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Abstract

This thesis addresses the question of how the exalted Jesus relates to the God of Israel in Paul’s theology, and the function of Jesus’ subordination within that relationship. In approaching christology, scholars frequently turn to analogies that can shed light on the portrayal of Jesus as a divine figure, such as the analogies of Adam, angels, the Davidic king, and, more recently, God himself. However, the use of these analogies leads the interpreter to emphasise either Jesus’ unity with God or his distinction from God as constitutive of his identity. None of these analogies sufficiently balance Jesus’ exercising of divine prerogatives with his subordinate role as obedient agent and as mediator to believers.

As a different means of approach, this thesis uses a Graeco-Roman first-century understanding of asymmetrical social-relations, namely those between patrons, brokers and clients, to analyse elements of reciprocity, asymmetry and dependence in four christological texts. It employs Greek sources to identify a common perception of patronage and brokerage in Paul’s cultural context, along with its associated vocabulary, that can be applied to the interactions between God and Jesus.

By reading Philippians 2:6-11, 1 Corinthians 15:20-28, Ephesians 1:20-23 and 1 Corinthians 8:6 in comparison with a range of patron-broker-client relationships, we find that Jesus is consistently portrayed as a loyal agent in relation to God and as a patronal benefactor in relation to believers. Jesus’ loyal service is a reciprocal response to God’s raising and empowering of him and, in turn, determines the way that he is positioned alongside God as an object of worship. In light of the interdependency involved in patron-client relationships, the worship of Jesus also honours God, thus maintaining God’s primary position as the Father. Whilst the relation between Jesus’ unity with God and his distinction from God is, at times, ambiguous, the analogy of the broker provides a coherent framework for understanding his multifaceted position between God and mankind.
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CHAPTER 1: Introduction: A study of the ‘shape’ of the relationship between God and Jesus through a Graeco-Roman cultural lens

1.1. Aims and occasion: The relationship between God and Jesus from a Graeco-Roman perspective, and the problems in scholars’ uses of analogies.

This thesis addresses the question of how the exalted Jesus relates to the God of Israel in Paul’s theology. It explores Jesus’ subordinate role in relation to God the Father and the way that this role functions with Paul’s conception of Jesus’ divinity. Two issues provide the context for this study. The first is a lack of detailed work on ‘subordination’ motifs in Paul’s christology within a first-century Graeco-Roman cultural context. The second is the imbalance in the ways that scholars use analogies to analyse Paul’s christology. Some scholars focus on intermediary figures from Second Temple Jewish traditions to explain how Paul can envision a subordinate heavenly figure to share in God’s divinity. Others argue that only the figure of God himself provides a suitable analogy for the role of Jesus in Paul’s theology. Questions remain as to whether either of these approaches can sufficiently explain how Paul depicts Jesus as both divine and as a subordinate agent.

1.2. Scope and approach: Using a Greek perception of asymmetrical social relations to analyse the relational dynamics in Paul’s christology

This thesis proposes that certain forms of interpersonal relationship in Paul’s Graeco-Roman cultural context shed light on the relational dynamics between God, Jesus and believers. The thesis isolates the pattern of interaction between God and Jesus in four texts from Paul’s letters. It uses the sociological models of patronage and brokerage to compare the pattern of interaction between God and Jesus with certain relationships in the Graeco-Roman world—relationships that exemplify an ideology of interaction between persons of asymmetrical status. It argues that patterns of resource exchange between patrons, brokers and clients provide a conceptual framework for understanding how early Christians could both worship Jesus and treat Jesus as an agent distinct from God.
To aid its comparative analysis, the thesis collects lexical data from depictions of ‘patronal’ and brokered relationships in the first-century Graeco-Roman world. It categorises the lexica according to ‘labels’, ‘reciprocal actions’, ‘attributes’ and ‘attitudes’ in order to demonstrate a common set of characteristics and expectations that Greek speakers attached to the relationships between patrons and clients and to reciprocal relationships between persons of unequal statuses in the early principate. These lexica are compared with the lexica of the Pauline texts to analyse similarities and differences in characterisation. Areas of similarity are used to interpret the significance of the interactions between God and Jesus in Paul’s social world—how their interactions communicate information about their respective statuses and about their respective roles in the exchange of resources between themselves and believers. Areas of difference are used to analyse Paul’s understanding of the relationship between God and Jesus in contrast to popular expectations of certain ‘patronal’ relationships.

1.2.1. Isolating the interactions between God and Jesus in the Pauline texts based on concentrations of lexical data

The first stage has been to identify the interactions between God and Jesus. This was done by surveying Paul’s letters to identify the actions that God and Jesus perform on one another, that God performs for believers through Jesus and that Jesus performs for believers on behalf of God. From here, three texts—Phil 2:6-11, 1 Cor 15:20-28 and Eph 1:20-23—were selected for their concentrated sets of data relating to actions performed by God and Jesus in relation to one another and to believers.

Whereas focussing on a single text such as 1 Corinthians would have the advantage of allowing the text to be read on its own terms, and thus minimising the degree to the text could be shaped to suit the interpreter’s question, we are limited by the fact that Paul nowhere presents a systematised account of his christology. Rather, Paul largely argues from it. Fee concludes that, of the whole Pauline corpus, only Col 1:15-20 can be said to be a truly christological text.¹ Thus, this thesis analyses the more explicit, concentrated interactions between God and Jesus in Phil 2:6-11, 1 Cor

¹ Fee (2007: 2).
15:20-28 and Eph 1:20-23, to identify the ‘shape’ of the relationship that is then, in turn, identified in briefer christological references, such as 1 Cor 8:6. This text is treated with great significance in reconstructions of Paul’s christology but instead of treating it as paradigmatic for Paul’s christology, our approach is to interpret its significance in light of more explicit christological patterns from the wider letter.

Some might question the inclusion of Ephesians amongst ‘Paul’s letters’ and the neglect of Col 1:15-20. Col 1:15-20 contains important christological titles pertaining to the relationship between Jesus, God and creation, such as εἰκών τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀδράτου, and πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως. However, it lacks the verbs expressing the actions that God and Jesus perform in relation to one another, in contrast to Eph 1:20-23 where God raises Jesus, seats Jesus in heaven and Jesus fills all things. Colossians 1:15-20 has received more critical attention in recent years and, whilst it is of great value as a doxology to Christ, it largely focuses on Jesus in his mediating position between God and creation, rather than focussing on God and his actions upon Jesus. Regarding the authorship of Ephesians, it is this author’s judgement that the reasons given against authenticity are not convincing enough to dismiss Pauline authorship. The letter’s unique occasion, literary genre and style sufficiently account for its differences to the undisputed epistles.

That said, given the significant disagreement between scholars, it is worthwhile justifying the value of Ephesians as a witness to Paul’s christology in a Graeco-Roman context in both of its historical reconstructions. As an authentic letter written towards the end of Paul’s life, Ephesians attests the continued significance of christological subordination in Paul’s thought. As a pseudonymous letter, Ephesians is highly valuable as a source for the very early reception of Paul’s christology, affirming the successful transmission of Paul’s christological teaching amongst his followers and amongst Christian communities in Asia Minor shortly after his death.

---

2 See Hoehner (2002) for a thorough analysis of the debate over authorship. O’Brien (1999) argues that the intolerance of pseudonymity shown by some early church leaders makes it easier to imagine the letter being written by the apostle to his contemporaries rather than by a writer to Christians living a generation after Paul’s death. However, this difficulty in imagination does not make pseudonymity impossible. It cannot be discounted that a pseudonymous letter could have been judged to be sufficiently Pauline by in some Christian communities.

3 Fowl (1990: 17, 28) states that there is currently no way of knowing with certainty whether Paul wrote Ephesians.
With regards to the essential structure of the relationship between God and Jesus, Eph 1:20-23 shows significant continuity with 1 Cor 15:20-28 and Phil 2:6-11.

1.2.2. Comparing the relationship between God and Jesus with asymmetrical social relations in the Graeco-Roman world

The second stage of the process was to select relationships from Paul’s Graeco-Roman context based on common characteristics identified from the God-Jesus relationship in Phil 2:6-11, 1 Cor 15:20-28 and Eph 1:20-23. Characteristics include structural features such as asymmetry, reciprocal exchange of resources, dependency and mediation. We have predominantly selected parallels from ‘patronal’ relationships involving the Roman emperor—those between the emperor and his legates, and those between the emperor and his patron deity. Whilst chapter 3 will define our use of the term ‘patronage’ against the background of Graeco-Roman social relations, for now it will suffice to say that there are strong thematic reasons for reading Paul’s depiction of God and Jesus through the lens of Roman imperial structures.

Second Temple Judaism had a long tradition of using metaphors of royal rule to envisage their deity. Their depictions of the heavenly throne room with its hierarchies of angelic intermediaries echoed the structures of government employed by Judea’s distant overlords. The thematic parallels are quite clear: the principes of the early Roman Empire were paternal figures wielding absolute public authority. They had vast material resources at their disposal to maintain and govern the communities under their protection. They empowered specific individuals to represent and broker their interests. Favoured individuals could raise their fortunes dramatically through loyal service. From the perspective of imperial ideology, the princeps himself was a broker who stood at the intersection of divine and human spheres. He stood before state as a vice-regent of divine rule, and before the gods as priest on behalf of his people. Thematic parallels provide a starting point for using relationships involving the emperor as means for exploring dynamics of resource-exchange between God, Jesus and believers.
The thesis uses lexical data collected from depictions of ‘patronal’ and brokered relationships to aid its comparative analysis. The data are found to consistently feature combinations of terms relating to status, power, benefaction, honour, transaction, family and agency—combinations that are also found in Phil 2:6-11, 1 Cor 15:20-28 and Eph 1:20-23. Individual motifs expressing the types of actions that God and Jesus perform in relation to one another, and the resources that they exchange, are explored against the background of these patronal relationships.

Given that familial terminology features in each of the Pauline texts selected for analysis, it is important to address the reason for using patronal and brokered relationships as heuristic tools rather than familial relationships. Firstly, patronal relationships are characterised by reciprocity and resource exchange. Whilst the significance of Paul’s language of divine sonship is disputed, the patron-client model provides a means for analysing the exchange of resources between God and Jesus. In Paul’s writings, such exchange is manifested most explicitly in Jesus’ death as an act of obedience and in God’s resurrection and exaltation of him.

Patronal relationships also involve familial terminology. Sources are known to describe parent-child relationships in the terms of patronal relationships and vice versa. In fact, the parent-child and patron-client relationship are closely related conceptually. Both relationships are characterised by hierarchy and reciprocity. Roman clients were thought of as an extension of the family unit. The familial language of patron-client relationships will be discussed in the Excursus where we demonstrate that the title ‘father’ could be used to describe and address patrons in a variety of situations.

Lastly, the patron-broker-client relationship better fits the relationships between God, Jesus and believers than do the categories of family relationships. Even when Paul uses the title ‘Son of God’ in familial contexts such as that of adoption (Gal

---

4 Fee (2007: 546-542) understands the title to speak of Jesus’ pre-existent, ontological relation to God whilst Hurtado argues that it is used primarily to speak of Jesus’ unique status and intimate relationship of favour with God (2000: 900, 903). Peppard (2011: 135-140) has made a recent case for reading the title in the context of royal adoption.

5 See, for example Hierocles 4.25.53 and Seneca the Younger, Ben. 2.11.5 who describe the duties of parents in terms of benefaction.

6 Burke (2003: 50-95).
3:26; 4:4, 6), he depicts Jesus as an agent sent to create new relationships between God and believers, based on πίστις. Thus, this thesis has also used parallels from the Graeco-Roman world of brokers who are also sons of their imperial patrons, such as Germanicus, Titus and Commodus to interpret Paul’s christology. Although the patron-client model certainly does not exhaust all aspects of father-son relationships, it provides a framework for analysing personal interactions between a larger group of actors.

1.2.3. Using parallels and sources that are relevant to Paul and his churches

Our focus is on the Graeco-Roman context—the wider social, political and cultural background of Paul’s audience—rather than on the Jewish background.7 It does not focus on the origins of early christology but the shape of the relationship between God and Jesus in the Pauline corpus, that is, in the letters to communities made up largely of Greek and Roman converts. In the cities of Asia Minor, Macedonia, Achaea and finally Rome, Paul the apostle to the Gentiles communicated his Christ-devotion to Greeks and Romans enmeshed in the social matrices of urban life.8 To fully understand Paul’s christology, it is necessary to place his depictions of—and devotion to—Jesus within such matrices.9 Whilst sources belonging to the Graeco-Roman context predominate in this thesis, the relational structures to which they attest would be deeply familiar to Jewish inhabitants of the Roman empire.10

Our selection of sources for comparative work is made on the bases of historical period and language. Our focus is primarily on examples of imperial brokerage from
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7 There is a danger that the label Graeco-Roman, as opposed to Jewish, can set up a false impression of clearly defined boundaries between two monolithic cultural worlds. In fact, closer inspection reveals diversity within, and numerous points of contact between, these worlds (Hengel 1974).
8 Whilst Paul’s congregations included Jews, many of his letters imply that they are addressed to non-Jews (1 Thess 1:9; 4:1-8; 1 Cor 8:7; cf. 12:2; Eph 2:11; 3:1).
9 Kirk (2016: 15) acknowledges that the Graeco-Roman setting provides a corrective to the focus on the Jewish setting of early christology. However, he also warns that ‘connections might be drawn that were consciously or unconsciously eschewed either by the Hellenised Jewish community at large or by the Hellenised Jewish followers of Jesus’. Kirk’s warning fails to grasp how negative relation, or ‘eschewal’, can be a powerful influence in addition to positive relation, or how the Graeco-Roman sources make explicit concepts, such as patronage ideology, which had already influenced Hellenistic Jewish traditions (cf. Crook 2004: 79-80).
10 Writers such as Josephus lived in both cultural settings and his witness to interpersonal relations within the Flavian house makes him a valuable resource. Chapters 7-8 of this thesis explore how concepts of brokerage manifested in Graeco-Roman social relations might be understood by those with a Jewish monotheistic worldview who believed Jesus to be God’s agent.
the first century CE but we also consider examples from the wider period of the Roman principate (31 BCE-235 CE). The political and administrative structures introduced and consolidated by Augustus largely remained stable throughout the period but changed dramatically in the ensuing centuries.\textsuperscript{11} We predominantly use sources written in Greek for making direct lexical comparisons with Paul’s letters. In addition, the Greek language of brokerage and patronage has received significantly less attention than its Latin equivalent.

Our study employs a wide range of literary and epigraphic sources because patronal relationships between actors in ancient sources tend to be elusive. The thesis uses literary texts such as histories and biographies because of their more detailed depictions of the relationship between the emperor and his legates. At other times, it uses panegyrics, treatises and rhetorical handbooks because of the insight they provide into the relationship between the emperor and the gods in imperial ideology. However, in many of these sources, patronal dynamics are simply assumed rather than considered the subjects of discussion. In elite circles, those who wielded power and influence often did so in an underhand manner, dressing their interactions in the more flattering terms of friendship. Examples of brokerage are even more elusive. It is rare that sources will address more than one link in the wider chain of personal connections. More frequently, relationships that are connected by brokers require piecing together. The thesis uses a range of texts to identify an ideology of patronal and brokered relationships shared by elite and non-elite inhabitants of the early empire.

The social-economic profile of Paul’s churches also determines the range of sources used in this thesis. The most compelling studies done on the social profiling of Paul’s churches are those which offer a moderate position between the two extremes of scholarly views from the last century, based on more detailed analysis of a variegated middle section between the top and bottom strata of the socio-economic scale.\textsuperscript{12} They neither belonged to the upper strata of senatorial, equestrian or

\textsuperscript{11} \textit{OCD}, s.v. ‘History’, §2.
\textsuperscript{12} Longenecker’s most recent model (2009: 263-264) estimates that Paul’s audience is primarily portrayed as having ‘moderate surplus resources’, but could also include those of ‘Near subsistence level but stable’ and even those of ‘Moderate surplus resources’.
decurion ranks (less than three percent of the population of the empire), nor did they appear to live in absolute poverty. In fact, to speak of a monolithic ‘they’ is to distort the evidence. The emerging consensus on the Pauline communities is one which recognises economic and status diversity within their groups.

Chapter 3 argues that an ideology of patronage influenced relations between social unequals across the various strata of Roman society. Those of highest status in Paul’s communities may have been involved in patronal relationships, perhaps even patrocinium relationships as personal clients of Romans or as members of associations. However, it is more likely that Paul’s audiences would have been involved in other sorts of dependency relationships with someone of higher or lower status than themselves—whether relationships between tenant and landlord, between trade master and apprentice, freed slave and patronus, worshipper and god, debtor and creditor—all of which had, or could take on, ‘patronal’ characteristics.

NT scholars have been criticised in recent years for their dependence on literary sources—evidence that represents the experiences, perspectives and interests of a tiny proportion of the population, as opposed to the social worlds of ordinary people, amongst which early Christians can be counted. Thus, the use of evidence, such as inscriptions, graffiti and archeology, brings us closer to the experiences of Paul’s implied audience. The exploitative reality of patrocinium may well have led the poor to avoid becoming embroiled in such relationships. However, negative relation can still be a powerful force of influence. Whilst literary texts were only shared amongst the most educated of peoples, the same ideology of reciprocity between social

---

13 Longenecker argues that the rhetoric of Paul’s letters implies an audience belonging to a middle strata of non-elite society who were expected to have sufficient material resources to support the poor within and without their communities. Longenecker (2010: 258) argues that middling groups constituted a larger proportion of Roman society, and thus Pauline churches, than previously thought, and that were can recognise diversity within middling groups. The evidence weighs against those who elevate of Paul’s congregations to a demographic high enough to posit that some of Paul’s converts come from elite circles (Murphy O’Connor 2002; Clarke 1993). Meggitt (1996) and Friesen (2010) have undermined connections between the Erastus of Paul’s epistles and the aedile Erastus of Corinth. Judge (1960: 52) felt it unlikely that many Christians would have come into contact with the socio-economic elite.

14 Oakes’ model Christian community (2009: 96, table 3.7), which is based on space distribution amongst the population of Pompeii, presents a craft worker-hosted house church, made up family, friends, dependents, slaves, freedmen, homeless people and migrant workers. This picture presents a range status differentials between church members that would have significant influence on their interactions.

unequals appears to operate in non-elite spheres, as seen in private associations.\footnote{Esler (2003: 81) argues that the non-elite largely shared the same social system as the elite ‘even if they had neither the resources nor leisure to play prevalent social games’.} Chapter 7 employs the collection of inscriptions and papyri attesting to Graeco-Roman association curated by Harland, Ascough and Kloppenborg in the AGRW database that provides an extensive insight into the relational dynamics and the honorific language of corporate, non-elite patronage.

1.3. A plan of the argument

Chapters 2-3 set the stage for our analysis, reviewing the research contexts for work on NT christology and introducing our heuristic framework. Chapter 2 discusses a problem amongst scholarly approaches to Paul’s christology—that the use of certain analogies forces the interpreter to prioritise the divine or subordinate aspect as constitutive of Jesus’ identity. It proposes the analogy of the broker as a more neutral model for analysing both Jesus’ distinction from God and his unity with God without allowing either aspect to be predominant.

Chapter 3 outlines a Greek perception of patronage and brokerage during the early principate. It justifies using a sociological definition of patronage to demonstrate an ideology of social relations perceivable in a range of relationships. The chapter sets out the criteria for identifying an ideology of ‘patronal’ interactions in Greek sources for the purpose of comparing the interactions between God and Jesus to examples of political, social and religious brokerage in the Graeco-Roman world. Many of the examples relate to the Roman, and later provincial, aristocracy, who were positioned between the possessors of resources and those who sought after them. We explore the roles they played as brokers between elite individuals, as well as between communities.

Chapters 4-5 employ parallels from relationships between the Roman emperor and his legates to highlight aspects of hierarchy, reciprocal exchange and mutual benefit in Phil 2:6-11 and 1 Cor 15:20-28. These chapters draw on examples of Roman military commanders acting as agents and brokers for their emperors to demonstrate
a familiar pattern of social interaction in the relations between God, Jesus and believers. Chapter 4 largely focuses on analysing the reciprocal interactions between God and Jesus in Phil 2:6-11 in light of the exchange of services for favours between the Roman emperor and his legates. Chapter 5 takes the military imagery that accompanies the interactions between God and Jesus in 1 Cor 15:20-28 as a point of comparison with depictions of emperors and their legates on military campaigns. Both chapters discuss the power dynamics between the emperor and his generals in claiming military victories to analyse the functions of praise and glory at the end of the two texts.

Chapter 6 analyses the eulogy to God for his blessings through Christ in Ephesians 1 in relation to the relationship between Jupiter/Zeus and the emperor in imperial panegyrics. It takes characterisations of the emperor from the speeches and treatises of Pliny and Dio Chrysostom to explore a common ideology of the ruler as patron of the state whilst being a disciple and imitator of the beneficent gods. Seeing these two dimensions together illustrates the emperor’s position as broker between divine and human spheres. The chapter applies this relational structure to Ephesians 1:20-23 to analyse Jesus’ role as ‘head of all things for the church’. The ideology of the ruler as broker sheds light on Jesus’ multifaceted but distinct identity as head of the cosmos whilst also being dependant upon God. The analogy of public praises to political and divine brokers enables analysis of the role of Jesus in the eulogy and thanksgiving of Ephesians.

