probably not in view here, interpreters have correctly observed that the destruction of the wall is connected to the reconciliation between God and humankind (2: 16) by the ἵνα in 2:15; so Schlier, *Epheser*, 124–36; Derwood Smith, "Two Made One," 35. For other interpretive possibilities, see Martin, "Reconciliation," 220–24.

151. Whether the author himself viewed the Law of Moses this way, or whether he believed his gentile audience would so view it, remains an open question.

152. So Barth, *Ephesians*, 1:264.

153. For further evidence of the charge of misanthrophy resulting from Jewish law

above in chapter three, Josephus seeks to answer the charge of Jewish misanthropy by portraying Solomon as having a welcoming attitude to foreigners (*Ant.* 8.117). Taken together, Philo, Josephus, and the author of Ephesians betray an awareness that the Law of Moses is a source of enmity between Jews and gentiles. Philo's ideal statesman presents a way of dealing with such disunity—by ruling in accordance with natural law (implicitly understood as Torah), which transcends the inherent divisiveness of laws particular to the *polis*. Josephus' King Solomon presents a way of diffusing hatred arising from Jewish law observance—by welcoming outsiders. Ephesians presents yet a third response: the abolition of the Torah, seen as the source of enmity between Jews and gentiles, for which is substituted the rule of Christ, the living law.

The establishment of peace within the state was a nearly universal commonplace in kingship treatises. In certain traditions, Alexander the Great was credited with having aspired to extend this harmony beyond Greeks to include Persians as well. Thus Plutarch, in his encomiastic rehearsal of Alexander's virtues, attributes to the world-conqueror the vision of uniting all ethnic groups "in one great loving-cup" (*Alex. fort.* 329C–D). Diodorus of Sicily similarly records Alexander as having left instructions to Craterus to unite Europe and Asia through intermarriage (18.4.4). This policy of ethnic fusion, though admired by his successors, was never implemented (18.4.6). Ephesians 2:11–22 makes the bold claim that the reconciliation of two separated groups of people, gentiles and Jews, is an integral part of the reconciliation of humanity to God.[154] Taken within the larger context of the letter's theme of the restoration of the cosmos through Christ,

---

observance, and the resulting hatred by non-Jews, see 3 Macc 3:3–4.

154. See the discussion of the parallelism in 2:15b and 2:16a in Sellin, *Epheser*, 217: "ποιῶν εἰρήνην bezieht sich auf den Aspekt der Vereinigung der beiden getrennten Menschen gruppen (insbesondere V.14b), διὰ τοῦ σταροῦ auf die Versöhnung (beider nun vereinter) mit Gott."

this "unity within the Church is thought to be a restoration of the original unity of mankind and creation."[155] It must be observed, finally, that although Ephesians resonates with Imperial propaganda that proclaimed the *Pax Romana* to be a golden age of peace, the letter's perspective upon what constitutes authentic peace provides an implicit critique of this propaganda.[156] The *Pax Romana* was an era of prosperity and concord for the élites within the Roman Empire, but not for those subjugated by Rome's military might. For conquered nations, the peace of Rome often meant severely limited freedom and even servitude.[157] The peace envisioned in Ephesians is wholly other. Whereas the Roman peace was achieved by the blood of the slain, the peace of the Christ is achieved through his own blood. Whereas the status of Jews within the Roman peace was often imperiled,[158] Ephesians envisions a new humanity in which Jewish and gentile Christians coexist peacefully.

In sum, Ephesians 2 portrays the Christ as God's ideal king, through whom the cosmos is being reconciled. Two complementary aspects of this reconciliation are presented: between humankind and God, and between Jews and gentiles within the church. In the former, the Christ functions as the ideal king who resolves the problem of human sin that has resulted in alienation from God. In the latter, the Christ functions as the ideal king who brings peace between formerly hostile ethnic groups, thus establishing divine harmony on earth. Certain traditions regarding

---

155. Dahl, "Christ, Creation and the Church," 438.

156. For a similar claim with regard to Matthew and various aspects of Roman imperial theology, see Warren Carter, "Toward an Imperial-Critical Reading of Matthew's Gospel," *SBLSP* 37, no. 1 (1998): 296–324.

157. Wengst, *Pax Romana*, 7–13, 21–24.

158. See Faust, *Pax Christi*, 226–315; Christopher D. Stanley, "'Neither Jew Nor Greek': Ethnic Conflict in Graeco-Roman Society," *JSNT* 64 (1996): ; MacDonald, "The Politics of Identity in Ephesians," 434–37.

the role of the ideal king as a living law may further help to explain the problem of the Christ having abolished the law.

3. *The Christ is the Benefactor of the Church (4:1–16)*

Consistent with the portrayal of the ideal king in antiquity, Ephesians presents the Christ as a benefactor. In Ephesians, God's blessings for the church are mediated through the Christ. This function is signalled prominently in the opening *berakah*: "Blessed is God . . . who has blessed us with every spiritual blessing in the heavenlies through Christ" (1:3).[159] As the *berakah* unfolds, the audience is told the extent of the blessings received from God and mediated through the Christ—adoption, redemption, forgiveness of transgressions, and an inheritance. The intended result of Christ's benefaction is that the auditors, who have earlier placed their hope in the Christ, might redound to the praise of God's glory (1:12, 14).[160] The author's praise of God's benefaction through the Christ leads directly to intercession on behalf of his audience, that God would bestow a spirit of wisdom and revelation upon them (1:17). He thereby hopes they will appreciate the extent of God's power demonstrated in raising Christ from the dead and enthroning him in the heavenlies (1:19–21). The closing verses of the initial prayer for the audience make clear that Christ fills the universe as ruler, and that the church is the realm of his beneficent rule (1:22–23).[161] As the opening *berakah*

---

159. Taking ἐν Χριστῷ instrumentally; see above, p. 243.

160. The phrase, τοὺς προηλπικότας ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ (1:12) is appositional rather than predicative: it intends to describe "us" as those who hope in Christ rather than indicate what "we" *ought* to be. It does not indicate Jewish Christians as opposed to gentile Christians; rather the distinction (indicated by the change of pronouns from 1pl to 2pl) is between Christians in general (ἡμᾶς in v. 12) and those addressed in the letter (ὑμεῖς in v. 13); so Schnackenburg, *Epheser*, 62–63.

161. So Schnackenburg, *Epheser*, 82–83; cf. Masson, *Éphésiens*, 156 n. 3: the church is the object of Christ's filling. Faust, *Pax Christi*, 48–54, makes the disctinction between the nature of Christ's rule over the church, and over the cosmos: the former is beneficent, the latter, despotic.

and intercession show, the Christ is the church's benefactor in two senses: he is the one through whom God's benefits are conferred, and he rules cosmically for the benefit of the church.[162]

That the ideal king should be a benefactor who transmits divine benefits to his subjects is well attested in Greco-Roman and Jewish sources. Aristotle recognizes that the excellence of kings lies in their ability to confer benefits to their people (*Pol.* 1286b 9–12). Xenophon characterizes Cyrus as the father of his people because of his benefaction (*Cyr.* 8.6.23; 8.2.9; cf. 8.1.44). Isocrates highlights the reciprocal nature of such benefaction: by his magnanimity, the king enslaves his subjects to himself (*Evag.* 45). This bond of obligation became an essential means of ensuring loyalty among Hellenistic monarchs. The Neopythagorean, Diotogenes, held that the king's beneficence was also a sign of his divine nature (Stob. 4.7.62; Thesleff 75.1–11). Furthermore, according to Ecphantus, the king's beneficence allows his subjects to become like him; the king's greatest gift is the bestowal of divine virtue (Stob. 4.7.65; Thesleff 82.29–83.1). Roman imperial ideology adapted the Greek concept of the king as divine benefactor, emphasizing the benefits themselves that only the emperor was divinely empowered to confer.[163] During the Roman period, the depiction of the ideal king or emperor as the universal benefactor of humankind was ubiquitous.[164] The concept finds expression also in the Hellenistic Jewish *Letter of Aristeas* (281; cf. 205, 210, 259). Philo viewed God

---

162. Taking τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ in 1:22 as a dative of advantage, "for the church." Even if, with Hoehner, *Ephesians*, 289, it is taken as a dative of indirect object, it may nevertheless be presumed that the Christ's cosmic rule is beneficial to the church.

163. See the discussion above, p. 65.

164. *Res. gest.* 15–24; Musonius Rufus 60.8–12; Martial, *Epig.* 9.101.21–22; Statius, *Sylv.* 4.2.10–12; cf. 5.1.13–15; Dio, *Or.* 1.23–24, 62–63; 2.26; cf. 3.109–10; Plutarch, *Princ. iner.* 780D; *Alex.* 25.8; 39–42.2; 59.1–5; cf. 15.3–6; 23.9f; 29.5f; Diodorus, 17.69.9; 85.6; 109.2; Pliny, *Pan.* 28-31, 37, 50; Suetonius, *Aug.* 57, 101.

as the benefactor of the whole world (*Legat.* 118); the good ruler should imitate God's virtue, thereby conferring God's benefits upon humanity (*Legat.* 81, 86–87; cf. *Mos.* 1.151; 2.256). Similarly, Josephus portrayed Solomon as the source of divine benefits for God's people (*Ant.* 8.124). The ideal king's role as divine benefactor was demonstrably pervasive in antiquity.

The significance of the letter's portrayal of the Christ as a benefactor may be appreciated in 4:1–16, in which the Christ gives gifts to the church that build up its unity. Just as Christ has effected peace between gentiles and Jews within the church (2:14, 17), so now the audience is enjoined to maintain this peace (4:3). What is it that enables them to maintain this unity? To begin with, the church into which they have been called is itself a unity: there is one body, spirit, hope, Lord, faith, baptism, and God (4:4–6).[165] In addition, Christ, from his exalted position of cosmic rule (ὑπεράνω πάντων τῶν οὐρανῶν, 4:10), has bestowed both the gift of grace upon each member of the church (4:7), and gifts upon the entire church in the form of apostles, prophets, evangelists, shepherds and teachers (4:11). The purpose of these gifts is the building up the church (4:12). Christ is the head of this body (4:15), the source of its unity and growth (4:16). That Christ is to be seen as a benefactor is made clear through the quotation and midrash upon Ps 67:19 LXX (ET 68:18), which introduces Christ's activity in 4:7-16. The author has noticeably modified the text to emphasize that Christ, portrayed as a triumphant divine warrior, did not receive gifts but rather gave them.[166]

---

165. The Neopythagorean, Ecphantus, believed that the entire universe was the reason, or *phronēsis* of God: δᾶλον, ὅτι δ᾽ ἁ τῶ κόσμω φρόνασις ὁ θεός ἐντι, φανερόν (Stob. 4.7.66; Thesleff 84.4–5); see Blumenfeld, *Political Paul*, 232.

166. Timothy G. Gombis, "Cosmic Lordship and Divine Gift-Giving: Psalm 68 in Ephesians 4:8," *NovT* 47 (2005): 367–380, argues that this does not constitute a reversal of the psalm's meaning. Rather, the author has christologically refocused the psalm's celebration of Yahweh, the Divine Warrior.

What is the effect of Christ's benefaction to the church? That the audience may "come to the unity of the faith (εἰς τὴν ἑνότητα τῆς πίστεως) and of the knowledge of the Son of God" (4:13). This should be understood in the context of the overall vision of God reconciling the cosmos through Christ. In Ephesians, the harmony in the heavens is reflected in the unity in the church: through the Christ, God is reconciling the cosmos, aspects of which include peace between humankind and God (2:1–10) and peace between Jews and gentiles within the church (2:11–22). This bond of peace is maintained (4:3) and the church is built up in love (4:16) through the benefaction of the Christ. Thus the unity that Christ establishes in the church through his benefaction is but a part of the larger vision of the reconciliation of the cosmos. This reflects the pervasive idea in antiquity that the ideal king establishes on earth the harmony believed to exist in the heavens.

A further effect of Christ's benefaction to the church in the form of leadership gifts is not only that all of the church's members be built up in the unity of faith, but also that they attain completion, described as a "measure of the fullness of the stature of Christ (εἰς μέτρον ἡλικίας τοῦ πληρώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ)" (4:13),[167] and in all things growing into the Christ, the head (4:15). The Neopythagorean, Ecphantus, believed that the *logos* residing within the king filled up that which is missing, or destroyed by sin, in the lives of his subjects (Thesleff 83.16–17). Blumenfeld thus comments that "the *Logos* appears in a guise that can be called 'pleromatic'. He 'fills' (ἀναπλαροῖ) a lack, he corrects, enlightens and perfects."[168] This function of Ecphantus' ideal king corresponds to the activity of the Christ in

---

167. See Mikeal C. Parsons, "'Short in Stature': Luke's Physical Description of Zacchaeus," *NTS* 47 (2001): , for the argument that Zacchaeus' stature in Luke 19:3 would be heard in the ancient Mediterranean context as a reflection of his moral character. This suggests that 4:13 is expressing the desire that the church should attain to Christ's moral character. This is more plausible than any other reading of ἡλικία (e.g., physical stature, or age).

168. Blumenfeld, *Political Paul*, 226 n. 165.

Ephesians. The church, Christ's body, is the fullness of the one filling all things (1:23).[169] The auditors are to know the love of the Christ in order that they may be filled with fullness of God (3:19). From his exalted position, the Christ fills all things (4:10). Rather than being drunk, the audience is to be filled with the spirit (5:18).[170] In a number of the texts considered above in chapters two and three, the ideal king reflects the majesty of God. In some of these texts, the king is understood in fact to transmit this divine majesty to his subjects. Such a king is, as Goodenough has observed, "the immediate means by which men may get into harmony with the universe."[171] This idea provides a useful conceptual background for understanding how Ephesians' authorial audience would have heard the letter's talk of the fullness of God, and of the Christ as the one who fills all things.[172] It is a way of speaking of Christ's ability to make the church like God. This ability is consonant with the expectation of the ideal king's function. This final line of thought anticipates the concern of the following section, that Christ enables moral transformation within the church. We mention it here to show that this function of Christ (enabling virtue) is connected in Ephesians to Christ's role as benefactor. Enabling virtue and conferring divine benefits were both understood to be functions of the ideal king in antiquity.

---

169. Taking πληρουμένου as a middle participle with an active sense; so Barth, *Ephesians*, 1:183–210; Sellin, *Epheser*, 153–59.

170. Interestingly, Ecphantus' ideal king rescues his subjects from a forgetfulness induced by drink (Thesleff 83.9–14).

171. Goodenough, "Political Philosophy," 84.

172. Matera, *New Testament Christology*, 153: "Christ already enjoys this fullness and communicates it to the church, which is filled by the fullness of Christ, in whom the fullness of God dwells."

4. *The Christ Enables Moral Transformation in the Church (4:17–5:21)*

The first half of the letter seeks to form the audience's identity; the second half of the letter exhorts the audience to live a lifestyle consonant with their identity, or calling.[173] According to the letter, what is it that enables this lifestyle? The answer is adumbrated in chapter three, in which the author prays for the audience that Christ may dwell in their hearts through faith (3:17). The desired effect, indicated by the ἵνα clause which follows, is that the auditors will know the love of Christ (3:18–19a). The purpose of this acquired knowledge, again indicated by a ἵνα clause, is that they will be filled with the fullness of God (3:19b). In the concluding doxology which immediately follow, the author speaks of the "power at work within us," by which God can do immeasurably more than we ask or conceive (3:20). To what could he be referring except the power whose benefits he has just extolled, namely the indwelling Christ?[174] Thus before the author has exhorted his audience to walk worthily of their calling (4:1), he has suggested the resources by which this might be achieved. These resources are further elaborated in chapter four. As mentioned briefly above, in 4:13 one of the desired results of Christ's benefaction to the church is mentioned: attaining a measure of the fullness of the Christ's stature. In the comparative literature, the ideal king is understood to be the model of virtue for his subjects to imitate. Attaining the Christ's stature should be read in light of this idea. That is, because of Christ's benefactions, the church is able to reach maturity, to become like their virtuous ideal king, the Christ. But how is this to be done?

---

173. That these two themes are inextricably interwoven is widely recognized; see Schnackenburg, *Epheser*, 61, 74.

174. Experientially speaking, the author does not appear to distinguish between the Christ and the Spirit. This is consistent with the undisputed Paulines (Rom 8:9–10). So Schnackenburg, *Epheser*, 151; Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 206; Talbert, *Ephesians and Colossians*, 102; Sellin, *Epheser*, 281.

To answer this question, one must first consider the form and function of Eph 4:17–5:21. J.-N. Aletti laments the lack of unanimity amongst commentators with regard to this issue: "Apparently the easiest solution consists in dividing it into units that are loosely held together, without further explanation (vv. 17–24; vv. 25–32; etc.)."[175] A minority of commentators do read 4:17–5:21 as a unit, but amongst these, there is no consensus as to how the unit functions within the argument of the letter.[176] In what follows, I argue that this block of text comprises a "Two Ways" form of ethical exhortation, common within Christian, Jewish and pagan writings. Research into the function of the Two Ways form has demonstrated that this type of parenesis was used to exhort the reader not only to cleave to a certain way of behavior, but to identify with a community characterized by this mode of behavior.

---

175. Aletti, *Ephésiens*, 229: "La solution apparemment la plus aisée consiste à diviser en unités de faible extension, sans plus d'explication (v. 17–24; v. 25–32; etc.)." See, e.g., Gnilka, *Epheserbrief*; Barth, *Ephesians*; Norbert Hugedé, *L'Épître aux Éphésiens* (Geneva: Labor et fides, 1974); Lincoln, *Ephesians*; Ralph P. Martin, *Ephesians, Colossians, and Philemon* (Interpretation; Atlanta: John Knox, 1991); Perkins, *Ephesians*; Best, *Ephesians*; O'Brien, *Ephesians*; Hoehner, *Ephesians*. A partial exception to this trend is found in Schnackenburg, *Epheser*, who finds unity in this section but delimits it at 5:14.

176. See, e.g., Michel Bouttier, *L'Épitre de Saint Paul aux Éphesiens* (CNT 9b; Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1991), ; Petr Pokorný, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Epheser* (Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament 10.2; Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1992); MacDonald, *Colossians and Ephesians*; Aletti, *Ephésiens*; Talbert, *Ephesians and Colossians*. Included in this group are commentators who see Eph 5:21 as part of the following *Haustafel*. Arguments for including or excluding this verse from 4:17–5:21 have little bearing on the internal unity of this section. For an argument for its inclusion in the unit, see Talbert, *Ephesians and Colossians*, 181–84. For the opposite argument, see Pokorný, *Epheser*, 220–21.

4.1. *The Two Ways Form: Background, Form and Function*

4.1.1. *Historical background.* Interest in this form's historical background was sparked by Byrennios' publication of the *Didache* in 1883, following which a number of scholars suggested that the author of *Barnabas* used *Did.* 1–6 as a source for the Two Ways form found in *Barn.* 18–21.[177] Other voices early in the debate insisted that both texts were reliant upon a common Jewish source, a theory eventually supported by the discovery of sectarian texts from Qumran. The *Manual of Discipline* preserves a Two Ways form (1QS 3:13–4:26), which antedates both *Barnabas* and the *Didache*. On the basis of this new evidence, J.-P. Audet argued decisively for a common Two Ways source rooted in Jewish tradition, which has remained the scholarly consensus.[178] The Two Ways tradition likely underwent modification from its Jewish form before Christian writers encountered it, however.[179]

---

177. The history of the debate is summarized in Leslie W. Barnard, "The Dead Sea Scrolls, Barnabas, the *Didache* and the Later History of the 'Two Ways'," in *Studies in the Apostolic Fathers and Their Background* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1966), 92–94; James Carleton Paget, *The Epistle of Barnabas: Outlook and Background* (WUNT 2/64; Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1994), 81–82.

178. Jean-Paul Audet, "Affinités littéraires et doctrinales du Manuel de Discipline," *RB* 59 (1952): . See the list of scholars supporting this position in Robert A. Kraft, *Barnabas and the Didache* (vol. 3 of *The Apostolic Fathers: A New Translation and Commentary*; New York: Nelson, 1965), 4 n. 3. For a hypothetical development of the Two Ways tradition, see further, Barnard, "Dead Sea Scrolls," 107; Suggs, "Two Ways," 63.

179. Robert A. Kraft, "Early Developments of the 'Two-Ways Tradition(s),' in Retrospect," in *For a Later Generation: The Transformation of Tradition in Israel, Early Judaism, and Early Christianity* (ed. Randal A. Argall, et al.; Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 2000), 140. See further, Margaret Mary McKenna, "The Two Ways in Jewish and Christian Writings of the Greco-Roman Period: A Study of the Form of Repentance Paranesis," PhD diss. (University of Pennsylvania, 1981), 361–62, 386–87, on the development of Jewish Two Ways form in Greco-Roman period. She argues that the variety found in Christian texts is a synthesis of Persian and Greek patterns.

4.1.2. *Literary form.* In its earliest form, the Two Ways teaching consisted of the following: (1) a sharply dualistic introduction;[180] (2) lists of virtues and vices;[181] and (3) a concluding eschatological admonition.[182] All these elements are present in Eph 4:17–5:21.[183] One finds (1) a sharply dualistic introduction. After the initial command not to walk as the gentiles do (4:17–19), the audience is exhorted to put off the *old* person and put on the *new*: ἀποθέσθαι ὑμᾶς . . . τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον . . . καὶ ἐνδύσασθαι τὸν καινὸν ἄνθρωπον (4:22–24). This dualistic schema is repeated throughout the text: ἦτε γάρ ποτε σκότος, νῦν δὲ φῶς ἐν κυρίῳ (5:8); μὴ ὡς ἄσοφοι ἀλλ' ὡς σοφοί (5:15). (2) Lists of virtues and vices are found in several places (4:25–32; 5:1–4; 5:17–20). (3) An eschatological warning is found towards the end of the unit: "Let no one deceive you with empty words, for because of these things the wrath of God comes on those who are disobedient" (5:5–6). In her exhaustive survey of the Two Ways form in all extant Jewish and Christian literature, M. McKenna develops the following taxonomy: (1) texts in which the antithetical structure and repentance parenesis is clear, and all structural elements are represented; (2) texts in which the antithetical structure is present, and most, but not all structural elements are present; and (3) texts in which the antithetical structure, parenetic element or Two Ways imagery is absent or weak. She classifies

---

180. Willy Rordorf, "An Aspect of the Judeo-Christian Ethic: The Two Ways," in *The Didache in Modern Research* (ed. Jonathan A. Draper; AGJU 37; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 153, argues that OT ethical tradition associated with the *Bundesformular* (covenant formulary) underwent dualistic modification through Persian influence. Christianity inherited both dualistic (*Doctrina Apostolorum, Barnabas*) and non-dualistic (*Didache*) versions.

181. Virtue- and vice-catalogues were comon in Hellenistic literature. For examples, see Hans Dieter Betz, *Lukian von Samosata und das Neue Testament: religionsgeschichtliche und paränetische Parallelen: Ein Beitrag zum Corpus Hellenisticum Novi Testamenti* (TUGAL; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1961), 185–194 (vice), 206–11 (virtue).

182. Suggs, "Two Ways," 64.

183. Talbert, *Ephesians and Colossians*, 167.

texts from categories (1) and (2) as "Two Ways texts" while those from category (3) are "Two Ways related texts." McKenna places Eph 4:17–6:20 in the first category.[184]

While the presence of Two Ways imagery in Eph 4:17–5:21 is often noted,[185] it is rarely acknowledged that this passage constitutes a Two Ways form. Yet, if this passage contains all the elements of what McKenna demonstrates to be a widespread form in contemporary Jewish and Christian texts, it seems reasonable to suggest that the authorial audience of Ephesians would have been familiar with the form and would have read Eph 4:17–5:21 as an example of it. Any reading of Ephesians through the eyes of its authorial audience must take this factor into account.

4.1.3. *Function.* Much scholarship has focused on the social function of Eph 4:17–5:21. The consensus view is that this lengthy ethical exhortation functions to effect social differentiation, distinguishing those inside the church from those outside. There is disagreement, however, regarding the purpose of this differentiation. Is it intended merely to depict and denounce a type of lifestyle, thereby promoting a vision of shared ethical values, or rather to effect the actual social withdrawal of the church from its pagan milieu?[186] Understanding the

---

184. McKenna, "Two Ways," 260, 266, 276. Note that she extends the unit all the way to 6:20. This is difficult to explain if it is not a typographical error, since the *Haustafel* (5:22-6:9) and the call to stand firm (6:10-20) do not appear to fit within the parameters of the Two Ways form.

185. Barth, *Ephesians*, 2:251–52; Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 297; Martin, *Ephesians*, 63; O'Brien, *Ephesians*, 319, 335, 381; MacDonald, *Colossians and Ephesians*, 320.

186. Ernest Best, "Ephesians: Two Types of Existence," *Int* 47 (1993): 39–51, represents the former view. He contends that the exaggerated portrait of gentile ethical misconduct is drawn for rhetorical emphasis; similarly, Schnackenburg, *Epheser*, 235, 245; Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 335; Perkins, *Ephesians*, 117–18. MacDonald, *Colossians and Ephesians*, 320–24, tends towards the latter view, contending that Ephesians promotes "a stronger sense of introversion" than the undisputed Paulines (321). She qualifies this position, somewhat paradoxically perhaps, noting that while the letter "encouraged a strong separation from nonbelievers the author of Ephesians intended this

function of the Two Ways form in contemporary literature may help to answer this question.

M. McKenna argues that the broad function of the Two Ways form of teaching was "repentance parenesis, that is, the exhortation and admonition to turn towards the positive way from the negative one." It contains two aspects: a call to turn from the negative to the positive way; and a call for intense and absolute devotion to the new way.[187] An additional function of the form may have been the consolidation of group identity, which is reflected in the *Manual of Discipline* (1QS). The highly dualistic Two Ways form of 1QS III 13–IV 26 must be understood within the larger purpose of the *Manual of Discipline*, which "was written to clarify by what criteria one was to be admitted into the community and by what standard a member of the congregation was to be promoted, demoted or ejected."[188] The Two Ways form may have functioned to present a vivid picture of the community's ideals, in the context of an initiation ceremony, contrasting the way of life within the community with the way of life outside.[189] Given the prevalence of this form of teaching within Jewish and Christian circles, the audience of Ephesians may well have been aware of "the sociological significance of Two

---

separation to be lived out by Christians who remained physically integrated with the broader community" (323–24). The recent critique of MacDonald's position by Daniel K. Darko, *No Longer Living as the Gentiles: Differentiation and Shared Ethical Values in Ephesians 4.17–6.9* (LNTS 375; London: T & T Clark, 2008), 6–8, fails to appreciate this qualification.

187. McKenna, "Two Ways," 181, 275. McKenna further claims that "repentance parenesis" is the general function of the Two Ways form in all the Jewish and Christian texts surveyed in her study (192, 281).

188. James H. Charlesworth, "Critical Comparison of the Dualism in 1QS III, 13-IV, 26 and the 'dualism' Contained in the Fourth Gospel," *NTS* 15 (1969): 396.

189. Jean L. Duhaime, "L'Instruction sur les Deux Esprits et les Interpolations Dualistes à Qumrân (1 QS III,13-IV,26)," *RB* 84 (1977): 578.

Ways texts as the intensification of the 'in-group/out-group' dynamic."[190]

According to M. J. Suggs, the Two Ways form in 1QS had precisely this function:

> The Two Spirits passage in 1QS functions to establish and maintain a strong sense of in-group awareness. It sharpens the sense of "we-ness" among the sons of Light, who are expected to identify themselves unambiguously as the 'guys in the white hats.' Those instructed are meant to learn the difference between 'we' and 'they', those who belong to the community and those who do not, and the significance of being brought into a covenant 'to love all the sons of light . . . but to hate all the sons of darkness' (1.9)."[191]

E. Kamlah observes that as the virtue/vice catalog was incorporated into Jewish Christian thought, pagans could be identified by their lifestyle of sin, without specifically being identified as pagans.[192] From this one may infer that the Two Ways form (of which the virtue/vice catalog was a central component) functioned to identify a group (e.g., pagans, outsiders) by its behavior (e.g., a sinful lifestyle). It is therefore reasonable to assume that the Two Ways form and related imagery in Ephesians is functioning in much the same way as it does in 1QS III 13–IV 26 and in Jewish and Christian literature more broadly, namely to identify outsiders (or those who should be outsiders in the author's estimation) with the way of darkness. Thus, the Two Ways form in Ephesians may function to exhort

---

190. McKenna, "Two Ways," 277.

191. Suggs, "Two Ways," 67–68; so also John G. Gammie, "Spatial and Ethical Dualism in Jewish Wisdom and Apocalyptic Literature," *JBL* 93 (1974): 357, 381, who claims that the ethical dualism of 1QS 3-4 serves the purpose of dividing people into two groups. See further Dale C. Allison, Jr., "The Authorship of 1QS III,13-IV,14," *RevQ* 10 (1980): 265; Ellen Juhl Christiansen, "The Consciousness of Belonging to God's Covenant and What It Entails According to the Damascus Document and the Community Rule," in *Qumran Between the Old and New Testaments* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1998), 93.

192. Ehrhard Kamlah, *Die Form der katalogischen Paranese im Neuen Testament* (WUNT 7; Tübingen: Mohr, 1964), 180: "Eine Form der Ausweitung des Bezuges der Kataloge auch auf die Vergangenheit der Judenchristen war, daß die Sünde als Lebensart der Heiden gekennzeichnet wird, ohne daß damit die Angeredeten ausdrücklich als Heiden bestimmt werden."

the audience not only to adopt a pattern of behavior, but also to identify itself exclusively with the community characterized by such behavior.[193]

4.2. *The Function of the Two Ways Form in Ephesians*

In addition to functioning as both "repentance parenesis" and as a means of strengthening group identity, the Two Ways form in Ephesians may function in two further ways. First, it may serve to remind the audience not only how they should behave, but also the means by which such behavior is enabled. Second, within the overall argument of the letter, the Two Ways form suggests that before harmony within the church can be established, vice must be eliminated. Both of these functions are seen more clearly against the constellation of expectations surrounding the reign of the ideal king.

4.2.1. *"Learning Christ": a metaphor for transformation.* In contrast with the depravity of the gentiles, the audience is reminded: Ὑμεῖς δὲ οὐχ οὕτως ἐμάθετε τὸν Χριστόν (but you did not thus learn the Christ, 4:20). As many commentators have observed, the use of the verb μανθάνω with an accusative of person is almost without parallel. A number of theories have been proffered as to the meaning behind this odd expression. M. Dibelius suggested that, originally, it was an expression connoting mystical union, yet here employed to denote the audience's conversion to Christianity.[194] H. Schlier insisted rather that it was an anti-gnostic

---

193. So also Darko, *No Longer Living as the Gentiles*, 66–70. Darko insists, however, that the rhetoric of differentiation is not used in the letter to advocate a withdrawal from society.

194. Dibelius and Greeven, *Epheser*, 86. He points to alleged parallel expressions in *Odes Sol.* 7:3 (cf. Phil 3:12), in which other verbs (to receive, to put on, to see, to understand) are used with an accusative personal direct object (the Lord), to indicate the gaining of knowledge, possibly in a mystical sense. Klaus Wegenast, *Das Verständnis der Tradition bei Paulus und in den Deuteropaulinen* (WMANT 8; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1962), 131–132, argues similarly that the expression connotes conversion, although he insists that the expression reflects the practice of initiation into the mystery religions.

formulation, intended to combat false teaching that drove a wedge between the earthly Jesus and the exalted Christ.[195] Perhaps the majority of recent commentators believe the expression speaks of receiving the tradition about Jesus Christ, that is, the content and significance of Christian catechesis.[196] Several, however, believe the phrase has more to do with coming to know the living Christ personally and ordering one's life in such a way as to please Christ.[197] It must be noted that these interpretations should not be considered mutually exclusive, and in fact are frequently combined in the secondary literature. In particular, there is an integral connection between Christian catechesis and coming to know the living Christ, as J.-N. Aletti observes: "the object of catechesis is to introduce one to a living person, in order to make him known."[198]

The use of the verb μανθάνω to denote a divine being, rather than doctrine, as the object of learning, is found in a pseudonymous novel in letters, which is roughly contemporaneous with Ephesians. A collection of eighteen letters attributed to Chion of Heraclea tell the story of Chion's study of philosophy with Plato in Athens, and of his conspiracy to assassinate Clearchus, the tyrant of Heraclea (d. 353/2 B.C.E.).[199] In a letter addressed to Clearchus, Chion attempts to dispel Clearchus' suspicion that he is involved in machinations against Clearchus.

---

195. Schlier, *Epheser*, 217.

196. Masson, *Éphésiens*, 201 n. 4; Gnilka, *Epheserbrief*, 226–27; Conzelmann, "Epheser," 80; Schnackenburg, *Epheser*, 202–3; Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 279; MacDonald, *Colossians and Ephesians*, 303; Muddiman, *Ephesians*, 216; Sellin, *Epheser*, 359. This interpretation is frequently based, in part, on the analogy of Col 2:6, 7.

197. Bouttier, *Éphesiens*, 208; Best, *Ephesians*, 426; Hoehner, *Ephesians*, 593–94.

198. Aletti, *Ephésiens*, 235–36: "l'objet de la catéchèse est d'introduire à un vivant, pour le faire connaître." Similarly, O'Brien, *Ephesians*, 324; Barth, *Ephesians*, 2:529–30.

199. Ingemar Düring, ed., *Chion of Heraclea: A Novel in Letters* (Greek Texts and Commentaries; New York: Arno, 1979), 7–25, argues that these letters were written in the second half of the first century C.E.

In his defense, Chion protests that he has merely been studying philosophy with Plato in Athens, being "instructed in a most godlike doctrine (τὸν ἔγγιστα θεῷ λόγον παιδευόμενος)" (*Ep.* 16.5.12-13).[200] He further describes this process:

> I spent this time acquiring knowledge about God, who surveys alls [*sic*] things, and about the state of the world (θεὸν . . .ἐμάνθανον), contemplating the principles of nature, learning to honor justice and what else philosophy teaches. And nothing is more worth while not only to know but also to investigate. For, to one who is of godlike nature and thus has a share in divine providence, what can be more beautiful than to devote one's leisure solely to one's immortal self and try to bring that part of oneself into closer contact with that which is akin? (For I hold that the godlike is akin to the Divinity.) (*Ep.* 16.6.17-22).

Chion concludes the defense of his own innocence with an address to himself spoken by the goddess Tranquility (θεὸς Ἡσυχία). The goddess reminds Chion that he has "learned God" through the study of philosophy: "Sheltered by me you practised justice, acquired self-control and learnt to know God (θεὸν ἔμαθες)" (*Ep.* 16.8.11-12). Despite the disingenuous nature of Chion's letter, it nonetheless provides some useful information. First, the letter gives evidence of a similar grammatical construction (μανθάνω with a personal direct object in the accusative), used to denote the acquisition of divine knowledge. Second, this divine knowledge is associated with the attainment of virtues such as justice and self-control. Finally, the means by which knowledge is gained and virtues acquired is the study of philosophy. In antiquity, the study of philosophy often presumed (as suggested in Chion's letter) a master-apprentice relationship, which facilitated not simply the transmission of knowledge, but also the adoption of the philosopher's way of life. The life of the apprentice (ὁ μαθητής) was thus brought into conformity with the life of the philosopher by association with him.[201] The nexus of divine knowledge,

---

200. The Greek edition and English translation is that of Düring, *Chion of Heraclea.*

201. See the data assembled by Vernon K. Robbins, *Jesus the Teacher: A Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation of Mark* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 87–108; see further the discussion in Talbert, *Sermon*, 37–42. The comments of Barth, *Ephesians*, 2:532–33; Sellin, *Epheser*, 359, regarding the

moral transformation, and the study of philosophy is found also in discussion of ideal kingship. The way in which an auditor may have heard the injunction to "learn Christ" may be thus further illumined when set in the context of the way in which the ideal king was thought to enable the inculcation of virtue in his subjects.

In Greco-Roman thought, the tradition of the king's function vis-à-vis moral transformation has its roots in the political theorizing of Plato, who believed that the ideal king should be a philosopher, in order to attain virtue (*Resp.* 473D). Becoming virtuous was the prerequisite for the king's art, or τέχνη, the making of virtuous persons. Like Cronus, the divine shepherd, the king would care for his people, weaving them into a harmonious state (*Pol.* 268A–B, 269C, 311B). Plato's student, Aristotle, similarly believed that the goal of the state should be to inculcate virtue in its citizenry (*Eth. nic.* 1179b–81b). Although Aristotle primarily looked to laws to train people in the habits of virtue, he conceded that this task could be accomplished by a person supreme in virtue, who would indeed be a god among men (*Pol.* 1284a.3–11). Just how the king might inculcate virtue in his subjects is not a question Aristotle entertains. Plato's contemporary, Xenophon, however, suggests that the king made his subjects virtuous through his sheer presence (*Oec.* 21.3, 9–10).

The theoretical musings of classical Greek philosophers found currency in the era of Hellenistic monarchies among the Neopythagorean philosophers. Autocratic rule was no longer a possibility, but a reality whose legitimacy must be defended. If indeed they are to be dated from this era, the Neopythagorean philosophers apparently took up this task with gusto.[202] The experience of monarchy suggested to these creative minds a novel synthesis of ideas proposed

---

possibility of philosophical school traditions behind Eph 4:20-24, point in this direction as well.

202. Dating them later would have little effect on the current argument.

earlier by Aristotle and Xenophon. The ideal king, they insisted, needed no laws, for he himself was the incarnation of divine law or *logos*. Laws were not necessary to inculcate virtue, but only the presence of the king, the living law. Such a person could transfer his virtue to those who gazed upon his person. Ecphantus believed that the king's function was to make his subjects like himself, because the king alone partook of the divine nature in a way that ordinary humans did not (Stob. 4.7.65; Thesleff 82.29–83.1).[203]

These ideas became more widespread in the Roman era, as autocratic rule expanded its horizon beyond the *polis* to the world. For Musonius Rufus, the king's ability to rule perfectly is identified with the fact that he is a living law (64.10-15). Likewise, Plutarch believed that the ideal king ruled by animate law (*Princ. iner.* 780C). By merely gazing upon such a king, his subjects would be enabled to live virtuously and in harmony. Such was the effect, Plutarch recounts, of Rome's legendary king Numa (*Num.* 20.6–8). Philo's writings suggest that these ideas were known among first century Jews as well.[204] Joseph, by his words and presence, was able to transform the disordered lives of his fellow prisoners (*Ios.* 86–87, 157; cf. 164). Philo regards both Joseph and Moses to be the incarnation of divine law (*Ios.* 174; *Mos.* 2.4; cf. 1.162). Since it is divine law that trains one in the habits of virtue (*Mos.* 2.36, 43, 189), the king as living law is uniquely able to inculcate virtue in his subjects. For Philo as well, it is the vision of virtue itself that stamps an indelible image on the souls of those who wish to return to virtue and wisdom (*Praem.* 114–15).

---

203. Ecphantus understood the king to have a divine mind (Ἄνπερ ἱερὰν καὶ θείαν ἔχων ἔννοιαν τῷ ὄντι βασιλευς εἴη) (Stob. 4.7.66; Thesleff 83.18–19). Blumenfeld, *Political Paul*, 199, claims that in Paul's thinking, Christ fulfills precisely the function of Ecphantus' ideal king: "Christ is in the station of the king. He is, with a difference, precisely in the position of being both human and divine."

204. For evidence of Philonic ideas in Ephesians, see Faust, *Pax Christi*.

This survey of data reflects a widespread concern in Mediterranean antiquity with the role of the ideal king in the inculcation of virtue. What remains is to suggest a plausible manner in which the authorial audience of Ephesians might have read the injunction to "learn Christ" against these elements of its cultural repertoire. One must of necessity go beyond the evidence at this point, as no single writer appears to have synthesized the various elements discussed above into a unified theory. The following set of propositions is a cautious attempt to bridge this gap. (1) The ideal king is a living law: he embodies in his person the divine law, which guides humankind to virtue. (2) As a living law, the king enables the inculcation of virtue among his subjects. (3) The king's subjects become virtuous in much the same way as one studies philosophy. As one may be understood to "learn a philosopher" by acquiring the philosopher's virtuous habits, so they "learn the king." (4) These virtues are acquired by imitating the king, and by being in his presence. The last proposition implies that responsibility for transformation lies both with the king and his subjects. As the universal benefactor of humankind, the ideal king gives the gift of divine virtue. Divine virtue must be imitated by the king's subjects, but the king's very presence makes the imitation possible.

The audience of Ephesians may thus have understood "learning the Christ" as shorthand for leading virtuous lives enabled by the presence of their king, the risen and living Christ in the church. The idea that the Christ enables ethical living is furthermore adumbrated earlier in the letter. First of all, Christ is the means by which the audience receives the spirit (Ἐν ᾧ . . . ἐσφραγίσθητε τῷ πνεύματι τῆς ἐπαγγελίας τῷ ἁγίῳ, 1:13). Second, the author concludes the first part of the digression in chapter 2 by declaring that "we are God's creation, created through Christ Jesus (ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ) for good works, which God prepared beforehand (προητοίμασεν), that we should walk in them" (2:10 [author's translation]). The

author is probably not thinking here of the Jewish idea of things created before the existence of the world, but rather that the very possibility of good works is dependent upon God.[205] Taking the force of the preposition ἐν as instrumental, Christ appears to be the means by which this possibility is actualized.[206] Finally, in 3:16–17, the author prays that the audience may be strengthened by God's spirit in the inner person, that Christ may dwell within them through faith. In 3:19, the result of knowing the love of Christ is that they will be filled with all the fullness of God. To summarize, Christ is: the means of receiving the spirit; the spiritual entity that dwells within them; and the means by which God's fullness is experienced. Because ethical behavior is dependent upon God, who now dwells in them through Christ, the possibility for such behavior may now be actualized.

When the author reminds his audience that they "did not thus learn the Christ," it would thus have been heard as a further elaboration of the way in which the possibility of ethical behavior is realized. This actualization is described in three movements: casting off the old person, renewing the mind through the indwelling spirit, and putting on the new person (4:22–24). The metaphor of taking off and putting on is borrowed from the discourse of moral transformation, and indicates the rejection of vices and the acquisition of virtues.[207] The renewal of the mind may evoke the notion, expressed by Ecphantus, that the ideal king possesses the mind of God (Stob. 4.7.65).[208] Such a king functions to make his subjects like himself, that is, to impart to them the mind of God. In Ephesians, the

---

205. Masson, *Éphésiens*, 161; Schnackenburg, *Epheser*, 99.

206. See above, p. 246.

207. Aletti, *Ephésiens*, 238; Talbert, *Ephesians and Colossians*, 123–24; Sellin, *Epheser*, 363.

208. Chesnut, "Ruler and Logos," 1319–20.

Christ is able to effect this renewal because he dwells within the believer's heart (3:19). Christ, the ideal king, is a living law: he embodies the divine law that enables moral transformation.[209] Believers, who have been raised and seated with Christ in the heavenlies, are transformed by the vision of the Christ, and by the reality of the Christ dwelling within them. Thus they have "learned the Christ."

The Neopythagorean idea that the king is able to inculcate divine virtue in his subjects by his radiant presence further provides an illuminating conceptual background for understanding the way in which Ephesians speaks of the enablement of virtuous behavior in 4:17–5:21. Ecphantus lays emphasis upon the brilliant appearance of the king, claiming that he "is judged and approved by this light," and noting that the "excessive brilliance" of royalty is hard to behold (Stob. 4.7.64; Thesleff 80.7–11, 14–17). According to Diotogenes, a good king is able to charm those who behold him (Stob. 4.7.62; Thesleff 74.12–19), and Ecphantus believed the king "restores what has been lost by sin" by means of the *logos* residing within him (Stob. 4.7.65; Thesleff 83.9–14).

The Neopythagorean emphasis on the excessive brilliance of the king is helpful in illuminating the light-darkness imagery in Ephesians. These contrasting images appear intensively in 5:7-14, which follows an exhortation to imitate God by walking in love as the Christ loved "us," avoiding the immoral behavior that characterizes those who have no share in the kingdom of the Christ and God (5:1-6). This singular command to imitate God[210] is perhaps most helpfully understood in light of the notion that the king alone amongst human beings best imitates God.

---

209. On Philo's understanding of divine law as the means by which moral transformation is enabled, see the discussion above, p. 198. For the concept of the living law, see further, Goodenough, "Political Philosophy," 65–66; Chesnut, "Ruler and Logos," 1311–12.

210. It appears only here in the NT; see Schnackenburg, *Epheser*, 215–17.

The rest of humanity imitates the king, thereby imitating God.[211] This appears to be the thought here, where the command to imitate God is immediately coupled with a command to walk in love as Christ did. Following this exhortation, the author then urges his audience not to become participants with such people, reminding them that formerly they were darkness, but now they are light in the Lord; they should walk as children of light (ἦτε γάρ ποτε σκότος, νῦν δὲ φῶς ἐν κυρίῳ· ὡς τέκνα φωτὸς περιπατεῖτε) (5:8). He interrupts himself to add that the fruit of this light (ὁ γὰρ καρπὸς τοῦ φωτὸς) is in all goodness and righteousness and truth (5:9). Picking up the train of thought, he continues that, as they are now light, they are to approve what is pleasing to the Lord (δοκιμάζοντες τί ἐστιν εὐάρεστον τῷ κυρίῳ) (5:10).[212] They are not to participate in the fruitless, shameful works of darkness, but rather expose them (μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ ἐλέγχετε) (5:11–12).[213] Everything exposed is illumined by light (ὑπὸ τοῦ φωτὸς φανεροῦται), for everything illumined is light (πᾶν γὰρ τὸ φανερούμενον φῶς ἐστιν) (5:13–14a). A fragment of a poem or song rounds off the section:

> Awake, O sleeper,
> And arise from the dead,
> and the Christ will shine (ἐπιφαύσει) on you. (5:14b)

---

211. See further, Blumenfeld, *Political Paul*, 209–11, 222–23.

212. Remember that, for Ecphantus, the ideal king "is judged and approved by this light" (see above). Blumenfeld, *Political Paul*, 205–6, discusses Paul's use of φῶς and δοκιμάζω in Rom 2:18–19 in ways that evoke Ecphantus' doxology of the king. Another relevant parallel is found in the command that Isocrates places on the lips of the young king, Nicocles. He admonishes his subjects to scrutinize (δοκιμάζετε) their actions, judging as good those which will earn them the king's approval (*Nic.* 52).