Chapter 7 shows how the relational structure between God, Jesus and believers, which is explicit in the three texts above, can be seen to underlie Paul’s wider christology. It approaches 1 Cor 8:6, a text representing a markedly Jewish worldview, using a range of examples of religious brokerage. It combines depictions of Jesus as broker in First Corinthians with examples of local benefactors in Corinth who performed the roles of priests and brokers in cultic associations, as well as with examples of divine mediation in Second Temple Jewish sources. This three-pronged approach proposes ways that Jesus’ role as mediator might allow Paul to assimilate Jesus into the devotional language of the Shema.
Chapter 8 discusses the implications of Jesus’ intermediary role for understanding his exercising of divine functions. It proposes that, as God’s representative par excellence, Jesus’ performance of divine functions also leads him to share in God’s exclusive claim to devotion. The symbiotic relationship between a patron and his broker means that the worship of Jesus is inextricably linked to the worship of God. To further develop the models of Paul’s christology that tend towards a ‘static’ picture of Jesus sharing the identity of God, we propose a model based on a dynamic, reciprocal relationship between actors. In such a model, Jesus’s actions upon believers associate him with God as God’s agent and representative. At the same time, Jesus remains distinct from God through his services to God and through his generation of honour for God.
CHAPTER 2: Balancing divinity with subordination: The advantages of brokerage for Paul’s christology

2.1. Outline

This chapter reviews some common methodological features of recent scholarship on Paul’s christology, namely its uses of analogies. It is not a comprehensive survey but highlights the most representative and influential works, many of which situate the divine aspects of Paul’s depiction of Jesus within a Jewish context. This chapter groups the major analogies employed by scholars into two categories—those that analyse the relationship between God and Jesus using analogies from the relationship between YHWH and intermediary figures, and those that analyse the relationship between Jesus and believers through the lens of YHWH and Israel/creation. A third category is reserved for approaches which, to some degree, have married the two—it is alongside these approaches that the present study situates itself. The final section of this chapter describes the model of brokerage as a way of holding the divine and subordinate aspects of Paul’s christology together in a balanced and coherent manner.

It is commonly accepted that Paul’s letters contain passages which portray Jesus as distinct from God and passages which portray Jesus as divine. But in constructing a coherent christology, scholars use analogies that prioritise one characteristic over the other. A high christology that employs the analogy of God, emphasises Jesus’ divine characteristics and incorporates aspects of subordination as a somewhat secondary move. A ‘lower’ christology that employs the analogy of an intermediary figure prioritises Jesus’ subordinate status while incorporating aspects of divinity. Either analogy can incorporate elements of the other—the intermediary figure shows aspects of divinity or else God’s action can be described in a way that suggests a distinction from God—but both analogies emphasise one of the characteristics as predominant. These analogies lead to the conclusions that Paul either identifies Jesus with God as a distinct, subordinate being, or that he identifies Jesus as God, included within God’s identity.
It is necessary to begin by defining the kinds of ‘analogies’ or ‘types’ used in this context. Firstly, there are biblical analogies signified by the texts themselves, such as Adam, Wisdom, the Davidic king or the Isaianic Servant. These parallels may be explicitly signified by Paul himself but might feature as allusions. Most scholars recognise that Paul utilises a range of these analogies, or ‘leitmotifs’. Secondly, there are analogies from the Jewish tradition or Graeco-Roman context that are based on perceived similarities in their status or role, such as angelic intermediaries, legal agents, Moses, or Graeco-Roman rulers. These analogies are less visible and naturally are more disputed. Thirdly, there are analogies, or types, which operate on a higher level of abstraction such as the chief agent figure and the figure of God himself.

Prior to the final decades of the twentieth century it was common for NT scholars, led by the religionsgeschichtliche Schule, to analyse Paul’s christology as a second or third stage of historical development against the background of Hellenistic and Roman religions. The Imperial cults, with the κύριος emperor as their object of veneration, were taken as analogies for the Gentile Christ cult. Bousset argued in 1913 that the Hellenistic mystery cults with their roots in Egypt and the Orient had provided the Gentile Christian communities at Antioch, Damascus and Tarsus with a ὁ κύριος at the centre of pneumatically-orientated cultic veneration. The ‘one idea which seizes Hellenistic superstitious piety with mystical power, the idea of the dying and rising, salvation-bringing deity’, which is manifest in the cults of Osiris, Attis and Dionysos, provided the starting point of Paul’s christology and his intense devotion to Jesus (‘Christ-mysticism’). After the challenges of Hengel (against the consignment of christological titles to distinct Jewish, Hellenistic or Roman contexts) and of Hurtado (against the consignment of cultic worship of Christ to a second-stage, Gentile context), recent scholarship has focussed on analogies in the Jewish cultural-religious context.

---

17 Deissmann (1927: 342-384).
2.2. The relationship between God and an intermediary figure

Scholars have commonly looked to intermediary figures in biblical and Second-Temple traditions who participate in divine functions to understand how Paul could conceive of Jesus as divine without threatening the supremacy of God the Father. Sometimes the figure is an agent who delivers messages or performs actions on God’s behalf. Sometimes the figure is a representative figure for Israel. Sometimes it is both. These figures are positioned next to God or adopt divine functions but are usually subordinate to God.

2.2.1. God and Adam

Previous scholars have argued that the analogy of Adam to be the underlying framework for Paul’s christology and anthropology. In 1980, Dunn argued that Paul's theology reflects a hope, also found in Jewish literature, for the restoration of humanity to the status it had prior to Adam’s fall. Dunn argued that the analogy Paul draws between the resurrected Jesus and Adam in Rom 5:12-19 and 1 Cor 15:45-49 is an explicit reference to an underlying belief that Jesus’ death and resurrection was understood through the lens of the story of Adam in Genesis 1-3 (Phil 2:6-11). His resurrection is a restoration of the imago dei—the role of being God’s representative and vice-regent over creation which Adam himself had, but lost (Rom 3:23). His life, but particularly his death on the cross, ‘recapitulates’ the fate of Adam and the plight of man (Rom 8:3; Gal 4:4; 2 Cor 5:21) but restores the glory intended for mankind (indicated through application of Ps 8:6) through his obedience.

The attraction of Dunn’s influential reading is its capacity to explain how a human figure can manifest divine attributes whilst also being subordinate to God. Pre-lapsarian Adam is created in the image of God and thus reflects the glory commonly associated with God’s presence. As a created being, Adam should be obedient to God. Jesus thus has a ‘two-sidedness’ that is expressed within a thoroughly Jewish
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framework, indicated by application of the Psalms. Jesus is humanity’s representative on one hand, and is co-regent, giver of the spirit, connected with God in worship, on the other.\textsuperscript{23} Recent commentaries and monographs challenge whether the Adam Christology is as widespread as Dunn claims.\textsuperscript{24} Some scholars, such as Collins and Bauckham, have doubted the evidence for allusions to Adam in Philippians and many remain unpersuaded of Dunn’s rejection of pre-existence in Paul, although Dunn himself has softened and revised his position on passages such as Phil 2:6-8, 2 Cor 8:9 and Col 1:15-20. Others maintain elements of Dunn’s thesis but rehouse it within a divine christology.\textsuperscript{25}

2.2.2. God and the Davidic king/Messiah

Others employ the figure of the Jewish king/messiah as the dominant framework for interpreting Paul’s christology. The connection can be found in Paul’s descriptions of Jesus as Son of God (e.g. Rom 1:4; 1 Thess 1:9-10; 1 Cor 15:24-28; Col 1:3),\textsuperscript{26} his association with kingdom (Rom 14:17; 1 Cor 6:9-11; 15:50; Gal 5:21; 1 Thess 2:12), his references to David (Rom 1:3; 15:12; 2 Tim 2:8), his use of χρίστος\textsuperscript{27} and in his application of royal Psalms to Jesus, such as Pss 2; 89; 110. The Jewish king was believed to be God’s vice-regent over the nation of Israel, a representation or even embodiment of God’s authority over the cosmos, providing divine benefits. He was also a representative of the people before God, sometimes described in priestly terms, suffering and fighting for their security.\textsuperscript{28} In this broader respect, the representational role of the king corresponds to Jesus’ bilateral role.

The king/messiah analogy provides a range of lexical and thematic parallels to Paul’s christological titles, incorporation motifs, application of OT texts and apocalyptic eschatology.\textsuperscript{29} Jipp’s argument, that Paul reworks an ideology of kingship in light of the story of Christ to ‘remap the symbolic universe and the social
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\bibitem{23} Dunn (1998b: 265).
\bibitem{26} For the king as God’s son see 2 Sam 7:14; Pss 2:7; 89:26-27; 4QFlor; 4QAraraic Apocalypse.
\bibitem{27} Collins & Collins (2008); Novenson (2012); Wright (2013b: 815-825).
\bibitem{28} Jipp (2015: 29-41). Horbury (1998: 65) shows that the various concepts surrounding messianic figures are the same that surrounded the king and that kingship is central to the notion of messiah.
\bibitem{29} Jipp (2015: 273); Smith (2011).
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existence of his churches’, is largely persuasive and compliments more modern studies of messianic expectation in Second Temple Judaism. Horbury argues that the cultic elements of early Christian groups (evidenced in their honorific titles, acclamations and hymns to Christ) should be understood against the background of a coherent Jewish messianism, rooted in biblical traditions of kingship and influenced by the customs of Hellenistic ruler cults, which praised the king with divine epithets and obeisance. Collins sees indications of ontological divinity such as pre-existence implied in Jewish kingship traditions, influenced by Near Eastern royal ideology. These traditions emerge in Pauline texts such as Phil 2:6 in a Jewish-Hellenistic context of divine and human messianic expectation, however, without denoting equality with God.

Whilst Jewish royal/messianic traditions provide partial precedents they do not provide parallels for the patterns or personal fervour of Christ devotion in Paul writings. Nor do they entirely explain the systematic inclusion of Jesus into Christian cultic practices. Finally, Paul’s use of Ps 110 is clearly rooted in ancient Israelite royal traditions but his literal, spatial/cosmic interpretation of ‘sit at my right hand’ cannot be understood from that analogy alone. The heavenly status of Jesus requires an analogy from a different spatial sphere.

2.2.3. God and principal angels

Angels and angelomorphic humans provide another broad conceptual framework through which one can view Jesus’ heavenly glory, his performance of divine functions and receipt of honorific gestures. Biblical and later Jewish traditions depict angels as heavenly servants of the deity who represent YHWH (Gen 16:13; 30 Jipp (2015: 42).
31 Horbury (1998: 3).
33 Collins & Collins (2008: xi).
34 Collins (2007: 63).
36 Fletcher-Louis (2000: 292) defines ‘angelomorphic’ as human beings who are depicted as ‘angelic in status or nature without necessarily having their status reduced to that of an angel’. Applications of angel traditions to NT christology have mainly been focussed on the gospel of John and Revelation (see Stuckenbruck 1995; Hannah 1999). Gieschen (1998) is notable for his attention to angelomorphic categories in the Pauline materials more widely (1 Cor 10:1-10; 1 Cor 15; 2 Cor 4:4-6; Gal 4:14; Col 1:1-15), concluding that such categories were employed in the earliest expressions of christology.
Judges 13:13), who sometimes manifest his glory (Exod 23:20-21; Ezek 8:2-4; Dan 10:2-9), who can be described as ‘sons of God’ (Gen 6:2-4; Deut 32:8; Ps 29:1; 89:6), and who can be charged with performing divine functions such as participation in creation (Philo, *Her.* 205-206) and eschatological deliverance (1QM 17.6-8; 1 En. 61:8-9; 62:2, 5; 69:27-29). Whilst few have accepted proposals that Christians believed Jesus to be an angel, scholarship such as that of Hannah (1999) has shown that angel and angelomorphic traditions may have influenced Christian depictions of Jesus’ exalted state and his role as heavenly agent.  

Angelic categories provide the language to speak of Jesus’ glorious appearance. Gieschen reads the ‘form of God’ (Phil 2:6) in angelic terms—the visible manifestation of God, as well as image/glory/spirit of God in 2 Cor 4:4-6. As an exalted heavenly being, Jesus can be described as pre-existent (1 Cor 8:6). However, from the Pauline letters, it is the bestowal of the divine name in Phil 2:9-11 that is most often identified with angelic traditions, particularly the angel Yahoel from the *Apocalypse of Abraham* (I-II CE). This angel has YHWH’s name ‘in him’ (Apoc. Ab. 10.8), YHWH’s glorious appearance (11), and authority over creation (10.9-12). Casey, in his chronological schematising of NT christology, argues that Yahoel is a ‘static parallel [that] shows quite how exalted a being could be perceived to be without being thought of as a deity.’ Gieschen concludes that the transfer of the κύριος title to Jesus is a key move in the development of christology that enabled Christians to connect the human Jesus to the unnamed intermediary figure associated with YHWH. This interpretation of the function of the divine name bestowal motif contrasts strikingly to approaches that treat the motif as a symbol of the sharing of personal (divine) identity.

Others find angelic analogies to go some way towards understanding praise and honorific gestures to Jesus. Whilst Hurtado and Stuckenbruck find little evidence for
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37 Hannah shows that Second Temple Jewish beliefs about principal angels included a wide variety of motifs, many of which are echoed in NT depictions of Christ as a heavenly figure. For motifs in Paul, see Hannah (1999: 143, 162).  
40 The tradition is most likely based in Exodus 23:20-23 where God promises to send an angel bearing his name to lead the Israelites into Canaan.  
the cultic worship of angels in Second Temple Judaism, Stuckenbruck concludes that some Jewish traditions accommodate veneration of angels whilst also asserting their monotheism.\(^{42}\) McGrath argues that the angel Yahoel both appears to receive honour whilst also worshipping YHWH, in a pattern not unlike Paul’s depiction of Jesus as both receiving honour and as subordinate to God in Phil 2:6-11.\(^{43}\) Fletcher-Louis suggests that angelomorphic traditions provide the primary conceptual resources for the emergence of Christ worship.\(^{44}\)

Angel/angelomorphic models allow christology scholars to place Jesus’ exalted status and divine functions within a Jewish context where such ideas were extended to angelic figures without the sense of God’s supremacy being compromised. Whilst some scholars posit some principal angels to share YHWH’s divine nature,\(^{45}\) most interpret such figures to stand in subordinate positions next to YHWH. McGrath writes, against this background, that Jesus’ exalted position does not represent a significant break from Jewish monotheism, ‘because even though Jesus reigns over absolutely everything on God’s behalf, God himself is not subjected to Christ, but Christ is subjected to God.’\(^{46}\) These approaches allow scholars to argue that even for passages where Jesus seems most God-like, there are traditions grounded in the OT which allow such divine characteristics to be applied to heavenly figures who are distinct from God (Ezek 8:2-4; Dan 10:2-9).

2.2.4. God and divine attributes

Personified divine attributes, or hypostases, described in Hellenistic Jewish writings also provide an analogy for depictions of Jesus as a heavenly figure but have the additional advantage of providing a precedent for Jesus’ participation in God’s creative work (cf. 1 Cor 8:6; Col 1:15-17). The honorific titles that some Jewish sources attribute to God’s Wisdom or Logos appear to parallel some of the titles that

\(^{42}\) This pattern could provide a conceptual framework for honorific gestures to Christ. Stuckenbruck (1995: 272) appears to leave some room for such connections if the devotional actions made toward Christ are judged to be honorific rather than cultic.

\(^{43}\) McGrath (2009: 49), citing Apoc. Ab. 10:3, 8; 17:2, 7-14.

\(^{44}\) Fletcher-Louis (1997: 214, 252) argues that, whilst angels were not worshipped, exalted humans such as the Jewish high priest, the pre-lapsarian Adam, Moses and the Son of Man could be. For a critique, see Stuckenbruck (1999: 88, n. 65); Hurtado (2003: 37-42); Sullivan (2004).


\(^{46}\) McGrath (2009: 50).
Paul attributes to Jesus such as the ‘image of God’ and ‘firstborn of creation’. Hengel, in his succinct monograph on the Hellenistic Jewish origin of the Son of God title in early Christianity, argues that the language of God sending the Son (Gal 4.4; Rom 8:3) expresses belief in his pre-existence and mediation in creation. Because Wisdom was commonly identified with Torah, Jesus as God’s Wisdom could be said to be the end of the Law. Kim takes Hengel’s thesis further, locating Paul’s identification of Christ with the wisdom of God at the Damascus vision where Christ appears as the image of God.

Wisdom provides a framework for conceptualising depictions of Jesus as protological agent. However, the ways that scholars interpret Paul’s use of Wisdom language varies and a Wisdom christology can either cast Jesus as an intermediary figure or can identify him with God. Fee makes a thorough exegetical critique of Wisdom christology, showing effectively the superficiality of Dunn’s reading of Jesus as divine Wisdom in 1 Cor 1-4 (1:24, 30; 2:7). However, the pervasiveness of ideas of Wisdom’s presence at the creation makes it difficult to discount its relevance to notions of Jesus role in creation. Whether divine attributes are to be taken literally or metaphorically, they allow scholars to place Paul’s language of pre-existence within a Jewish context in which a secondary figure could be closely associated with God without constituting an aberration from Jewish monotheism.

47 These figures sometimes appear as the firstborn of God’s creation and sometimes as a mediator of creation. Wisdom is called ‘the first of his works’ (Prov 7:22), a ‘master builder’ (8:30). Wisdom refers to God as ‘my creator’ (Sir 24:8), is an ‘associate in his works (Wis 8:4), the image of God (Wis 7:26; Philo, Leg. All. 1.43; Fug. 101). Philo calls the Logos ‘the second God’ (Quaest. Gen. 2.61), first born and archangel (Agr. 51), the angel of the Lord and a mediator (Quaest. Exod. 2.13).
50 See also Dunn (1998b: 274) and McGrath (2009: 45f) for the relation between Torah, Wisdom and christology.
52 For some, Paul’s language is metaphorical. Dunn (1980: 163-76, 213-30; 1998b: 272, 274, 277) understands Wisdom to speak of God’s attributes and his existence before time. Pre-existent wisdom is now to be recognised in Christ. See also McGrath (2009: 46). For others, the language is more literal and is used to include Jesus in God’s identity (see Wright 1991: 131-132; 2013b: 670-677; Bauckham 2008: 216-218). Fee (2007: 612, 619) considers Wisdom a personification whilst denying that it is depicted by the sources as a mediator in creation. It is thus unconnected to pre-existence in Paul’s christology. Other scholars consider Wisdom in Jewish tradition to be a hypostatization—an entity between persona and personification (Hengel 1974: 153-155; Fossum 1985: 345-346). However, the concept of ‘hypostatization’ has been critiqued as an anachronistic category imported from the christological disputes of third and fourth centuries (Moore 1922: 55).
2.2.5. The benefits of using intermediary figures

Intermediary figures provide a useful category as they naturally share some of the divine characteristics of the principal on whose behalf they act, whilst also being distinct figures. The king rules the nation as YHWH rules the cosmos. Angels come from beside YHWH’s throne to appear with heavenly glory. Divine attributes/hypostases portray the transcendent YHWH’s immanence. Of the multiple analogies, the figures of Adam and the Davidic king provide the broadest models because they both act as God’s agent and representative of humanity/Israel. They also provide conceptual frameworks (rather than historical precedents) for how Christians could view Jesus as a figure of obeisance as God’s agent in Jewish context.

2.3. The relationship between God and Israel/creation

In reaction to the focus on intermediary figures in studies of early christology, a second group of scholars find the closest correlations to Paul’s christology in depictions of YHWH himself. In 1998, Bauckham argued that Jewish intermediary figures were irrelevant to the origins of christology, and that interest in such figures in a minority of texts distorts our understanding of monotheism Second Temple Judaism.54 Instead of a host of heavenly beings with divine or semi-divine status, only God was considered divine, a quality better expressed though his identity—his unique relationship to creation and Israel—than in terms of substance. In relation to Israel, God is known by his special name, YHWH, and by his acts in history and revelation of his character. In relation to the world God is the sole creator and the sovereign ruler and judge of history. A corollary, or expression, of these attributes is that only God is the rightful recipient of cultic worship.55 Bauckham sums up these three connected aspects of Jewish religious faith as creational, eschatological and cultic monotheism.

54 Bauckham judges intermediary figures, with the exception of hypostatised attributes, to be outside of the divine identity. See Bauckham (2008: 222-232) for his arguments against Melchizedek (11QMelch), Yahoel (Apoc. Ab.) and other messianic figures (1 En. 52:6; 2 Esd/4 Ezra 13:3-4; Pss. Sol. 17:31) being identified with YHWH.
55 Ibid. 7-11, 183-4.
Bauckham’s model of divine identity has had great influence on recent christology scholarship. Wright expresses the shift away from analogies of intermediaries in the following words;

If the phenomena to be explained is the fact that from extremely early on the followers of Jesus used language for him (and engaged in practices, such as worship, in which he was invoked) which might previously have been thought appropriate only for Israel's God, why should we not begin, not with ‘exalted figures’ who might as it were be assimilated into the one God, but with the One God himself?\(^ {56}\)

In turning to the analogy of God himself, scholars base their arguments on a view of Second Temple Judaism in which certain activities and characteristics were believed to be YHWH’s alone. With this view of monotheism, traditional distinctions between ‘functional’ and ‘ontological’ divinity become redundant as divine ‘functions’ are tied to God’s own identity. The underlying principle of the model is that ‘Jesus can manifest the unique identity of the one God […] only if he himself belongs to the unique identity of God.’\(^ {57}\)

2.3.1. Creator

Through the model of divine identity, Paul’s depictions of Jesus as pre-existent and mediating creation (1 Cor 8:6, 10:26 and Phil 2:6-11) do not to depict Jesus as an intermediary, but as part of the divine identity itself. Bauckham argues that Second Temple Jewish monotheism conceived of distinctions within the divine identity, rather than unitariness—with divine attributes such as Word and Wisdom being part of the divine identity rather than being subordinated intermediaries.\(^ {58}\) First Corinthians 8:6 then, highlights Paul’s inclusion of Jesus in his creational monotheism with Jesus taking the instrumental position of the Word of God in the creation of ‘all things’—a phrase that distinguishes God from the totality of the created order.\(^ {59}\)

---

56 Wright (2013b: 653).
58 Ibid. 10, 17, 183.
59 Ibid. 218.
2.3.2. Eschatological Sovereign

However, the spear-point of the divine identity model is that depictions of Jesus as ‘sharing or implementing God’s eschatological lordship’ constitute an intent to include Jesus in Jewish eschatological monotheism.\(^{60}\) This means that even in texts such as 1 Cor 15:24-28 where Jesus appears subordinate to God, his subjugation of ‘all things’ identifies him with God rather than with the created order. In Phil 2:6-11, where Paul appears to depict Jesus as an obedient agent based on the biblical analogy of the suffering servant, Bauckham asserts that the figure in fact belongs to the identity of God himself.\(^{61}\) Bauckham reads Deutero-Isaiah’s expectation of the universal recognition of YHWH’s sovereignty (Isa 6:1; 45:23; 52:13; 57:15) to be inextricably linked to the suffering and exaltation of YHWH’s servant in Isa 52:32.\(^{62}\) When Paul proclaims salvation to those who call on the name of the Lord (Rom 10:13) he finds Jesus ‘to be’ YHWH, not a non-divine agent of God.\(^{63}\) The eschatological element of Bauckham’s model has provided an influential framework which others have developed in more specific ways.\(^{64}\)

2.3.2.1. Return to Zion

Wright ties Bauckham’s view of eschatological monotheism to the Second Temple expectation that YHWH would lead his people out of exile return himself as king.\(^{65}\) Wright argues that such expectation was shared by Paul who ‘reworked’ it around Jesus. For Wright, key christological passages in Paul’s letters depict Jesus and his soteriological work in the language of the Exodus and with the sending of divine Wisdom (Rom 8:1-4; 1 Cor 8-10; 2 Cor 3-4; Gal 4:1-11; Phil 2:6-11; Col 1).