213. Isocrates' *Nicocles* provides another intriguing parallel. The subjects of Nicocles are commanded to expose (ἐξελέγχετε) those disloyal to their king (*Nic.* 53). This concern to expose disloyalty is found in a passage that takes up the larger concern of the need for the people to emulate the king's virtues in order to maintain a happy and prosperous state (*Nic.* 47–64). Disloyalty to the king, therefore, may perhaps be seen as a particular failure to live virtuously.

Of course, this dualistic imagery was something of a commonplace in ethical exhortation, so by no means is it suggested that the Neopythagoreans provide a direct conceptual link.[214] Nevertheless, it is plausible to believe that this stirring imagery would have evoked for the audience a picture of a radiant king whose very presence drives away the shadowy darkness of a lifestyle that leads to death.

In Ephesians, Christ enables the obedience, or moral transformation of the church in two ways. The first is by providing an example for the church to follow. Christ loved and gave himself for the church; he is thus to be the exemplar of "walking in love" and "imitating God" (5:1–2, 25b, 29b). As the object of the church's submission, he is an example of submission within the church and household (5:22–23, 24, 32; 6:1 (variant), 4, 5, 6, 7).[215] This is consistent with the portrayal of the ideal king as the exemplar of virtue for his subjects to imitate. Second, Christ's enablement of the church must be viewed in the context of certain strains of Hellenistic political philosophy, in which the ruler was seen to rule by means of embodied law (νόμος ἔμψυχος). The exclamation, "you did not so learn the Christ" (4:20; cf. 4:21), may betray this concept. "Learning Christ" would thus have been understood by the audience to refer not to the memorization of doctrine or codes of behavior, but rather to the appropriation of a way of life embodied in the Christ. The same idea is behind "Paul's" prayer that Christ dwell in the readers' hearts to effect empowerment, comprehension, and being filled with the fullness of God (3:16-19; cf. 6:10).[216] Christ is the measure by which the maturity of the

---

214. One notes, for example, the use of light-darkness imagery at Qumran (1QS I, 9–10; II, 1–10; III, 13, 20–21, 24–25); see further, Karl Georg Kuhn, "The Epistle to the Ephesians in the Light of the Qumran Texts," in *Paul and Qumran: Studies in New Testament Exegesis* (ed. Jerome Murphy-O'Connor; London: Chapman, 1968), 115–31; Schnackenburg, *Epheser*, 226–28.

215. Christ is also the basis for the humane treatment of slaves (6:9).

216. The concept of Christ indwelling the church to transform it may also help to understand the claim that Christ fills the church, his body, with himself (1:23; cf. 5:30).

church is to be reckoned (4:15; cf. 5:10).[217] To conclude, the background concept of "learning the king, who is a living law" may illuminate what the audience would have understood by the recollection of "learning the Christ."

4.2.2. *Abolishing vice: the necessary precursor to harmony.* The first half of the letter ends with a prayer that the Christ may dwell in the hearts of the audience in order that they will ultimately come to experience the fullness of God (3:14–19). This prayer must be understood in the context of the letter's central theme, the reconciliation of the cosmos. Being filled with the fullness of God may envision a kind of experiential knowing of one's place, and the church's place, within this grand plan. Following this prayer the author exhorts the audience to live worthily of their calling: they have been called into God's plan of cosmic reconciliation; their lives are now to reflect this ever-growing harmony. They are enabled to do so on the basis of Christ's benefaction, which establishes the unity of the church. It would be logical for an exhortation for unity in the church to be followed by an exhortation for unity in the household. The Two Ways form interrupts this logical progression. Why?

Abolishing vice is the corollary of inculcating virtue. Both were the prerogative of the ideal king in antiquity. Virgil implies that it is the *scelus* (an offense meriting divine wrath) of the Roman people that is the root of civil war (*Georg.* 1.463–68). Augustus must therefore wipe out every trace of *scelus* when he ushers in the golden age (*Ecl.* 4.11–14). Seneca also assumes the state of humankind to be characterized by *scelus* (*Clem.* 1.1.1; 1.6.3; cf. 1.22.1). He sincerely hoped that the *princeps* would rid the state of vice through his *clementia* (*Clem.* 1.22.2–3; 2.1.3–2.2). According to Dio Chrysostom, the ideal king should

217. On this reading see Talbert, *Ephesians and Colossians*, 161–62.

first cleanse himself from all vices; only then would he be able to root out vice within his kingdom (*Or.* 2.55–56, 77). Suetonius regards the emperors as the guardians of public morality, praising those who, like Vespasian, curbed unrestrained "licentiousness and extravagance" (*Vesp.* 11). Similar ideas may be found in Second Temple Jewish literature. The author of the *Psalms of Solomon* likewise believes that the messiah's reign would cause unrighteous behavior to cease (17.27). In the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, sin will vanish at the advent of the messiah (*T. Levi* 18.9c). The eradication of vice was not, however, an end in itself, but rather the means to a greater good, the establishment of harmony, another prerogative of the ideal king. This is implied perhaps already in Virgil, but comes to expression most potently with Dio Chrysostom. He is emphatic that "only by getting rid of the vices" that plague civic life within the *polis*, "only so . . . is it possible ever to breathe the breath of harmony" (*Or.* 34.19). For Dio, then, the abolition of vice is a necessary precursor to the establishment of harmony. The establishment of divine harmony through the Christ has already been seen to be central to the argument of Ephesians. The eradication of vice occupies a position of signal importance within this larger argument.

The contours of this argument can be summarized as follows: (1) God is realizing his eternal plan, the reconciliation of the cosmos through the Christ (1:10; 3:11). (2) The Christ dwells in the auditors' hearts so that they will come to experience the reality of their place in God's plan (3:17–19; 1:16–18). (3) God is working out his plan by bringing about unity in the church and household through the Christ (4:1–16; 5:22–6:9). (4) Before this unity can be established, vice must be abolished (4:17–5:21). (5) This happens as the auditors "learn the Christ," becoming transformed into the likeness of the Christ, a living law, who dwells within them (4:20). The eradication of vice through the Christ, the ideal king,

enables the fulfillment of God's plan of reconciliation being carried out through his vicegerent, the Christ. The Two Ways form is thus seen to be an integral component in the letter's argument that God is reconciling the cosmos through the Christ. Such rhetoric may serve to lend cosmic significance to the task of moral formation. As they put off vice and put on virtue, the audience participates not only in the edification of the church, but in God's eternal plan to restore divine harmony to creation.

5. *The Christ Enables Harmony in the Household (5:22–6:9)*

The idea that the ideal king effects within the state the harmony that is believed to exist in the cosmos was common in antiquity, as was the related idea that a harmonious household is a microcosm of the harmonious state, and hence of the harmonious cosmos.[218] The importance of a harmonious household within the vision of a harmonious state was expressed in a variety of ways in antiquity. Isocrates believed that the king should preserve harmony not only in the state, but in his own household (*Nic.* 41). Obedience to the king was therefore expected from the entire household, children as well as adults (*Nic.* 57). According to Martial, Domitian's virtues have a transformative effect on the members of his own household (*Epig.* 9.79.7–8). Suetonius relates that Augustus, intolerant of the moral failings of his household, banished his own daughter, Julia (*Aug.* 65; 67; *Tib.* 11).

---

218. On the household as a microcosm of the state, see Dio Cassius, *Rom. Hist.* 65.8. Aristotle likens universal monarchy, or παμβασιλεία, to the rule of the household (*Pol.* 1285b 29–33). On this see Carlier, "*Pambasileia*," 107–8. Interestingly, according to Aristotle, the phenomenon of the disordered household is most commonly associated with a tyrannical government (*Pol.* 1313b 33-41). Darko, *No Longer Living as the Gentiles*, 75–79, has shown that the welfare of the state is not always linked to domestic order; however the majority of texts he surveys deal with the issue of domestic order, not politics. One would not expect such texts to be concerned with the welfare of the state.

The argument of Ephesians betrays familiarity with these widespread cultural assumptions.[219] The extended digression in Eph 2 highlights the reconciliation effected through the Christ: sinful humanity is reconciled to God, and gentiles and Jews are reconciled within the church. This reconciliation, it has been stressed, is the manifestation of the larger reconciliation of the fractured cosmos that God is in the process of achieving through the reign of Christ. The working out of this central theme—the summing up of all things through the Christ—may be seen in the present section, which is concerned with the harmonious functioning of the household (5:22–6:9).

Much scholarly effort has been focused on the origin and function of the so-called *Haustafel*, or "household code," in Ephesians and elsewhere in the NT. The consensus appears to be that the origin of the household code in the NT can be traced back to the *topos* of household management frequently found in Greek philosophy. Christian usage of the household code was likely influenced by its earlier adoption within Hellenistic Judaism.[220] The function of the code within Ephesians is debated. The variety of interpretive possibilities may be seen in the following. A. T. Lincoln believes the code serves to bring stability to Christian households and to help the letter's audience better assimilate into society.[221] By

---

219. In discussing the household code in Eph 5:21–6:9, commentators frequently note, for example, the cultural assumption that the welfare of the state was connected with that of the household. See, e.g., Best, *Ephesians*, 523; MacDonald, *Colossians and Ephesians*, 337. See further, David L. Balch, *Let Wives be Submissive: The Domestic Code in 1 Peter* (Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series 26; Chico, Ca: Scholars Press, 1981), 73–74, 112–14, 132–33, 149–59.

220. See the seminal work, David L. Balch, *Let Wives be Submissive: The Domestic Code in 1 Peter* (SBLMS 26; Chico, Ca: Scholars Press, 1981). Further helpful discussions may be found in Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 356–65; Best, *Ephesians*, 520–27; Muddiman, *Ephesians*, 250–55; Sellin, *Epheser*, 424–33.

221. Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 360. He makes clear, however, that while household roles and duties prescribed by Ephesians differed little from those outside the church, the "internal ethos and dynamic" of relations within the Christian household were significantly different (390, referring to the marriage relationship).

contrast, P. Perkins concludes that the letter presents "a well-ordered Christian household independent of the views or actions of outsiders."[222] M. Y. MacDonald insists that the primary purpose of the code is "to provide theological justification" for conventional subordination within household relationships.[223] E. Faust insists that the household code functions as part of the letter's larger aim to present an alternative to the imperial state, namely the *politeia* of Christ.[224] Here it will be argued that the household code functions to demonstrate the extent of Christ's reconciling rule. As in the church, so also in the household, the reign of Christ brings harmony.

The basic form of the household code in antiquity is relatively conventional. Regardless of whether it appears in Greco-Roman, Jewish, or Christian literature, the code spells out the relations between husbands and wives, fathers and children, and masters and slaves within the context of the family estate.[225] Two observations of the way in which this basic form is adapted in Ephesians will prove instructive. First, submission and obedience on the part of the subordinate parties (wives, children, slaves) is to be carried out "as to the Lord," "in the Lord," "as to the Christ," or "as slaves of Christ." Second, the behavior of the superordinate parties (husbands, fathers, masters) toward those subordinate to them is likewise to be modeled upon Christ's relationship to the church. Husbands are to love their wives

---

222. Perkins, *Ephesians*, 140.

223. MacDonald, *Colossians and Ephesians*, 341.

224. Faust, *Pax Christi*, 432–41.

225. That an estate, or family business, is in view rather than simply the nuclear family is made clear in the comparative literature. See, e.g., the comments of Xenophon: "But what do we mean now by an estate (οἶκος)? Is it the same thing as a house (οἰκία), or is all property that one possesses outside the house (οἰκίας) also part of the estate (οἴκου)?" Well, I think that even if the property is situated in different cities, everything a man possesses is part of his estate (οἴκου)"(*Oec.* 1.5).

as Christ loved the church (5:25); fathers are to bring up their children in the instruction and admonishment of the Lord (6:4), and masters are to treat their slaves in such a way that reflects the impartiality of their master in heaven (6:9). This portrayal of Christ as the model for the sort of behavior that promotes harmony within the household reflects at least two widely held expectations regarding the ideal king in antiquity. The first is that the ideal king serves as both the model for, and the enabler of virtuous behavior in antiquity. The second is that the ideal king establishes divine harmony on earth.

How does Eph 5:22–6:9 function within the letter's larger argument that God is reconciling the fractured cosmos through the Christ? The implications of God's plan for the fullness of time—to sum up all things through the Christ (1:10)— are developed throughout the letter in the following manner. Christ resolves the alienation between humankind and God caused by sin (2:1–10). Christ effects harmony between alienated ethnic groups within the church (2:11–22). Christ gives gifts that contribute to the unity of the church (4:1–16). Christ eradicates vice (the necessary precursor to achieving harmony) and enables virtuous behavior through his reign as a living law (4:17–5:21). Finally, Christ ensures the harmonious function of the household (5:22–6:9). This last passage thus demonstrates the extent of the divine harmony effected through Christ's reign. This harmony is thus seen to be comprehensive: it affects the transcendent human-divine relationship as well as the immanent household relationships. Each of these aspects of reconciling work could have been understood by the letter's authorial audience as the provenance of the ideal king.

It was mentioned above that the household code in Ephesians may have functioned to help the letter's audience better assimilate into society. This evaluation of the code's function makes much of the wider cultural assumption that

the household was a microcosm of the state and its harmonious function was essential for that of the state. This cultural assumption is indeed important to understanding the function of the household code in Ephesians, although not in the way it has frequently been construed. Within the letter's argument, there seems to be little concern that Christian households function harmoniously so that the social order of the state may be preserved. Rather, the letter is anxious to preserve unity in the church, and sees the household as an integral element within that. Here, it is important to recognize that the cultural assumption that correlates the state with the household is still operative. It has, however, been significantly transposed, such that the household is viewed primarily as a microcosm of the church rather than the state. As in the household, so in the church and so in the cosmos. As the Christ reigns over the cosmos, so he reigns over the church and the household as well. The code therefore does not primarily aim to teach the auditors how to behave in society, but rather how to behave within the church, the realm of the Christ's beneficent reign.

6. *The Christ Enables Victory Over the Powers (6:10–20)*

In antiquity, the ideal king was nothing if not victorious. Indeed, from the Hellenistic era onwards, military victory was widely seen as one of the sources of a king's legitimacy.[226] Augustus, for example, characterizes his reign as one of unparalleled military success (*Res gest.* 26–33; cf. 2–3, 25.1). Historians, court poets, and panegyricists alike echoed his boast.[227] Statius, moreover, believed that

---

226. Arrian, *Anab.* 7.9.1–10.7. See especially Préaux, "L'image du roi," 56–63; M. M. Austin, "Hellenistic Kings, War, and the Economy," *CQ* 36 (1986): 450–466; Busse, "Das Bildfeld vom König ," 287.

227. Military success appears to be one of the evaluative categories used by Suetonius. See, e.g., *Jul.* 36–37 (cf. 52); 55; *Aug.* 13; 22; *Tib.* 1–3; 9; 17; 21; *Cal.* 43–47, 51; *Claud.* 17; *Nero* 18; 13; 44; *Galb.* 6; *Vesp.* 4; *Tit.* 4. Further praise for the emperor's military exploits can be found in Martial, *Epig.* 5.19.1–2, 6; Pliny, *Pan.* 12.1.

the emperor fought on behalf of Jove; his military role was thus a function of his vicegerency (*Sylv.* 1.1.79). At Qumran, portrayals of the ideal king emphasized his military role (1QSb; 1QM; 4Q161; 4Q285); the king's victory would be ensured by Yahweh (4Q246). The *Sibylline Oracles* envision the destruction of unjust empires at the hands of gentile kings (3.652–56). Additionally, there is a long tradition in both Greco-Roman and Jewish literature of portraying kings and heroes in full battle armor as a means of conveying martial valor.[228]

If the principal claim of this is study is correct, that the authorial audience would have understood the Christ portrayed in this letter as a type of ideal king, then Eph 6:10–20 is puzzling to say the least. Given that, in the estimation of many commentators, this section provides the rhetorical climax to the entire letter,[229] one might expect to encounter the Christ as the subject of this passage. The image of the Christ, God's warrior-king, armed for battle would surely be a fitting conclusion. The problem, of course, is that Eph 6:10–20 does not present us with a picture of the Christ in full battle armor. It is rather the church that is enjoined to put on God's armor and thus take on the role of the Divine Warrior.[230] The extended metaphor of putting on the full armor of God implies the church's certain victory over hostile powers. Aside from the injunction to be strong in the Lord (ἐνδυναμοῦσθε ἐν κυρίῳ) at the beginning of the passage (6:10), no association between the Christ and the armor of God is to be found. Given the widespread

---

228. One notes, for example, the arming of Achilles (Homer, *Il.* 19.389–427). On the arming of the divine warrior in Isa 59:17 and Wis 5:17–23, see Thomas R. Yoder Neufeld, *'Put on the Armour of God': The Divine Warrior from Isaiah to Ephesians* (JSNTSup 140; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 15–72.

229. So Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 456; O'Brien, *Ephesians*, 457; Talbert, *Ephesians and Colossians*, 158.

230. See the discussion of the appropriation of Isaianic image of the Divine Warrior in Ephesians in Yoder Neufeld, *Divine Warrior*, 109–53.

correlation between ideal kingship and military victory, the audience may have found this conclusion to the letter surprising.

Upon reflection, however, the conclusion may be seen to accord with the overall theological perspective of the letter, which emphasizes the present peace of the church, achieved through the Christ's supreme triumph over the hostile powers.[231] The author states emphatically that God exercised the overwhelming greatness of his power by raising Christ from the dead and enthroning him at his right side, "far above all rule and authority and power and dominion," having subjected all things under his feet (1:19–22). It is, moreover, because the audience shares in Christ's cosmic rule that they too have victory over the powers (2:5–6).[232] The presentation of Christ as victor in Ephesians is therefore not in doubt.

The lack of emphasis on the Christ as a military victor is furthermore not without parallel in contemporaneous literature. Despite widespread agreement that the ideal king should be prepared for war, certain texts were reluctant to view the ideal king as a warrior. Indeed, Aristotle observed that tyranny was preserved by the habit of kings continually stirring up war (*Pol.* 5.1313b.28-30).[233] A. B. Bosworth has recently drawn attention to Hellenistic monarchs whose political success lay not so much in their military success, but rather in their ability to cultivate an enduring heroic ethos.[234] Although the notion of a warrior messiah

---

231. Gombis, "Triumph of God," 51–85, argues that ANE divine warfare ideology animates the entire argument of Eph 1–2, in which Christ's victory over hostile powers are praised. On the portrayal of Christ as triumphant divine warrior in Eph 4:8, see further, Gombis, "Cosmic Lordship," 367–80.

232. On enthronement as a royal metaphor, see Schnackenburg, *Epheser*, 84–85. On the church's participation in Christ's triumph and reign, see Beskow, *Rex Gloriae*, 150.

233. *Sibylline Oracle* 3.202–05 similarly prophesies that because of the wicked rule of tyrannous Greek kings, humankind will not have rest from war.

234. Bosworth, *Legacy*, 246–78: most notably, Lysimachus and Demetrius Poliorcetes.

enjoyed currency at Qumran, the *Psalms of Solomon* downplayed the messiah's martial role, emphasizing his wisdom instead (17.24b, 33). In the *Letter of Aristeas*, emphasis is placed upon the king's reliance upon God rather than his military prowess (193–94). Dio Chrysostom recognized the validity of a king's military preparedness insofar as it served the greater goal of peace: "they who are best prepared for war have it most in their power to live for peace"(*Or.* 1.27). Nevertheless he was highly critical of Alexander's militaristic ambitions (*Or.* 4.4–5, 46–51, 66–70).[235] Such texts give evidence of a stream of tradition that highlighted the king's wisdom or virtue rather than his military prowess.[236] Ephesians, which exercises restraint in its characterization of the Christ as a warrior, may reflect this stream of tradition.

What implications for the letter's larger argument might this observation hold? First, the letter's reserve in portraying the Christ as divine warrior accords with the letter's pronounced ecclesiological accent. As A. T. Lincoln observes, when the author first refers to the church in 1:22, it is to say that God exalted the Christ in order to benefit the church. This statement sets the tone for the letter's exalted ecclesiology.[237] It is not therefore surprising to discover that the author "replaces Christ the warrior with the saints as corporate warrior."[238] Second, the lack of emphasis on Christ as warrior reinforces the peaceful means by which God is

---

235. Alexander the Great was often referred to as κοσμοκράτωρ (world-conqueror), but Dio Chrysostom takes Alexander to task for his ambition and aggression. One notes in Eph 6:12, the term is used not in reference to Christ, but to the hostile powers that beset the letter's audience.

236. Philo, *Mos.* 1.148, claims that Moses is appointed king not on the basis of military might but because of his virtues, namely, piety and benevolence (cf. 1.154 for additional virtues). On the virtues of a king, see further, Diotogenes (Stob. 4.7.62); Höistad, *Cynic Hero*, 150, 184ff.

237. Andrew T. Lincoln and A. J. M. Wedderburn, *The Theology of the Later Pauline Letters* (New Testament Theology; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 93.

238. Yoder Neufeld, *Divine Warrior*, 124.

reconciling the cosmos through the Christ. In Eph 2:14–17, Christ is portrayed as a peacemaker, reconciling humanity to God, and reconciling gentiles and Jews in the church. This is a peace achieved without war, yet not without bloodshed. In those Greco-Roman and Jewish texts that emphasize the ideal king's military might, peace is achieved through the defeat of enemies. In Ephesians, the only blood shed is that of Christ.[239]

Yet a third reason that the warrior role of Christ is de-emphasized in Ephesians may be that the author perceives the real fight not to lie in the realm of "blood and flesh" (6:12), but rather against hostile spiritual powers, who have in principle already been defeated (1:20–21). The audience is not enjoined to fight these powers, but rather to stand firm against them (6:13, 14). A number of Jewish texts hoped for an eschatological divinely appointed king who would lead them in a decisive military victory against a foreign oppressor.[240] By contrast, in Hellenistic political ideology, divine honor is conferred upon the king in view of what he has already done for his subjects. The epithet σωτήρ, for example, was bestowed upon a king by the *polis* in gratitude for his having liberated it from a foreign king. Dio Chrysostom, recounting the legend of Heracles' choice of Royal Virtue, concludes that the hero was entrusted with the universal kingship of humankind by Zeus in recognition of his having liberated the world of tyranny:

> This, she [Virtue] maintained, was what made him Deliverer of the earth and of the human race [τῆς γῆς καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἔφη Σωτῆρα εἶναι], . . . the fact that he chastised savage and wicked men, and crushed and destroyed the power of overweening tyrants. And even to this day Heracles continues this work and you have in him a helper and protector of your government as long as it is vouchsafed you to reign. (*Or.* 1.84)

---

239. See above discussion, p. 285.

240. See, e.g., *Ps. Sol.* 17; 1QSb; 1QM; 4Q161; 4Q246; 4Q285; *Sib. Or.* 3.

Two observations may be made about Dio's conclusion. The first is evidently that the ideal king is such because he liberates the earth from tyrannical rule. The second is that Heracles continues to help and protect just governments from his throne on Mount Olympus. The difference is one of temporal perspective: in the former, the decisive battle lies in the imminent future; in the latter it is in the past. The characterization of the Christ in Ephesians reflects the perspective of the latter.

The Christ is the ideal king who has already liberated the church from the tyrannical domination of the "ruler of the power of the air" (2:2). In the present, he is the source of the church's strength, enabling it to be strengthened "in the Lord, and in the strength of his power (ἐν κυρίῳ καὶ ἐν τῷ κράτει τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ)" (6:10). Thus, for example, when Christ is described as the savior of the church (σωτὴρ τοῦ σώματος) (5:23), the salvation effected by Christ is understood to have taken place in the past.[241] Likewise, when he tells his audience that were made alive with, and enthroned with Christ, the author twice interjects, "you are saved by grace (χάριτί ἐστε σεσῳσμένοι)" (2:5, 8). The periphrastic construction with the perfect passive participle makes clear that the continuance of a completed action is in view.[242] Ephesians presents the reign of the Christ as one of peace, in which forces hostile to God's rule have already been defeated.

The argument of this chapter may now be summarized briefly. Ephesians portrays Christ as God's vicegerent, his deputy appointed to rule in his place. Through the Christ, God is carrying out a plan to restore harmony to a fractured cosmos. This restoration, and Christ's central role within it, constitutes the main theme of the letter. As God's ideal king, Christ reconciles humanity to God (2:1–

---

241. Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 371 Compare the perspective of Phil 3:20, in which the activity of Christ as savior is expected at the *parousia*.

242. BDF §340; cf. §352. See further, Hoehner, *Ephesians*, 333.

10); reconciles Jew and gentile within the church (2:11–22); brings harmony to the church through his benefaction (4:1–16); enables the moral transformation of the church through his presence as living law (4:17–5:21); brings harmony to the household (5:22–6:9); and enables the church to stand firm against the already defeated powers (6:10–20). The larger significance of Christ's role as ideal king within the letter's attempt to shape the identity and behavior of its audience is the subject of the concluding chapter.

CHAPTER FIVE

Conclusion: Listening to Ephesians with the Authorial Audience

The principal burden of this study has been to demonstrate that the argument of Ephesians can be better understood when it is realized that its principle character, the Christ, functions as an ideal king. The final step in this task remains to be taken. While various parts of the letter have received illumination from the motif of ideal kingship, it remains to be seen whether, and how, the characterization of the Christ as an ideal king affects the reading of the entire letter. What follows is a paraphrastic and interpretive rehearsal of the letter's argument, as it might have been filtered through the authorial audience's expectations of the reign of an ideal king. (To lend emphasis to the prevalent motif of kingship, the term *Christ* is replaced throughout by the term *king*.) Following this paraphrase, we offer discussion of the most salient benefits of such a reading for understanding the letter's attempt to form the identity and behavior of its audience, as well as avenues of possible research that this reading may open up.

1. *Ephesians: a Paraphrastic and Interpretive Summary*

"From Paul, emissary of Jesus the king. To those made holy and faithful through the king. Grace and peace from God, our father, and from the king (1:1–2).

"May God be blessed for having bestowed upon us every blessing through his king. God has furthermore made known to us the mystery, namely that he is reconciling the cosmos through the king, in whose kingdom we have a share (1:3–14). I therefore pray for your enlightenment, that is, that you may understand

the implications of this mystery. Witness the exceedingly great power of God that he exercised through the king when he raised him from the dead and enthroned him as king (1:15–23).

"What does the king's reign mean for you? To begin with, God's savior-king has liberated you from the thralldom of the malevolent powers which previously kept you alienated from God. Because you have been enthroned with the king, you are freed from these powers to walk in good works. This new state of affairs brought about by the king brings glory to God as it demonstrates, before the defeated powers, God's kindness to you through the king. Thus, as part of his plan to reconcile the cosmos, God has dealt with the alienating effects of sin, reconciling you to himself through his king (2:1-10). This reconciliation extends, moreover, to the subjects of the kingdom, the church. God's king has effected a golden age of peace within the church between those who have long been subjects of the Heavenly King and you newcomers to the commonwealth. The king, the living law, has abolished the law which formerly was a cause of hostility between you both, and now rules in its stead. God's king has brought peace by making you two former enemies into one new humanity (2:11–22).

"This is why I was made emissary of the king on your behalf, to proclaim this mystery that God is now restoring the divine unity of the cosmos. When you give close attention to what I have just written, you will understand my insight into this mystery, namely that you gentiles are now fellow heirs of the promise through the king. This now-reconciled church into which you have been brought is in fact the vehicle through which God receives glory as his manifold wisdom is demonstrated to the powers he has defeated through the king (3:1–13). Therefore I pray that the king may dwell within you, and knowing the king's love, that you will be filled with God's fullness (3:14–19). Glory to God through the king (3:20–21)!

"Since you have been called into this kingdom, the church, I therefore exhort you to walk worthily of your calling, being eager to maintain unity within the kingdom. Indeed, the king, God's benefactor, has given gifts from the divine realm that will promote such unity. These royal benefactions—in the form of emissaries, prophets, heralds, shepherds and teachers—enable your progress towards unity and maturity. The king himself is the ideal of the complete person, the model of virtue into whose likeness you are to grow. The harmony within God's kingdom on earth, the church, reflects the divine harmony that exists in the cosmos. The unity within the church brought about by the king's benefaction is therefore part and parcel of the reconciliation of the cosmos that God is effecting through his king (4:1-16).

"If there is to be true harmony in this kingdom, vice must first be abolished and virtue established. Do not walk therefore in darkness, as those who are separated from the life of God (as you were formerly yourselves). You were not thus transformed by the vision of the king! Rather, imitate God by walking in love. The example you have is the self-giving love of the king. Avoid all immoral behavior, for those who live in this manner will have no share in the kingdom of God and his vicegerent. Formerly you were in darkness; now all is illuminated by the brilliance of the king. In the words of a familiar song: 'wake up sleeper . . . and the king will shine upon you.' Give thanks to God the father in the name of the king, submitting to each other in fear of the king. In sum: as God effects harmony in the cosmos through his king, he effects harmony in his kingdom, the church. Before harmony can reign, vice must be abolished and virtue established. Virtue is inculcated in you as gaze upon God's king, the living law, who reigns over you (4:17–5:21).

"As you know, the household is a microcosm of the kingdom, which is a microcosm of the cosmos. The divine harmony of the cosmos, which is now being

established in God's kingdom, the church, must therefore now reign in your households. Let every relationship within your households be ordered appropriately as though unto the king (5:22–6:9).

"Finally, remember that God has defeated the powers through his mighty king. Your task, therefore, is not to fight, but rather to stand firm against these defeated powers. Peace, love, and grace to all those who love our lord, Jesus the king (6:10–24)!

2. *Indicative and Imperative Reunited*

As the foregoing interpretive paraphrase of Ephesians suggests, the motif of kingship functions as a thread through the entire letter, lending it cohesion and supplying rhetorical emphasis. The Christ fills many of the key roles that the ideal king was thought to fill in antiquity. He rules as vicegerent of the Heavenly King; he liberates his people from oppression; he effects reconciliation between humanity and God and brings harmony to human relationships; and his reign inculcates virtue amongst his subjects. The king's liberating and reconciling activity is understood to have occurred in the past: they are the direct result of God having raised Christ from the dead. They comprise what is sometimes referred to as the indicative thrust of the letter, in contrast to its imperative thrust. They constitute the activity of God through the Christ on behalf of the audience. This divine activity is what constitutes their identity as a people. The king's inculcation of virtue among his subjects is ongoing and occurs in the present. It is, however, more commonly spoken of not as the *inculcation* of virtue, but rather as the *exhortation* to virtue: that which the church is admonished to do in light of what God has done.[1] This is more than a minor semantic difference. Exhortation

---

1. Thus Best, *Ephesians*, 353; O'Brien, *Ephesians*, 272.

implies that the audience is urged to pursue a virtuous life, although nothing is indicated as to the resources necessary to succeed in this endeavor. Inculcation implies that the transference of virtues is successful. To read the second half of the letter as mere exhortation to virtue is to fail to understand the integral connection between indicative and imperative in Ephesians.

The reign of the ideal king was thought to effect a return to the golden age. This halcyon existence was imagined as one in which people were made righteous not through the rule of law, but through the king himself, the living law. The king, in this scenario, is the one who both constitutes the identity of his people, and forms, or shapes, the identity of his people. That is to say, the king makes *a* people *his* people, and the king makes *his* people virtuous. In the person of the king, therefore, the indicative and imperative are integrally united. Recognition of this fact helps us understand that, in the ears of the authorial audience, there would have been no disjunction between the indicative and imperative thrusts of Ephesians. Christ, the ideal king through whom God has constituted a people, is also the one through whom that people is enabled to live as God's people. Although not expressed as it has been here, this insight has, in fact, long been recognized as being characteristic of the undisputed Pauline tradition. N. A. Dahl, for example, writes,

> The Pauline idea of a restoration of creation in the Church is rightly understood only if the main emphasis is laid, not upon any moral and social ameliorations, but upon the participation in Christ through the Gospel and the sacraments, leading to conformity with him in life. Accordingly, the Church's conformity with creation is dependent upon its conformity with Christ.[2]

For Paul, as Dahl sees it, the church's conformity with Christ is of a piece with the restoration of creation. The same idea applies equally to Ephesians, in which the

---

2. Dahl, "Christ, Creation and the Church," 442.

audience is informed not only that God is restoring the cosmos through Christ, but also that Christ is the means by which they are conformed to God's restored creation. Christ, the ideal king, both reigns over God's restored creation, and enables the church to return to God's intention for humankind at creation.[3]

The chief value of reading Ephesians in the light of ideal kingship is that it enables us to understand the integral connection between the letter's attempt to form the identity *and* behavior of its readers. There is perhaps a connection between these two agendas that is self-evident: in an ideal world, one's behavior flows from the core of who one is. Nevertheless, the indicative and imperative thrusts of Ephesians have more than once been separated from each other by scholars.[4] This study shows that, in the ears of its authorial audience, the letter's imperative thrust flows out of its indicative thrust: the same king who liberated and reconciled them will make them virtuous as he reigns over them.

3. *Avenues for Further Research*

To the extent that this study has succeeded in demonstrating that Christ functions as a type of ideal king in Ephesians, two avenues of further research are warranted. The first avenue to explore is whether, how, and why Christ is portrayed as a royal figure elsewhere in the NT. One of the central conclusions of this study—that the reign of the Christ inculcates virtue—confirms an insight from cultural anthropology, applied to the study of the NT by Bruce Malina. In *The New Testament World*, Malina suggests that the ancient Mediterranean understanding of

---

3. Cf. Cullmann, "Königsherrschaft," 5–10, who argues that in the NT, the kingship of Christ implies his dominion over creation as well as over the church.

4. C. J. Bjerkelund, *ΠΑΡΑΚΑΛΩ: Form und Funktion der parakalo-Sätze in den paulinischen Briefen* (BTN; Oslo: Universiteitsforlaget, 1967), 183.

the self is "dyadic," or corporate, rather than individualistic.[5] That is to say, one perceived oneself primarily as a member of a group, and one's behavior would ideally conform to standards of behavior espoused by that group. Within such a construction of identity, the inculcation of virtue through the reign of an ideal king is easily conceivable. As goes the king, so go the people. Assuming the prevalence of such thinking, one would expect the portrayal of Christ elsewhere in the NT to reflect the background assumption that the reign of Christ is transformative for the lives of his subjects. Matthew, John, and Luke-Acts would be promising texts to investigate for evidence of such beliefs. The belief that the ideal king could inculcate virtue among his subjects is of course but one of many aspects of ideal kingship which might illuminate the portrayal of Christ in the NT.

The second avenue of exploration relates to several questions that have interested interpreters of Ephesians itself. If the dominant fixture in the symbolic world of Ephesians is the reign of God's vicegerent who accomplishes God's will in the church and in the cosmos, the following features of the letter may be better understood in relationship to that fixture: eschatology, ecclesiology, and relationship to the Roman Empire. What follows is a suggestive sketch of how each of these issues might be reconsidered in light of the portrayal of Christ as ideal king in Ephesians.

3.1. *Ephesians and Eschatology*

Ephesians is sometimes believed to differ from the undisputed Paulines in two related ways. To begin with, the letter portrays salvation as a fully realized state, in contrast with the eschatological reserve that characterizes the undisputed Pauline letters. Second, salvation in Ephesians is conceived of largely in spatial

---

5. Bruce J. Malina, *The New Testament World: Insights from Cultural Anthropology* (rev. ed.; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1993), 63–73.

terms. This stands in contrast to the temporal framework derived from Jewish eschatology, which is common to the undisputed Paulines. The distinction drawn between Ephesians and the undisputed Paulines with regard to these two features is sometimes overdrawn.[6] There are, of course, unrealized elements of Ephesians' vision. One notes, for example, the fact that the Spirit has been given as a down payment of an inheritance, the full reception of which lies in the future (1:14). Or again, hostile spiritual powers, although in principle defeated, still exist, and the church must be prepared to stand against them (2:2; 6:10–20). The contrast drawn between the present age the and coming age make clear that the letter's eschatological framework is comprised of both spatial and temporal elements (1:21; 2:7). Nevertheless, the fact that, in the symbolic world of Ephesians, the Christ is already seated on the throne belies a greater measure of eschatological fulfillment than one finds in the undisputed Paulines. These observations regarding the letter's eschatological perspective are sometimes cited as evidence of gnosticizing tendency, and of discontinuity with Pauline tradition.[7]

This comparative lack of eschatological reserve and spatial focus can be helpfully understood, however, in the context of kingship literature. In antiquity, examples can be found of texts which look forward in anticipation of the reign of an ideal king, as well as texts which laud the king who is currently on the throne. *Psalms of Solomon* 17 is a good example of the former: its perspective is dominated by the hope for a future king who will liberate Jerusalem. Pliny's *Panegyricus*

---

6. E.g., Schlier, *Epheser*, 109–12. See, however, Andrew T. Lincoln, *Paradise Now and not Yet: Studies in the Role of the Heavenly Dimension in Paul's Thought with Special Reference to His Eschatology* (SNTSMS 43; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 167, who contends that a coherent reading of Ephesians does not entail the rejection of a futurist eschatology. With Sellin, *Epheser*, 157–58, it is better to see that the author has *both* a temporal (1:10) and spatial (1:23) conceptual framework.

7. See, e.g., Schlier, *Epheser*, 19.

provides an example of the latter. Here the perspective is focused squarely on the present benefits accrued under Trajan's reign. In texts like this, emphasis is laid upon the current benefits derived from the king's reign rather than upon the hope of yet unrealized benefits which lie in the future. Even in texts which look toward the future, it should be added, the anticipated change to be effected by the reign of the king is envisioned as immediate. The return to a golden age, it was believed, would not be brought about in stages, but all at once. Moreover, although a king's reign exists in both space and time, when one discusses a king who is presently reigning, the spatial dimension receives priority. The restoration of the physical territory of Jerusalem was a central element in the anticipated reign of the Jewish ideal king, for example. Similarly, "spear-won territory" was potent evidence of the legitimacy of a Hellenistic king's reign. Hellenistic royal ideology, most notably that of the Neopythagoreans, promised that the subjects of the king could in effect become kings themselves. Their realm was not political, but cosmic. While the one political king ruled a geographical kingdom on earth, his subjects ruled the cosmos with God.[8] The emphasis on the present spatial dimension of a king's reign in such texts is thus both easily explained and conventional.

This emphasis in Ephesians upon the present and spatial dimensions of salvation follows the logic of texts which laud a king who reigns in the present. So when the author claims that Christ currently reigns from the heavens and has authority over the powers, that reconciliation between Jew and gentile has already been achieved, that believers have already been seated with Christ—he is making claims consistent with his overall metaphor of Christ as king. The choice of royal metaphor may also help explain a preference for speaking of "salvation" rather than

---

8. Blumenfeld, *Political Paul*, 233.

"justification" (2:5, 8). The ideal king is commonly thought of as the one who saves rather than as the one who justifies.

Although Ephesian's eschatological perspective is neither fully realized nor entirely spatial, the accent laid on salvation in Ephesians is upon its present and spatial aspects. The letter's emphasis on the present dimension of salvation, however, should not be taken as the wholesale abandonment of a Jewish eschatological perspective characteristic of Pauline tradition. Nor should the emphasis on the spatial dimension of Christ's cosmic reign be read necessarily as evidence of a gnosticizing tendency. Rather, these features of the letter can be explained as cohering with the letter's overall portrayal of Christ as a reigning ideal king. Whatever other significance it may be argued that these features possess must take this into account.

3.2. *Ephesians and Ecclesiology*

It is frequently observed that, in contrast to the christological focus of Colossians, the focus of Ephesians is decidedly more ecclesiological.[9] For E. Käsemann, in fact, Christology has been eclipsed by ecclesiology in Ephesians: "the church has become the central eschatological event. . . . The function of Christology in the letter to the Ephesians consists in caring for the orderly growth of the church.[10] Such a perspective fails to appreciate the relationship between Christology and ecclesiology in the letter, however. Ecclesiology in Ephesians does not eclipse Christology, as though the latter were a minor concern. Indeed, the portrayal of Christ as God's vicegerent—the one whom God has authorized to rule in his stead—strongly suggests that Christology is at the forefront of the letter's

---

9. See, e.g., J. Christiaan Beker, *Heirs of Paul: Paul's Legacy in the New Testament and in the Church Today* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), 70.

10. Ernst Käsemann, *Perspectives on Paul* (London: SCM, 1971), 120–21.

concerns. What Käsemann and others perceive as a relative lack of concern for Christology is better described as a different relationship between Christology and ecclesiology in the letter, as compared to the undisputed Paulines. When the Christ is envisaged as the ideal king who reigns over his kingdom (the church),[11] the proper perspective is restored.[12]

A king is inseparable from his kingdom. That is to say, a king is defined in relation to the people and territory over which he rules. This somewhat self-evident observation points to the true significance of a king, namely that he provides leadership such that his subjects enjoy the benefits of divine blessings. A good king is so thought of because of what he accomplishes on behalf of his people. Indeed, this is the intended effect of royal propaganda, to portray the king as being absolutely essential for the well-being of those over whom he rules. Similarly, one finds in *Fürstenspiegel* literature the persistent effort to convince the king that he must be solicitous for the well-being of his people. Any discussion of kingship—whether it be directed to the king or his subjects—will focus, therefore, on the benefits accrued to the kingdom.

In Ephesians, it is not surprising to find such an evident focus on the church, the realm of the Christ's beneficent rule. The metaphor of an eclipse is, however, an infelicitous mode of describing the church's relationship to Christ in the letter. Rather—to keep with the celestial imagery—the church is the moon reflecting the brilliance of Christ, the sun. One recalls the words of the song quoted by the author of Ephesians: "rise . . . and the Christ will shine upon you"

---

11. It might not be entirely accurate to identify the church with the kingdom of the Christ and God (cf. Eph 5:5). The latter is wider in scope.

12. For a critique of Käsemann's position, see Matera, *New Testament Christology*, 146, 157; Brevard S. Childs, *The New Testament as Canon: An Introduction* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985), 327.

(5:14). To return to the point made above in section two of this chapter—that the motif of kingship reunites the indicative and imperative thrusts of the letter—one may something similar about the relationship between Christology and ecclesiology. The first half of the letter paints a picture of God's plan to restore harmony to the cosmos, a plan he is enacting through his vicegerent. Elements of this plan directly affect the church: God has brought gentiles into the church and has effected peace within the church between gentiles and Jews. The second half of the letter spells out in greater detail the implications of the outworking of Christ's reign for the church: through the Christ's benefactions and through his presence, the church is enabled to walk in a manner worthy of their calling, a manner that is consistent with the restoration of God's intention in creation (cf. 2:10). Perceiving the motif of kingship in Ephesians permits one to see that Christology is not eclipsed by ecclesiology. Rather, even as the ideal king constitutes and gives shape to his kingdom, Christology is the catalyst for ecclesiology in Ephesians.

3.3. *Ephesians and Empire*

The portrayal of the Christ as an ideal king in Ephesians owes much to the conceptual framework of Hellenistic royal ideology. This same ideology was employed in the service of Roman imperial political propaganda. How should the appearance of such concepts in the letter be evaluated? What might the appearance of such ideology within Ephesians imply about the letter's stance towards the Roman empire? For instance, does it signal tacit approval of the Roman empire? That is, does the use of Roman propaganda tools imply support for the structures supported by that propaganda? Such a notion coheres with what some have argued is a larger trend in Ephesians of accommodation to the political and social structures of Rome.[13] The appropriation of royal ideology in Ephesians has little

---

13. Neil Elliott, "The Apostle Paul and Empire," in *In the Shadow of Empire: Reclaiming*

bearing on this question, however. This becomes apparent when it is recalled that the kingship treatise in antiquity functioned as a *Fürstenspiegel*. On the surface, such literature appears to be descriptive: it praises the king, or emperor, for his boundless virtue and perfectly just rule. Yet, in fact, it functions prescriptively, presenting the ruler with the standard of rule to which he must aspire. In effect it seeks to charm the king by flattery into just rule. On this account, the authors of kingship treatises were not themselves necessarily convinced that the king in fact possessed the royal virtues for which they so eloquently lauded him. The use of such ideology, therefore, should not in and of itself be construed therefore as an acceptance of the regimes into whose service the ideology was pressed.

If the conceptual apparatus of royal propaganda in Ephesians does not suggest support for Rome, might it imply just the opposite? Does the letter's characterization of the Christ as an ideal king represent an implicit polemic against the identical claim made on behalf of the Roman emperor? Would the portrayal of Christ as God's vicegerent, his appointed ruler over not only the church but over all creation, have flown in the face of propaganda to the effect that the Roman emperor ruled as Jove's deputy?[14] These questions echo a larger debate regarding Paul and the Roman Empire: did Paul in his letters intend to critique Rome, or ignore it?[15] It is not the intent of this study to adjudicate this complex dispute vis-

---

the Bible as a History of Faithful Resistance (ed. Richard A. Horsley; Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 2008), 100, 114.