\(^{60}\) Ibid. 184.

\(^{61}\) Ibid. 36-37, 209. The important, converse aspect of Bauckham’s argument is that God also shares in the humiliation of the son to achieve YHWH’s eschatological glorification.

\(^{62}\) Ibid. 36-38, 205-206.

\(^{63}\) Ibid. 193.

\(^{64}\) Eskola, for example, examines Jesus’ connection to God by way of throne image that is also commonly found in Jewish merkebah mysticism. Eskola argues that visionary experiences of Jesus sitting on God’s throne do not so much depict Jesus as the vice-regent of God’s but as the embodiment of God—Jewish theocracy becomes Christocracy (2001: 309). See also Newman (1991) and Chester (2007) who identify images of heavenly enthronement and glory with God’s divine status.

\(^{65}\) Wright (2013b: 653).
According to Wright, Paul’s language places Jesus *within* the identity of God—it does not simply identify Jesus *with* God but *as* God.\(^66\)

Wright’s account of Paul’s christology illustrates the difficulty for interpreters to maintain a balance between analogies that liken Jesus to God and those that liken him to subordinate figures. Wright’s analysis of 1 Cor 15:20-28 in his earlier work is noticeably more agent-focused compared to his recent treatment of the same passage. Where he previously focused on Jesus’ Messianic role in fulfilling Israel’s calling to be the agent of YHWH’s salvific purposes, Wright’s recent work on ‘Monotheism—freshly revealed’ emphasises Jesus in YHWH’s exclusive role defeating death.\(^67\) Wright is emphatic in his assessment that Paul’s statement that God was in the Messiah reconciling the world to himself (2 Cor 5:19) means that Jesus is included in the divine identity: “This is not to be watered down to *through* Christ, as though the Messiah was a mere agent.”\(^68\) For Wright, understanding Jesus as agent does not sufficiently communicate Jesus’ identification with God nor God’s action in Jesus.\(^69\)

2.3.2.2. Saviour

In his comprehensive exegetical study, *Pauline Christology*, Fee finds that it is Jesus’ soteriological role which identifies him with God.\(^70\) The role of saviour is the exclusive prerogative of God in the OT (Deut 32.15; Pss 25.5; 27.9) but Christ as saviour is now ‘clearly the central feature of Pauline theology’.\(^71\) In this shared divine identity, God is prime mover, the first cause, but ‘the focus of Paul’s life is on Christ’.\(^72\)

Fee’s approach builds on the notions of unique divine identity and exclusive devotion introduced by Bauckham and Hurtado to demonstrate ‘a coherence in

\(^{66}\) Ibid. 696.

\(^{67}\) Ibid. 733-737, 821.

\(^{68}\) Ibid. 676.

\(^{69}\) In response to Wright, Hurtado (2016b: 423) rightly argues that God’s ‘return to Zion’ was expected to be performed through a chief agent figure. Horbury (1998: 65-82) shows that God was understood to use agents even when being described as acting directly.

\(^{70}\) Fee (2007: 7).

\(^{71}\) Ibid. 481.

\(^{72}\) Ibid. 9.
Paul’s thought concerning the person of Christ’ across the entire corpus, despite Paul’s focus being primarily soteriological. However, in his exegeses of texts where Jesus appears subordinate to God, Fee deviates sharply from Bauckham’s method to separate Jesus’ ontological divinity from his subordinate function—a return to metaphysical categories that appears at odds with the the divine identity model. His treatment of 1 Cor 15.20-28 is symptomatic; despite frequently asserting throughout that God and Christ share purposes and activities (function) Fee here separates Jesus’ functional subordination from his divine being which avoids the tricky issues of status and hierarchy expressed in the passage.

Fee is also unclear as to how he connects the belief in Jesus as agent of salvation and his worship as divine. On the one hand, Paul depicts Jesus as the agent of creation and redemption (1 Cor 8:6; 10:4, 9; Col 1:15–20; Col 2:9)—Jesus shares all divine prerogatives except being the source of salvation. On the other hand, in Christian devotion, Jesus’ role as Saviour does not make him a mediator of salvation but ‘the object of devotion and worship in the Pauline corpus, both for Paul and his churches’. As we will discuss in chapter 8 (§8.4), Jesus’ role as mediator of salvation rather than as source implies that Jesus’ inclusion in cultic worship needs to be further defined. We might reconsider whether the description of Jesus as ‘full deity’ is the most accurate phrase.

2.3.3. Sharing the title κύριος and Paul’s application of OT texts to Jesus

Studies of Paul’s application of OT ‘Yahweh texts’ to Jesus often play a significant role in christologies of divine identity. Capes argues that Paul’s divine christology can be illustrated through Paul’s ascribing the title κύριος to Jesus—a practice Paul

---

73 Ibid. 1-3.
74 An aspect also noted by Martin (2009) and Tilling (2012: 40-41).
75 Fee (2007: 142-143) interprets 1 Cor 3:23 as a motif of Jesus fulfilling his Father’s will: ‘But such statements fall far short of speaking to his essential being or eternal relationship with the Father. That is, such statements as these reflect functional subordination and have to do with Christ’s function as Savior, not with his being as such’.
76 Ibid. 500, 559.
77 Ibid. 494. In Fee’s analysis of Colossians, Jesus is also creator (303-304, 504-505).
78 Ibid. 559.
79 The term refers to OT texts in which κύριος stands in for YHWH.
inherited from the earliest Christians in Palestine.⁸⁰ According to Capes, the title is similar to Son of God in that it identifies Jesus with God but it primarily functions to assign prerogatives to Jesus that originally belonged to YHWH in the OT. For example, Capes expects Jewish hearers of Phil 2:10 to have recognised Isa 45:23 and that they would have identified Jesus with God, equal in divinity and therefore worthy of veneration.⁸¹ Capes writes:

> Given his high regard for scripture, his exegetical practice means Paul considered Jesus to be a manifestation of Yahweh. It means that he identified Jesus with Yahweh in a substantive way despite the opinion of some to the contrary.

Capes argues that Paul’s use of YHWH texts means that Jesus cannot be seen as an intermediary figure (contra. Hurtado). According to Capes, Jesus is distinct but is fully identified with God in the devotional life of the church, with no real subordination.⁸² Fee has since added more ‘Yahweh texts’ that Paul applies to Jesus, arguing that, as κύριος, Jesus shares all divine prerogatives with God except initiation of salvation.⁸³

The volume of OT texts applied to Christ in Paul’s letters certainly supports the view that Paul believed Jesus to be divine. Whether it supports the ontological claims of Capes, Fee and Bauckham is less clear.⁸⁴ Indeed, the manner with which Jesus bears the title κύριος is complex. Litwa argues that in the Greek and Roman context, the monarch’s adoption of the proper name of his patron deity identified him with the deity, making him divine, but leaves open whether the monarch is claiming to be a vice-regent to, or a manifestation of the deity.⁸⁵ In christology scholarship, the possibility that Jesus performs divine functions on behalf of God and receives worship on behalf of God is often neglected. If we are discussing christology in terms of personal identity which is revealed in narrative then we could arguably

---

⁸¹ Ibid. 185.
⁸² Ibid. 64, 159, 185.
⁸⁴ Dunn (1998b: 250, n. 58) and Tilling (2012: 210) challenge whether the application of YHWH texts can bear the maximal theological conclusions Capes draws, citing 1 En. 52:6 which applies Mic 1:3-4 to the Son of Man.
⁸⁵ Litwa (2014). For further discussion see chapters 6 (§6.5.3) and 7 (§7.5.3).
conclude that Paul depicts Jesus as a monarch who is exalted to represent the deity, rather than as God himself.

2.3.4. Divine-relation

A different way that scholars have drawn on the character of God himself as a basis for Paul’s christology is through examining Paul’s relational language. Tilling’s focus on Paul’s intense personal devotion to Jesus, whilst aligning closely with Hurtado’s interest in Christian corporate devotion, is closer to Bauckham’s approach in its use of analogies. Tilling argues that Paul shows the same kind of intense, personal devotion to Jesus that Israel showed to YHWH, as exemplified in the Shema. He argues that a pattern of ‘divine-relation’ can be seen in Paul’s expressions regarding his goals, motivations, passionate devotion, his belief in Jesus’ presence and activity, in his rejection of idols vis-à-vis Christ worship, and in Jesus’ communications with believers. Tilling focuses on 1 Cor 8:1-10:22 and 1 Cor 16:22, whilst charting the wider shape of Paul’s Christ-relation across the undisputed letters.

Tilling’s focus on the relational language makes significant progress in the notion of divinity, offering a view that moves past a narrow focus on christological titles and themes. It also avoids artificial distinctions of the person from the work of Christ. He marshals a large amount of data from the texts to successfully demonstrate that there is indeed a high correspondence between the way that Christians related to Jesus and the way Israel related to YHWH. However, like the other approaches which employ divine-identity models, Tilling’s method is unclear as to how Paul’s devotion to Christ relates to his devotion to God. Tilling argues that Paul’s Christ-relation does not annul his relational monotheism but rather they belong together. But it is not clear how they do so when apparently, they are the same type of relationship. In fact, Tilling’s account tends towards flattening the position of Jesus onto that of God.

---

86 Tilling 2012: 8, 235.
87 Ibid. 250.
88 A similar effect is achieved by Fee (2007: 8) where he claims that Paul’s worldview is ‘utterly christocentric’.
From another angle, Tilling’s approach does not sufficiently explain how sharing some of the relational characteristics of God equates to a divine-Christology in the highest, fullest sense that Tilling intends. Tilling instead appeals to the tension, paradox and mystery which a relational epistemology can accommodate in ways that a propositionally-orientated logic cannot: ‘Christ was subordinate to God yet was grasped in Paul’s relational pattern of language in a manner which affirms a divine Christology’. However, if the model of divine identity is adopted which is dependent on characterisation revealed within narrative, then it is difficult to avoid the issue that Jesus functions as a distinct character within Paul’s narrative theology regardless of Paul’s relation to him.

Tilling’s chapter on the Christ-relation in comparison with the God-relation in Paul’s letters demonstrates the substantial degree to which the two correspond. However, marked distinctions between the two figures should not be underestimated. The most notable are the characterisations of God as Father, supreme in knowledge, wisdom and counsel. In terms of Paul’s communication with God and Jesus, God is prime speaker and revealer, the one who calls believers, and it is towards God that Paul directs his thanks. In regard to devotion, Paul places more emphasis on human accountability before God, rather than before Christ and it is God who is to be glorified. Whilst Tilling acknowledges the distinctions he also domesticates them to his thesis, arguing that the two relations have the same essential shape. But if the Christ-relation was so similar to the God-relation in shape, then we might expect Paul’s references to Jesus to be more independent of God than the evidence shows. It possibly would result in the Christ-relation eclipsing the God-relation and in its worship practices resembling a distinct cult.

These differences in Paul’s characterisations of God and Jesus are substantial enough that they imply the two relations do in fact have different ‘shapes’. Further exploration of the differences between the relations could clarify how the two are

90 Ibid. 235-236.
91 Ibid. 239.
92 Richardson (1994)’s study of the grammar of Paul’s language about God finds that Jesus is Jesus is consistently identified by his relation to God whilst also influencing the way God himself is understood.
calibrated in Paul’s divine-relation. Whilst it is true that ‘low’ christologies have largely neglected the relational aspects of Paul’s theology, it is not necessary that a subordination christology is mutually exclusive with Paul’s Christ-relation. Instead, an account of Paul’s christology would be attentive to how Paul’s devotion to Jesus might belong within his devotion to God, based on a narrative in which Jesus himself is devoted to God the Father.

This thesis argues that Tilling’s valuable work on the Christ-relation can answer more questions when it is framed within the conceptual structure of patronage and brokerage. Instead of the divine-relation being a relationship involving two parties it is, in fact, three-part. Christ functions as the broker between God and believers. A God-relation now entails a Christ-relation but it is not reducible to it.

2.3.5. Problems with divine identity models

One of the key issues with Bauckham’s model of divine identity, and with others that employ it, is that some of the characteristics or functions that are claimed to be exclusive to God can be shared by other beings as well. Certain heavenly figures appear as agents of eschatological judgement and deliverance. Other figures share the throne of God, the symbol of God’s universal sovereignty. Even Bauckham’s view of creational monotheism also needs to be qualified. The anointed king could, to a certain extent, be said to ‘share’ in God’s creating activities by building Jerusalem and the temple. The Psalms depict the Davidic kings as being given charge over the whole creation, not just the political realm. Whilst these texts represent a small minority compared to those which attribute God with these roles,

93 Tilling (2012: 244).
94 11QMelch, col ii, ll. 13-14 (judgement), 15-29 (deliverance). See also the role of Michael in texts such as Dan 10:1-2.
95 As raised by Hurtado (2003: 47, n. 66), citing Rev 3:21; Ezek. Trag. We could add Eph 2:6. As Bauckham (2008: 16, 169-172) himself acknowledges, the Lord of Spirits exalts the Enochic ‘son of man’ to sit on his throne as judge the righteous and the wicked (1 En. 61:8-9; 62:2, 5: 69:27-29). He is ‘the exception which proves the rule’. Kirk (2016: 21) concludes that the notion that exercise of divine sovereignty is a prerogative of God alone is ‘[…] a falsifiable thesis that is falsified by the evidence’.
96 Barker (2003: 539), citing the tradition that David had to conquer the deeps before building Jerusalem (Ps 24:2; b.Sukk. 53b). See also Cyrus as God’s creator (LXX Isa 44:25-28, 45:13), the task expected of the servant of the Lord (Zech 6:12, Tg. Isa. 53.5). Chester (2007: 20-27) argues that Philo also blurs the boundaries between creator and created with the figures of Word and Wisdom, calling them archangels.
they nonetheless undermine the claim that God could not be thought to share these functions with a subordinate figure.

Another more obvious issue with models of divine identity is that they leave little room for the parts of texts which identify Jesus with the created order. For example, Wright’s treatments of 1 Cor 15:20-28 take either the Messianic analogy or the divine analogy as the dominant framework through which to interpret its christology. This is the problem with which most christology scholarship wrestles—which aspect is the starting point or base into which the other aspect is incorporated? This thesis offers the analogy of the broker whose purpose is to represent two parties, and who thus can function as the basis of a model which can hold the data depicting divine and human aspects together. This role constitutes its own, ambiguous yet distinct, identity which will be outlined at the end of the chapter.

The final issue is the inability of the divine identity model to facilitate agent figures. The rationale which underlies the model is:

a) Only God is described as X.

b) Paul describes Jesus as X.

c) Therefore, Jesus is God.

This logic, however, cannot facilitate the phenomenon of agency where a principal extends his presence and power via an agent acting as his interface. The angel of the Lord in the OT illustrates how a subordinate figure can speak as God himself (Gen 16:7-14, 22:11-18; Ex 14:19-20). Yahoeel appears somewhat similar to the Ancient of Days in Ezek 1:26-28 and Dan 7:9. For Jesus, who is said to be the very image of God (2 Cor 4:4; Col 1:15), shared characteristics can be expected without necessarily bearing ontological assertions. Thus, Wright’s comment that the sending passages present Jesus as 'the second self (so to speak) of Israel's god' can be true without the ontological claims accompanying it.

97 Bauckham’s treatment of the passage emphasises Jesus’ eschatological rule but neglects 1 Cor 15:27-28 which appears to explicitly position Christ alongside creation in subjection to God (2008: 177).

98 See, for example, Wright (2013b: 654).

99 Apoc. Ab. 11, which can be compared to Jesus appearance in Rev 1:12-16.

100 Wright (2013b: 696).
Alexander highlights the Rabbinical saying ‘The servant of the king is as the king himself’ to argue against the worship of Jesus being equivalent to an ontological identification with God. Instead, Alexander suggests that Jesus could be like the Jewish king who could be worshipped as God’s agent without constituting a modification to monotheism. The language of ‘identification with God’ is not the same as ‘identification as God’. Alexander writes:

[…] one cannot jump, so to speak, from agency to ontology. If one observes someone offering obeisance and service to the agent of God, one cannot assume that they regard that agent as belonging to the same order of being as God.\footnote{Alexander (2016: 108).}

Intention precedes action and thus it is not possible to infer from the reverence or worship one might show to a divine agent what one might believe about that agent.\footnote{Ibid. 107.} Worship of the agent can be worship without identifying the agent with his principal.

The problem in the logic underlying these models often surfaces in instances where Paul applies texts describing God’s exclusive prerogatives to Jesus. This issue will be discussed further in Chapter 4 in relation to Isa 45:23 in Phil 2:10 but it is worth introducing here in relation to wider methodologies. Recent scholarship tends to maximise the significance of Paul applying to the Christ event texts proclaiming the uniqueness of YHWH. However, just because YHWH \textit{alone} provides salvation to his people does not necessarily mean that he does not use agents. Horbury shows that even in contexts such as LXX Isaiah and some Rabbinic traditions of the later Roman period where God is invoked to intervene directly, ‘not by the hand of an angel and not by the hand of a legate’—such actions usually include agents. The claim of texts such as LXX Isa 63:9 which refer to God’s action in the Exodus (‘not an envoy nor a messenger, but the Lord Himself saved them’) suggest that the ‘no agent’ claim is aimed rather at the insistence that it is God who saves Israel, than at the denial of an agent’s participation.\footnote{Horbury (1998: 80).} The logic of divine identity models threatens to oversimplify the phenomenon of agency and thus misrepresent that narrative underlying Paul’s theology.

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext[1]{Alexander (2016: 108).}
\footnotetext[2]{Ibid. 107.}
\footnotetext[3]{Horbury (1998: 80).}
\end{footnotes}
Our argument is that Christ’s role as mediator presents a sufficiently distinct identity from that of the God who is the source of benefits. This is based on three reasons: Firstly, on the fierce exclusivity of Jewish monotheism which holds God above all other beings. Such exclusivity demands that we explore other possibilities of relating God and Jesus before resorting to an equating of the two. Secondly, on the narrative lying behind Paul’s soteriology in which Christ is predominantly characterised as God’s agent. Thirdly, on the importance of honour and status in Late Antiquity in which being the source of benefits would connote more power than one who is a mediator of those benefits.

2.4. Combinations of the two approaches: distinction and agency within the divine identity

Some scholars attempt to hold the two basic analogies together in order to maintain the differentiation between God and Jesus whilst affirming Jesus’ divinity. Hurtado effectively combines two analogies to argue that Jesus is worshipped as God’s agent. Since 1988, Hurtado has argued that it is cultic devotion in Second Temple Judaism that distinguishes God from all other beings. It is not a corollary of beliefs regarding his unique functions. Hurtado argues that the NT, including Paul’s letters and the pre-Pauline traditions preserved within them, attest to a matrix of devotional patterns with Christ as the object of cultic worship.104 These practices include the invocation of Jesus in prayers, confessions, baptisms, community meals, hymns and prophecies. The devotional phenomena reflected in Paul’s letters’ amount to ‘a programmatic treatment of Jesus as recipient of cultic devotion’.105 This development constitutes an innovation, an innovation that has its origins in the earliest beliefs in Jesus’ resurrection and in powerful religious experience.106 Hurtado asserts that there is no evidence of any such figures receiving cultic devotion in Jewish circles that provides a historical precedent or analogy for the phenomenon.107

---

105 Hurtado (2003: 134-153, 137). Casey (1999: 222-229; 2004) doubts whether all the passages Hurtado cites, such as Phil 2:6-11, reflect a cultic setting. Collins (2007: 56) argues against Hurtado’s pattern of devotions actions, that actions like baptising, healing, prophesying in name of Jesus suggest “transcendent authority” not necessarily full divinity.
106 Hurtado (2010: 64-74).
107 Ibid. 32-42. A view supported by Stuckenbruck (1995: 200-203, 269).
However, Hurtado argues further that Jesus is included with God in worship in a particular way. Unlike, Bauckham, Hurtado holds that there are precedents for intermediary figures in the Jewish tradition who participate in God’s eschatological sovereignty and judgement, namely principal angels. These figures provide the likeliest conceptual framework for Christians to understand Jesus as God’s heavenly agent and provided a language for expressing the meaning of their visionary experiences of Christ exalted in heaven. Whilst angels do not provide a full analogy, nor the impetus for Christ-worship, they do provide ‘honorific categories’ such as eschatological redeemer, creative agent, image of glory, military commander, receiver of name, and reception of universal acclamation. ‘We could say, thus, that in the NT Jesus is the chief-agent par excellence.’

Hurtado’s combination of analogies leads him to conclude that Christ-devotion is neither a break from nor a continuation of Jewish monotheism but is a mutation of the chief agent tradition. It is dyadic, or ‘binitarian’, with texts such as Phil 2:11 asserting that God is now to be worshipped through Jesus, making Jesus the uniquely divine agent of God. Hurtado’s account is very persuasive and his combination of exclusive cultic worship and chief agent categories via divine mandate holds together more of the Pauline data than other approaches. As will be discussed below, the next question is whether Hurtado’s ‘binitarian’ label really captures how Christians themselves would have viewed their worship? This thesis attempts to place the devotional structures that Hurtado identifies within a wider cultural context of honouring intermediary figures. This context helps to understand how Jesus is held alongside God in Pauline devotion.