14. Cullmann, "Königsherrschaft," 9–10.

15. N. T. Wright, *Paul in Fresh Perspective*, argues that Paul offers a harsh critique of Rome in his letters. By contrast, Christopher Bryan, *Render to Caesar: Jesus, the Early Church, and the Roman Superpower* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), contends that Paul's critique of Rome is merely the critique of *all* human powers found in Israel's scriptures. That is, all human power is accountable to God, and must therefore rule justly. See also the critique of Wright in Seyoon Kim, *Christ and Caesar: The Gospel and the Roman Empire in the Writings of Paul and Luke* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2008). Beskow, *Rex Gloriae*, 71–73, contends that the issue of seemingly anti-Roman sentiment in the NT is the Hellenization of the church's language, rather than a

à-vis Ephesians. Instead, a few observations will be offered with respect to what Ephesians says, and does not say, on the subject of the ideal king.

Warren Carter, in a recent book dealing with the relationship between the NT and the Roman Empire, makes the salutary observation that the reality of the Roman Empire must be "foregrounded" in our reading of NT texts.[16] That is to say, we must acknowledge the fact that NT writers would have been keenly aware of Rome's pervasive and unjust presence in all matters political, cultural, and religious. Carter and others argue elsewhere that much of the NT should be read as a coded critique of Rome's ungodly power. This subversive and subtle critique is discerned by the discovery of what are termed "hidden transcripts."[17] It does not necessarily follow, however, that every NT text is equally and in the same way concerned with Rome.[18] In Ephesians, the very presentation of the Christ as God's vicegerent of course implies that Caesar is not. One must not forget, however, that this crucial implication is precisely that—an implication. The fact that the letter nowhere explicitly condemns Roman rule, or lays out an alternative political vision, should caution one against too quickly concluding that Ephesians represents a perspective diametrically opposed to the Roman Empire. Consider, by analogy, the treatment

---

polemical use of Caesar's titles. Blumenfeld, *Political Paul*, 282–87, goes so far as to claim that Paul's relation to the Roman Empire was distinctly *positive*. He believes that the apostle's support for the empire was paradoxical, however; Paul believed that Rome would survive "only if Christ, or rather a Christ-type, takes over" (291).

16. Warren Carter, *The Roman Empire and the New Testament: An Essential Guide* (Abingdon Essential Guides; Nashville: Abingdon, 2006).

17. See his essay, and others, in Richard A. Horsley, ed., *Hidden Transcripts and the Arts of Resistance: Applying the Work of James C. Scott to Jesus and Paul* (SemeiaSt 48; Leiden: Brill, 2004).

18. I do not mean to imply that Carter himself jumps to such a conclusion without warrant. The question of the stance towards the Roman empire taken by various NT writers is complex. See in particular ch. 6 ("Imperial Theory: A Clash of Theological and Societal Claims") of Carter, *Roman Empire*.

of Augustus in Virgil's work. It goes without saying that Virgil considered Augustus superior to all the kings he conquered. The *Aeneid* should not, for that reason, be read as a polemic against deposed Hellenistic kings. In the same way, Ephesians presents the Christ as vastly superior to any other human or spiritual ruler or power. The letter is not therefore necessarily a polemic against those entities.

Politics and religion were closely connected in the ancient world. They were not, however, indistinguishable concepts. Ephesians is not a political text, but a religious one. This is simply to say that the focus of the letter is not in any sense political; it does not concern itself with the governing of society. The letter's focus is upon what kind of king Christ is, and what kind of lives the subjects of this king should lead. Ephesians appropriates political language, but adapts it to a non-political end. This is not to say, however, that political implications cannot be drawn from the letter; they can, and perhaps should. A thoughtful first-century auditor may well have concluded that wholehearted allegiance to the Roman emperor would be incompatible with loyalty to the Christ. It does not appear to be a central concern of this letter—as it is, for example, of Revelation—to sound this warning. Indeed, whatever the political ramifications of the letter may be, they are not spelled out within the letter itself. This fact is telling. The letter is simply not concerned with how one relates to the Roman empire. Certainly, any flesh-and-blood Christian at the turn of the first century who heard Ephesians might be led to reflect upon his or her relationship to the empire based upon the implications of Christ's lordship. But the ability to prompt a reader to think about things beyond the concerns of the text itself is a feature of good literature in general.

Rome took up royal ideology and applied it to the emperor. The author of Ephesians takes the same ideology and applies it, *mutatis mutandi*, to Christ. The

fact that two masons use the same tools and materials gives no indication of the type of structure they are building. One cannot infer from Ephesians' use of the conceptual framework of royal ideology anything about whether the letter implies a critique of Rome. The polemical nature of a text must be demonstrated by its argument rather than asserted because of an assumed "hidden transcript." The argument of Ephesians has much to say about the kingship of Christ and its significance for the church. Audiences, both ancient and modern, may be led to reflect on the ramification of Christ's kingship to the structures of governance in our own society. Given that the central theme of Ephesians is God's reconciliation of a fractured cosmos, and human governments are of course included in the cosmos, such reflection is clearly in order. It must be kept in mind, however, that such second-order reflection is distinct from the central message of the letter itself.

WORKS CITED

Aalders, Gerhard Jean Daniel. "ΝΟΜΟΣ ΕΜΨΥΧΟΣ." Pp. 315–29 in *Politeia und Res Publica: Beiträge zum Verständnis von Politik, Recht und Staat in der Antike*. Edited by Peter Steinmetz. Palingensia: Monographien und Texte zur Klassischen Altertumswissenschaft 4. Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1969.

Abegg, Martin G., Jr. "The Messiah at Qumran: Are We Still Seeing Double?" *Dead Sea Discoveries* 2 (1995): 125–44.

———. "Messianic Hope and 4Q285: A Reassessment." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 113 (1994): 81–91.

Abrahams, I. "Recent Criticism of the Letter of Aristeas." *Jewish Quarterly Review* 14 (1902): 321–42.

Adam, Traute. *Clementia Principis: Der Einfluss hellenistischer Fürstenspiegel auf den Versuch einer rechtlichen Fundierung des Principats durch Seneca*. Kieler historische Studien 11. Stuttgart: Klett, 1970.

Aeschylus. *Persians*. Translated and edited by Edith Hall. Warminster, England: Aris & Phillips, 1996.

Ahlström, Gösta W. "Administration of the State in Canaan and Ancient Israel." Pp. 587–603 in *Civilizations of the Ancient Near East*. 4 vols. Edited by Jack M. Sasson. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2000.

Aletti, Jean-Noël. *Saint Paul, Epître aux Ephésiens*. Etudes Bibliques. New Series 42. Paris: Gabalda, 2001.

Allan, John A. "The 'In Christ' Formula in Ephesians." *New Testament Studies* 5 (1958): 54–61.

Allison, Dale C., Jr. "The Authorship of 1QS III,13-IV,14." *Revue de Qumran* 10 (1980): 257–68.

Alt, Albrecht. "The Formation of the Israelite State in Palestine." Pp. 171–238 in *Essays on Old Testament History and Religion*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1966.

———. "The Monarchy in the Kingdoms of Israel and Judah." Pp. 241–59 in *Essays on Old Testament History and Religion*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1966.

Aristotle. *The Complete Works of Aristotle: The Revised Oxford Translation*. 2 vols. Edited by Jonathan Barnes. Bollingen Series 71. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984.

———. *Nicomachean Ethics*. 2nd ed. Translated by H. Rackham. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1934.

———. *Politics*. Translated by H. Rackham. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1944.

———. *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*. Translated by H. Rackham. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957.

Arnim, Hans Friedrich August von. *Leben und Werke des Dio von Prusa*. Berlin: Weidmann, 1898.

Arnold, Clinton E. *Ephesians: Power and Magic: The Concept of Power in Ephesians in Light of Its Historical Setting*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 63. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Atkinson, Kenneth. "Herod the Great, Sosius, and the Siege of Jerusalem (37 BCE) in Psalm of Solomon 17." *Novum Testamentum* 38 (1996): 313–22.

———. *I Cried to the Lord: A Study of the Psalms of Solomon's Historical Background and Social Setting*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 84. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

———. "On the Use of Scripture in the Development of Militant Davidic Messianism at Qumran: New Light from Psalm of Solomon 17." Pp. 106–23 in *The Interpretation of Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity: Studies in Language and Tradition*. Edited by Craig A. Evans. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series 33. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.

Audet, Jean-Paul. "Affinités littéraires et doctrinales du Manuel de Discipline." *Revue Biblique* 59 (1952): 219–38.

Austin, M. M. "Hellenistic Kings, War, and the Economy." *The Classical Quarterly* 36 (1986): 450–66.

Badian, Ernst. "Alexander the Great and the Unity of Mankind." *Historia* 7 (1958): 425–44.

Baines, John. "Ancient Egyptian Kingship: Official Forms, Rhetoric, Context." Pp. 16–53 in *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar*. Edited by John Day. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 270. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.

Balch, David L. *Let Wives be Submissive: The Domestic Code in 1 Peter*. Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series 26. Chico, Ca: Scholars Press, 1981.

Baldry, H. C. "Who Invented the Golden Age?" *Classical Quarterly* 2 (1952): 83–92.

Balz, Horst, and Gerhard Schneider, eds. *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament*. 3 vols. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1990.

Barclay, John M. G. *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora from Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE - 117 CE)*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996.

Barker, Ernest. *Greek Political Theory: Plato and His Predecessors*. London: Methuen, 1918.

———. *The Political Thought of Plato and Aristotle*. New York: Putnam's sons, 1906.

Barnard, Leslie W. "The Dead Sea Scrolls, Barnabas, the *Didache* and the Later History of the 'Two Ways'." Pp. 87–107 in *Studies in the Apostolic Fathers and Their Background*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1966.

Barth, Markus. *Ephesians*. 2 vols. Anchor Bible 34–34A. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1974.

Bartlett, John R. *Jews in the Hellenistic World: Josephus, Aristeas, the Sibylline Oracles, Eupolemus*. Cambridge Commentaries on Writings of the Jewish and Christian World, 200 BC to AD 200 1.1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

Barton, John. "The Messiah in Old Testament Theology." Pp. 365–79 in *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar*. Edited by John Day. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 270. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.

Bassler, Jouette M. "Philo on Joseph: The Basic Coherence of De Iosepho and De Somniis II." *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 16 (1985): 240–55.

Beasley-Murray, George Raymond. "The Two Messiahs in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." *Journal of Theological Studies* 48 (1947): 1–12.

Beavis, Mary Ann L. "Anti-Egyptian Polemic in the Letter of Aristeas 130–165 (the High Priest's Discourse)." *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 18 (1987): 145–51.

Becker, Joachim. *Messianic Expectation in the Old Testament*. Translated by David E. Green. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980.

Becker, Jürgen. *Untersuchungen zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen*. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 8. Leiden: Brill, 1970.

Becker, Michael. "4Q521 und die Gesalbten." *Revue de Qumran* 18 (1997): 73–96.

Begg, Christopher. *Josephus' Account of the Early Divided Monarchy: (AJ 8,212–420): Rewriting the Bible*. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum theologicarum Lovaniensium 108. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1993.

———. *Josephus' Story of the Later Monarchy: (AJ 9,1–10,185)*. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum theologicarum Lovaniensium 145. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2000.

Beker, J. Christiaan. *Heirs of Paul: Paul's Legacy in the New Testament and in the Church Today*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.

———. *The New Testament: A Thematic Introduction*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994.

Belayche, N. "Les figures politiques des messies en Palestine de la première moitié du premier siècle de notre ère." Pp. 58–74 in *Politique et religion dans le judaïsme ancien et médiéval*. Edited by D. Tollet. Paris: Desclée, 1989.

Berger, Peter L., and Thomas Luckmann. *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1966.

Bergmann, Marianne. *Die Strahlen der Herrscher: theomorphes Herrscherbild und politische Symbolik im Hellenismus und in der römischen Kaiserzeit*. Mainz: Von Zabern, 1998.

Berry, Edmund. "Dio Chrysostom the Moral Philosopher." *Greece & Rome* 30, no. 1 (April 1983): 70–80.

Beskow, Per. *Rex Gloriae: The Kingship of Christ in the Early Church*. Translated by Eric J. Sharpe. Stockholm: Almquist & Wiksell, 1962.

Best, Ernest. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Ephesians*. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998.

———. "Ephesians 2: A Christian View of Judaism." Pp. 47–60 in *Text as Pretext*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992.

———. "Ephesians: Two Types of Existence." *Interpretation* 47 (1993): 39–51.

———. *One Body in Christ: A Study in the Relationship of the Church to Christ in the Epistles of the Apostle Paul*. London: SPCK, 1955.

———. "Recipients and Title of the Letter to the Ephesians: Why and When the Designation 'Ephesians'?" *ANRW* 2.25.4 (1987): 3247–79.

———. "Who Used Whom? The Relationship of Ephesians and Colossians." *New Testament Studies* 43 (1997): 72–96.

Betz, Hans Dieter. *Lukian von Samosata und das Neue Testament: religionsgeschichtliche und paränetische Parallelen: Ein Beitrag zum Corpus Hellenisticum Novi Testamenti*. Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1961.

Betz, Ulrich. *Einssein in Christus: Eine Einführung in den Epheserbrief*. Kassel: Oncken, 1969.

Béranger, Jean. "Remarques sur la Concordia dans la propagande monétaire impériale et la nature du principat." Pp. 470–91 in *Beiträge zur alten Geschichte und deren Nachleben: Festschrift Franz Altheim*. Edited by R. Stiehl and H. E. Stier. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1969.

Bickerman, E. J. "Zur Datierung des Pseudo-Aristeas." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 29 (1930): 280–98.

———. "The Date of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 69 (1950): 245–60.

Bilde, Per. *Flavius Josephus Between Jerusalem and Rome: His Life, His Works and Their Importance*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series 2. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988.

Bjerkelund, C. J. *ΠΑΡΑΚΑΛΩ: Form und Funktion der parakalo-Sätze in den paulinischen Briefen*. BTN. Oslo: Universiteitsforlaget, 1967.

Blass, Friedrich, Albert Debrunner, and Robert Walter Funk. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Edited by Robert Walter Funk. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Blumenfeld, Bruno. *The Political Paul: Justice, Democracy and Kingship in a Hellenistic Framework*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament 210. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.

Boccaccini, Gabriele. *Middle Judaism: Jewish Thought, 300 B.C.E. to 200 C.E.* Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.

Boer, P. A. H. de. "'Vive le roi!'." *Vetus Testamentum* 5 (1955): 225–31.

Borgen, Peder. "Moses, Jesus, and the Roman Emperor: Observations in Philo's Writings and the Revelation of John." *Novum Testamentum* 38 (1996): 145–59.

Born, Lester K. "The Perfect Prince According to the Latin Panegyrists." *American Journal of Philology* 55 (1934): 20–35.

Bosworth, A. B. "Alexander and the Iranians." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 100 (1980): 1–21.

Bosworth, A. B. *Conquest and Empire: The Reign of Alexander the Great*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

———. *The Legacy of Alexander: Politics, Warfare, and Propaganda Under the Successors*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Bouttier, Michel. *En Christ: Étude d'exégèse et de théologie pauliniennes*. Études d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses 54. Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1962.

———. *L'Épitre de Saint Paul aux Éphesiens*. Commentaire du Nouveau Testament 9b. Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1991.

Bowersock, Glen W. "Greek Intellectuals and the Imperial Cult in the Second Century A.D." Pp. 177–206 in *Le Culte des souverains dan L'Empire Romain*. Edited by Willem den Boer. Geneva: Fondation Hardt, 1973.

Bradley, Keith R. "The Imperial Ideal in Suetonius' 'Caesares'." *ANRW* 2.33.5 (1991): 3701–32.

Braun, F.-C. "Les Testaments des XII Partrairches et le problème de leur origine." *Revue biblique* 67 (1960): 516–49.

Brent, Allen. *The Imperial Cult and the Development of Church Order: Concepts and Images of Authority in Paganism and Early Christianity Before the Age of Cyprian*. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Bréhier, Émile. *Les idées philosophiques et religieuses de Philon d'Alexandrie*. Études de Philosophie Médiévale. Paris: Vrin, 1925.

Bringmann, Klaus. "The King as Benefactor: Some Remarks on Ideal Kingship in the Age of Hellenism." Pp. 7–24 in *Images and Ideologies Self-Definition in the Hellenistic World*. Edited by A. W. Bulloch, E. Gruen, A. Long, and A. Stewart. Hellenistic Culture and Society. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.

Brunt, P. A. "Aspects of the Social Thought of Dio Chrysostom and of the Stoics." *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 19 (1973): 9–34.

Brunt, P. A., and J. M. Moore, eds. *Res Gestae Divi Augusti: The Achievements of the Divine Augustus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1967.

Bryan, Christopher. *Render to Caesar: Jesus, the Early Church, and the Roman Superpower*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Buitenwerf, Rieuwerd. *Book III of the Sibylline Oracles and Its Social Setting: With an Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*. Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha 17. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Bultmann, Rudolf Karl. *Theology of the New Testament*. 2 vols. Translated by Kendrick Grobel. New York: Scribners, 1951–55.

Burkert, Walter. "Zur geistgeschichtlichen Einordnung einiger Pseudopythagorica." Pp. 23–56 in *Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by Kurt von Fritz. Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique 18. Geneva: Fondation Hardt, 1972.

Burnett, Fred W. "Characterization and Reader Construction of Characters in the Gospels." *Semeia* 63 (1993): 3–28.

Busse, Ulrich. "Metaphorik und Rhetorik im Johannesevangelium: Das Bildfeld vom König ." Pp. 279–318 in *Imagery in the Gospel of John: Terms, Forms, Themes, and Theology of Johannine Figurative Language*. Edited by Jörg Frey, Ruben Zimmermann, J. G. Van der Watt, and Gabriele Kern. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 200. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.

Büchsel, Friedrich. "'In Christus' bei Paulus." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 42 (1949): 141–58.

Caird, G. B. *Paul's Letters from Prison: Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Philemon, in the Revised Standard Version*. The New Clarendon Bible. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976.

Cairns, Francis. *Virgil's Augustan Epic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Camponovo, Odo. *Königtum, Königsherrschaft und Reich Gottes in den frühjüdischen Schriften*. Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984.

Canevet, Mariette. "Remarques sur l'utilisation du genre littéraire historique par Philon dans Vita Moysis, ou Moise général en chef-prophète." *Revue des sciences religieuses* 60 (1986): 189–206.

Caquot, André. "Deux textes messianiques de Qumrân." *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses* 79 (1999): 155–71.

———. "Les Hasmonéens, les Romains et Hérode: observations sur Ps Sal 17." Pp. 213–18 in *Hellenica et Judaica: hommage à Valentin Nikiprowetzky*. Edited by A. Caquot, J. Riaud, and M. Hadas-Lebel. Leuven: Peeters, 1986.

Carleton Paget, James. *The Epistle of Barnabas: Outlook and Background*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2/64. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1994.

Carlier, Pierre. "L'idée de monarchie impériale dans la Cyropédie de Xénophon." *Ktèma* 3 (1978): 133–63.

———. "La notion de *pambasileia* dan la pensée d'Aristote." Pp. 103–18 in *Aristote et Athènes*. Edited by Marcel Piérart. Fribourg: Séminaire d'histoire ancienne de l'Université de Fribourg, 1993.

Carter, Warren. *The Roman Empire and the New Testament: An Essential Guide*. Abingdon Essential Guides. Nashville: Abingdon, 2006.

———. "Toward an Imperial-Critical Reading of Matthew's Gospel." *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* 37, no. 1 (1998): 296–324.

Cerfaux, Lucien. *Le Christ dans la Théologie de Saint Paul*. 2nd ed. Lectio Divina. Paris: Cerf, 1954.

———. "Le titre Kyrios et la dignité royale de Jésus." Pp. 1:3–63 in *Recueil Lucien Cerfaux*. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum theologicarum Lovaniensium 6–7. Gembloux: Duculot, 1954.

Chadwick, Henry. "Die Absicht des Epheserbriefes." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 51 (1960): 145–53.

Chae, Young S. *Jesus as the Eschatological Davidic Shepherd: Studies in the Old Testament, Second Temple Judaism, and in the Gospel of Matthew*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen Zum Neuen Testament 2/216. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.

Chaney, Marvin L. "Systemic Study of the Israelite Monarchy." *Semeia* 37 (1986): 53–76.

Charles, R. H. *The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1908.

Charlesworth, James H. "The Concept of the Messiah in the Pseudepigrapha." *ANRW* 2.19.1 (1979): 188–218.

———. "Critical Comparison of the Dualism in 1QS III, 13-IV, 26 and the 'dualism' Contained in the Fourth Gospel." *New Testament Studies* 15 (1969): 389–418.

———. "From Messianology to Christology: Problems and Prospects." Pp. 3–35 in *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.

Charlesworth, James H., ed. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*. 10 vols. Edited by James H. Charlesworth, F. M. Cross, and et al. Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1994.

———, ed. *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.

Charlesworth, M. P. "The Refusal of Divine Honours: An Augustan Formula." *Papers of the British School at Rome* 15 (1939): 1–10.

———. "The Virtues of a Roman Emperor: Propaganda and the Creation of the Belief." *Proceedings of the British Academy* 23 (1937): 105–33.

Chatman, Seymour. *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1978.

Chesnut, Glenn F. "The Ruler and the Logos in Neopythagorean, Middle Platonic, and Late Stoic Political Philosophy." *ANRW* 2.16.2 (1978): 1310–32.

Chester, Andrew. "The Christ of Paul." Pp. 109–21 in *Redemption and Resistance: The Messianic Hopes of Jews and Christians in Antiquity*. Edited by Markus Bockmuehl and James Carleton Paget. London: T&T Clark, 2007.

Chevallier, Max-Alain. *L'Esprit et le Messie dans le Bas-judaïsme et le Nouveau Testament*. Etudes d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses 49. Paris: Presses Universitaire de France, 1958.

Childs, Brevard S. *The New Testament as Canon: An Introduction*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.

Christiansen, Ellen Juhl. "The Consciousness of Belonging to God's Covenant and What It Entails According to the Damascus Document and the Community Rule." Pp. 69–97 in *Qumran Between the Old and New Testaments*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1998.

Chrysostom, John. *Homilies on the Epistle of St. Paul to the Ephesians*. Vol. 13 of *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers,* Series 1. 14 vols. Edited by Philip Schaff. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1886–89.

Claudian. 2 vols. Translated by Maurice Platnauer. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1922.

Clemens, Thoma. "Entwürfe für messianische Gestalten in frühjüdischer Zeit." Pp. 15–29 in *Messiah and Christos: Studies in the Jewish Origins of Christianity*. Edited by Ithamar Gruenwald, Shaul Shaked, and Gedaliahu A. G. Stroumsa. Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum 32. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1992.

Cohen, Shaye J. D. "Respect for Judaism by Gentiles According to Josephus." *Harvard Theological Review* 80 (1987): 409–30.

Collins, Adela Yarbro, and John J. Collins. *King and Messiah as Son of God: Divine, Human, and Angelic Messianic Figures in Biblical and Related Literature*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2008.

Collins, John J. *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora*. 2d ed. The Biblical Resource Series. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2000.

———. "Hellenistic Judaism in Recent Scholarship." Pp. 1–20 in *Jewish Cult and Hellenistic Culture: Essays on the Jewish Encounter with Hellenism and Roman Rule*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 100. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

———. "Messiahs in Context: Method in the Study of Messianism in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pp. 213–29 in *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present Realities and Future Prospects*. Edited by Michael O. Wise, Norman Golb, John J. Collins, and Dennis G. Pardee. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences 722. New York: New York Academy of Sciences, 1994.

———. "The Nature of Messianism in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pp. 199–217 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Their Historical Context*. Edited by Timothy H. Lim, Larry W. Hurtado, A Graeme Auld, and Alison Jack. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000.

———. *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature*. The Anchor Bible Reference Library. New York: Doubleday, 1995.

———. *The Sibylline Oracles of Egyptian Judaism*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 13. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars' Press, 1974.

———. "Sibylline Oracles." Pp. 317–472 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Anchor Bible Reference Library. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1983–85.

———. "Teacher and Messiah? The One Who Will Teach Righteousness at the End of Days." Pp. 193–210 in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Eugene Ulrich and James VanderKam. Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity Series 10. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994.

———. “The Testamentary Literature in Recent Scholarship.” Pp. 268–85 in *Early Judaism and Its Modern Interpreters*. Edited by Robert A. Kraft and George W. E. Nickelsburg. Society of Biblical Literature The Bible and Its Modern Interpreters 2. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.

———. “The Third Sibyl Revisited.” Pp. 82–98 in *Jewish Cult and Hellenistic Culture: Essays on the Jewish Encounter with Hellenism and Roman Rule*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 100. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

———. “What Was Distinctive About Messianic Expectation at Qumran?” Pp. 71–92 in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Second Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins*. Vol. 2. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2006.

Conzelmann, Hans. “Der Brief an die Epheser.”. In *Die kleineren Briefe des Apostels Paulus*. Edited by Hermann Wolfgang Beyer. Neue Testament Deutsch 8. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972.

———. “Was glaubte die frühe Christenheit?” Pp. 106–19 in *Theologie als Schriftauslegung: Aufsätze zum Neuen Testament*. Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie 65. Munich: Kaiser, 1974.

Coutts, John. “Ephesians 1:3–14 and 1 Peter 1:3–12.” *New Testament Studies* 3 (1957): 115–27.

Cullmann, Oscar. *The Christology of the New Testament*. Translated by Shirley C. Guthrie and Charles A. M. Hall. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1959.

———. “Königsherrschaft Christi und Kirche im Neuen Testament.” Pp. 174–92 in *Theologische Studien*, Vol. 10. Edited by Karl Barth. Zürich: Evangelischer Verlag, 1941.

Culpepper, R. Alan. *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.

Dahl, Nils Alstrup. “Adresse und Proömium des Epheserbriefes.” *Theologische Zeitschrift* 7 (1951): 241–64.

———. “Christ, Creation and the Church.” Pp. 422–43 in *The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology*. Edited by W. D. Davies and David Daube. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956.

———. “The Messiahship of Jesus in Paul.” Pp. 15–26 in *Jesus the Christ: The Historical Origins of Christological Doctrine*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.

———. *Studies in Ephesians: Introductory Questions, Text- & Edition-Critical Issues, Interpretation of Texts and Themes*. Edited by David Hellholm, Vemund Blomkvist, and Tord Fornberg. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 131. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.

———. *Studies in Ephesians: Introductory Questions, Text- & Edition-Critical Issues, Interpretation of Texts and Themes*. Edited by David Hellholm, Vemund Blomkvist, and Tord Fornberg. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 131. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.

Daniélou, Jean. *Philon d'Alexandrie*. Les Temps et les destins. Paris: Fayard, 1958.

Darko, Daniel K. *No Longer Living as the Gentiles: Differentiation and Shared Ethical Values in Ephesians 4.17–6.9*. Library of New Testament Studies 375. London: T & T Clark, 2008.

Davenport, Gene L. "The 'Anointed of the Lord' in Psalms of Solomon 17." Pp. 67–92 in *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms*. Edited by John J. Collins and George W. E. Nickelsburg. Septuagint and Cognate Studies 12. Chico, Ca.: Scholars Press, 1980.

Davies, Philip R. "Judaisms in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Case of the Messiah." Pp. 219–32 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Their Historical Context*. Edited by Timothy H. Lim, Larry W. Hurtado, A Graeme Auld, and Alison Jack. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000.

Day, John. "The Canaanite Inheritance of the Israelite Monarchy." Pp. 72–90 in *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar*. Edited by John Day. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 270. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.

Day, John, ed. *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 270. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.

Deichgraber, Reinhard. "Zur Messiaserwartung der Damaskusschrift." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 78 (1966): 333–43.

Deissmann, Adolf. *Die neutestamentliche Formel "in Christo Jesu."* Marburg: Elwert, 1892.

———. *Paul: A Study in Social and Religious History*. Translated by William E. Wilson. Harper Torchbooks. New York: Harper, 1957.

Delatte, Louis. *Les traités de la royauté d'Ecphante, Diotogène et Sthénidas*. Paris: Droz, 1942.

Dell, Katharine J. "The King in the Wisdom Literature." Pp. 163–86 in *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar*. Edited by John Day. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 270. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.

Dexinger, Ferdinand. "Ein 'messianisches Szenarium' als Gemeingut des Judentums in nachherodianischer Zeit." *Kairos* 17 (1975): 249–78.

Dibelius, Martin, and D. Heinrich Greeven. *An die Kolosser, Epheser, an Philemon*. 3d ed. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1953.

Dio Chrysostom. 5 vols. Translated by J. W. Cohoon and H. L. Crosby. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1932–51.

Diodorus Siculus. 12 vols. Translated by Charles Henry Oldfather, C. Bradford Welles, and Russell M. Geer. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1933.

Donaldson, Terence L. "Royal Sympathizers in Jewish Narrative." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 16 (2006): 41–59.

Dudley, Donald Reynolds. *A History of Cynicism from Diogenes to the 6th Century AD*. 2d ed. Bristol Classical Paperbacks. London: Bristol Classical, 1998.

Duff, Tim. *Plutarch's Lives: Exploring Virtue and Vice*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1999.

Duhaime, Jean L. "L'Instruction sur les Deux Esprits et les Interpolations Dualistes à Qumrân (1 QS III,13-IV,26)." *Revue Biblique* 84 (1977): 566–94.

Dunning, Benjamin. "Strangers and Aliens no Longer: Negotiating Identity and Difference in Ephesians 2." *Harvard Theological Review* 99 (2006): 1–16.

Dupont-Sommer, André. *Nouveaux aperçus sur les manuscrits de la mer Morte*. L'Orient ancien illustré 5. Paris: Maisonneuve, 1953.

Düring, Ingemar, ed. *Chion of Heraclea: A Novel in Letters*. Greek Texts and Commentaries. New York: Arno, 1979.

Dvornik, Francis. *Early Christian and Byzantine Political Philosophy: Origins and Background*. 2 vols. Dumbarton Oaks Studies 9. Washington, D. C.: Dumbarton Oaks Center for Byzantine Studies, 1966.

Eder, Walter. "Augustus and the Power of Tradition." Translated by Karl Galinsky. Pp. 13–32 in *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Augustus*. Edited by Karl Galinsky. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Ehrlich, Ernst Ludwig. "Ein Beitrag zur Messiaslehre der Qumransekte." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 68 (1956): 234–43.

Elgvin, Torleif. "Jewish Christian Editing of the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha." Pp. 278–304 in *Jewish Believers in Jesus: The Early Centuries*. Edited by Oskar Skarsaune and Reidar Hvalvik. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2007.

Elledge, C. D. "The Prince of the Congregation: Qumran 'Messianism' in the Context of *Milhāmâ." Pp. 178–207 in Qumran Studies: New Approaches, New Questions*. Edited by Michael Thomas Davis and Brent A. Strawn. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2007.

———. *The Statutes of the King: The Temple Scroll's Legislation on Kingship, 11Q19 LVI 12-LIX 21*. Cahiers de la Revue biblique 56. Paris: Gabalda, 2004.

Elliott, Neil. "The Apostle Paul and Empire." Pp. 97–116 in *In the Shadow of Empire: Reclaiming the Bible as a History of Faithful Resistance*. Edited by Richard A. Horsley. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 2008.

Embry, Brad. "The Psalms of Solomon and the New Testament: Intertextuality and the Need for a Re-Evaluation." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 13 (2002): 99–136.

Engberg-Pedersen, Troels. Review of *The Political Paul. Theologische Literaturzeitung* 133 (2008): 161–62.

Engnell, Ivan. *Divine Kingship: Studies in Divine Kingship in the Ancient Near East*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell, 1967.

Eppel, Robert. *Le piétisme juif dans les testaments des douze patriarches*. Etudes d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses 22. Paris: Alcan, 1930.

Erskine, Andrew. "Approaching the Hellenistic World." Pp. 1–16 in *A Companion to the Hellenistic World*. Edited by Andrew Erskine. Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World. Oxford: Blackwell, 2003.

Farber, J. Joel. "The *Cyropaedia* and Hellenistic Kingship." *American Journal of Philology* 100 (1979): 497–514.

Faust, Eberhard. *Pax Christi et Pax Caesaris: Religionsgeschichtliche, traditionsgeschichtliche und sozialgeschichtliche Studien zum Epheserbrief*. Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus 24. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993.

Fears, J. Rufus. "The Cult of Jupiter and Roman Imperial Ideology." *ANRW* 2.17.1 (1981): 3–141.

———. "The Cult of Virtues and Roman Imperial Ideology." *ANRW* 2.17.2 (1981): 827–948.

———. "Cyrus as a Stoic Exemplum of the Just Monarch." *The American Journal of Philology* 95 (1974): 265–67.

———. "Nero as the Vicegerent of the Gods in Seneca's *De Clementia*." *Hermes* 103 (1975): 486–96.

———. Princeps a Diis Electus: *The Divine Election of the Emperor as a Political Concept at Rome*. Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome 26. Rome: American Academy in Rome, 1977.

———. "The Solar Monarchy of Nero and the Imperial Panegyric of Q. Curtius Rufus." *Historia* 25 (1976): 494–96.

———. "The Stoic View of the Career and Character of Alexander the Great." *Philologus* 118 (1974): 113–30.

———. "The Theology of Victory at Rome: Approaches and Problems." *ANRW* 2.17.2 (1981): 736–825.

Feldman, Louis H. *Josephus's Interpretation of the Bible*. Hellenistic Culture and Society. Berkeley ; London: University of California Press, 1998.

———. *Philo's Portrayal of Moses in the Context of Ancient Judaism*. Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity Series, 15. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 2007.

———. "Restoration in Josephus." Pp. 223–61 in *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives*. Edited by James M. Scott. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 72. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

———. *Studies in Josephus' Rewritten Bible*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 58. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

Fisch, M. H. "Alexander and the Stoics: Part I." *American Journal of Philology* 58 (1937): 59–82.

Fischer, Karl Martin. *Tendenz und Absicht des Epheserbriefes*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 111. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973.

Fishwick, Duncan. "Genius and Numen." *Harvard Theological Review* 62 (1969): 356–67.

———. *The Imperial Cult in the Latin West: Studies in the Ruler Cult of the Western Provinces of the Roman Empire*. 7 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1991–2004.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins*. Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2000.

———. *The One Who is to Come*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2007.

Fowler, Barbara Hughes, trans. *Vergil's Eclogues*. Chapel Hill, N. C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1997.

Fraine, J. de. *L'aspect religieux de la royauté israélite: L'institution monarchique dans l'Ancien Testament et dans les textes mésopotamiens*. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1954.

Frankfort, Henri. *Kingship and the Gods: A Study of Ancient Near Eastern Religion as the Integration of Society and Nature*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948.

Fredricksmeyer, Ernst. "Alexander the Great and the Kingship of Asia." Pp. 136–66 in *Alexander the Great in Fact and Fiction*. Edited by A.B. Bosworth and E.J. Baynham. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Friedländer, Moriz. *Geschichte der jüdischen Apologetik als Vorgeschichte des Christentums*. Zurich: Schmidt, 1903.

Gallagher, Eugene V. *Divine Man or Magician?: Celsus and Origen on Jesus*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 64. Chico, Ca.: Scholars Press, 1982.

Gammie, John G. "Spatial and Ethical Dualism in Jewish Wisdom and Apocalyptic Literature." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 93 (1974): 356–85.

García Martínez, Florentino, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

Garthwaite, John. "Martial, Book 6, on Domitian's Moral Censorship." *Prudentia* 22 (1990): 13–22.

———. "The Panegyrics of Domitian in Martial Book 9." *Ramus* 22 (1993): 78–102.

Gatz, Bodo. *Weltalter, goldene Zeit und sinnverwandte Vorstellungen*. Spudasmata 16. Hildesheim: Olms, 1967.

Gauger, Jorg-Dieter. *Sibyllinische Weissagungen: Griechisch-Deutsch*. Sammlung Tusculum. Dusseldorf: Artemis, 1998.

———. "Antiochos III. und Artaxerxes: Der Fremdherrscher als Wohltäter." *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 38 (2007): 196–225.

Geffcken, Johannes. *Die Oracula sibyllina*. Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1902.

Getty, R. J. "Romulus, Roma, and Augustus in the Sixth Book of the *Aeneid*." *Classical Philology* 45 (1950): 1–12.

Geyssen, John W. *Imperial Panegyric in Statius: A Literary Commentary on Silvae 1.1*. Studies on Themes and Motifs in Literature 24. New York: Lang, 1996.

Gnilka, Joachim. *Der Epheserbrief*. Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 10.2. Freiburg: Herder, 1971.

Gombis, Timothy G. "Cosmic Lordship and Divine Gift-Giving: Psalm 68 in Ephesians 4:8." *Novum Testamentum* 47 (2005): 367–80.

———. "Ephesians 2 as a Narrative of Divine Warfare." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 26 (2004): 403–18.

———. "The Triumph of God in Christ: Divine Warfare in the Argument of Ephesians." Ph.D. diss. University of St. Andrews, 2005.

Goodenough, Erwin R. *By Light, Light: The Mystic Gospel of Hellenistic Judaism*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1935.

———. "Kingship in Early Israel." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 48 (1929): 169–205.

———. "Philo's Exposition of the Law and His De Vita Mosis." *Harvard Theological Review* 26 (1933): 109–25.

———. "The Political Philosophy of Hellenistic Kingship." *Yale Classical Studies* 1 (1928): 55–102.

———. *The Politics of Philo Judaeus: Practice and Theory*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1938.

Goodspeed, Edgar Johnson. *The Meaning of Ephesians*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1933.

Goukowsky, Paul. *Essai sur les origines du mythe d'Alexandre (336–270 av. J.C.)*. 2 vols. Annales de l'Est 60. Nancy: Université de Nancy II, 1978–81.

Gradel, Ittai. *Emperor Worship and Roman Religion*. Oxford Classical Monographs. Oxford: Clarendon, 2002.

Green, Peter. *Alexander of Macedon, 356–323 B.C.: A Historical Biography*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991.

Griffin, Miriam T. *Seneca: A Philosopher in Politics*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1976.

Gruen, Erich S. *Heritage and Hellenism: The Reinvention of Jewish Tradition*. Hellenistic Culture and Society 30. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.

———. "The Coronation of the Diadochoi." Pp. 253–71 in *The Craft of the Ancient Historian: Essays in Honor of Chester G. Starr*. Edited by John William. Eadie. Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1985.

Guthrie, Kenneth Sylvan, trans., David R. Fideler, ed. & intro. *The Pythagorean Sourcebook and Library: An Anthology of Ancient Writings Which Relate to Pythagoras and Pythagorean Philosophy*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Phanes, 1987.

Hacham, Noah. "The *Letter of Aristeas*: A New Exodus Story?" *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 36 (2005): 1–20.

Hadas, Moses, ed. and trans. *Aristeas to Philocrates (Letter of Aristeas)*. Jewish Apocryphal Literature. New York: Harper, 1951.

Hadas, Moses. "Aristeas and III Maccabees." *Harvard Theological Review* 42 (1949): 175–84.

Hadas-Lebel, Mireille. *Flavius Josèphe: Le Juif de Rome*. Paris: Fayard, 1989.

———. "L'évolution de l'image de Rome auprès des juifs en deux siècles de relations judéo-romaines, -164 à +70." *ANRW* 2.20.2 (1987): 715–856.

Hadot, P. "Fürstenspiegel." P. 555ff in *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, vol. 8. Edited by Georg Wissowa, Wilhelm Kroll, Karl Mittelhaus, and Konrat Ziegler. Stuttgart: Druckenmüller, 1972.

Hahn, Ferdinand. *The Titles of Jesus in Christology: Their History in Early Christianity*. Translated by Harold Knight and George Ogg. London: Lutterworth, 1969.

Hall, Edith. *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek Self-Definition Through Tragedy*. Oxford Classical Monographs. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.

Hall, Jonathan M. *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Hammond, N. G. L. *Sources for Alexander the Great: An Analysis of Plutarch's* Life *and Arrian's* Anabasis Alexandrou. Cambridge Classical Studies. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Hann, Robert R. "Christos Kyrios in PsSol 17:32: 'the Lord's Anointed' Reconsidered." *New Testament Studies* 31 (1985): 620–27.

———. "The Community of the Pious: The Social Setting of the Psalms of Solomon." *Studies in Religion* 17 (1988): 169–89.

Hartin, P. J. "ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι τὰ πάντα ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ (Eph 1,10)." Pp. 228–37 in *A South African Perspective on the New Testament*. Edited by J. H. Petzer and P. J. Hartin. Leiden: Brill, 1986.

Hartog, François. *The Mirror of Herodotus: The Representation of the Other in the Writing of History*. Translated by Janet Lloyd. The New Historicism: Studies in Cultural Poetics. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.

Hay, David M. *Glory at the Right Hand: Psalm 110 in Early Christianity*. Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series 18. Nashville: Abingdon, 1973.

Heil, John Paul. *Ephesians: Empowerment to Walk in Love for the Unity of All in Christ*. Society of Biblical Literature Studies in Biblical Literature. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007.

Heinemann, Izaak. *Philons griechische und jüdische Bildung: Kulturvergleichende Untersuchungen zu Philons Darstellung der jüdischen Gesetze*. Hildesheim: Olms, 1962.

Helleman, Wendy E. "Philo of Alexandria on Deification and Assimilation to God." *Studia Philonica* 2 (1990): 51–71.

Hengel, Martin. "'Christos' in Paul." Pp. 65–77 in *Between Jesus and Paul: Studies in the Earliest History of Christianity*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983.

Herrmann, Léon. "La Lettre d'Aristée à Philocrate et l'empereur Titus." *Latomus* 25 (1966): 58–77.

Higgins, A. J. B. "Priest and Messiah." *Vetus Testamentum* 3 (1953): 321–28.

———. "The Priestly Messiah." *New Testament Studies* 13 (1966–67): 211–39.

Hoehner, Harold W. *Ephesians: An Exegetical Commentary*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic, 2002.

Holladay, Carl R. *Theios Aner in Hellenistic-Judaism: A Critique of the Use of This Category in New Testament Christology*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 40. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1977.

Hollander, H. W., and Marinus de Jonge. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary*. Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha 8. Leiden: Brill, 1985.

Honigman, Sylvie. "The Narrative Function of the King and the Library in the Letter of Aristeas." Pp. 128–46 in *Jewish Perspectives on Hellenistic Rulers*. Edited by Tessa Rajak. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007.

Hooke, S. H. "Myth and Ritual: Past and Present." Pp. 1–21 in *Myth, Ritual, and Kingship: Essays on the Theory and Practice of Kingship in the Ancient Near East and in Israel*. Edited by S.H. Hooke. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958.

Horace. *The Odes and Epodes*. Translated by C. E. Bennett. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1934.

Horbury, William. *Messianism Among Jews and Christians: Twelve Biblical and Historical Studies*. London: T&T Clark, 2003.

Horsley, Richard A., ed. *Hidden Transcripts and the Arts of Resistance: Applying the Work of James C. Scott to Jesus and Paul*. Semeia Studies 48. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

———. "The Law of Nature in Philo and Cicero." *Harvard Theological Review* 71 (1978): 35–59.

Howard, George E. "The Letter of Aristeas and Diaspora Judaism." *Journal of Theological Studies* 22 (1971): 337–48.

Höffken, Peter. "Überlegungen zum Leserkreis der 'Antiquitates' des Josephus." *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 38 (2007): 328–41.

Höistad, Ragnar. *Cynic Hero and Cynic King: Studies in the Cynic Conception of Man*. Uppsala: Gleerup, 1948.

Hölscher, T. "Homonoia/Concordia.". In *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae*. Zurich: Artemis, 1981–97.

Hugedé, Norbert. *L'Épître aux Éphésiens*. Geneva: Labor et fides, 1974.

Hultgård, Anders. "Figures messianiques d'Orient comme sauveurs universels dans le monde greco-romain." Pp. 734–48 in *Soteriologia dei culti orientali nell'Imperio Romano*. Edited by Ugo Bianchi and M. J. Vermaseren. Leiden: Brill, 1982.

———. *Composition de l'ouvrage; textes et traductions*. Vol. 2 of *L'eschatologie des Testaments des Douze Patriarches*. 2 vols. Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Historia Religionum 7. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1982.

———. *Interprétation des textes*. Vol. 1 of *L'eschatologie des Testaments des Douze Patriarches*. 2 vols. Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Historia Religionum 6. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1977.

Hurtado, Larry W. *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2003.

Ishida, Tomoo. *The Royal Dynasties in Ancient Israel: A Study on the Formation and Development of Royal-Dynastic Ideology*. Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 142. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1977.

Isocrates. 3 vols. Translated by George Norlin and Larue van Hook. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1954.

Jaeger, Werner von. *Paideia: Die Formung Des Griechischen Menschen*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1936.

Jal, P. "'Pax Civilis'–'Concordia'." *Revue des études latines* 39 (1961): 210–31.

Jauss, Hans Robert. "Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory." Pp. 3–45 in *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1982.

Jervell, Jacob. "Ein Interpolator interpretiert: Zu der christlichen Bearbeitung der Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen." Pp. 30–61 in *Studien zu den Testamenten der Zwölf Patriarchen*. Edited by Walther Eltester. Beiheft Zur Zeitschrift Für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der Älteren Kirche 36. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1969.

Jones, Brian, and Robert Milns. *Suetonius: The Flavian Emperors: A Historical Commentary*. Classical Studies Series. London: Bristol Classical, 2002.

Jones, C. P. *Plutarch and Rome*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1971.

———. *The Roman World of Dio Chrysostom*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1978.

———. "Towards a Chronology of Plutarch's Works." *Journal of Roman Studies* 56 (1966): 61–74.

Jonge, Marinus de. "Christian Influence in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." *Novum Testamentum* 4 (1960): 182–235.