Where Hurtado holds together the two analogies through the concept of mutation, others have also tried to combine the two analogies in order to emphasise the differentiation within the divine identity. Fletcher-Louis accepts the conclusions of Bauckham and Hurtado regarding divine identity and cultic divinity but argues that

108 Hurtado (1988: 71-92)
109 Ibid. 21.
111 Hurtado (2016a: 91).
113 Fletcher-Louis (2015: 61).
Hurtado’s terminology of divine agent does not go far enough in explaining his sharing of the title ‘Lord’ nor the degree to which Jesus has his own distinct personal identity: ‘An agent is not a person’. 114 Fletcher-Louis would rekindle the use of ‘person language’ as an appropriate way of speaking of the distinct ‘biographies’ of God and Jesus within the divine identity and the part Jesus plays in reciprocally defining the identity of God. 115

Fletcher-Louis’ work raises the issue of whether the chief agent category provides a conceptual framework for Jesus’ role as mediator and representative of humanity. Jesus not only appears as an agent performing his principal’s will, but is a mediator representing God and humanity. Fletcher-Louis sees incarnation as the way to understand the NT texts which portray Christ as occupying multiple spheres of being (e.g. in divine, intermediary and creaturely roles). This thesis meets Fletcher-Louis’ concerns but with a very different approach—focusing on the multiplex role of the broker/mediator within Paul’s socio-historical context as an analogy that explains Jesus’ multiple roles.

Hill likewise accepts Bauckham’s model but attempts to balance Jesus’ divine identity with his differentiation from God. However, unlike the work of others, Hill argues that the distinction and unity between God and Jesus should not be assumed to exist in competition. Rather, Hill builds the argument that Jesus’ relation to God should be characterised as one of reciprocal but asymmetrical interdependence. Hill employs categories of relations from Trinitarian theology to read Rom 4:24, 8:1, 1 Cor 8:6, 15:20-28, Gal 1:1 and Phil 2:6-11 showing how Jesus’ unity with God correlates with his differentiation. Hill uses the tools of ‘redoublement’ (—the need to speak twice as to what is common and what is proper to divine persons) and ‘persons in relation’ (—the identities of divine persons being mutually defining) to ‘expose the substructure underlying Paul’s affirmations’. 116 Whilst Paul’s ‘doubling’

114 Ibid. 96, 98.
115 Fletcher-Louis also follows Horbury to argue that certain intermediary figures within and without Jewish tradition—particularly the high priest, or the Roman emperor—were at times believed to have an ontological connection with the deity and received cultic worship. Such figures act a ‘partial’ precedents for the worship of Christ. However, Stuckenbruck (1999) and Hurtado (2015: 37-42) are doubtful that figures such as the high priest (Josephus, Ant. 11.326-338) are worshipped.
of God’s functions necessarily posits Jesus in a subordinate relationship to the Father, Paul posits them together as sharing one identity.

Hill’s approach foregrounds the degree of asymmetric interdependency in Paul’s depictions of the relationship between God and Jesus, particularly in 1 Cor 15:24-28 and Phil 2:6-11. However, while his methodology is useful in emphasising the broad contours of the relationship, there is a certain amount of circularity in employing categories which are themselves derived from the NT data. Most importantly, they do not help to explain how the asymmetrical reciprocity between God and Jesus would have been understood in a first-century context, or how it might have emerged. This thesis proposes that the ideology of patronage in ancient social relations bears all the features of interdependence, mutual benefit and asymmetry (the substructure of Paul’s christology) with the advantage of being grounded in Paul’s historical context. Hill argues that the relationship between God and Jesus is asymmetric and that neither figure has primacy, but it would be difficult to have asymmetry without connotations of hierarchy once the relationship is transposed to a first-century context of social relations.

2.5. The figure of the broker

We have seen that the analogies employed in scholarship of Paul’s christology leads scholars to prioritise either Jesus’ distinction from God or his unity with God as the starting point for understanding Jesus’ role and status. They then tend to incorporate elements associated with the other analogy in a secondary phase. However, the breadth of the christological data resists simple incorporation into either framework. Some scholars resort to the language of mystery and paradox when explaining how Paul holds Jesus’ unity with God together with Jesus’ differentiation from God.

117 Hill makes too much of the mutually-defining elements of the relationship between God and Jesus. In the OT, God is defined in relation to Abraham or to Israel. The passages Hill (2015a: 49-76) cites from Galatians and Romans do not so much redefine God’s identity as God’s story, with the resurrection of Jesus presented as God’s definitive act of deliverance.

118 Hill (2015b) argues that Trinitarian theological categories do not attempt to ‘amplify’ ambiguities in Paul’s writing, but rather they represent ‘an effort to expose the substructure underlying Paul’s affirmations’ through dialectic between Pauline and Trinitarian theology.

119 Bousset (1970: 160) held that ‘In the Pauline communities the veneration of the Kyrios stands alongside the veneration of God in an unresolved actuality.’ Fee (2007: 293) rejects christologies that
For example, Schnelle understands that the intermediary role of Jesus in creation and salvation (1 Cor 8:6) brings together the ‘tendency towards subordination’ in Paul’s thought with the ways that Paul depicts Jesus as equal to God or as ‘belonging to the same category’ as God. Jesus is both ‘incorporated into God’s essence and status’ and is subordinate to him. For Schnelle, this role is the only way to grasp the paradoxical and definition-stretching ‘meaning formation’ of early Christian writings which expressed the belief that God fully revealed himself in Jesus. Despite emphasising the dual-nature of the mediator role, Schnelle still resorts to ontic/functional distinctions whilst holding to a christological monotheism that predominantly places Jesus on the side of God. Our alternative approach to Paul’s christology focuses on an analogous figure who can incorporate aspects of divinity and subordination simultaneously; that is, our analogy is not defined by either the aspects of divinity or subordination but by the figure’s ability to play multiple roles. The broker who works within the context of patron-client relations is such an analogy because he can be both a patron, client and intermediary according to the actors to whom he is related.

Whilst conceptualisations of brokerage vary among sociologists, common themes allow Shaw and Stovel to define brokerage as ‘the process of connecting actors in systems of social, economic, or political relations in order to facilitate access to valued resources’. The concept derives from analysis of personal networks in which relations within a given social group or society are conceptualised as a constellation of connected stars. Individuals/groups are connected to others directly or indirectly, negotiating a shifting environment wherein they occupy positions of dependence upon, and influence over, others. If transactions between two actors are asymmetric in directional flow it is indicative of inequality in the statuses of the two actors. Asymmetric exchanges also have the potential to give one party power over another by the creation of obligation. Brokers operate in the
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121 Ibid. 396.
122 Ibid. 399.
123 Stovel & Shaw (2012: 141); Golub, Milgrom, & Stovel (2011); Blok (1969).
125 Ibid. 34.
126 Ibid. 26.
gaps between individuals/groups, providing a bridge in the transaction of resources and influence. Where patrons deal in ‘first order resources’ (land, jobs, food, specialist knowledge), brokers deal in ‘second order resources’ — a capital of ‘strategic contacts’ who either possess first order resources or have access to those who possess them.\textsuperscript{127} Brokerage thrives in segmented societies where the centre of power is inaccessible to those on the periphery—often in urban centres distanced from those living in the country side.\textsuperscript{128} Wolf’s seminal study on relations between nation-orientated groups and community orientated groups in post-colonial Mexico, described brokers as ‘guarding the crucial junctures or synapses of relationships which connect the local system to the larger whole.’\textsuperscript{129}

NT scholars have long been interested in sociological models of brokerage. The landmark studies are Malina’s application of the patron-broker-client model (based on Boissevain) to the Jesus movement, and Neyrey’s application of patronage to divine-human relations across the NT.\textsuperscript{130} However, there are few detailed studies of Jesus as broker in Paul’s letters.\textsuperscript{131} The majority concentrate on Jesus as broker in the gospels or in Hebrews.\textsuperscript{132} Those that do focus on Paul’s letters tend to focus on Paul as broker or on the unilateral aspects of Jesus as God’s agent.\textsuperscript{133}

Brokerage goes beyond current models of Jesus as agent because the broker is a ‘dual agent’, representing both individuals/groups rather than just the one. The analogy can thus hold together data depicting Jesus as God’s agent and data depicting him as human representative. The broker’s success depends upon his centrality between actors,\textsuperscript{134} and upon having expertise in the cultural worlds of

\textsuperscript{127} Ibid. 147-8.
\textsuperscript{128} Blok (1969: 369).
\textsuperscript{129} Wolf (1956: 1075-76).
\textsuperscript{130} Malina (1996: 143-175; 1993); Neyrey (2004).
\textsuperscript{131} Neyrey (2004) deals with Jesus as God’s client in First Corinthians. Introductions to brokerage tend to focus on the gospels (cf. Stewart 2010: 165-66; Batten 2010). Davis (1994)’s article on Jesus as mediator discusses NT christology in general rather than Paul’s christology in particular.
\textsuperscript{132} Borgen (1968) and Harvey (1987) argue that the Jewish juridical concept of the agent (as attested in the Mishnah and Talmud) has explanatory force for the language of commission, sending, oneness, obedience and return in John’s christology. Harvey (1987: 248) does suggest that Paul had the agency model in mind when he wrote of God reconciling the world (2 Cor 5:1) and all things (Col 1:19-20) to himself in Christ.
\textsuperscript{133} For Paul as broker, see Joubert (2000), Rice (2013). Crook’s work on Paul’s conversion against the background of Graeco-Roman patronage and benefaction language frequently refers to Jesus as broker but tends to focus on Jesus as God’s agent.
\textsuperscript{134} Boissevain (1974: 154).
both. Good brokers ‘belong to the worlds of both patron and clients, and so represent fairly the interests of both’. The model of the broker, which emphasises bi-lateral representation, can makes sense of Paul’s corporate language—his Adam christology, some of his ‘in Christ’ expressions—as well as the data which falls under the category of agency.

An extension of this bilateral representation is that the broker appears differently according to the actor he is representing. This aspect of the analogy has explanatory value for texts that present Jesus in both a divine role and in that of a created being. Brokers ‘keep a foot in both structures between which they bridge the gap’, and therefore appear, in Wolf’s terms, ‘Janus-like’. However, the broker’s multiplexity extends beyond his ability to represent multiple actors for, in the context of patron-client relations, *he can be both a patron and client*. He is a client to those for whom he acts as an agent and to those who possess first-order resources. He depends upon them and so can be influenced by them. Simultaneously, the broker can be a patron to those for whom he provides access to resources and who he puts in his debt. The ambiguity and multiplexity in the broker’s identity makes it a fitting framework for christology where Jesus is both a subordinate figure to God and a divine figure to believers.

The broker-as-patron also provides a framework for coordinating Paul’s personal devotion to Jesus with Paul’s devotion to God. Like the patron, the broker is a social entrepreneur who benefits from the services he provides. Benefits are context-specific but can range from payments, access, or information to things less quantifiable such as enhanced status, influence and future obligations. The more successful the broker is in transmitting resources between actors, the more credit he
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135 Wolf (1956: 1076). Whilst representing the interests of both actors, the broker may be closer ‘relationally, socially or informationally’ to one than the other. These aspects are analysed in terms of ‘bias and cohesion’ (Stovel & Shaw 2012: 142).
141 Schmidt (1974) and Boissevain (1974) argue that brokers can convert their power into first-order resources, become patrons in their own. However, even as brokers of second-order resources they still function as patrons.
accrues as he increases trust and good will in him. In NT christology, Jesus is an intermediary of unique status closely connected to the unique benefits he delivers to believers. In one respect, believers function as Jesus’ clients on the basis that they are God’s clients and Jesus is God’s agent to them. However, simply being an agent would not necessarily explain the intense personal devotion Paul shows to Jesus. This phenomenon is more comprehensible, however, through the lens of brokerage where the broker gains credit and resources to act as a patron himself.

Aspects of brokerage sometimes emerge in discussions of the monarch as an analogy for christology. We have already mentioned the dual position of the Jewish king, or messiah, as God’s vice regent and a representative of the people. Some elements are shared by Roman views of the good ruler. Augustus was made pontifex maximus in 12 BCE, the highest position in Roman state religion. His role as augur was a defining image of the emperor in the political theology of the principate (literally ‘chief bridge-builder’). Like Hellenistic monarchs, the Roman emperor had the same relation to the state as the gods to the cosmos. He sat at the intersection of the human and divine spheres, being the image of the divine on earth. The figure of the Roman emperor is an apt analogy for Jesus as broker of salvific benefits, as a number of studies have illustrated. However, more attention should be paid to the differentiation that some ancient sources made between the emperor and the gods. Chapter 6 of this thesis will focus on the emperor as a client figure to the gods, who serves both the state and the gods in his imitation of the divine through dispensing justice.

However, rather than arguing that Paul’s depiction of Jesus corresponds to a particular broker—such as the emperor, or the Davidic king, or Adam—this thesis focuses on the relationship between the broker and his patron, and the broker and his client, within first-century patron client relations. Chapter 3 outlines some key ways that brokerage manifested itself in the Roman principate and identifies a language of
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143 Boissevain (1974: 159-164).
144 In the Res gestae, Augustus highlights his office of augur as well as that of pontifex maximus.
146 Smith (2011: 37-47). The theology and political ideology of the Augustan period was that Augustus was at the centre of the pax deorum, a cosmic process that returned society and nature to its proper order (Brent 2009: 105).
patronage and brokerage in Greek sources. These will then be used to analyse how Paul depicts Jesus as broker in his letters in ways recognisable to his readers.
CHAPTER 3: A Greek perception of patronage and brokerage: The shape of the relationships with their associated lexica for comparison with three christological texts

3.1. Outline

This chapter introduces the model of the broker within the field of patron-client relations as an analogy for examining Jesus’ subordinate relation to God and his divine relation to believers. Within a wider system of patron-client relations, the broker, or ‘middle-man’ is both a patron and a client whilst also being a mediator. This chapter outlines a model of patronage and brokerage in the historical setting of first-century Graeco-Roman society. It describes patronal relations during the time of the Roman principate. It argues that the ideology of patronage—most vividly but not solely expressed in the institution of Roman patrocinium—pervaded multiple strata of Graeco-Roman society and shaped how Greeks expected relationships between unequal figures to be conducted. It identifies a lexicon of terms commonly associated with patronal relations in order to place Paul’s conception of the relationship between God and Jesus and Jesus’ role as broker firmly within the first-century world. The chapter will employ literary and epigraphic sources to outline the essential elements and lexical features of a ‘patronal’ ideology. It will then compare the ideology with three descriptions of the relationship between God and Jesus in Paul’s letters. It argues that there is sufficient indication of the central motifs of patronage and brokerage to justify reading these texts in light of more specific parallels from first-century patron-broker-client relationships.

3.2. Defining patronage

Ancient historians differ over the best way to approach ancient patronage. Some use sociological and anthropological models to analyse structures of exchange and dependency whilst others prefer to focus on how Romans themselves understood patronage. For the purposes of analysing Paul’s christology through the lens of ancient brokerage, it is first necessary to clarify our view of patronage against the background of what has become a complex debate.
3.2.1. Roman patronage

The Roman institution of patronage (patrocinium) was a formal (but not legally-enforceable) arrangement extended to particular sets of relationships useful for public life, such as those between a defense lawyer in court (patronus) and an individual he represented; those between senatorial and elite Romans (patroni-clientes); and those between elite Romans and provincial cities or communities (patroni-clientes). A variant, but closely related relationship was that between manumitted slaves and their ex-masters (liberti-patroni). Other relationships which are disputed but often referred to under the rubric of Roman patronage are those between wealthy elites and the philosophers, poets and artists they supported.

3.2.1.1. Personal patronage

The role of a patronus was to protect the economic, political and social interests of his cliens, representing their clients in the courts or providing legal advice. In return, the cliens performed services for his patronus, supporting him in his political and social interests, through financial gifts or through non-material gestures that advanced his prestige, such as accompanying him in public and applauding his speeches. These relationships were defined through public acknowledgement and thus were bound to specific terminology and customs. The central custom was the salutatio—the practice of clients to greet and petition their patrons at their houses early in the morning. The clients’ attendance might be reciprocated with the sportulae—some food or a small amount of money provided in the afternoon.
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147 A patron’s bond to his liberti would not fit the sociological definition of patronage as it was enforceable by law. However, the voluntary aspect of patronage relationships is a complex issue—one could point to the limited free will in being pushed into one’s patronage by economic instability.
148 Eilers (2002: 4, 98) rejects literary patronage as a patronus-cliens relationship and, for the same reasons, Roman suffragium and Greek customs of euergetism. The relationship between ex-master and freedmen is often discounted from discussions of clientela because the freedman is described with the title libertus not cliens, and from social scientific definitions of patronage because the relationship was not voluntary and was enforceable by law. Disagreements over the boundaries of patrocinium naturally lead to disagreements over its lexicon: Gelzer (1969: 67) includes necessitudo and necessitas, as well as amicitia and hospitium which Brunt and Verboven reject. Lavan (2013,183) adds adsectatio and conuiuium to characteristic displays of deference to patrons.
149 Mouritsen (1988: 50-6, 68-9) suggests that patronage networks are visible in the placements of election graffiti (programmata) at Pompeii.
150 Clients became known as those who salute (Cicero, Comm. Pet. 35; Martial, Epig. 10.70, 74, 82).
A common ideal pervades the various forms of *patrocinium* that distinguished it from other social relationships such as *amicitia* and *hospitium*. Badian suggests that despite the diversity in the services expected and resources exchanged, different patronage relationships were ‘united by the element of a permanent (or at least long-term) *fides* to which corresponds the *officium* of the client who receives its *beneficia*’. In addition to the above Latin terms, other vocabulary is common to *patrocinium*. Eilers believes that *patrocinium* was initiated by the self-commendation of a prospective client (*applicatio*), whilst Verboven argues that it could be initiated in a more coercive manner by a patron putting a prospective client in their debt through the giving of gifts (*beneficia*) that could not be reciprocated in value. Saller argues that, in addition to *meritum* (favour) and *gratia* (goodwill), Roman patronage relationships can also be identified by the presence of terms from the fields of *amicitia* and debt and credit.

3.2.1.2. Patrons and brokers of collective clients

Patronage of Greek cities and associations (*collegia/θίασοι*) in the late Republic/early Empire mirrored the patterns of patronage of individuals—patrons (senators under the Republic or provincial governors during the Late Republic) provided a range of first-order resources (benefits) such as financial sponsorship for building projects, festivals and other activities, arbitration of internal disputes in the city, and the conferred honour that comes with being associated with their name. In return, client groups provided their patrons with prestige and reputation through statues and inscriptions, honours at festivals, political support, testimonials for trials, and possibly material resources. *Patroni* of collective clients were also desirable as brokers. Their second-order resources—their contacts at Rome—meant that they
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151 Lavan (2013: 180) describes ‘a certain coherence’ in the Roman imagination and cautiously describes the lexical cluster associated with the relationship as a ‘language of clientele’.
152 Badian (1958: 10). A patronage could be described with the phrase *in fide esse, in fidem uenire, in fidem recipere*. Morgan (2015: 62) defines *fides*/*πίστις* as the trust that enabled patrons and clients to ‘do business with each other’ for mutual benefit.
156 Eilers (2002: 19-37) also argues that clients could only become clients by a gesture of self-commendation called the *applicatio*. This is disputed by Verboven (2002: 62; 2003).
could be ‘catalysts’ for creating new relationships, supporting and making introductions for embassies from the city. They could also be ‘middlemen’, advocating for honours and privileges on behalf of cities/groups, acting as priests, and providing the general service of acting for the client.

3.2.2. Sociological patronage

The sociological model of patronage, used by historians since the 1970s and 80s, illuminates relationships between gods and men, husbands and wives, masters and slaves in different ancient societies. A minimal definition of patronage would be ‘a structural principle which underlies asymmetric, personal transactions [interactions which are governed by reciprocity] involving protection and loyalty between two persons or groups of persons.’ Other scholars specify that the relationship is voluntary, that services exchanged are often of different types, or that ‘the transaction is initiated and ‘directed’ by the patron.’ The model enables scholars to do cross-cultural comparison and to analyse the dynamics of relationships and social systems. It can identify patterns of social interaction which sources and social conventions might consciously or unconsciously disguise.