———. "The Earliest Christian Use of Christos: Some Suggestions." *New Testament Studies* 32 (1986): 321–43.

———. "The Expectation of the Future in the Psalms of Solomon." *Neotestamentica* 23 (1989): 93–117.

———. "The Future of Israel in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 17 (1986): 196–211.

———. "Hippolytus' 'Benedictions of Isaac, Jacob and Moses' and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." *Bijdragen* 46 (1985): 245–60.

———. “The Interpretation of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs in Recent Years.” Pp. 183–92 in *Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Text and Interpretation*. Edited by Marinus de Jonge. Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha 3. Leiden: Brill, 1975.

———. “Josephus und die Zukunftserwartungen seines Volkes.” Pp. 205–19 in *Josephus-Studien: Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament*. Edited by Otto Betz, Klaus Haacker, and Martin Hengel. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1974.

———. “The Main Issues in the Study of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.” *New Testament Studies* 26 (1980): 508–24.

———. “Messiah.” Pp. 777–88 in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, vol. 4. Edited by David Noel Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

———. “Die Paränese in den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und in den Testamenten der Zwölf Patrarchen.” Pp. 538–50 in *Neues Testament und Ethik*. Edited by Helmut Merklein. Freiburg: Herder, 1989.

———. “The Psalms of Solomon.” Pp. 159–77 in *Outside the Old Testament*. Edited by Marinus de Jonge. Cambridge Commentaries on Writings of the Jewish and Christian World, 200 BC to AD 200 4. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

———. *Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament as Part of Christian Literature: The Case of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and the Greek Life of Adam and Eve*. Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha 18. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

———. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Study of Their Text, Composition and Origin*. Van Gorcum’s theologische bibliotheek 25. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1953.

———. “Two Messiahs in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs?” Pp. 150–62 in *Tradition and Re-Interpretation in Jewish and Early Christian Literature*. Edited by Jan W. van Henten, H. J. de Jonge, and Peter T. van Rooden. Studia Post Biblica 36. Leiden: Brill, 1986.

———. “Use of the Word ‘anointed’ in the Time of Jesus.” *Novum Testamentum* 8 (1966): 132–48.

Jonge, Marinus de, in collaboration with H. W. Hollander, H. J. de Jonge, and Th. Korteweg. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text*. Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece 1.2. Leiden: Brill, 1978.

Joosten, J. “Christ a-t-il aboli la loi pour réconcilier juifs et païens?” *Etudes théologiques et religieuses* 80 (2005): 95–102.

Josephus, Flavius. *Jewish Antiquities*. 9 vols. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray, Ralph Marcus, and Louis H. Feldman. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1998.

Kaerst, Julius. *Geschichte des hellenistischen Zeitalters*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1927.

Kamlah, Ehrhard. *Die Form der katalogischen Paranese im Neuen Testament*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 7. Tübingen: Mohr, 1964.

Käsemann, Ernst. "Ephesians and Acts." Pp. 288–97 in *Studies in Luke-Acts*. Edited by L. E. Keck and J. L. Martyn. Nashville: Abingdon, 1966.

———. *Perspectives on Paul*. London: SCM, 1971.

Kee, Howard C. "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." Pp. 775–828 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Anchor Bible Reference Library. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1983–85.

———. "The Ethical Dimensions of the Testaments of the XII as a Clue to Provenance." *New Testament Studies* 24 (1978): 259–70.

Kennedy, George Alexander, ed. and trans. *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric*. Writings from the Greco-Roman World 10. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003.

Kienast, Dietmar. *Augustus, Prinzeps und Monarch*. 3d ed. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1999.

Kim, Jay J. "Hierophany and History." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 40 (1972): 334–48.

Kim, Seyoon. *Christ and Caesar: The Gospel and the Roman Empire in the Writings of Paul and Luke*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2008.

Kirby, J. C. *Ephesians: Baptism and Pentecost: An Inquiry Into the Structure and Purpose of the Epistle to the Ephesians*. London: SPCK, 1968.

Kitchen, Martin. *Ephesians*. New Testament Readings. London: Routledge, 1994.

Kittel, Gerhard, and Gerhard Friedrich, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. 10 vols. Translated by Geoffrey William Bromiley. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1985.

Klausner, Joseph. *The Messianic Idea in Israel from Its Beginning to the Completion of the Mishnah*. 3d ed. Translated by W. F. Stinespring. New York: Macmillan, 1955.

Knibb, Michael A. "Eschatology and Messianism in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pp. 2: 379–402 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. Edited by Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

———. "The Interpretation of Damascus Document VII, 9b-VIII, 2a and XIX, 5b-14." *Revue de Qumran* 15 (1991): 243–51.

———. “Messianism in the Pseudepigrapha in the Light of the Scrolls.” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 2 (1995): 165–84.

Knoppers, Gary N. “The Deuteronomist and the Deuteronomic Law of the King: A Reexamination of a Relationship.” *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 108 (1996): 329–46.

Kocsis, Elemer. “Ost-West Gegensatz in den jüdischen Sibyllinen.” *Novum Testamentum* 5 (1962): 105–10.

Kraft, Robert A. *Barnabas and the Didache*. Vol. 3 of *The Apostolic Fathers: A New Translation and Commentary*. New York: Nelson, 1965.

———. “Early Developments of the ‘Two-Ways Tradition(s),’ in Retrospect.” Pp. 136–43 in *For a Later Generation: The Transformation of Tradition in Israel, Early Judaism, and Early Christianity*. Edited by Randal A. Argall, Beverly Bow, and Rodney Alan Werline. Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 2000.

———. “Setting the Stage and Framing Some Central Questions.” *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 32 (2001): 371–95.

Kramer, Werner R. *Christos, Kyrios, Gottessohn: Untersuchungen zu Gebrauch und Bedeutung der Christologischen Bezeichnungen bei Paulus und den Vorpaulinischen Gemeinden*. Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments 44. Zurich: Zwingli, 1963.

Kreitzer, L. Joseph. “The Messianic Man of Peace as Temple Builder: Solomonic Imagery in Ephesians 2:13–22.” Pp. 484–512 in *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel*. Edited by John Day. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2005.

Krieger, Klaus Stefan. “War Flavius Josephus ein Verwandter des hasmonäischen Königshauses?” *Biblische Notizen* 73 (1994): 58–65.

Kugler, Robert A. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.

Kuhn, Karl Georg. “Die beiden Messias Aarons und Israels.” *New Testament Studies* 1 (1955): 168–79.

———. “The Epistle to the Ephesians in the Light of the Qumran Texts.” Pp. 115–31 in *Paul and Qumran: Studies in New Testament Exegesis*. Edited by Jerome Murphy-O’Connor. London: Chapman, 1968.

Kügler, Joachim. “Spüren ägyptisch-hellenistischer Königstheologie bei Philo von Alexandria.” Pp. 231–49 in *Ägypten und der Östliche Mittelmeerraum Im 1. Jahrtausend v. Chr.* Edited by Manfred Görg and Günther Hölbl. Ägypten und Altes Testament 44. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2000.

Lambert, W. G. “Kingship in Ancient Mesopotamia.” Pp. 54–70 in *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar*. Edited by John Day. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 270. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.

Langkammer, Hugolinus. "Jesus in der Sprache der neutestamentlichen Christuslieder." Pp. 467–86 in *Vom Urchristentum zu Jesus*. Edited by Karl Kertelge and Hubert Frankemölle. Freiburg: Herder, 1989.

Langner, C. "Was für ein König ist Jesus?" Pp. 247–68 in *Israel und seine Heilstraditionen im Johannessevangelium*. Edited by Michael Labahn, Klaus Scholtissek, and Angelika Strotmann. Paderborn: Schöningh, 2004.

Langstadt, Erich. "Zu Philos Begriff der Demokratie." Pp. 349–64 in *Occident and Orient*. Edited by Bruno Schindler and A. Marmorstein. London: Taylor's Foreign Press, 1936.

Laniak, Timothy S. "Esther's *Volkcentrism* and the Reframing of Post-Exilic Judaism." Pp. 77–90 in *The Book of Esther in Modern Research*. Edited by Sidnie White Crawford and Leonard Greenspoon. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 380. London: T&T Clark, 2003.

Laperrousaz, Ernest-Marie. "Hérode le Grand est-il 'l'ennemi (qui) a agi en étranger' des Psaumes de Salomon?" Pp. 29–32 in *Politique et Religion dans le Judaïsme Ancien et Médiéval: Interventions au Colloque Des 8 et 9 Décembre 1987*. Edited by D. Tollet. Relais-Desclée. Paris: Desclée, 1989.

Laporte, Jean, ed. and trans. *De Iosepho*. Vol. 21 of *Les oeuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie*. Paris: Cerf, 1964.

Leberl, Jens. *Domitian und die Dichter: Poesie als Medium der Herrschaftsdarstellung*. Hypomnemata 154. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004.

Leisegang, Hans. "Philons Schrift über die Gesandtschaft der alexandrinischen Juden an den Kaiser Gaius Caligula." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 57 (1938): 377–405.

Liebeschuetz, J. H. W. G. *Continuity and Change in Roman Religion*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1979.

Lincoln, Andrew T. "The Church and Israel in Ephesians 2." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 49 (1987): 605–24.

———. *Ephesians*. Word Biblical Commentary 42. Dallas: Word, 1990.

———. *Paradise Now and not Yet: Studies in the Role of the Heavenly Dimension in Paul's Thought with Special Reference to His Eschatology*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 43. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

———. "The Use of the OT in Ephesians." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 14 (1982): 16–57.

Lincoln, Andrew T., and A. J. M. Wedderburn. *The Theology of the Later Pauline Letters*. New Testament Theology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Lindemann, Andreas. *Die Aufhebung der Zeit: Geschichtsverständnis und Eschatologie im Epheserbrief*. Studien zum Neuen Testament. Gütersloh: Mohn, 1975.

Liver, J. "The Doctrine of the Two Messiahs in Sectarian Literature in the Time of the Second Commonwealth." *Harvard Theological Review* 52 (1959): 149–85.

Lohmeyer, Ernst. *Grundlagen paulinischer Theologie*. Beiträge zur historischen Theologie. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1929.

Long, William R. "Ephesians 2:11–22." *Interpretation* 45 (1991): 281–83.

Longenecker, Bruce W., ed. *Narrative Dynamics in Paul: A Critical Assessment*. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 2002.

Lorenz, Sven. *Erotik und Panegyrik: Martials Epigrammatische Kaiser*. Classica Monacensia 23. Tübingen: Narr, 2002.

Lutz, Cora E. "M. Rufus, 'The Roman Socrates'." *Yale Classical Studies* 10 (1947): 3–147.

Ma, John. "Kings." Pp. 177–95 in *A Companion to the Hellenistic World*. Edited by Andrew Erskine. Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World. Oxford: Blackwell, 2003.

MacDonald, Margaret Y. *Colossians and Ephesians*. Sacra Pagina 17. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical, 2000.

———. "The Politics of Identity in Ephesians." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 26 (2004): 419–44.

Mack, Burton L. "Imitatio Mosis: Patterns of Cosmology and Soteriology in the Hellenistic Synagogue." *Studia Philonica* 1 (1972): 27–55.

———. "Wisdom Makes a Difference: Alternatives to 'Messianic' Configurations." Pp. 15–48 in *Judaisms and Their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era*. Edited by Jacob Neusner, William Scott Green, and Ernest S. Frerichs. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Maier, Johann. "Messias oder Gesalbter? Zu einem Übersetzung- und Deutungsproblem in den Qumrantexten." *Revue de Qumran* 17 (1996): 585–612.

———. *The Temple Scroll: An Introduction, Translation & Commentary*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 34. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985.

Malherbe, Abraham J., ed. *The Cynic Epistles: A Study Edition*. Sources for Biblical Study 12. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1977.

Malina, Bruce J. *The New Testament World: Insights from Cultural Anthropology*. Rev. ed. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1993.

Martial. *Epigrams*. 2 vols. Translated by Walter C. A. Ker. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1930.

Martin, Ralph P. "The Christology of the Prison Epistles." Pp. 193–218 in *Contours of Christology in the New Testament*. Edited by Richard N. Longenecker. McMaster New Testament Studies. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2005.

———. *Ephesians, Colossians, and Philemon*. Interpretation. Atlanta: John Knox, 1991.

———. *New Testament Foundations: A Guide for Christian Students*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975–78.

———. "Reconciliation and Unity in Ephesians." *Review and Expositor* 93 (1996): 203–35.

Mason, Steve. *Josephus and the New Testament*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2003.

Masson, Charles. *L'Épitre de Saint Paul aux Éphésiens*. Commentaire du Nouveau Testament 9. Paris: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1953.

Matera, Frank J. *New Testament Christology*. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 1999.

Mauriac, Henry M. de. "Alexander the Great and the Politics of 'Homonoia'." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 10 (1949): 104–14.

Mause, Michael. *Die Darstellung des Kaisers in der lateinischen Panegyrik*. Palingenesia 50. Stuttgart: Steiner, 1994.

McConville, J. G. "King and Messiah in Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History." Pp. 271–95 in *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar*. Edited by John Day. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 270. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.

McHugh, John. "A Reconsideration of Ephesians 1.10b in the Light of Irenaeus." Pp. 302–9 in *Paul and Paulinism*. FS C. K. Barrett. Edited by M. D. Hooker and S. G. Wilson. London: SPCK, 1982.

McKenna, Margaret Mary. "The Two Ways in Jewish and Christian Writings of the Greco-Roman Period: A Study of the Form of Repentance Paranesis." PhD diss. University of Pennsylvania, 1981.

McMahan, Craig. "The Wall Is Gone!" *Review and Expositor* 93 (1996): 261–66.

Meeks, Wayne A. "Moses as God and King." Pp. 354–71 in *Religions in Antiquity*. FS E. R. Goodenough. Edited by J. Neusner. Leiden: Brill, 1968.

———. "The Divine Agent and His Counterfeit in Philo and the Fourth Gospel." Pp. 43–67 in *Aspects of Religious Propaganda in Judaism and Early Christianity*. Edited by Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza. Studies in Judaism and Christianity in Antiquity 2. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1976.

———. *The Prophet-King: Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 14. Leiden: Brill, 1967.

Meisner, Norbert. "Untersuchungen zum Aristeasbrief." PhD diss., 2 vols. Berlin: Kirchliche Hochschule, 1972.

Mendels, Doron. "'On Kingship' in the 'Temple Scroll' and the Ideological *Vorlage* of the Seven Banquets in the 'Letter of Aristeas to Philocrates'." *Aegyptus* 59 (1979): 127–36.

Merkel, H. "Der Epheserbrief in der neueren exegetischen Diskussion." *ANRW* 2.25.4 (1987): 3156–3246.

Mettinger, Tryggve N. D. *King and Messiah: The Civil and Sacral Legitimation of the Israelite Kings*. Coniectanea Biblica: Old Testament Series 8. Lund: Gleerup, 1976.

Meyers, Carol. "King and Kingship: The Early Monarchy." Pp. 221–71 in *The Oxford History of the Biblical World*. Edited by Michael David. Coogan. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Mézange, Christophe. "Josèphe et la fin des temps." Pp. 209–30 in *Le Temps et les Temps: dans les litteratures juives et chretiennes au tournant de notre ere*. Edited by Jean-Claude Ingelaere and Grappe Christian. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 112. Leiden: Brill, 2006.

Michel, Otto, and Otto Betz. "Nocheinmal: 'Von Gott gezeugt'." *New Testament Studies* 9 (1963): 129–30.

Milik, J. T. "Le Testament de Lévi en araméen: Fragment de la Grotte 4 de Qumrân." *Revue Biblique* 62 (1955): 398–406.

Millar, Fergus. *The Emperor in the Roman World (31 BC-AD 337)*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1977.

Mitton, C. Leslie. *The Epistle to the Ephesians: Its Authorship, Origin, and Purpose*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1951.

Moles, John L. "The Career and Conversion of Dio Chrysostom." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 98 (1978): 79–100.

———. "The Date and Purpose of the Fourth Kingship Oration of Dio Chrysostom." *Classical Antiquity* 2 (1983): 251–78.

———. "The Kingship Orations of Dio Chrysostom." Pp. 297–375 in *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar*, Vol. 6. Leeds: F. Cairns, 1990.

Momigliano, Arnaldo. "Camillus and Concord." *Classical Quarterly* 46 (1942): 111–20.

———. "Dio Chrysostomus." Pp. 257–69 in *Quarto contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico*. Storia e Letteratura 115. Rome: Storia e letteratura, 1969.

———. "Seneca Between Political and Contemplative Life." Pp. 239–56 in *Quarto contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico*. Storia e Letteratura 115. Rome: Storia e letteratura, 1969.

Mooren, Leon. "The Nature of the Hellenistic Monarchy." Pp. 204–40 in *Egypt and the Hellenistic World*. Edited by E. Van't Dack, P. Van Dessel, and W. Van Gucht. Louvain: Orientaliste, 1983.

Morford, Mark P. O. "Iubes Esse Liberos: Pliny's Panegyricus and Liberty." *The American Journal of Philology* 113 (1992): 575–93.

Mowinckel, Sigmund. *He That Cometh*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1956.

Muddiman, John. *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians*. Black's New Testament Commentaries. London: Continuum, 2001.

Murray, Oswyn. "Aristeas and Ptolemaic Kingship." *Journal of Theological Studies* 18 (1967): 337–71.

Murray, Oswyn. "Peri Basileias: Studies in the Justification of Monarchic Power in the Hellenistic World." D. Phil thesis. Oxford, 1971.

———. "Philodemus on the Good King According to Homer." *Journal of Roman Studies* 55 (1965): 161–82.

———. "Philosophy and Monarchy in the Hellenistic World." Pp. 13–28 in *Jewish Perspectives on Hellenistic Rulers*. Edited by Tessa Rajak. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007.

———. "Review of Dvornik (1966)." *Journal of Theological Studies* 19 (1968): 673–78.

Nauta, Ruurd R. *Poetry for Patrons: Literary Communication in the Age of Domitian*. Mnemosyne, Bibliotheca Classica Batava. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

———. "Seneca's 'Apocolocyntosis' as Saturnalian Literature." *Mnemosyne* 40 (1987 1987): 69–96.

Neugebauer, Fritz. "Das paulinische 'in Christo'." *New Testament Studies* 4 (1957–58): 124–38.

Newlands, Carole E. *Statius'* Silvae *and the Poetics of Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Nickelsburg, George W. E. *Ancient Judaism and Christian Origins: Diversity, Continuity, and Transformation*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003.

———. *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction*. 2d ed. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005.

———. "Seeking the Origins of the Two Ways Tradition in Jewish and Christian Ethical Texts." Pp. 95–108 in *A Multiform Heritage: Studies on Early Judaism and Christianity in Honor of Robert A Kraft*. Edited by Benjamin G Wright. Scholars Press Homage Series 24. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999.

Nickelsburg, George W. E., and Michael E. Stone. *Faith and Piety in Early Judaism: Texts and Documents*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983.

Niebuhr, Karl-Wilhelm. *Gesetz und Paranese: Katechismusartige Weisungsreihen in der fruhjudischen Literatur*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2/28. Tübingen: Mohr, 1987.

Nikiprowetzky, Valentin. "L'exégèse de Philon d'Alexandrie." *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses* 53 (1973): 309–29.

———. *La troisième Sibylle*. Études juives 9. Paris: Mouton, 1970.

———. "ΚΥΡΙΟΥ ΠΡΟΣΘΕΣΙΣ: note critique sur Philon d'Alexandrie, *De Iosepho*, 28." *Revue des études juives* 127 (1968): 387–92.

Nisbet, R. G. M. "Virgil's Fourth Eclogue: Easterners and Westerners." *Bulletin of the Institute for Classical Studies* 25 (1978): 59–78.

Nock, Arthur Darby. "A Diis Electa: A Chapter in the Religious History of the Third Century." *Harvard Theological Review* 23 (1930): 251–74.

Nodet, Étienne. "Après l'Exil." Pp. 63–76 in *L'Ancien Testament: cent ans d'exegese a l'école biblique*. Edited by Jean-Luc Vesco. Cahiers de la Revue biblique 28. Paris: Gabalda, 1990.

Nolland, John. "Sib Or III. 265–94: An Early Maccabean Messianic Oracle." *Journal of Theological Studies* 30 (1979): 158–66.

North, C. R. "The Religious Aspects of Hebrew Kingship." *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 50 (1932): 8–38.

Novakovic, Lidija. "4Q521: The Works of the Messiah or the Signs of the Messianic Time?" Pp. 208–31 in *Qumran Studies: New Approaches, New Questions*. Edited by Michael Thomas Davis and Brent A. Strawn. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2007.

O'Brien, Peter Thomas. *The Letter to the Ephesians*. Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1999.

Oegema, Gerbern S. "Messianic Expectations in the Qumran Writings: Theses on Their Development." Pp. 53–82 in *Qumran-Messianism: Studies on the Messianic Expectations in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth, Hermann Lichtenberger, and Gerbern S. Oegema. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.

Parsons, Mikeal C. "'Short in Stature': Luke's Physical Description of Zacchaeus." *New Testament Studies* 47 (2001): 50–57.

Pelletier, André, ed. and trans. *Legatio ad Caium*. Vol. 32 of *Les oeuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie*. Paris: Cerf, 1972.

Pelletier, André, ed. and trans. *Lettre d'Aristée à Philocrate*. Sources Chrétiennes 89. Paris: Cerf, 1962.

Pelling, C. B. R. "Plutarch and Roman Politics." Pp. 319–56 in *Essays on Plutarch's Lives*. Edited by Barbara. Scardigli. Oxford: Clarendon, 1995.

———. "Plutarch's *Caesar*: A Caesar for the Caesars?" Pp. 253–65 in *Plutarch and History*. London: Duckworth, 2002.

Percy, Ernst. *Die Probleme der Kolosser- und Epheserbriefe*. Lund: Gleerup, 1946.

Perkins, Pheme. *Ephesians*. Abingdon New Testament Commentaries. Nashville: Abingdon, 1997.

Petersen, Norman R. *Rediscovering Paul: Philemon and the Sociology of Paul's Narrative World*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.

Philo. 12 vols. Translated by F. H. Colson. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1929.

Philonenko, Marc. *Les interpolations chrétiennes des Testaments des Douze Patriarches et les manuscrits de Qoumrân*. Cahiers de la Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses 35. Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1960.

Plato. *Laws*. Translated by Robert Gregg Bury. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1967.

———. *Politicus*. Translated by Harold N. Fowler. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1939.

———. *The Republic*. 2 vols. Translated by Paul Shorey. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1937.

———. *Timaeus, Critias, Cleitophon, Menexenus, Epistles*. Translated by R. G. Bury. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1929.

Pliny. *Letters, and Panegyricus*. Translated by Betty Radice. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1972.

Plutarch. *Lives*. 11 vols. Translated by Bernadotte Perrin. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1914–26.

———. *Moralia*. 15 vols. Translated by Frank Cole Babbitt et al. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1927–69.

Pokorný, Petr. *Der Brief des Paulus an die Epheser*. Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament 10.2. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1992.