Saller uses sociological models of patronage and brokerage to understand the ‘machinery’ of the Roman political class during the principate, arguing that patronage provided a key mechanism in the race for offices, financial support and reputation. The sociological model identifies the functional characteristics of patrocinium where the Latin terms are scarce in the primary sources. Saller’s effective use of an etic definition of patronage for identifying the emic phenomenon
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162 Following the definition of Boissevain (1966).
163 Saller (1982: 10-11) argues that the term cliens was socially unacceptable for the most aristocratic members of elite society as it carried connotations of inferiority and superiority. See Cicero, Off. 2.69 for example. Rather, they used the language of amicitia, despite the fact that, ‘Amici rarely could be and rarely considered themselves as peers’ (White 1978: 81).
of Roman patronage (*patrocinium*) has been hugely influential in both classical and NT studies.\textsuperscript{164}

3.3. Criticisms of patron-client models and the approach to patronage adopted in this thesis

Use of sociological models has faced resistance from those who prefer to focus on what Romans themselves understood as patronage. Proponents of the sociological model have sometimes conflated the Roman institution of *patrocinium* with the structural phenomenon of patronage, when they are entirely different things.\textsuperscript{165} The model can also be used to include relationships which Romans themselves would never have considered patronage.\textsuperscript{166} As a sociological model, it defines ‘a dyadic social relation’, ‘a ubiquitous and elementary form of social life, found in the most diverse social settings.’\textsuperscript{167} Eilers argues, ‘Definitions are valuable not only for what they include, but also for what they exclude. The above definition disallows almost nothing.’\textsuperscript{168} The issue arises in Saller’s work where the help that elite Romans gave their protégées in securing offices is identified as Roman patronage, where in fact it constitutes *suffragium*, which Eilers holds to be a distinct practice.\textsuperscript{169} Others argue that scholars too readily talk of the Greek practice of benefaction as patronage.\textsuperscript{170} Some consider euergetism a distinctly Greek cultural phenomenon that cannot be reduced to patronage, whilst Roman patronage could include acts of euergetism. Patronage based on sociological definitions is also critiqued for its inclusion of certain lexica. Terms such as *amici* comes from the word group related to friendship, and whilst use of such terms might be indicative of *patrocinium* they do not necessarily identify it.\textsuperscript{171} For example, discourse between *amici* might sometimes employ a flattering, submissive tone characteristic of interactions between patrons

\textsuperscript{164}Wallace-Hadrill (1989: 3); Nauta (2000); Bowditch (2001); Verboven (2002).
\textsuperscript{165}Whilst historians employing the sociological model of patronage do often note the difference between sociological and classical definitions, their work sometimes conflates the two. For example, Saller (1982: 1, 8) uses the Latin terms to describe the sociological model of patronage and confusingly writes of the sociological phenomenon of patronage as a Mediterranean ‘institution’.
\textsuperscript{166}Sherwin-White (1983: 272). D’Arms (1986: 95) states that a definition so broad goes well beyond what the Romans technically understood by *patrocinium*.
\textsuperscript{167}Johnson & Dandeker (1989: 222).
\textsuperscript{168}Eilers (2002: 6-7).
\textsuperscript{169}Ibid. 4.
\textsuperscript{170}See also Joubert (2000; 2001) and Marshall (2009) who maintain this distinction.
and clients. However, such a tone might not reflect the structural reality of the long-
term relationship.\footnote{Nicols (1992: 131). Downs (2009) also finds the sociological model problematic because it relies on judgements regarding an individuals’ status—an aspect of ancient society that can be ambiguous and multiplex.}

These criticisms have also been echoed by NT scholars concerned that colleagues have applied models of patronage too indiscriminately to intra-human relationships and human-divine relationships in the NT.\footnote{For intra-human patronage (rather than simply reciprocity and interdependence) in Pauline churches see Judge (1960: 60); Chow (1992), Clarke (1993: 32, 35, 93, 167), Kirner (2002; 2003), Rice (2013). The most frequent application of the model to NT theology has centered on the gospels (Malina 1996; Neyrey 2004) and Hebrews (deSiva 1996; Whittlark 2008). See also Batten (2004: 258) on James. Downs (2009: 132, n. 9) critiques Neyrey and Batten for merging definitions of sociological patronage and \textit{patrocinium}.}

McGillivray argues that a greater distinction needs to be made between patron-client relations and reciprocity more generally.\footnote{Eilers (2002: 1-18, 183-184); Harrison (2003: 15).} He argues that too often scholars label relationships as ‘patron-client’ where they are simply reciprocal, thus presenting Roman patronage and general reciprocity as ‘an incomprehensible hybrid’.\footnote{MacGillivray (2009: 42). MacGillivray also makes the valid critique of scholars who interpret hospitality in the NT as a necessary cause of patron-client bonds (2009: 42, n. 20). MacGillivray (2011) argues that Rom 16:1-2 depicts Phoebe as a benefactor, not a patron.} Downs argues that the patron-client model becomes increasingly problematic when it is applied to NT theology because neither sociological patronage nor classical patronage fit Paul’s theology.\footnote{Downs (2009).}

For Downs, Paul’s principal image for God is a father, not a patron.

Whilst these critiques have helpfully drawn attention to the problems of merging sociological patronage with Roman \textit{patrocinium}, not all their criticisms are persuasive. With regard to issues with the structure of patron-client models, it is immediately apparent that the criticism of Saller’s sociological definition for being overly broad is exaggerated. Contra Eilers, relationships such as those between slaves and masters and the \textit{patronus-libertus} relationships are not included under the patron-client model because they were not \textit{voluntary} relationships.\footnote{Contra Downs (2009: 134), Eilers (2002: 5-6). This is not to say that \textit{patronus-libertus} relationships is not relevant to classical patronage.} Although Greek, public euergetism is a distinct cultural phenomenon (as Eilers, Joubert, Marshal and others demonstrate), certain asymmetrical reciprocal relationships that operated in the Hellenistic world more widely can be included in sociological
definitions of patronage. As we will show, Greeks quickly adapted to, and participated in, Roman systems of patronage.

Second, Nicols and Downs’ arguments regarding the complexity of social status is certainly relevant to discussions of the social makeup of the Pauline churches where scholars are working with sparse amounts of data. It is true that patron-client models need to be flexible and adaptable to the complexity and even fluidity of a person’s statuses as power between actors is continuously negotiated. However, there are instances where status differentials are clearly evident, such as relationships between gods and worshippers, or the emperor and his subjects which are both central to this study.

Downs questions the appropriateness of patronage as an analogy for understanding Paul’s view of God. He argues that the patronage system was essentially exploitative and was driven by the race for limited resources. According to Downs, these factors do not fit with Paul’s understanding of God as the sole wielder of infinite resources. However, Downs’ argument fails on two points. It does not consider fully the biblical traditions reflected in Paul’s writings (cf. Rom 1:20-23; 1 Cor 8-10) in which YHWH competes against other claimants for honour and worship. Neither does Downs’ argument appreciate the cultural power of patronal ideology and the significance of patron-benefactor analogies in Graeco-Roman thought. If the patron-benefactor analogy was as important to ancient conceptions of fatherhood as the sources suggest, then it follows that the analogy would be significant to Paul’s conception of God as father.

178 Herman (1987: 8, 10) sheds light on the ‘ritualised friendship’ (ξενία or ‘guest-friendship’) as a bond of solidarity between elites from distinct social units, formed by the exchange of goods and services and intended for the gain of material and political resources. Although these ties are broadly horizontal, they could lop-side into clientage (1987: 37, 39-40, 116-128, 144). Herman also finds that these relationships are not restricted to the Greek world but also included the Macedonians, Epirotes and non-Greeks (1987: 12). Millett (1989,18) argues that classical Athens took steps to minimise patronage amongst the elite although ‘something very like it’ persisted on the periphery. Lintott (1993: 170) notes attestations to group patronage in Gaul, and that Greek cities calls individuals ‘benefactors’ which ‘effectively’ places them in position of patrons. With regard to group/city patronage, Gruen (1984: 199) shows that similar dependency relationships pre-existed Roman dominance in the East. See Osiek (2009: 144) for further discussion.
With regard to issues relating to terminology, it is not sufficiently recognised that *patrocinium* was a specific cultural expression of a broader ideology of social relations. As a recognised, formalised relationship of dependency it overlaps with other dependency relationships in its relational dynamic and in its wider terminology. For example, one of the reasons that Downs gives for not interpreting Paul’s God as a patron is that he does not know of any evidence of a god being referred to as a *patronus*. However, there are clear instances of gods being treated as *patroni* without the specific Latin label being applied by the sources.

By understanding *patrocinium* as a formal expression of a common social ideology we can better understand how ancient sources could compare senators and their protégés with *patroni* and their *clientes*. Because some senatorial relationships exhibited the qualities of asymmetry and reciprocity, they could be easily likened to *patrocinium*. In fact, the more that a senator’s protégés acted like *clientes* by showing deference at the *salutatio* or by depending on the influence of their *suffragatores*, the more likely it was that such protégés would be thought of as *clientes*. *Patrocinium* was so embedded in first-century life that it was used as a metaphor to describe other relationships, such as those between Rome and the *socii*, between the emperor and the state, between non-elites and between gods and worshippers. Whilst it would be historically inaccurate to speak of *patrocinium* amongst the non-elite strata of the Roman world, we can speak of a common ideology of social relations for relationships characterised by asymmetrical reciprocity that we could call a ‘patronal’ ideology.

---


180 For worshippers treating the gods as *patroni* at temples see Seneca, *Ep. 95.47-8*; Augustine, *Civ. 6.10*; as patrons in *defixiones* see Versnel (1991a: 71, 90; 1991b).

181 See Saller’s comments on *Dig. 49.15.7.1* (1989: 51-52) and his analysis of Fronto, *Ad Ver. 2.7* (1989: 59-60).

182 Plutarch, *Praec. ger. rei publ. 814D*.

183 Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. rom. 2.11.1*; Cicero famously described Roman rule as a *patrocinium* of the world (*Cicero, Off. 2.26-7*). See also Lavan (2013) and Rich (1989).

184 For emperors as *patroni* to individuals see Suet. *Aug. 56.4*, Plin. *Paneg. 23.1*; Statius, *Silv. 4.1.46*. For Augustus’ patronage of communities and for his avoidance of patronage language see Nicols (2013: 83-124). For the emperor as *patronus* to the state see Excursus §E7.

185 See Osiek (2005) and Hemelrijk (2015) for civic and personal patronage exercised by elite Roman women and by non-elites. See Dickey (2002: 105-106, 238-239) for sources that use *patronus* figuratively to refer to a ‘powerful man protecting or helping the less powerful’. See Freu (2016) for apprentices of trades from the middle strata who benefitted from the *patrocinium* of their masters.
This thesis focuses on a structural model of patronage rather than on the Roman institution of *patrocinium*. As Downs shows, Greek terms that translate the technical terms of Roman patronage are scarce, especially in Paul’s letters. This definition of Roman patronage is equally difficult to tie to Paul’s theology and christology. Paul does not refer to God or Jesus προστάτης or πελάτης (the Greek terms for the *patronus* and *cliens* in Roman patrocinium). He does not describe Jesus offering a *salutatio* to the Father (the nearest we might find are in Mark 1:35; Heb 5:7). The structural model of patronage, however, provides a framework for assessing the resources exchanged within a given relationship and for analysing the exercise of power, dependence and influence within it. This has immediate relevance for investigating how Jesus relates to God in key christological texts.

Use of the sociological definition does not mean that we should be inattentive to language. If an ideology of social relations does underlie Paul’s thinking then we would expect to see it manifested in certain linguistic patterns. The next section will apply the structural model of patronage to Greek sources that describe certain hierarchical exchange relationships, including *patrocinium*, to reveal a consistent pattern of vocabulary. This structure and vocabulary can then be applied to Paul's depiction of the interrelationship between God and Jesus.

3.4. A Greek perception of Roman *patrocinium*: the shape of the relationship and its associated lexicon

Scholars from classical and NT studies have shed light on a Greek lexicon of patronage. Rice’s work on Paul and patronage goes further than most in applying
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186 See Paul’s use of προστάτης (Rom 16:1-2); προϊόστημι (1 Thess 5:12; 1 Tim 5:17). This is not to say that terms associated with this definition are foreign to other NT authors: Acts 10:38 refers to Jesus as a benefactor (δοξοφυτέω); Hebrews 5:7 refers to Jesus making supplications (ἰκετηρία) to God.

187 In fact, use of patronage by NT scholars has often gone astray when it has not paid sufficient attention to the linguistic aspects of the phenomenon. Lampe, in his introduction to Paul and patronage, suggests that Paul’s language of horizontal relationships between Christ and Christians sits in tension with the language of vertical relations characteristic of patronage (2016: 226). However, the primary sources show that patrons and clients frequently described their relationship in ‘friendly’ and familial (horizontal) terms.

188 Danker (1982) introduced NT scholars to the language of benefaction in epigraphy. Herman (1987: 10-13) provides a useful vocabulary for ritualised friendship, which could well become patronal in shape. Millett (1989: 15, 38) states that the Greek material concerning classical Athens almost
a Greek lexicon of Graeco-Roman patronage to Pauline texts. Rice constructs three patronage lenses (personal, communal and imperial) to understand the relational dynamics between Paul and the church at Corinth. Where Rice focuses on patronage, our focus is on brokerage within patron-client relations. Rice’s model of personal patronage is only based on two Greek sources (Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Luke 7), and he is mainly interested in their thematic patterns rather than linguistic ones.

Other NT scholars have provided lexicon specific to mediators. Neyrey provides a list of labels associated with mediators from Graeco-Roman political, religious, and legal spheres. Harvey and others highlight ἀπόστολος as the common Greek term for an agent. However, their lexica are mainly labels for brokering figures in different contexts rather than terms associated with brokering activity. διακονία and its cognates are the most flexible of the terms that have been associated with brokerage. A more holistic way to describe the broker is to analyse his role within a wider system of patron-client relations. Because a broker is both a patron and client we can delineate a word field of brokerage by identifying him with both the language of patronage and clientage. Identifying the broker with a wider field of functions rather than specific labels also has the benefit of allowing us to see how brokering activity is expressed in Paul’s own language of divine-human relations.

Roman Dionysius of Halicarnassus’ Antiquitates romanae (first century BCE) and L. Mestrius Plutarch’s Romulus (first century CE) provide the most extensive descriptions of Roman patronage written in Greek. Their idealistic accounts have sometimes been read in a rather naïve fashion as reflecting the actual state of patronage in the time of their authors. More astute approaches consider them responses to patronage. However, their accounts of Rome’s foundation myths entirely devoid of terminology of patronage, although the figure of the κόλαξ is one form of dependant. See also Damon (1997: 11-12).

Rice (2013).
Collins (2009) demonstrates that the terms refer to the activity of go-betweens and agents.
Brunt (1988); Rice (2013). They also have notable similarities with Isocrates’ fourth century political pamphlet, Areopagiticus (§32-35) which Wallace-Hadrill (1989: 26-27) calls ‘an apologia for patronage’.

entirely devoid of terminology of patronage, although the figure of the κόλαξ is one form of dependant. See also Damon (1997: 11-12).
also function as ‘mental reference map’s, that reveal an ideology of social relations, hierarchy and resource exchange for Graeco-Roman society under the principate.\textsuperscript{194}

Despite describing a Roman institution both Dionysius and Plutarch write about \textit{patrocinium} within a framework that familiarises Roman culture for Greeks. Dionysius is explicit. His \textit{Antiquitates romanae} chronicles Rome’s origins from its mythic past in the eighth-century up to the time of the First Punic War, arguing that Romans were originally Greeks whose institutions and customs can be understood through corresponding Greek practices. Whilst Dionysius presents the institution of patronage as a distinctly Roman custom, he writes of it as one that overlaps with Greek practices.\textsuperscript{195} Indeed, scholars have highlighted Dionysius’ over-simplification of many of Rome’s customs in order to fit them to Greek analogies. He presents Rome as a Greek \textit{polis} whose success as a world power is attributed to Roman emulation of Greek virtues.\textsuperscript{196}

Plutarch’s \textit{Bioi paralleloi} promotes Hellenic virtues through the victories and failures of celebrated Greeks and Romans.\textsuperscript{197} Whilst Plutarch’s work should be understood as a moral, not political, consolatory work,\textsuperscript{198} it does to an extent reconcile Greek and Roman cultures. Despite Rome and its customs retaining a strong degree of otherness,\textsuperscript{199} Plutarch’s Romans are no less than his Greeks in virtues and achievements and their patronage system, though different, is translatable through existing Greek structures.\textsuperscript{200} The similarities between the two authors may have something to do with the fact that they were both writing in the aftermaths of great social upheaval. Dionysius came to Rome under the stabilised regime of Augustus after a bloody civil war.\textsuperscript{201} Plutarch likely wrote his \textit{Bioi} under the stability of Trajan’s reign after the tyranny of Domitian.\textsuperscript{202} Despite being written in different centuries both authors represent worlds in which Roman rule and customs establish

\textsuperscript{194}Verboven (2002: 60).
\textsuperscript{195}Dionysius of Halicarnassus, \textit{Ant. rom.} 2.9.2-3.
\textsuperscript{196}Duff (1999: 301-2).
\textsuperscript{197}Stadter (2015: 6).
\textsuperscript{198}Jones (1978: 105-9).
\textsuperscript{199}Duff (1999: 299).
\textsuperscript{200}Whilst Plutarch avoids using Greek analogies he does offer Greek equivalents to transliterated Roman terms (Stadter 2015: 22).
\textsuperscript{201}\textit{Ant. rom.} 1.7.2.
\textsuperscript{202}Stadter (2015: 6).
stability. The following presents Dionysius and Plutarch’s accounts of Roman *patrocinium* under the headings of the sociological definition of patronage in order to highlight the consistent shape across various descriptions of asymmetrical reciprocity relationships in Greek sources.

3.4.1. Unequal standing

According to Dionysius, the institution of patronage was established when Romulus himself separated the patricians from the plebeians. They are appointed for ‘kindly services and honours (τὰ φιλάνθρωπα καὶ τὰς τιμὰς) in accordance with merit (ἀξίαν)’.

He distinguished those who were eminent (τοὺς ἐπιφανεῖς) for their birth, approved for their virtue (ἀρετὴν ἐπαινοῦμένους) and wealthy for those times, provided they already had children, from the obscure, the lowly and the poor (τῶν ἀσήμων καὶ ταπεινῶν καὶ ἀπόρων).203

Patrons are selected from ‘illustrious families’ (ἐπιφανῶν οἴκων).204 Plutarch distinguishes ‘the foremost and most influential citizens (τοὺς πρῶτους καὶ δυνατωτάτους)’ from ‘the more lowly’ (τῶν ταπεινοτέρων), and later, ‘the nobles’ (τοὺς δυνατοὺς) from ‘the multitude’ (τῶν πολλῶν).205

3.4.2. Reciprocity

Patrons and clients perform different types of services for each other. It was the duty of the patricians to explain the laws, to take care (ἐπιμελέσομαι) of the plebeians’ financial and legal matters and to defend them in court (προστάτης).206 In turn the plebeians would provide (συνεκδίδωμι) their patricians’ with dowries for their daughters, provide payment (λύω) for their ransoms and share (μετέχω) the costs of their public expenditure ‘not as loans but as thank-offerings’ (οὔ δανεῖσματα ποιοῦντας, ἀλλὰ χάριτας).207 Plutarch describes clients as devoted (θεραπεύω) to

---

203 Ant. rom. 2.8.1 (trans. Earnest Carey, LCL).
204 Ant. rom. 2.10.1.
205 Rom. 13.3-4, 5.
206 Rom. 13.5.
207 Ant. rom. 2.10.1-2.
their patrons, honouring them (τιμάω), providing (συνεκδίδωμι) dowries and paying (συνεκτίνω) their debts.208

3.4.3. Duration

The exchanges between patrons and clients are part of a relationship (συζυγία).209 Their duties to each other are expected at different times of life, particularly in times of crisis. Dionysius describes some patronus-clients relationships as passed down through successive generations.210

3.4.4. Other elements

Other elements of the two foundation myths also correspond to sociological definitions of patronage. The relationship has a prominent kinship and friendly glaze. The patricians/patrons are called fathers.211 Clients are likened to sons (2.10.1: παῖς). They support their patrons financially ‘in the same manner as if they were their relations’.212 The relationship is one of ‘kindness’ (φιλάνθρωπος) and ‘befitting fellow citizens’ (2.9.3: πολιτικός).213 The relationship is also characterised by good will (εὔνοια), gift-giving (2.10.2: χάρις) and faithfulness.214 They do not testify against (καταμαρτυρέω) one another in court.215 The relationship is voluntary—plebeians choose (βούλομαι) their patrons.216

---

208 Rom. 13.6.
209 Ant. rom. 2.9.3, 10.4
210 Ant. rom. 2.10.1.
211 Ant. rom. 2.8.1.
212 (2.10.2-3)
213 The relationship is also pervaded with notions of honour. Patrons are characterised by their high social standing. Clients honour patrons (Rom. 13.6: τιμάω). Clients’ financial support is given as a gift (Ant. rom 2.10.2: χάριτας).
214 Ant. rom. 2.10.4.
215 Ant. rom. 2.10.3; Rom. 13.6.
216 Ant. rom. 2.9.2.
3.4.5. A lexicon of Roman *patrocinium*

The lexicon relating to the relationship between patrons and clients is presented in five categories: ‘labels’ (the titles and referents used for patrons and clients), ‘transactions’ (what patrons do for clients and what clients do for patrons), ‘attributes’ (notable characteristics associated with the figures), ‘attitudes’ (the tone of interactions between patrons and clients) and ‘relationship’ (terms associated with the relationship itself). It is evident from the lexicon below that the terms associated with *patrocinium* (and in later tables, relationships that we term ‘patronal relationships’) overlap with numerous other word fields, such as the fields of payment and transaction, honour and status, kinship and friendship. When terms from these fields are combined with terms of status inequality then they suggest the presence of an ideology of asymmetrical, reciprocal (‘patronal’) relations. For all the lexicons in this chapter, full versions are found in the appendix.

*Table 3.1: Selected terms for Roman patrocinium from Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Antiquititates romanae and Plutarch, Romulus*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patrons</th>
<th>Greek term</th>
<th>Clients</th>
<th>Greek term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Labels</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Superior</td>
<td>κρείσσων, ον</td>
<td>Inferior</td>
<td>ἡσσων, ον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patron/protector</td>
<td>προστάτης, ὁ</td>
<td>The Lowly</td>
<td>ταπεινός, ἠ, ὁν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guardian (to cities)</td>
<td>φύλαξ, ὁ</td>
<td>The Poor</td>
<td>ἄπορος, ον; πένης, ὁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>πατήρ, ὁ</td>
<td>Client</td>
<td>πελάτης, ὁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The powerful</td>
<td>δυνατός, ἦ, ὁν</td>
<td>Inferior, deficient</td>
<td>ὑποδεής, ἐς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protector of inferior</td>
<td>κηδεμονικός, ἦ, ὁν</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helper</td>
<td>βοηθητικός, ἦ, ὁν</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attributes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved for being distinguished</td>
<td>ἐπαινέω; ἐπιφανής</td>
<td>Lacking rank</td>
<td>καταδεής; τύχη, ἦ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father-like</td>
<td>πατήρ, ὁ</td>
<td>Son-like</td>
<td>παῖς, ὁ, ἦ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerful</td>
<td>δυνατός, ἦ, ὁν</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquires clients by their merit</td>
<td>ἀρετή, ἦ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best</td>
<td>ἀριστος, ἦ, ὁν</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reciprocal actions

| Havehonours | τίμη, ἡ | - | - |
| Defendscharges againstclient | ὑπέχω | Pays ransom | καταβάλλω; λότρον, τὸ |
| Explainslaws | ἐξηγέομαι | Assists with dowries when needed | συνεκδίδωμι |
| Takescareof | ἐπιμελέομαι | Shares costs of patron’s offices as with kin | μετέχω; ἀνάλομα, τὸ |
| Doesallthings thatfathers do for sons | πράσσω; ἀπας; πατήρ, ὁ; παῖς, ὁ, ἡ | Renders all services | ἀξίω; ὑπηρετέω |
| Competes in showingkindness | χάρις, ἡ | Competes in kindness | χάρις, ἡ |
| Watch overclients | ἐπιμελέομαι | Pay debts | συνεκτίνω |
| Wereadvisers in legalissues | ἔξηγητής, ὁ | Honours | τιμᾶω |
| Were defenders in court | προστάτης, ὁ | - | - |

Attitudes

| Wishes not to trouble | βούλομαι, ἐνοχλέω | Share costs of patron’s offices as with family | γένος, τὸ |
| Good will toward other | εὔνοια, ἡ | Deem patrons worthy to render services to them | ἀξίω |
| - | - | Good will toward other | εὔνοια, ἡ |

Attitudes

| Watches over clients with father care and concern | πατρικός, ὁ, ὁν; κηδεμονία, ἡ; φροντίς, ἡ; | Devoted | θεραπεύω |

Depiction of the relationship

| A protection | προστασία, ἡ |
| Brings rights and privileges | δίκαιος, α, ὁν |
| Union | συζυγία, ἡ |
| Kind | φιλάνθρωπος, ὁν |
| Virtuous way of life bringing happiness | ἀρετὴ, ἡ |
As foundation myths Dionysius and Plutarch’s accounts communicate an ideology of interpersonal relations in Graeco-Roman society. In his study of the role of amicitia and patronage in the economy of the late Roman Republic, Verboven highlights its importance of Dionysius’ account as a source for emic analysis, representing a ‘narrative embodiment of a mental reference map’. \(^{217}\) Stadter also considers Plutarch’s account relevant for understanding patron-client relations in the first century CE, with its emphasis on mutual obligations reflecting ‘the fundamental features of personal patronage under the empire’. \(^{218}\) As a particular cultural expression of the wider phenomenon of patronage, Roman patrocinium makes explicit the roles, behaviours and attitudes expected from relationships between people of unequal status. Both accounts characterise the reciprocal services as protection exchanged for honour and support. We will now show how the key functional elements of patrocinium and its associated constellation of lexicon are also present in descriptions of informal, asymmetrical reciprocity relationships between Romans and Greeks.

3.5. The shape and lexica of patronal relationships between elite Greeks and Romans

Plutarch provides a good example of how asymmetrical reciprocal relations reflect the essential shape and lexical characteristics of patrocinium. His advice to statesmen, Praecepta gerendae rei publicae, shows how patron-client relationships were consciously manipulated by members of elite classes to further political careers.

As a benefactor of his hometown Chaeronea in Boeotia and a priest in the neighbouring town of Delphi, Plutarch writes from experience as a Greek ingratiated into systems of patronage. Greeks from Asia Minor had already risen to positions of power in the Roman political hierarchy, becoming consuls and generals of armies. \(^{219}\) ‘Friends’ such as the consuls L. Mestrius Florus and Q. Sosius Senecio appear to have been instrumental to Plutarch’s social advancements. Florus took Plutarch on a

\(^{217}\) Verboven (2002: 60).
\(^{218}\) Stadter (2015: 24).
\(^{219}\) Jones (1978: 46-7).
trip to Northern Italy and introduced him to several Roman senators. It seems quite possible that Florus’ recommendation gained Plutarch his citizenship and equestrian rank. In return, these ‘friends’ would receive cultural capital from Plutarch’s company, as well as increased reputation as a patron responsible for Plutarch’s success.\(^{220}\) Plutarch clearly understood the power of patronage for the affairs of elite provincials under Roman rule.

 Whilst Plutarch’s advice to fellow Greeks frequently looks to examples from the Republican past, he assumes that they have practical relevance for the lives of his contemporaries.\(^{221}\) Plutarch argues that whilst there are many ways of forging a career in politics, the most ‘safe and leisurely way’ is via ‘friendship’ with great men:

> But anyone who is entering upon a public career (πολιτείας) should choose as his leader (ἡγεμόνα) a man who is not merely of established reputation and powerful (ἐνδόξον καὶ δυνατόν), but one who is all this on account of real worth (ἀρετήν).\(^{222}\)

Plutarch does not use the technical terms for patrons and clients but consistently uses the language of friendship.

> [...] he should also have always a friend (φίλον) among the men of high station who have the greatest power (ἀνω δυνατοτάτων) as a firm bulwark, so to speak, of his administration; for the Romans themselves are most eager (σπουδὰς) to promote the political interests of their friends (προθυμότατοι τοῖς φίλοις).\(^{223}\)

Despite being described with the terminology of friendship, these relationships are clearly hierarchical dependency relationships. Plutarch’s key metaphor for friendship between junior and senior statesmen is that of the grape vine which attaches itself to a host tree, benefiting from its strength.\(^{224}\) As Saller writes: ‘Plutarch shows that provincials thought patronal influence to be the natural path to procuratorships.’\(^{225}\)

\(^{220}\) Stadter (2015: 40-1).
\(^{221}\) As discussed in Plutarch, Praec. ger. rei publ. 814A-C.
\(^{222}\) 806C (trans. Harold N. Fowler, LCL).
\(^{223}\) 814C, cf. 806B.
\(^{224}\) 805E.
\(^{225}\) Saller (1982: 50).
In contrast with Plutarch’s terminology of *patrocinium*, his advice for statesmen describes juniors (clients) with terms associated with honour and high status. This is to be expected for relationships amongst members of the socio-political elite. But, hierarchy is inherent in a second metaphor: Like the moon reflecting the light of the sun, good junior statesmen act appropriately to their station by honouring (συνέπικοσμέω) their ‘leader’, cherishing (θεραπεύω) ‘the guide of their actions’ (καθηγεμόνα τῶν πράξεων).\(^{226}\) We also find recurring characteristics of patrons and clients from *Romulus* in his descriptions of senior and junior friends: the famous and the obscure, the young and the old, the counsellor and the guided.

As with *patrocinium*, eagerness, goodwill and trust binds the relationship but it is also characterised by utility—an element which resounds with Verboven’s notion of ‘instrumental friendship’.\(^{227}\) Use of ‘friends’ as agents is clear in metaphors of instrumentality where ‘good, trustworthy men’ (πιστοὺς καὶ ἀγαθοὺς ἄνδρας) offer means of communicating with and influencing other groups.\(^{228}\) Plutarch even describes politicians acting as clients at the *salutatio*, referring to public men who ‘grow old haunting the doors of other men’s houses’.\(^{229}\) Plutarch shows how the ideology of patronage influenced expectations of how reciprocal relationships between persons of unequal status should be conducted.

Plutarch’s depiction of provincial statesmen places them as bridging gaps in the administration of the provinces. Good statesmen attach themselves to powerful friends and they also have lesser friends at their disposal to act as their agents. These friends act as ‘living and thinking tools (ὄργανα) of the statesman’.\(^{230}\) He should assist and defend his friends, whilst bestowing favours on them such as help to gain offices or providing them with honourable tasks in administration or embassies.\(^{231}\) Rather than displaying a specific lexicon associated with brokerage, Plutarch presents layers of patron-client relations—the statesmen too is an instrument, ‘a subject, ruling a State controlled by proconsuls, the agents of Caesar.’\(^{232}\)

\(^{226}\) 806A; 805F.
\(^{227}\) 805E, 806B, 807D.
\(^{228}\) 812B-C; 813D-E.
\(^{229}\) 814D-E.
\(^{230}\) 807D.
\(^{231}\) 808B.
\(^{232}\) 813D-E.
Table 3.2: Selected terms for elite patronage from Plutarch, Praecepta gerendae rei publicae

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senior statesmen</th>
<th>Greek term</th>
<th>Junior statesmen</th>
<th>Greek term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Labels</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guide</td>
<td>καθηγεμόν, ὁ</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>φίλος, ὁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maker</td>
<td>ποιητής, ὁ</td>
<td>Living and</td>
<td>ὀργανός, ἦ, ὡν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>φίλος, ὁ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>ἕγεμον, ὁ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lover of noble</td>
<td>φιλόκαλος, ὡν</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>things</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisor of</td>
<td>σύμβουλος, ὁ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>favours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attributes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Famous, of</td>
<td>ἐνδοξος, ὡν</td>
<td>Obscure</td>
<td>ἄδοξος, ὡν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reputation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older</td>
<td>πρεσβύτερος</td>
<td>Young</td>
<td>νέος, ἂ, ὡν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High station</td>
<td>ἄνω; δυνατὸς, ἦ, ὡν</td>
<td>Does not snatch glory</td>
<td>ψφαρπάξω; δόξα, ἦ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eager</td>
<td>σκοῦδη, ἥ</td>
<td>Excellence</td>
<td>ἄρετη, ἥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reputation</td>
<td>δόξα, ἥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>πιστός, ἅ, ὡν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reciprocal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raises up, under</td>
<td>αἴρω; δύναμις, ἦ</td>
<td>Attaches</td>
<td>προστρέχω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>his protection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes great</td>
<td>αὐξάνω</td>
<td>Gives service,</td>
<td>θεραπεύω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>attend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causes to shine</td>
<td>λαμπρόνω</td>
<td>Joins in honouring</td>
<td>συνεπικοσμέω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favours</td>
<td>σκουδάζω; χάρις, ἦ</td>
<td>Enhances status</td>
<td>αὐξάνω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wills</td>
<td>ἐθέλω</td>
<td>Illuminates</td>
<td>συνεκφωτίζω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leads to</td>
<td>χειραγωγέω; δόξα, ἦ</td>
<td>Eagerly exalts virtues</td>
<td>συμφιλοτιμέομαι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reputation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sends</td>
<td>πέμπω</td>
<td>Receives glory,</td>
<td>λαμβάνω; ψφαρπάξω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>not snatching it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aids</td>
<td>βοηθέω</td>
<td>Learns to obey</td>
<td>δοκεῖοι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stands with</td>
<td>παρίστημι</td>
<td>Shows affection</td>
<td>ἀγαπάω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrusts roles</td>
<td>ἐγχειρίζω</td>
<td>Praises</td>
<td>ἐπαινέω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps to gain office</td>
<td>συλλαμβάνω; ἀρχή, ἡ</td>
<td>Provides service</td>
<td>χρεία, ἡ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selects as an assistant</td>
<td>προσασφαλέοι</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives praise, receives praise</td>
<td>ἐπαινέω</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Attitudes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wishes to be the first of many great ones</th>
<th>βούλομαι; πρῶτος, ἡ, ον; μέγας, μεγάλη, μέγα</th>
<th>Is not puffed up</th>
<th>ἐπαιρώ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rejects requests gently</td>
<td>πρᾶος, ον</td>
<td>Relinquishes ambition</td>
<td>ἀφεστήξω; φιλοτιμία, ἡ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good will</td>
<td>εὔνοια, ἡ</td>
<td>Receives glory in goodwill and friendship</td>
<td>εὔνοια, ἡ; φιλία, ἡ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Depiction of the relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek Terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safe and leisurely way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly-relations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6. The shape and lexica of patronal relations between the emperor and the Roman elite

Dio Chrysostom’s third oration focuses on the emperor as a patron to many friends. More will be said on Dio’s first essay in relation to patronage relationships under the reign of Trajan in chapter 6. Here, we focus on the patronal structure behind Dio’s language of imperial friendship.

As the saviour and restorer of the Republic, Augustus and his successors became the symbolic patron of the state. But in reality he was a patron only to select individuals and groups. As the richest and most powerful man in the empire, he restructured the senatorial and equestrian classes under him through competitive pursuit of his *beneficium*. Membership on jury panels or entry into senate and military and senatorial offices became the commodities of the emperor’s favours, things to be

---

233 Millar (1977: 7). Nicols (2004) remarks that competition for priesthoods were only available to the most eminent ranks, and was intensely competitive, with failure likened to death, citing Tacitus, *Ann.* 6.40.
petitioned for and granted, rather than earned through military services.\textsuperscript{234} Rather than being a personal patron to the entire empire, the emperor engaged in patronage relationships with critical groups necessary for his personal protection – namely his lieutenants, but also his family, friends, household staff, doctors, and teachers.

Dio depicts imperial clients, or ‘friends’, as being on a more equal footing with the emperor. There is a degree of interdependency: ‘the stronger [the good king] makes (ισχυρότέρος ποιή) his friends, the stronger (ισχυρότερος) he becomes himself’.\textsuperscript{235} However it is clear that this is not a symmetrical friendship as the emperor commands supreme resources:

\begin{quote}
Now, who is more able to appoint governors (ἀρχοντας ἀποδεικνύειν)? Who needs (δεῖται) more executives (ἐπιμελουμένων)? Who has it in his power to give a part (μεταδόναι) in greater enterprises? Who is in a better position to put a man in charge (πιστεύειν) of military operations? Who can confer more illustrious honours (τιμαὶ φανερώτεραι)? Whose table lends greater distinction (εὐδοξοτέρα τράπεζα)? And if friendship could be bought, who has greater means to forestall every possible rival?\textsuperscript{236}
\end{quote}

Whilst Dio’s essay shows less obvious hierarchical language, it clearly assumes an asymmetrical reciprocity. The emperor bestows favours on his friends and appoints them to office. They in turn help him to achieve his goals. Whilst familial analogies are absent from Dio’s essay, the emperor, who is the father of the state, here provides care (προνοία) and his friends provide praise (ἐπαινέω). It is the emperor who holds the initiative to share power, not his friends, and only he is described as providing salvation. Their relationship is held together by trust, eagerness and goodwill.

Like Plutarch, Dio views ‘friendship’ as both desirable and useful for connecting gaps in the imperial network. ‘Friends’ are also agents and brokers. They are the emperor’s eyes, ears, hands and feet: ‘[…] Through (διὰ) his friends he can hold converse (διαλέγεσθαι) with all the world and accomplish (ἐφικνεῖσθαι) every

\textsuperscript{234} Millar (1977: 11, 479). Lendon (1997: 149) writes: ‘Certainly under the principate the luxurious express-elevator to the highest offices to which those of patrician birth were entitle usually carried them right past the stores in which spears and swords were stored.’

\textsuperscript{235} Dio Chrysostom, 3 Regn. 89- 90 (trans. J. W. Cohoon, LCL).

\textsuperscript{236} 3 Regn. 132.
undertaking.\textsuperscript{237} This is the language of both personal and instrumental relationships.\textsuperscript{238} The emperor’s relationships with his friends have a similar shape to the relationships analysed in §3.5, while the lexicon shows that the resources exchanged in, and the attributes ascribed to, this relationship are of a grander scale.

Table 3.3: Selected terms for elite patronage from Dio Chrysostom, De regno iii

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emperor</th>
<th>Greek term</th>
<th>Friends</th>
<th>Greek term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Giver and receiver of favours</td>
<td>δίδωμι; κτάομαι</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>φίλος, ό</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Co-worker</td>
<td>συνεργέω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attributes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>ἰσχυρός, ἄ, ὀν</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>ἰσχυρός, ἄ, ὀν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care</td>
<td>πρόνοια, ἥ</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>ἀριστοτες, ἤ, ὀν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joy</td>
<td>τέρψις, ἥ</td>
<td>Useful</td>
<td>χρήσιμος, ἤ, ὀν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit</td>
<td>ἀρετή, ἥ</td>
<td>Faithfulness, trustworthy</td>
<td>πίστις, ἤ; πιστός, ἤ, ὀν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Best</td>
<td>σπουδαῖος, ἄ, ὀν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocal actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brings health and salvation</td>
<td>ὑγίεια, ἤ; σωτηρία, ἤ</td>
<td>Helps rule country</td>
<td>συνδιοικέω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrusts his interests</td>
<td>πιστεύω; σπουδαῖος, ἄ, ὀν</td>
<td>Loves, which provides protection</td>
<td>ἀγαπάω, φυλακή, ἤ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shares power and enterprises</td>
<td>μεταδίδωμι; δύναμις, ἥ</td>
<td>Admires</td>
<td>ἐπαινέω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows favours</td>
<td>χαρίζω</td>
<td>Enables to converse with world</td>
<td>διαλέγω, διά,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receives gifts</td>
<td>λαμβάνω; δῶρον, τὸ</td>
<td>Enables to accomplish undertakings</td>
<td>ἐφικνέωμαι, ἔργον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selects for offices</td>
<td>ἐκλέγω</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appoints governors</td>
<td>ἀποδείκνυμι</td>
<td>Does and says everything in his interest</td>
<td>λέγω, δράω, συμφέρω</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{237} 3 Regn. 106-107
\textsuperscript{238} Rice (2013: 87).
Puts in charge of military operations πιστεύω Accepts advances ύπακοντο

Attitudes Depends on loyalty εὔνοια, ἡ Wishes well εὔνοια, ἡ Delights in giving favours and receiving gifts ἡδομαι; ἡδος, ἡδεῖα, ἡδύ Gladly accepts advances - Rejoices as giver and receiver ἡδομαι Admires ἐπαινέω

Depiction of the relationship Greek terms

Friendship, considered sacred νομίζω; τερός, ἂν, ὁν
A protection φυλακή, ἡ Profitable ζύφορος, ὁν
Pleasurable ἡδος, ἡδεῖα, ἡδύ Useful χρήσιμος, ἂν, ὁν
A greater good than kinship ἀγαθός, ἂν, ὁν; φίλια, ἡ; συγγένεια, ἡ

3.7. Roman generals and governors as brokers

The interactions between the imperial general and his emperor on the one hand, and with the peoples he governed on the other, shows him to be an influential broker of imperial beneficia. From his very first settlement with the Senate in 27 BCE, Augustus personally selected the senators to be his governors (legati Augusti pro praetore) in the provinces of Gaul, Spain and Syria. Under the principate a number of posts, such as procuratorships, were made available to equites via imperial appointment. By conferring offices as favours which offered increasingly rare opportunities to attain honour and prestige for one’s name, the emperor could manipulate the honour system to bind those close to him in debts of gratitude and

---

239 Whilst the term ‘general’ can cast anachronistic impressions of a military high command (Campbell 1984: 330), it is used here to refer to those men Rome entrusted with imperium. The general’s role might revolve around military or governing duties, depending on the province to which he was assigned and upon whether a campaign was being fought at the time. Chapters 4 and 5 will explore how a general could act as a broker in both military and administrative roles.

240 Cassius Dio, Hist. rom. 53.12-14. Senatorial posts below that of a praetor were given by the emperor (Millar, 1977,300). He could also accept, reject or commend applicants for queasorships, tribunates, aedileships and praetorships (Millar 1977: 303).

241 Millar (1977: 131) writes: ‘It would not be easy to find many examples of senatorial careers which will not have required some imperial patronage at some stage.’
ensure loyalty as well as material advantages. As agents of Rome, provincial governors (both legati Augusti and proconsuls) were tapped as patrons by the provincial elite. They could provide a range of favours relating to their work overseeing legal cases, administration and finances, and the army. In return, governors could expect gifts, loyalty and support in case of future charges of maladministration. ‘No longer were they [provincials] governed by foreign conquerors, but by friends of friends.’

 Whilst being the emperor’s agents and representatives in the provinces, governors also represented the interests of their own friends and provincials to the emperor. Saller uses epigraphy to provide a picture of governors and other officials acting as mediators of resources between the provincial aristocracy in North Africa and the centres of power at Rome. The procurators of Mauretania Tingitana, Coiedius Maximus (procurator in 168-69 CE) and Vallius Maximianus (177 CE) who supported the successful petitions of leaders of the local tribe of the Zegrenses for Roman citizenship for their wives and sons. They could recommend provincials for senatorial and equestrian offices and support petitions for citizenship, the latus clavus, and administrative decisions.

 Pliny the Younger’s correspondence with Trajan is often cited as the most detailed illustration of brokerage in the provinces. His letters, from his time as governor (propraetor) of Bithynia and Pontus (111 CE), include petitions for favours on behalf of his friends and on behalf of his friends’ family and friends. He petitions for

---

242 Lendon (1997: 185); Saller (1982: 72). The patron-client relationship between emperor and legate is well illustrated by Herodian in his account of Septimus Severus’ discover of the plot against by Plautianus, his prefect: ‘Severus reproached Plautianus for all the benefits and honours he had given him (εὐεργεσίας τε καὶ τιμὰς), but Plautianus in return reminded Severus of the loyalty and goodwill (τοῦ δὲ πίστεως τε καὶ εὐνοίας) he had shown him in the past.’ (Herodian, Ab excess. div. Marci. 3.11.9-10, trans. C. R. Whittaker, LCL).
243 Millar (1966); Burton (1976) shows that there is little evidence of two separate hierarchies for the administration of public and imperial provinces.
244 Governors scheduled trials, accepted character references and provided protection from prosecution. They could influence selection for honours and offices and make decisions on building works. If a legate had imperium, he could make appointments in the legion.
247 Tabula of Banasa, published in (Seston & Euzennat, 1971).
honours, privileges and citizenship makes commendations for offices and career advancement, and provides testimonials. Pliny’s success as a broker relies on his own credit as a broker with Trajan. When he commends Rosianus Geminus, his quaestor from his time as consul, he writes:

> I entreat you then to comply with my request for the advancement of one, whom (if my recommendation has any weight) you will even honour with your particular favour […] I therefore pray you to give your personal attention to my request for his advancement; if you place any confidence in my advice you will bestow on him your favour.

On other occasions Pliny’s success relies on securing favours as a favour to himself as a client. When he asks Trajan for citizenship for the doctor who treated him he highlights his dependence on the princeps: ‘[…] I cannot adequately reward [the doctor’s care and attentiveness] without the help of your kind interest in the man.’ Pliny is not discreet in acknowledging that his success as a broker will increase his standing as his clients’ patron: ‘I pray you, Sir, most urgently, to permit me to rejoice as soon as possible in the due promotion of my quaestor—that is to say, in my own advancement in his person.’ The exchange of favours shows governors such as Pliny to be part of a wider system of relations that connected the peripheries of the empire to the centre.