———. *Der Epheserbrief und die Gnosis: Die Bedeutung des Haupt-Glieder-Gedankens in der entstehenden Kirche*. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1965.

Pomykala, Kenneth. *The Davidic Dynasty Tradition in Early Judaism Its History and Significance for Messianism*. Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and Its Literature 7. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.

Porter, Joshua Roy. *Moses and Monarchy: A Study in the Biblical Tradition of Moses*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1963.

Porter, Stanley E., ed. *The Messiah in the Old and New Testaments*. McMaster New Testament Studies. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2007.

Powell, Mark Allan. *What is Narrative Criticism?* Guides to Biblical Scholarship. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.

Préaux, Claire. "L'image du roi de l'époque hellénistique." Pp. 53–76 in *Images of Man in Ancient and Medieval Thought: Studia Gerardo Verbeke Ab Amicis et Collegis Dicata*. Edited by Fernand Bossier. Symbolae A/1. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1976.

Price, S. R. F. *Rituals and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Puech, Émile. "Messianisme, eschatologie et résurrection dans les manuscrits de la mer Morte." *Revue de Qumran* 18 (1997): 255–98.

———. "Préséance sacerdotale et messie-roi dans la règle de la congrégation (1QSa ii 11–22)." *Revue de Qumran* 16 (1994): 351–65.

Rabinowitz, Peter J. "Truth in Fiction: A Reexamination of Audiences." *Critical Inquiry* 4 (1977): 121–41.

———. "Whirl Without End: Audience-Oriented Criticism." Pp. 81–100 in *Contemporary Literary Theory*. Edited by G. Douglas Atkins and Laura Morrow. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1989.

Rawson, Elizabeth. "Caesar's Heritage: Hellenistic Kings and Their Roman Equals." *Journal of Roman Studies* 65 (1975): 148–59.

Reiser, Marius. *Die Gerichtspredigt Jesu: Eine Untersuchung zur eschatologicalischen Verkündigung Jesu und ihrem frühjüdischen Hintergrund*. Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen, NS 23. Münster: Aschendorff, 1990.

Reiter, Siegfried. "APETH und der Titel von Philos 'Legatio'." Pp. 228–37 in Epitymbion, *Heinrich Swoboda Dargebracht*. Reichenberg: Stiepel, 1927.

Remus, Harold. "Moses and the *Thaumaturges*: Philo's *De Vita Mosis* as a Rescue Operation." *Laval théologique et philosophique* 52 (1996): 665–80.

Res gestae divi Augusti. Translated by Frederick W. Shipley. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1979.

Rhoads, David M., Joanna Dewey, and Donald Michie. *Mark as Story: An Introduction to the Narrative of a Gospel*. 2nd ed. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999.

Richardson, W. "The Philonic Patriarchs as Νόμος Ἔμψυχος." Pp. 515–25 in *Studia Patristica: Papers Presented to the Second International Conference on Patristic Studies Held at Christ Church, Oxford, 1955*. Edited by Kurt Aland and Frank L. Cross. Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur 63. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1957.

Rietz, Henry W. Morisada. "The Qumran Concept of Time." Pp. 203–34 in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Second Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins*. Vol. 2. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2006.

Robbins, Vernon K. *Jesus the Teacher: A Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation of Mark*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.

Robinson, J. Armitage. *St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians*. 2d ed. London: James Clarke, 1922.

Roetzel, Calvin J. "Jewish Christian – Gentile Christian Relationships: A Discussion of Ephesians 2.15a." *ZNW* 74 (1983): 81–89.

Romilly, Jacqueline de. "Vocabulaire et propagande ou les premiers emplois du mot ὁμόνοια." Pp. 199–209 in *Mélanges de linguistiqe et de philologie grecques offerts à Pierre Chantraine*. Etudes et Commentaires 79. Paris, 1972.

Rooke, Deborah W. "Kingship as Priesthood: The Relationship Between the High Priesthood and the Monarchy." Pp. 187–208 in *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar*. Edited by John Day. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 270. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.

Rordorf, Willy. "An Aspect of the Judeo-Christian Ethic: The Two Ways." Pp. 148–64 in *The Didache in Modern Research*. Edited by Jonathan A. Draper. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 37. Leiden: Brill, 1996.

Rose, Wolter H. *Zemah and Zerubbabel: Messianic Expectations in the Early Postexilic Period*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 304. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.

Runia, David T. "God and Man in Philo of Alexandria." *Journal of Theological Studies* 39 (1988): 48–75.

Saller, R. P. "Martial on Patronage and Literature." *Classical Quarterly* 33 (1983): 246–57.

Samuel, A. E. "The Ptolemies and the Ideology of Kingship." Pp. 168–92 in *Hellenistic History and Culture*. Edited by Peter Green. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.

Sancisi-Weerdenburg, Heleen. "*Yaunā* by the Sea and Across the Sea." Pp. 323–46 in *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity*. Edited by Ira Malkin. Washington, D. C.: Center for Hellenic Studies, Trustees for Harvard University, 2001.

Saulnier, Christiane. "Flavius Josèphe et la propagande flavienne." *Revue Biblique* 96 (1989): 545–62.

Sauter, Franz. *Der römische Kaiserkult bei Martial und Statius*. Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 21. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1934.

Scheid, John. "Augustus and the Roman Religion: Continuity, Conservatism, and Innovation." Pp. 175–93 in *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Augustus*. Edited by Karl Galinsky. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Schiffman, Lawrence H. *The Courtyards of the House of the Lord: Studies on the Temple Scroll*. Edited by Florentino García Martínez. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 75. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

———. "Messianic Figures and Ideas in the Qumran Scrolls." Pp. 116–29 in *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.

Schimanowski, Gottfried. "Der Aristeasbrief zwischen Abgrenzung und Selbstdarstellung." Pp. 45–64 in *Persuasion and Dissuasion in Early Christianity, Ancient Judaism, and Hellenism*. Edited by Pieter Willem van der Horst. Leuven: Peeters, 2003.

Schlier, Heinrich. *Der Brief an die Epheser*. Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1963.

Schmauch, Werner. *In Christus: eine Untersuchung zur Sprache und Theologie des Paulus*. Neutestamentliche Forschungen 1.9. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1935.

Schnackenburg, Rudolf. *Der Brief an die Epheser*. Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 10. Zürich: Benziger, 1982.

———. "Die Kirche als Bau: Epheser 2.19–22 unter ökumenischen Aspekt." Pp. 258–72 in *Paul and Paulinism*. FS C. K. Barrett. Edited by M. D. Hooker and S. G. Wilson. London: SPCK, 1982.

Schofield, Malcolm. "Social and Political Thought." Pp. 739–71 in *The Cambridge History of Hellenistic Philosophy*. Edited by Keimpe Algra, Jonathan Barnes, Jaap Mansfeld, and Malcolm Schofield. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Schowalter, Daniel N. *The Emperor and the Gods: Images from the Time of Trajan*. Harvard Dissertations in Religion 28. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.

Schubart, W. "Das hellenistische Königsideal nach Inschriften und Papyri." *Archiv für Papyrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete* 12 (1935): 1–26.

Schüpphaus, Joachim. *Die Psalmen Salomos: ein Zeugnis Jerusalemer Theologie und Frömmigkeit in der Mitte des vorchristlichen Jahrhunderts*. Arbeiten zur Literatur und Geschichte des hellenistischen Judentums 7. Leiden: Brill, 1977.

Schürer, Emil. *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*. 3 vols. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1909.

Schwartz, Daniel R. "Josephus on Hyrcanus II." Pp. 210–32 in *Josephus and the History of the Greco-Roman Period: Essays in Memory of Morton Smith*. Edited by Fausto Parente and Joseph Sievers. Studia Post-Biblica 41. Leiden: Brill, 1994.

Schweitzer, Albert. *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*. Translated by W. Montgomery. London: A&C Black, 1931.

Schwindt, Rainer. *Das Weltbild des Epheserbriefes: Eine religionsgeschichtlich-exegetische Studie*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 148. Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002.

Scott, Ian W. "Epistemology and Social Conflict in *Jubilees* and *Aristeas*." Pp. 195–213 in *Common Judaism: Explorations in Second-Temple Judaism*. Edited by Wayne O. McCready and Adele Reinhartz. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2008.

Scott, Kenneth. "The Deification of Demetrius Poliorcetes: Part I." *American Journal of Philology* 49 (1928): 137–66.

———. "The Elder and Younger Pliny on Emperor Worship." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 63 (1932): 156–65.

———. *The Imperial Cult Under the Flavians*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1936.

———. "Plutarch and the Ruler Cult." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 60 (1929): 117–35.

———. "Statius' Adulation of Domitian." *The American Journal of Philology* 54 (1933): 247–59.

Sellin, Gerhard. *Der Brief an die Epheser*. 9th ed. Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament 8. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008.

———. "Die religionsgeschichtlichen Hintergründe der paulinischen 'Christusmystik'." *Theologische Quartalshrift* 176 (1996): 7–27.

Seneca. *Apocolocyntosis Divi Claudii*. Translated and edited by Apostolos N. Athanassakis. Lawrence, Kan.: Coronado, 1973.

———. *Moral Essays*. 3 vols. Translated by John W. Basore. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1928.

Shutt, R. J. H., trans. *Letter of Aristeas*. In *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Vol. 2. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Anchor Bible Reference Library. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1983–85.

Simon, Marcel. "Jupiter-Yahvé: Sur un essai de théologie pagano-juive." *Numen* 23 (1976): 40–66.

Slingerland, H. Dixon. "The Nature of Nomos (Law) Within the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 105 (1986): 39–48.

———. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical History of Research*. Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series 21. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1977.

Smallwood, E. Mary, ed. and trans. *Philonis Alexandrini Legatio ad Gaium*. Leiden: Brill, 1970.

———. "Philo and Josephus as Historians of the Same Events." Pp. 114–29 in *Josephus, Judaism, and Christianity*. Edited by Louis H. Feldman and Gohei Hata. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1987.

Smith, Derwood C. "Ephesian Heresy and the Origin of the Epistle to the Ephesians." *Ohio Journal of Religious Studies* 5 (1977): 78–103.

———. "The Two Made One: Some Observations on Eph 2:14–18." *Ohio Journal of Religious Studies* 1 (1973): 34–54.

Smith, Morton. "What Is Implied by the Variety of Messianic Figures?" *Journal of Biblical Literature* 78 (1959): 66–72.

Spicq, Ceslas. "La philanthropie hellénistique, vertu divine et royale (à propos de Tit 3:4)." *Studia Theologica* 12 (1958): 169–91.

Spilsbury, Paul. *The Image of the Jew in Flavius Josephus' Paraphrase of the Bible*. Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum 69. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1998.

Spisak, Art L. *Martial: A Social Guide*. London: Duckworth, 2007.

Sprague, Rosamond Kent. *Plato's Philosopher-King: A Study of the Theoretical Background*. Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 1976.

Stanley, Christopher D. "'Neither Jew Nor Greek': Ethnic Conflict in Graeco-Roman Society." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 64 (1996): 101–24.

Starcky, J. "Les quatres étapes du messianisme à Qumran." *Revue biblique* 70 (1963): 481–505.

Statius. *Sylvae*. Translated by J. H. Mozley. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1928.

Stegemann, Hartmut. *The Library of Qumran: On the Essenes, Qumran, John the Baptist, and Jesus.* Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1998.

———. "Some Remarks to 1QSa, to 1QSb, and to Qumran Messianism." *Revue de Qumran* 17 (1996): 479–505.

Sterling, Gregory E. "Platonizing Moses: Philo and Middle Platonism." *Studia Philonica* 5 (1993): 96–111.

Stewart, Andrew F. *Faces of Power: Alexander's Image and Hellenistic Politics.* Hellenistic Culture and Society. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.

Stewart, R. S. "The Sinless High Priest." *New Testament Studies* 14 (1967–68): 126–35.

Strabo. *Geography.* 8 vols. Translated by Horace Leonard Jones and J. R. Sitlington Sterrett. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1917–33.

Stuckenbruck, Loren T. "Messianic Ideas in the Apocalyptic and Related Literature of Early Judaism." Pp. 90–113 in *The Messiah in the Old and New Testaments.* Edited by Stanley E. Porter. McMaster New Testament Studies. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2007.

Stuhlmacher, Peter. *Reconciliation, Law, & Righteousness: Essays in Biblical Theology.* Translated by Everett R. Kalin. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986.

Suetonius. *Lives of the Caesars.* Translated by J.C. Rolfe. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1914.

Suggs, M. Jack. "The Christian Two Ways Tradition: Its Antiquity, Form and Function." Pp. 60–74 in *Studies in New Testament and Early Christian Literature: Essays in Honor of Allen P. Wikgren.* Edited by David Edward Aune. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 33. Leiden: Brill, 1972.

Sullivan, J.P. *Martial, the Unexpected Classic: A Literary and Historical Study.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Suolahti, Jaakko. *The Roman Censors: A Study on Social Structure.* Suomalaisen Tiedeakatemian Toimituksia. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1963.

Syme, Ronald. *The Augustan Aristocracy.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986.

———. *The Roman Revolution.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1939.

Talbert, Charles H. "Concept of Immortals in Mediterranean Antiquity." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 94 (1975): 419–36.

———. *Ephesians and Colossians.* Paideia. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic, 2007.

———. *Reading the Sermon on the Mount: Character Formation and Decision Making in Matthew 5–7*. Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 2004.

Talmon, Shemaryahu. "Waiting for the Messiah: The Spiritual Universe of the Qumran Covenanters." Pp. 111–37 in *Judaisms and Their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era*. Edited by Jacob Neusner, William Scott Green, and Ernest S. Frerichs. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Tarn, W. W. *Alexander the Great and the Unity of Mankind*. London: Milford, 1933.

———. *Alexander the Great*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1948.

Tatum, James. *Xenophon's Imperial Fiction: On the Education of Cyrus*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989.

Tatum, W. Jeffrey. "The Regal Image in Plutarch's Lives." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 116 (1996): 135–61.

Taylor, Lily Ross. *The Divinity of the Roman Emperor*. American Philological Association Monograph Series 1. Middletown, Conn.: American Philological Association, 1931.

Tcherikover, V. "The Ideology of the Letter of Aristeas." *Harvard Theological Review* 51 (1958): 59–85.

Thackeray, H. St. J. "Translation of the Letter of Aristeas." *Jewish Quarterly Review* 15 (1903): 337–91.

Theon, Aelius. "The Exercises." Pp. 1–72 in *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric*. Translated by George Alexander Kennedy. Writings from the Greco-Roman World. Atlanta: Society of biblical literature, 2003.

Thesleff, Holger. *An Introduction to the Pythagorean Writings of the Hellenistic Period*. Åbo: Åbo akademi, 1961.

———. "On the Problem of the Doric Pseudo-Pythagorica: An Alternative Theory of Date and Purpose." Pp. 57–87 in *Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by Kurt von Fritz. Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique 18. Geneva: Fondation Hardt, 1972.

———. *The Pythagorean Texts of the Hellenistic Period*. Acta Academiae Aboensis 30.1. Åbo: Åbo Akademi, 1965.

Thomas, Johannes. "Aktuelles im Zeugnis der zwölf Väter." Pp. 62–150 in *Studien zu den Testamenten der Zwölf Patriarchen*. Edited by Walther Eltester. Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche 36. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1969.

Torijano, Pablo A. *Solomon the Esoteric King: From King to Magus, Development of a Tradition*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 73. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

Tracy, Sterling. "III Maccabees and Pseudo-Aristeas: A Study." *Yale Classical Studies* 1 (1928): 241–52.

Trafton, Joseph L. "The Bible, the *Psalms of Solomon*, and Qumran." Pp. 427–46 in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Second Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins*. Vol. 2. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2006.

———. "The Psalms of Solomon in Recent Research." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 12 (1994): 3–19.

Tromp, Johannes. "The Davidic Messiah in Jewish Eschatology of the First Century BCE." Pp. 179–201 in *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives*. Edited by James M. Scott. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 72. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

———. "The Sinners and the Lawless in Psalm of Solomon 17." *Novum Testamentum* 35 (1993): 344–61.

Ulrichsen, Jarl Henning. *Die Grundschrift der Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen: eine Untersuchung zu Umfang, Inhalt und Eigenart der ursprünglichen Schrift*. Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Historia Religionum 10. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1991.

Valdenberg, V. "La théorie monarchique de Dion Chrysostome." *Revue des études grecques* 40 (1927): 142–62.

VanderKam, James. "Messianism in the Scrolls." Pp. 211–34 in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Eugene Ulrich and James VanderKam. Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity Series 10. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994.

Vaux, Roland de. "The King of Israel, Vassal of Yahweh." Pp. 152–80 in *The Bible and the Ancient Near East*. Translated by Damian McHugh. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1971.

Veldhuizen, Milo van. "Moses: A Model of Hellenistic Philanthropia." *Reformed Review* 38 (1985): 215–24.

Vermes, Geza. *Jesus the Jew: A Historian's Reading of the Gospels*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981.

Villiers, P. G. R. de. "The Messiah and Messiahs in Jewish Apocalyptic." *Neotestamentica* 12 (1978): 75–110.

Virgil. *Works*. Rev. ed. 2 vols. Translated by H. Rushton Fairclough. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1934.

Viteau, J. *Les Psaumes de Salomon: Introduction, texte grec, et traduction.* Documents pour l'étude de la Bible. Paris: Letouzy et Ané, 1911.

Volkmann, Hans. "Ἔνδοξος δουλεία als ehrenvoller Knechtsdienst gegenüber dem Gesetz." *Philologus* 16 (1956): 52–61.

Volz, Paul. *Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter.* Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1934.

Völker, Walther. *Fortschritt und Vollendung bei Philo von Alexandrien: Eine Studie zur Geschichte der Frömmigkeit.* Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur 49.1. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1938.

Wachsmuth, Curtius, and Otto Hense, eds. and trans. *Ioannis Stobaei Anthologium.* Berlin: Weidmann, 1884–1912.

Walbank, F. W. "Monarchies and Monarchic Ideas." Pp. 62–100 in *Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. 7.2. Edited by F. W Walbank, A. E. Astin, M. W. Frederiksen, and R. M. Ogilvie. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament.* Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan, 1996.

Wallace-Hadrill, Andrew. "Civilis Princeps: Between Citizen and King." *Journal of Roman Studies* 72 (1982): 32–48.

———. "The Emperor and His Virtues." *Historia* 30 (1981): 298–323.

———. "The Golden Age and Sin in Augustan Ideology." *Past and Present* 95 (1982): 19–36.

———. *Suetonius.* 2d ed. Bristol Classical Paperbacks. London: Bristol Classical, 1995.

Wasserstein, Abraham, and David J. Wasserstein. *The Legend of the Septuagint: From Classical Antiquity to Today.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Wegenast, Klaus. *Das Verständnis der Tradition bei Paulus und in den Deuteropaulinen.* Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 8. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1962.

Weinstock, Stefan. *Divus Julius.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1971.

Weippert, Otto. "Alexander-Imitatio und römische Politik in republikanischer Zeit." PhD diss. Augsburg: University of Würzburg, 1972.

Weiss, Johannes. *Earliest Christianity: A History of the Period A.D. 30–150.* 2 vols. Translated and edited by Frederick C. Grant. Harper Torchbooks. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959.

Wengst, Klaus. *Pax Romana and the Peace of Jesus Christ*. Translated by John Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.

Werline, Rodney Alan. "The Psalms of Solomon and the Ideology of Rule." Pp. 69–87 in *Conflicted Boundaries in Wisdom and Apocalypticism*. Edited by Benjamin G. Wright, III and Lawrence M. Wills. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 35. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005.

Whitelam, Keith W. "Israelite Kingship: The Royal Ideology and Its Opponents." Pp. 119–40 in *The World of Ancient Israel: Sociological, Anthropological, and Political Perspectives*. Edited by R. E. Clements. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Wickert, Lothar. "Princeps (Civitatis)." Pp. 1998–2296 in *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, vol. 22.2. Edited by Georg Wissowa, Wilhelm Kroll, Karl Mittelhaus, and Konrat Ziegler. Stuttgart: Druckenmüller, 1954.

Widengren, Geo. *Sakrales Königtum im Alten Testament und im Judentum*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1955.

Williams, Gordon. "Poetry in the Moral Climate of Augustan Rome." *Journal of Roman Studies* 52 (1962): 28–46.

Willitts, Joel. *Matthew's Messianic Shepherd-King: In Search of 'the Lost Sheep of the House of Israel.'* Beihefte zur Zeitschrift fèur die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der èalteren Kirche 147. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007.

Wise, Michael, Martin Abegg, and Edward Cook. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1996.

Wistrand, Erik Karl Hilding. *Felicitas Imperatoria*. Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia 48. Göteborg, Sweden: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis, 1987.

Wittlieb, Marian. "Die theologische Bedeutung der Erwähnung von 'Māšîaḥ/Christós' in den Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments palästinischen Ursprungs." *Biblische Notizen* 50 (1989): 26–33.

Wolfson, Harry Austryn. *Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*. 2d rev. ed. 2 vols. Structure and Growth of Philosophic Systems from Plato to Spinoza. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1948.

Woude, A. S. van der. *Die messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumran*. Studia Semitica Neerlandica 3. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1957.

Wright, N. T. *Paul in Fresh Perspective*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005.

Wright, Robert B., ed. and trans. *Psalms of Solomon: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text*. Jewish and Christian Texts in Contexts and Related Studies 1. London: T&T Clark, 2007.

Wright, Robert B., trans. *Psalms of Solomon*. In *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Vol. 2. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Anchor Bible Reference Library. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1983–85.

Xenophon. *Cyropaedia*. 2 vols. Translated by Walter Miller. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1914.

———. *Memorabilia and Oeconomicus*. Translated by E. C. Marchant. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1953.

Xeravits, Géza G. *King, Priest, Prophet: Positive Eschatological Protagonists of the Qumran Library*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 47. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Yadin, Yigael. *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light Against the Sons of Darkness*. Translated by Chaim Rabin. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962.

———. *The Temple Scroll: The Hidden Law of the Dead Sea Sect*. New York: Random House, 1985.

Yee, Tet-Lim N. *Jews, Gentiles, and Ethnic Reconciliation: Paul's Jewish Identity and Ephesians*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 130. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Yoder Neufeld, Thomas R. *'Put on the Armour of God': The Divine Warrior from Isaiah to Ephesians*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 140. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.

Ziccardi, Costantino Antonio. *The Relationship of Jesus and the Kingdom of God According to Luke-Acts*. Tesi Gregoriana. Roma: Editrice Pontificia Universita Gregoriana, 2008.

Zimmermann, Johannes. *Messianische Texte aus Qumran: Königliche, priesterliche und prophetische Messiasvorstellungen in den Schriftfunden von Qumran*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen Zum Neuen Testament 2/104. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.

Zuntz, Günther. "Aristeas Studies I: 'The Seven Banquets'." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 4 (1959): 21–36.

———. "Zum Aristeas-Text." *Philologus* 102 (1958): 240–46.