Provincial governors also acted as brokers of cult honours for the emperor. Paulus Fabius Maximus, proconsul of Asia in ca. 10-9 BCE, wrote to the Assembly of Asia, ‘suggesting’ that they align their provincial calendar to begin the year on Augustus’ birthday. The assembly agreed with enthusiasm and the edict was inscribed at imperial temples in numerous towns including Priene, Apamea Eumencia, Dorylaion and Maeonia. In 11 BCE, Maximus joined the succession of consuls who

---

249 Ep. 10.94.  
250 Ep. 10.5, 11, 106.  
251 Ep. 10.4, 12, 26, 87.  
252 Ep. 10.85.  
253 Ep. 10.26.2 (trans. Betty Radice, LCL); See also the commendation for Voconius Romanus for senatorial office he writes: ‘I can then be proud to think that your recognition of myself extends to my friend’ (Ep. 10.4.6). Williams (1975: 65) speculates that the careful recording of the governor’s name in the Tabula of Banasa (ll. 35-36) might suggest he is held responsible if their recommendations of new citizens proved erroneous.  
254 Ep. 10.26.3.
recommended Augustus for additional powers.\textsuperscript{255} Winter writes that ‘the profile of Maximus was that of a long-standing, well-connected and loyal imperial official who was also highly entrepreneurial in promoting the reign and prestige of Augustus.’\textsuperscript{256} Maximus was an innovator (l. 21), but at the same time he appears to have framed his recommendation within the province’s own diplomatic activities, as a response to a competition set by the secretary of the league of Asia some years prior (ll. 41-42). The inscriptions depict the structure of imperial brokerage from two perspectives. In Maximus’ letter he speaks of Augustus in the most honorific and, at times, literary, terms.\textsuperscript{257} He is ‘the most divine Caesar’ (l. 5: θειοτάτου), characterised by ‘excellent qualities (l. 28: τὰς ἀρετὰς)’.\textsuperscript{258}

If not exact from the point of view of the natural order of things, at least from the point of view of the useful, if there is nothing which has fallen to pieces and to an unfortunate condition has been changed which he has not restored (ἀνώρθωσεν), he has given (ἔδωκεν) to the whole world a different appearance, (a world) which would have met its ruin with the greatest pleasure, if as the common good fortune of everyone Caesar had not been born.\textsuperscript{259}

Augustus’ beneficiaries received ‘good fortune’ (ll. 9-10) and ‘luckier beginnings’ (ll. 13-14)’. They are encouraged to respond by giving honour (τιμῆς) to Augustus (l. 17);

[… it is difficult to return (εὐχαριστεῖν) for his many great benefactions thanks in equal measure, unless for each of them we think of some manner of repayment (ἀµείψεως) […].\textsuperscript{260}

As a promoter of Augustus’ honour, Maximus makes arrangements for the celebration to ‘become better known to everyone (l. 26). As a broker, Maximus both aligns himself with the Assembly as a beneficiary of Augustus and as a patron to the Assembly and province. He writes of ‘the plan formulated by us (ὑφἡµῶν) for the honour of Augustus may remain forever (µείνῃ αἰώνιον)’. He also exerts his

\textsuperscript{255} Res gest. divi Aug, 1.6.
\textsuperscript{256} Winter (2015: 32).
\textsuperscript{257} Sherk (1969: 337).
\textsuperscript{259} ll. 7-10.
\textsuperscript{260} ll. 17-19.
authority to ensure that the Assembly’s publication of the edict comes with appropriate honorific language (ll. 27-28).\footnote{Sherk (1969: 334) comments that Maximus’ suggestion is ‘virtually a directive’.} Maximus’ ‘unusual’ way to honour Augustus will also ‘render the greatest service to the province’ (ll. 26-27: ἢν οἶομαι καὶ πλείστην εὐχρηστίαν τῇ ἐπαρχίᾳ παρέξεσθαι), suggesting that they can expect reciprocal benefits from Rome.\footnote{Winter (2015: 36).}

The Assembly’s letter in response affirms the relational structure. Augustus is their saviour (σωτήρα) and benefactor \textit{par excellence} (ll. 36-7). His benefits are too great to relay (ll. 47-48). He ended the war and established peace (l. 37). Augustus himself is a benefit to them (l. 35: εὐεργεσίαν ἀνθρώπων), given for their salvation (l. 50: ἐπὶ σωτηρίᾳ δεδομέναι). The Assembly describes Maximus in similar honorific, patronal terms. As Augustus’ agent, Maximus is a ‘benefactor of the province’ (l. 45: τῆς ἐπαρχίας εὐεργέτης), sent (l. 46: ἀπεσταλμένος) along with others ‘through whom he [Augustus] bestowed benefits’ (ὁν εὐεργεσιῶν) on the province (l. 47).

For his work in leading the honouring of their patron the Assembly give (δεδομέναι) Maximus the greatest honours with a crown (ll. 44, 57-58). Maximus has found a way of honouring Augustus ‘unknown until now to the Greeks’ (l. 49). He shall be continuously proclaimed (ἀεὶ ἀναγορεύεσθαι) at the festivals in honour of Roma and Augustus around the cities (ll. 61-62).

A similar structure is reflected in the inscription (ca. 2 CE) for the governor (\textit{quaestor pro praetore}) of Messenia, P. Cornelius Scipio. He is honoured for leading the cities of the province in imperial festivals and making sacrifices. As an ‘friend’ of the emperor, Scipio shows ‘unexcelled goodwill’ (ἀνυπερβλήτῳ […] εὔνοιᾳ) toward his patron (ll. 4-5), honouring him with a great vow (ll. 6-7).\footnote{SEG XIII 206 (trans. Sherk 1988: §18).} He makes sacrifices on behalf of Augustus’ grandson Gaius who has been fighting the Armenians ‘on behalf of all men’ (l. 12: ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀνθρώπων πάντων σωτηρίας). As a broker he ‘conducts’ (ἐτέλεσε) the games (l. 8), ‘prepares’ (κατασκευασάμενος) the cities to join him in sacrificial thanksgiving (ll. 10-11: εὐχαριστίᾳ), instructs them to instructs (διέταξε) ‘everyone to wear wreaths and to sacrifice’ (ll. 14-15, 17). Although the rest of the inscription is lost, it appears that it goes on to decree (ἐδοξε)
honours to Scipio (l. 22). So we see that Roman governors, as *amici princeps*, took active roles in brokering prestige to the emperor and reciprocal privileges to the provinces. In turn they are acclaimed for their services.

3.8. The expectations of asymmetrical, reciprocal relationships

This chapter has outlined the essential components of asymmetrical reciprocity (‘patronal’) relationships which can be found in various spheres of Graeco-Roman society. The data show a consistency in the types of lexicon that are applied to the relationships between patrons and clients. Differences in status are expressed in the commodities or qualities ascribed to the two figures, or in the labels that are attached to them. Roman patrons are eminent, powerful and are associated with honour and excellence. Senior statesmen are leaders, and advisors of reputation and high station. The emperor is the giver of favours, strong, caring and possessing virtue. In contrast, clients are without rank, counted amongst the poor and the deficient. Junior statesmen do not snatch at honours and, to begin with, are without fame before they attach themselves to a powerful man.

Reciprocity is expressed in the services that each group provides. Patrons defend, teach, instruct, and care for their clients. Senior statesmen raise up, make great, favour, aid, help and send their junior friends. The emperor shows favours, selects, appoints and entrusts. In contrast, Roman clients assist, share tasks, support, and render services to their patrons. Junior statesmen honour, ‘illuminate’, exalt, praise, and obey their great friends, helping, admiring and enabling them. While these services are reciprocal, the types of services that each group provides also expresses distinctions in statuses.

The relationship is depicted as a protective, useful, pleasurable, even familial bond. Patrons are called fathers and their obligations are ‘father-like’, showing ‘fatherly care and concern’. The patronal relationship between members of the aristocracy is characterised by affection and friendship. Each of the relationships is characterised

\[^{264}\text{Winter (2015: 167); Price (1984: 70-71).}\]
by good will and trust—clients are entrusted to patrons, the patronal politician and the emperor entrusts roles to his friends.

The common functional elements of the relationships and the linguistic features associated with these relationships show that a patronal ideology was a powerful influence on how Greeks of the early empire expected relations between figures of different statuses to be conducted. The above sources suggest that Greeks understood patronal relationships to have been an important means to acquiring resources, whether political powers, public offices, community sponsorship, a daily allowance, salvation, debt or poverty. The ideology of patronage influenced expectations for how one should respond to those who showed favour to one’s plight, or to the plight of one’s family, community, or city. It set expectations of mutual benefit from such a relationship. It allowed for the profit that could be made by brokers who connected patrons and clients. It even had analogies in the heavenly realms in how the gods themselves interacted with their human worshippers.

3.9. Application of the shape and lexicon of patronal relationships to Paul’s christology

Once the functional components and lexical clusters of patronal relations have been formulated then their potential for comparison with Paul’s writings become more apparent. For example, once the lexical clusters associated with a patronal ideology are foregrounded, then the portrayal of God in the climactic doxology of Rom 11 appears to manifest a distinctly patronal flavour. God’s attributes are described in terms of wealth, wisdom and knowledge (Rom 11:33: πλοῦτος, σοφία, γνῶσις, νοῦς). He provides judgment (κρίμα) and in turn receives ‘glory forever’ (11:36 δόξα). No one is his councillor (σύμβουλος)—implying that he himself has that role—and no one can put him in their debt through gift-giving: ‘Or who has given a gift to him (προδωκεν), to receive a gift in return (ἀνταποδοθήσεται)?’ (11:34-35). As established at the beginning of the epistle, God is πατήρ (1:7), from whom come ‘all things’ (11:36: τὰ πάντα).

When we isolate the interactions between God and Jesus in 1 Cor 15:20-28, Phil 2:6-11 and Eph 1:20-23 we find similar clusters of lexicon to those of the ‘patronal
relationship’ in the labels, attributes, actions and attitudes ascribed to both figures. Whilst the lexical data provided in these texts are sparse in comparison with the texts analysed above, their sparseness lends weight to the essential ways in which the interaction between God and Jesus is characterised.

Jesus takes the form of a servant, makes himself nothing, humbles himself, comes in the form of a man, does not use divine honour to his advantage, rules God’s kingdom, hands over rule and subjects himself to God. God is the father and even the god of Jesus. He is associated with glory and his status is in the heavenly realms, above all other powers. He raises and exalts Jesus above all other powers, subjects enemies to Jesus, sits him at his right hand, and gives Jesus his own name.

In some places, the vocabulary of interaction overlaps directly with the lexicon of the patronal relationships, as in labels such as ‘father’ or attributes such as glory. In other places, it uses related terms, such as those belonging to the 

ταπειν-, χαρ-, θη-, or δω- groups. On occasions the terminology has thematic overlap, such as where God highly exalts Jesus (ὑπερψώ) while the senior statesmen ‘make great’ (αὐξάνω) or ‘lead to fame’ (χειραγωγέω, δόξα) their junior friends.

The tables below show how the depictions of the interactions between God and Jesus in Phil 2:6-11, 1 Cor 15:20-28 and Eph 1:20-23 manifest similar clustering of characteristics to those of the patronal relationships discussed so far. The tables do not take into account the broader characterisations of God and Jesus from the passages’ contexts which lend additional data to their characterisations.

Table 3.4: The terms of the relationship between God (G), Jesus (J) and believers in Philippians 2:6-11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>God</th>
<th>Greek term</th>
<th>Jesus</th>
<th>Greek term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God</td>
<td>θεός, ὁ</td>
<td>Messiah, anointed</td>
<td>χριστός, ὁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>πατήρ, ὁ</td>
<td>Lord</td>
<td>κύριος, ὁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attributes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glory</td>
<td>δόξα, ἡ</td>
<td>Is in the form of God</td>
<td>μορφή, ἡ; θεὸς ὁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the name above every name</td>
<td>ὄνομα, τό; ὑπέρ; πᾶς, πᾶσα, πᾶν</td>
<td>Has divine honours</td>
<td>ἵσος, ἡ, ὁν; θεὸς ὁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Takes the form of a slave</td>
<td>μορφή, ἢ; δοῦλος, ὁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Has human likeness</td>
<td>ὀμοίωμα, τό, ἄνθρωπος, ὁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Is found in human form</td>
<td>σχῆμα, τό, ἄνθρωπος, ὁ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reciprocal actions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly exalts J. in response to obedience</th>
<th>διὸ; ύπερψυχόω</th>
<th>Makes himself nothing</th>
<th>κενόω</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bestows the divine name</td>
<td>χαρίζομαι; ὄνομα, τό</td>
<td>Takes the form of a slave</td>
<td>λαμβάνω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Humbles himself</td>
<td>ταπεινόω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Becomes obedient</td>
<td>γίνομαι; ὑπήκοος, ὁν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Receives obeisance/ worship</td>
<td>κάμπτω; ὑόνυ, τό; γλώσσα, ἢ; εξομολογεῖο</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Attitudes**

| -                      | -                      | Does not consider divine honours something to be grasped/exploited | ἣγέομαι; ἀρπαγμός, ὁ |

**Table 3.5: The terms of the relationship between God (G), Jesus (J) and believers (B) in 1 Corinthians 15:20-28, 57**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>God</th>
<th>Greek term</th>
<th>Jesus</th>
<th>Greek term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Labels</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God</td>
<td>θεός, ὁ</td>
<td>Messiah, anointed</td>
<td>χριστός, ὁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>πατήρ, ὁ</td>
<td>First fruit</td>
<td>ἀπαρχή, ἡ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Son</td>
<td>υἱός, ὁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attributes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All in all</td>
<td>πᾶς, πᾶσα, πᾶν</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>ἄνθρωπος, ὁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>τάγμα, τό</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Presence</td>
<td>παρουσία, ἡ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reciprocal actions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raises J.</td>
<td>ἐγείρω</td>
<td>Mediates resurrection to B.</td>
<td>δία; ἀνάστασις, ἡ; ἐξομολογεῖο</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puts all enemies under J.’s feet</td>
<td>τίθημι</td>
<td>Hands over the kingdom to G.</td>
<td>παραδίδωμι; βασιλεία, ἡ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects all things to J.</td>
<td>ὑποτάσσομαι</td>
<td>Defeats enemies</td>
<td>καταργέω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives victory to B.</td>
<td>δίδωμι, νίκος, τό</td>
<td>Reigns</td>
<td>βασιλεύω</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Receives thanks from B. χάρις, ἥν Puts all enemies under his feet τίθημι

- - Subjects himself/is subjected to G. ὑποτάσσω

- - Mediates victory to B. διά; νίκος, τό

**Attitudes**

- - - -

**Table 3:6: The terms of the relationship between God (G), Jesus (J) and the church (C) in Ephesians 1:20-23**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>God</th>
<th>Greek term</th>
<th>Jesus</th>
<th>Greek term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God of J.</td>
<td>θεός, ὁ</td>
<td>Messiah, anointed</td>
<td>χριστός, ὁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father of glory</td>
<td>πατήρ, ὁ</td>
<td>Head of all things</td>
<td>κεφαλή, ἥν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attributes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glory</td>
<td>δόξα, ἥ</td>
<td>Is seated at the right hand of G. in the heavenlies</td>
<td>δεξιός, ἥν, ὧν, ἐπουράνιος, ὤν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is in the heavens</td>
<td>ἐπουράνιος, ὤν</td>
<td>Is above all powers and names</td>
<td>ὑπεράνω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is above all powers and names</td>
<td>ὑπεράνω; ὧνομα, τό;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocal actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raises J.</td>
<td>ἐγείρω</td>
<td>Fills the C. as he is filled.</td>
<td>πληρόω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seats J. at his right</td>
<td>καθίζω</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puts all things under J.’s feet</td>
<td>τίθημι</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives/installs J. as head</td>
<td>δίδωμι</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fills Jesus in every way</td>
<td>πληρόω, πᾶς, πᾶσα, πᾶν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attributes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ideology of patronal relations provides a logical basis for investigating how Paul conceives of the relationship between God and Jesus in texts which describe reciprocal exchange of resource between the two figures. The functions and language related to clients provides an ideological background for Paul’s depiction of subordination, as Jesus receives favour from God and returns service and obedience. The functions and language of agents provides a background for Jesus’
role as God’s mediator and ambassador. The motifs and language of patrons and brokers provides a way into analysing Jesus’ receipt of worship alongside God. The broker model in the context of patron-client relations can thus provide a framework for understanding how Jesus is both depicted as exercising divine functions and as a distinct agent who is subordinate to God.

Chapters 4-6 will compare the above christological texts to more specific parallels amongst Graeco-Roman patron-broker-client relationships, constructing a model for a broker christology in three stages. In turn, this model can clarify the relational dynamics described in these texts, the type of resources exchanged and the contexts in which this relational structure is more explicitly described. Philippians 2:6-11 will be explored in relation to texts demonstrating the characteristics of ideal imperial clients in relationships between the emperor and his legates. First Corinthians 15:20-20 will be compared to relationships between the emperor and his legates in the context of military campaigns. Ephesians 1:20-23 will be compared to a parallel that comes closer to Jesus’ relationship with God, but one that still retains a patron-client shape—that of the emperor and his patron deity.
Excursus: ‘Father’ as a patronal title

God’s title πατήρ is a significant term in all the key texts explored in this thesis. Before we read Phil 2:6-11, 1 Cor 15:20-28, Eph 1:20-23 and 1 Cor 8:6 through a patron-broker-client lens, this excursus demonstrates how the title ‘father’ was used as a deferential way of referring to, and addressing, patronal figures. It argues that, in certain contexts, God’s title ‘father’ should be understood as having a patronal, as well as a familial meaning.

E.1. Etymological connections

Classicists have long drawn attention to the interrelated analogies of fathers and patrons in Graeco-Roman thought. In the Roman institution of patrocinium, the connection can be shown etymologically—the Latin title patronus derives from pater. The noun cliens is suggested to be connected to cluere (to hear, to obey), or possibly to colere (to cultivate, to pay respect). But fathers and patrons also display functional overlap: Stevenson finds that the interrelation between the two roles is based on their common ‘procreative/tutelary terms, namely in terms of power to give, sustain and protect life.’

Fathers and patrons also overlap in Graeco-Roman forms of address. Dickey’s social-linguistic studies in Latin and Greek terms of address from the Hellenic period to the second century CE prove very useful in this regard, not only for providing a catalogue of terms of address and their diachronic developments in meaning, but for the light it sheds on the connection between forms of address and the social structures in which they are employed. Dickey finds that whilst the Latin term patronus was a deferential address from a client to his patron, it could also be applied figuratively to any citizen who acted as the protector or helper to the less powerful. Whilst Dickey does not make an explicit connection between pater and patronus titles, her definitions of the terms overlap by virtue of their function in expressing deference and gratitude. Pater was a highly complementary term, used

266 Dickey (2002: 348-9). Dickey’s work has been crucial for identifying a number of the examples in this section.
for the emperors, for gods and for men alike. Its Greek equivalent ‘generally (but not always) implied a special closeness between speaker and addressee’. Dickey’s work posits πατήρ and πάτρων as overlapping forms of address to the extent that it would seem entirely appropriate for one to act as a substitute for the other.

Some specific examples demonstrate how the title πατήρ was employed to refer to elite Roman patroni within the institution of patrocinium, as well as to informal patrons involved in asymmetrical dependency relationships amongst the lower strata of Graeco-Roman society.

E.2. πατήρ as a patronal title for Roman patroni

Chapter 3 (§3.4.4) showed how Dionysius and Plutarch describe the relationship between patrons and clients in familial terms. Dionysius frequently uses the titles ‘father’, ‘patrician’ and ‘patron’ interchangeably. Plutarch describes clients addressing their patrons as ‘fathers (πατέρες), whence their name of Patricii.’ Both authors suggest the functions of fathers and patrons in Roman society to be closely related, connected by the ideals of leadership, protection and responsibility.

E.3. πατήρ as a patronal title for figurative patrons

Whilst πατήρ was closely connected to formal Roman patrons, it could also be used in forms of address as an honorific title, expressing gratitude for the patron-like services that an individual might provide. We find this usage of ‘father’ in another of Plutarch’s biographies which looks back to a time before the Principate. According to Plutarch, the decorated general Fabius Maximus and his men were greeted as

---

267 Ibid. 122, 348.
269 Dickey (2002: 105-106, 238-239). See also Horace’s account of a Republican pleader, Philippus, who orders his servant to inquire about a potential client Volteius Mena: ‘Go, ask, and bring me word, where that man’s from, who he is, and what’s his standing, who is his father, or who his patron is’ (Horace, Ep. 1.7.5-55 [trans. Fairclough, LCL]). Philippus’ inquiry suggests that the father and patron were associated together as providing the same type of information regarding a client’s social standing.
270 Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Ant. rom. 2.10.2.
271 Plutarch, Rom. 13.3.
father (πατήρ) and patrons (πάτρων) as they rescued Fabius’ rival Marcus Minucius.\(^{272}\) Plutarch’s Minucius says:

I call you by the name of Father (πατήρ), because it is the most honourable (τίµιος) that I can use, and yet even a father’s kindness is not so great as the kindness I have received from you. My father gave me life, but you have saved (σώζω) not only this but the lives of all the men under me.\(^{273}\) Plutarch describes πατήρ as highly honorific and, importantly, *distinguishes it from the familial use of the term by its association with ‘salvation’.* Latin sources show certain awareness of the potential of the ‘father’ title to flatter their literal and figurative patrons.\(^{274}\) Horace assures his literary patron Maecenas: ‘Often you have praised my modesty, and have been called “king” and “father” to your face, nor do I stint my words behind your back.’\(^{275}\) To call a protector πατήρ was to recognise their role and renders them the honour due for their services.

E.4. πατήρ as a patronal title for flattering formal clients

The established nature of πατήρ as a title for patrons is further shown in instances where the title is used in an unconventional manner. We find in both formal and informal patronage relationships instances when actors reverse the normal use of the title for patrons to flatter their clients. Whilst we have so far concentrated on voluntary patron-client relations, the relationship between *patroni* and *liberti* is equally important to consider in a study of the customs relating to ancient patronage.

Plautus’ plays frequently include plots revolving around relations between slaves and their masters, freedmen and their patrons. Written ca. 205-184 BCE, Plautus’ plays were performed for another two centuries to elite and non-elite audiences. In these comedies we frequently find patron-figures addressing their dependents as ‘patron’ and ‘father’ as expressions of gratitude or as a means of flattering the

---

\(^{272}\) Minucius clearly posits himself as a client as he publically acknowledges his need for command and promises to follow advise and orders (Plutarch, *Fab.* 13).

\(^{273}\) Plutarch, *Fab.* 13.5.

\(^{274}\) Horace finishes his advice on successful flattery with the instruction: ‘Throw in “Brother!” “Father!”’— politely adopt each one according to his age’ (Horace, *Ep.* 1.6.54-5).

\(^{275}\) rexque paterque audisti coram, nec verbo parcius absens (Hor. *Ep.* 1.7.37-8 [Fairclough, LCL]). Additionally, Marcus Brutus writes to Atticus: ‘Octavius may call Cicero his father, ask his opinion on everything, flatter him, thank him, but it will be plain to see that the words contradict the realities’ (Cicero, *Brut.* 1.17.5 [trans. Shackleton Bailey, LCL]).
dependent into fulfilling their wishes. Plesidippus, for example, calls his slave Trachalio who is trying to gain his freedom:

Repeat all this to me again, my life, my dear Trachalio, my freedman, or rather my patron, no, my father (mi liberte, mi patrone potius, immo mi pater).

In Casina, Plautus has Stalino address his slave Olympio: ‘I entreat you, my dear little Olympio, my father, my patron’.

When Tyndarus entrusts an errand to his slave Philocrates, he says: ‘Now you are my master, you my patron, you my father. I commend my hopes and my fortunes to you’. The common pairing of pater and patrone in these Latin texts shows that the two roles were perceived to share a number of characteristics and obligations in Roman thought. To call someone a patron or benefactor was an expression of gratitude given in response to a particular aid that an individual had provided, thus momentarily likening his actions to those of a patron.

E.5. πατήρ as a patronal title for flattering informal clients

Sources record figures in superior, patronal positions bestowing the title πατήρ on their clients and subordinates to flatter them. According to the consul and historian Cassius Dio (ca. 150-230 CE), Nero lured his decorated general Corbulo into a trap whilst continually calling him πατήρ and εὐεργέτης. Tacitus also records Nero bestowing ‘the Greek form of the title of saviour (conservator)’ on the freedman Milichus after he uncovers the Pisonian conspiracy—an honorific title often applied to patrons. Herodian describes the tribune who saved Septimius Severus from

---

276 See Plautus, Mil. 915 for a more conventional use of the title between patrons and freedmen.
277 Plautus, Rud. 1265-6 (trans. de Melo, LCL).
278 'opsecreo te, Olympisce mi, mi pater, mi patrone' (Plautus, Cas. 739 [trans. de Melo, LCL])
279 'tu mihi erus nunc es, tu patronus, tu pater, tibi commendo spes obesque meas' (Plautus, Capt. 245-6 [trans. de Melo, LCL]). See also Asinaria in which a slave demands that his indebted master to call him by the title ‘patron’, which the ex-master obliges along with the titles ‘guardian of your master, glory of the people, storehouse of riches, inner salvation of the body and commander of love’ (Plautus, Asin. 651-5, 689 [trans. de Melo, LCL]).
280 Dickey (2002: 105-6) urges caution in using Plautus to understand real speech. She argues that the deferential tone of address in these plays was likely to reflect historical reality, but proposes that the ‘father’ title was unlikely to have been used to flatter slaves except in comedy. However, the fact that we find a similar linguistic phenomenon in informal patronage relations might suggest that the title was more reflective of ordinary usage than Dickey allows for.
281 Cassius Dio, Hist. rom. 63.17.5 (trans. Earnest Cary, LCL).
Plautianus as σωτήρ and εὐεργέτης. This use of patronal titles as a means of praising or flattering imperial clients mirrors the practice between masters, slaves and freedmen suggesting that deferent titles, even that of father, could be used for clients in ordinary life.

E.6. πατήρ as a title for patrons of associations and cities

Parental metaphors are also commonly used from the second century onwards by elite and non-elite organisations that function as collective clients. Non-elite private associations and guilds were particularly keen to bestow the titles father and mother on their benefactors and leaders. An inscription from Neapolis (194 CE), by a phratry of Artemisians records their formal correspondence with their patron Lucius Munatius Hilarianus to:

[...] repay his goodwill and love of honor with, first of all, the honor of our being well-disposed and affectionate towards him, considering him a close relative, patron, and father (οἰκειότατον καὶ προστάτην καὶ πατέρα) and praying that he has a long, prosperous life. The patron agrees to provide for the association in return for public honours. The association agrees to treat him as a father, patron and kinsman. The titles carry connotations of reciprocity, honour and protection and so emphasise the patron’s duties to the association, as well as the reciprocal obligations to such a protector-figure.

There is some debate as to whether the fathers and mothers of associations are synonymous with patrons. Whilst some such as Waltzing have argued that parental metaphors were purely honorific titles for club officials of equal social standing to other members, others have argued that the titles denote a benefactor who was in the process of being considered by the association for patronal status. Hemelrijk marshals the evidence attesting to female benefactors to argue that ‘mothers’ of cities tended to come from decurion families within the community,

283 Herodian, Ab excess. div. Marci. 3.12.2.
284 INeapolis 44, l. 18, trans. Harland.
whilst ‘mothers’ of associations were often non-elite women. Harland argues that the titles ‘father’ and ‘mother’ are given on the bases of the patron’s services. The titles were ways for both elite and non-elite organisations to express honour and hierarchy, whilst simultaneously affirming a sense of belonging. The parental metaphor posited the individual as having raised the client group as their children, demonstrating their goodwill to the group. It articulated a privileged relationship that was both socially advantageous and honourable for both parties.

E.7. πατήρ as a patronal title for the Roman emperor

Finally, the most prominent patron and holder of the title πατήρ was the emperor himself. Whilst the emperor was a patronus to specific individuals and communities who could be distinguished from the subjects at large (Suetonius, Aug. 56.4, Pliny the Younger, Pan. 23.1), he generally avoided the title ‘patron of the empire’. In the late Republican era, Cicero had used L. Antonius’ receipt of the title ‘patron of the Roman people’ to blast the reputation of the Antonians.

However, the emperor’s avoidance of the title patronus did not prevent others from employing the metaphor. Velleius Paterculus described Tiberius as ‘the constant protector of the Roman Empire’ (perpetuus patron Romani imperii) after he defeated Varus and secured Gaul in the wake of the Pannonian War. In Cassius Dio’s depiction of Caesar’s funeral, Antony eulogises Caesar before the people:

[…] You loved him as a father and cherished him as a benefactor (ἐφιλήσατε αὐτὸν ὡς πατέρα καὶ ἠγαπήσατε ὡς εὐεργέτην), you exalted him with such honours as you bestowed on no one else (τιμαῖς τε οίαις οὐδένα ἄλλον

---

287 Hemelrijk (2015: 267-8) distinguishes mothers from patronesses on the basis of their social statuses and on the types of services they could provid, but assumes that both roles functioned within the same basic structures of patronage.


289 Ibid. 67; Hemelrijk (2015: 269).

290 ‘Who ever had so great a position, such a record of achievement as to dare to call himself the patron (patronum) of the Roman people, conqueror and lord of all nations? — let alone this brigand whom nobody would want to have as a client (clientem)’ (Cicero, Phil. 6.12-13).

291 Velleius Paterculus, Hist. 2.120.1 (trans. Frederick W. Shipley, LCL). Tiberius is also called ‘champion and guardian of the empire (vindicem custodemque imperii)’ (2.104.2). It is worth noting that this was still under the reign of Augustus.
ἡγήλατε), and desired him to be continual head (προστάτην) of the city and of the whole domain.\(^{292}\)

Whilst these occurrences of the use of *patronus* are scarce, they do suggest that at least some people saw the emperor’s role as protector of the empire as similar in type to the role of the *patronus*.

However, the image of the emperor as patron of the empire is most commonly manifested in the title *pater patriae*. Augustus’ assumption of the title in 2 BCE, propagated through coins,\(^{293}\) honorific inscriptions and panegyrics,\(^{294}\) meant that *πατήρ* as an honorific title would have become increasingly associated with the figure of the emperor.\(^{295}\) We will only briefly summarise the work others have done on the emperor’s paternal title here.\(^{296}\) Rather, we will focus on its patronal aspect. The title had its roots in the Republic—Roman generals received the title father for their salvific achievements.\(^{297}\) The Senate gave Cicero the title *parens patriae* for ‘saving’ the Republic from the Cateline conspiracy.\(^{298}\) Julius Caesar was called *pater patriae* before and after his death in 44 BCE.\(^{299}\)

The *Res gestae divi Augusti* is a good example of how the title *pater patriae* is associated with his role as patron. The biography is effectively a list of Octavian’s gifts and benefactions to the people of Rome that culminates with the Senate and the people awarding him the title ‘father of the fatherland’ (*Res gest. divi Aug.* 35.11).

Veyne highlights that the *Res Gestae* is not so much a list of Augustus’ administrative costs but a proclamation of the benefactions he bestowed as a private

\(^{292}\) Cassius Dio, *Hist. rom.* 44.48.2-3.

\(^{293}\) Lassen (1991: 132).

\(^{294}\) Thus Horace (*Carm.* 3.24.25 [trans. Niall Rudd, LCL]) calls Augustus ‘father of the Roman state’ (*pater urbius*) and compliments him by calling Jupiter ‘father and protector of the human race’ (1.20.49-53: *gentis humanae pater et custos*).

\(^{295}\) See Judge (2008: 205). Saller (198241) argues that this self-image carried over from the late Republic into the principate: ‘The *principes* of the late Republic were, first and foremost, great patrons – patrons of armies, of the urban masses, of foreign kings, and provincial cities, of senators and *equites*. After Octavian eliminated his rivals, the princep’s role continued to be defined in terms of patronal ideology.’


\(^{297}\) Weinstock (1972: 176, 200).

\(^{298}\) Lassen (1991: 132), citing Cicero, *Phil.* 2.5.12; *Pis.* 3.6; *Att.* 9.10.3.

\(^{299}\) Ibid. 132.
citizen—a personal patronage of the empire that would be the model for subsequent emperors until Trajan merged the role with his role as imperial magistrate.\textsuperscript{300}

Dio Cassius, writing in the second and third centuries picks out the father title as significant to Augustus’ reign, connecting it with other honorific titles: Dio reports Maecenas’ to have said to Octavian:

For how can men help regarding you with affection (φιλήσουσιν) as father (πατέρα) and saviour (σωτὴρα), when they see that you are orderly and upright in your life, successful in war though inclined to peace?\textsuperscript{301}

Likewise, the emperors’ wives provide evidence that parental metaphors were used to denote their patronal roles. According to Dio, some called Livia ‘Mother of her Country’ on account of her ‘saving’ of them and of the financial support she provided.\textsuperscript{302} Whilst πατήρ was still a title used for patrons during the early empire, particularly within Greek associations, the title gained increasing association with the emperor as Augustus and his successors consolidated their positions as unrivalled patrons \textit{par excellence}. This will have been particularly true in Rome, Italy and in Roman colonies such as Philippi.

E.8. Applying the patronal connotations of the father image to Paul’s descriptions of God as ‘father’

Evidence from ancient sources shows that, in some circumstances, the title ‘father’ could be employed as a label for one’s patron and as a metonym for a patronal relationship. It suggested a privileged relationship in which favours were reciprocally exchanged for loyalty and gestures of honour. It affirmed a social hierarchy with the patron having authority over the client, but also as having responsibilities to fulfil towards him. The patron bestowed gifts conceptualised through the familial metaphors of protection and provision. Importantly, it also connoted the ideals of goodwill and concord that should exist between the two parties. For some, the actual experience of the relationship could be one of

\textsuperscript{300} Veyne (1992: 257-8). Trajan still enjoyed the title \textit{pater patriae} – Pliny plays on the father metaphor in his panegyric (Pliny the Younger, \textit{Pan} 21.4; 26.3; 87.1; 94.4), written two years into Trajan’s reign.
\textsuperscript{301} Cassius Dio, \textit{Hist. rom.} 52.39.3.
\textsuperscript{302} \textit{Hist. rom.} 58.2.3.
dependency and exploitation, but Graeco-Roman ideology presents the relationship as one of mutual benefit.

Whilst Downs acknowledges that patronage and kinship are not always mutually exclusive, he concludes that “Paul’s consistent identification of “God our Father” […] functions to frame the identity and character of God outside the Greco-Roman patronage system.”\(^{303}\) However, as a patron was commonly understood to be a social superior who acted as one’s father,\(^{304}\) it can be difficult to distinguish the father image from that of the patron. Even when the father image is used in a generative sense, it can denote a patron who provides new life or salvation. Contrary to Downs and others, the evidence from Greek and Roman sources suggests that when Paul uses the father title in doxological and soteriological contexts, and alongside other honorific vocabulary, it would strongly evoke the image of the patron, especially the royal patron, with its associations of status, benefaction, reciprocal honours and loyalty.


\(^{304}\) Plutarch, *Rom.* 13.3.
CHAPTER 4: Jesus as God’s obedient ‘client’ and model for Paul’s ethics in Philippians 2:6-11

4.1. Outline

This chapter constructs our brokerage christology from the starting point of Phil 2:6-11. Whereas 1 Cor 15:20-28 might be a more natural starting point for an analysis of Jesus’ subordination to God, Phil 2:6-11 provides the clearest picture of the reciprocal interactions between God and Jesus manifested in Jesus’ life, death and exaltation. We analyse the text through the use of parallels from the relationship between the Roman emperor and his deputies to analyse the relational dynamics between God, Jesus and believers in the passage. The chapter shows how Paul depicts Jesus both as an exemplary client to God and as an exalted patron to believers. This brokering role is more concisely depicted in Phil 3:20-23. Because the primary purpose of Phil 2:6-11 is not christological but ethical, we must begin with the Philippian situation (1:17-2:4) that provides the context for 2:6-11. After showing how the narrative of 2:6-11 proceeds according to a logic of patronal relations with which Graeco-Roman readers would have been familiar, we will synthesise our findings to reflect on the christology of the passage.

Although Phil 2:6-11 is commonly considered a fragment of Christian traditional material that Paul appropriates for his own purposes, the last twenty years have seen some significant critiques of the consensus and an increased emphasis on reading the passage in its present context. We will treat the text as composed for the needs of the Philippian audience—an approach that appreciates the honour and status language present in the passage and in the wider letter. The background of the hymn is also highly debated with numerous figures hypothesised to be behind the narrative of the passage. In contrast, we will focus on the relational dynamic in

---

305 The main reasons for calling it a hymn include: parallelism, unique language, christological or theological concepts, rhythmical style, and use of the relative pronoun as an introductory formula.
Paul’s Christ-story that is manifested in certain high profile relationships in the Roman world.

4.2. Honour and status among the Philippians

The patronage of Rome was ever-present in the daily life of Philippi. From the name of the colony to the Roman dominance in land-ownership, town politics and administration, the inhabitants of Philippi were dependent on Rome in both symbolic and physical ways.\textsuperscript{308} Inscriptions attest to the importance of broadcasting one’s standing in the colony.\textsuperscript{309} Members of the humbler classes imitated the aristocracy’s race for honour within voluntary associations and cult groups.\textsuperscript{310}

The core of Paul’s letter to the Christian community at Philippi (Phil 1:17-2:1-18)\textsuperscript{311} addresses two issues both related to concern for honour and status. Philippians 1:27-30 suggests that some Christians are experiencing persecution from their neighbours, probably because of the loss of status incurred by their new lives in Christ.\textsuperscript{312} Philippians 2:1-4 suggests factionalism and disunity within the community, which would naturally arise between Christians less willing to sacrifice their social standing for the sake of the gospel.\textsuperscript{313} Disunity is characterised by ἐριθεία and κενοδοξία (2:3). ἐριθεία is best understood in relation to its use in Rom 2:8 as ‘selfish ambition’, ‘being concerned with one’s own (social) advantage’.\textsuperscript{314} κενοδοξία is

\textsuperscript{308} The colony had the status of \textit{ius italicum} meaning that it enjoyed certain tax exemptions, land rights and other privileges. Oakes (2001: 17, 50, 75-76) suggests 40 per cent as a nominal mid-range statistic for the number of Romans living in Philippi in the middle of the first-century. The majority of inscriptions from this period are in Latin, as are the coins (Pilhofer 2000). See Bormann (1995) for a presentation of the distinctive Roman character of Philippi, grounded in the patronal ties to its founder. Bormann argues that Graeco-Roman expectations of patron-client relationships form the background of the ‘matter of giving and receiving’ in Phil 4:10-20. The Philippians are attempting to support Paul in his mission and his troubles as a client group would with one’s patron (1995:206-224, 212).

\textsuperscript{309} Hellerman (2005: 88-109).

\textsuperscript{310} Ibid. 100-106. Martin (1990: 47-48) provides several examples of slaves who identify themselves as belonging to particular families and individuals, thus exercising a form of ‘status-by-association’ with those higher up in the ‘patronage structure of society’.

\textsuperscript{311} Following Fee (1995)’s broad delineation of Paul’s audience’s ‘affairs’ from his own (1:1-11) and from their future plans (2:19-30).


\textsuperscript{313} Hellerman (2005: 117-121) identifies a general preoccupation with honour among the Philippian community, reflected in Paul’s unique greeting (1:1), his use of πολιτεύομαι and in his claim to status in pharisaic Judaism (3:5-6). Philippians 4:2-3 likewise suggest unrest within the church.

\textsuperscript{314} Büschel (1966: 660-661); Oakes (2001: 183).
often translated as ‘vain conceit’ or ‘false thinking’ but literally means ‘empty glory’, suggestive of ‘posturing’ characteristic of the highly competitive culture of maintaining honour.\textsuperscript{315}

In response, Paul exhorts his community to ‘with humility (ταπεινοφροσύνη) regard others as better (ὑπερέχοντας) than yourselves’. In classical and Hellenistic Greek sources ταπεινός, from which ταπεινοφροσύνη is derived, commonly expresses the state of slaves, but its basic sense is ‘lowly’, ‘mean’, ‘insignificant’, ‘poor’—nearly always viewed negatively. It was used for those who were dependent upon or servile to others and could also refer to those who petitioned and flattered to gain favour.\textsuperscript{316} ταπεινοφροσύνη does not intrinsically indicate a slavish disposition but a disposition of someone of low status.\textsuperscript{317} Similarly ὑπερέχοντας denotes status rather than a moral quality.\textsuperscript{318} Whereas Grundmann states that ταπεινοφροσύνη in opposition to ἐρθεία and κενοδοξία carries the sense of unselfishness, in the context of the apparent Philippian concern for status and honour it is necessary to read ταπεινοφροσύνη as encompassing more proactive behaviour that treats others as preeminent, regardless of their social standing. This humility is exemplified in the obedience Jesus shows to God in Phil 2:6-11 and by his endurance in suffering.\textsuperscript{319}

4.3. Reading Philippians 2:6-11 in patron-client terms

The interaction between God and Jesus is divided into two parts (2:6-8 and 2:9-11, turning on διὸ καὶ), with the first part constituting two sentences (2:6a-7c and 2:7d-8b). The first sentence follows directly from 2:5, connecting and comparing the Philippians with Jesus, their ethical example. However, with the repetition of Jesus’ humanity in 2:7d, and the switch from the active sense of γενόμενος to the passive εὑρεθεὶς, Paul adjusts the focus to foreground Jesus and God.\textsuperscript{320} The second part

\textsuperscript{315} Fee (1995: 33); Osiek (2000: 53).
\textsuperscript{316} Dionysius (\textit{Ant. rom.} 2.8.1) and Plutarch (\textit{Rom.} 13.3) employ ταπεινός to describe the Roman plebeians who became clients to patricians.
\textsuperscript{317} Grundmann (1972: 5).
\textsuperscript{318} Fowl (2005: 84, n. 18). Both Paul and First Peter use ὑπερέχω to refer to local civic rulers and authorities, encouraging Christian submission to them (Rom 13.1-3, 1 Pet 2.13).
\textsuperscript{319} Oakes (2001: 199-200).
\textsuperscript{320} Interpreters who see pre-existence in the text locate 2:6-7c in the pre-temporal realm and 2:7d-8b in the earthly. Those who deny pre-existence usually have to describe the repetition as tautological. Hawthorne (2004: 121) calls the line “the final element in an emphatically unequivocal, repetitive
(2:9-11) deals with God’s actions for Jesus, providing divine legitimation of Christ’s conduct and a proclamation of a new world authority.

5 Have the same mind among you that was in the Messiah Jesus,
6a who, though having the form of a god, \( ^{321} \)
6b did not regard divine honours as something to be used for his advantage, \( ^{322} \)
7a, b but made himself nothing, adopting the form of a slave,
7c Coming in human likeness.
7d *And being found in form as a man*, \( ^{323} \)
8a *he humbled himself, becoming obedient to the point of death—*
8b *even death on a cross!*

9a Therefore God highly exalted him
9b and gifted him with the name that is above every name,
10a so that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow—
10b those in heaven and on those on earth and those in the underworld—
11a and every tongue should confess that Jesus the Messiah is Lord
11b to the glory of God the Father.

As we proceed though the text we shall see how the relationship between God and Jesus concords with the shape of ideal patronal relationships, employing the same clustering of terms relating to honour, status, transaction and kinship that we saw in the patronal relationships explored in Chapter 3. Oakes emphasises the importance of identifying an underlying logic in Phil 2:6-11 that its original audience would have been able to grasp. He argues that in a letter to a Gentile audience in Roman Philippi, a logic based on imperial ideology is more likely to frame the narrative of

---

affirmation of the reality of Christ’s humanity’. O’Brien (1991: 226) describes 7c and 7d as synthetically parallel with the progression of thought—a recapitulation occurring in the next strophe’. Fee (1995: 214) describes 7d as ‘clarifying’ 7c, providing the ‘factual’ side to the ‘quality’ of the incarnation in 7c.

\( ^{321} \)Wright (1986: 345, n. 87) and O’Brien (1991: 216) translate the participle as causal rather than concessive, e.g. ‘precisely because he was in the form of God…’. However, if there is an element of comparison to pagan despots, as O’Brien and Wright suggest there is, then some sense of concession must be present in the participle as Jesus acts contrary to expectations of a ruler.


\( ^{323} \)Following O’Brien (1991: 226) and Fee who argues that to force 7c and 7d together would be to create ‘a strange relationship’ (1995: 214-15, n. 3).
the text than Jewish principles based on the Old Testament. As Oakes writes, the logic of the text has to be one that a Philippian audience would deem appropriate because of their familiarity with Roman ideology. Oakes outlines the ways in which Phil 2:6-11 follows imperial ideology concerning the ethical attributes of an ideal emperor, the nature and purpose of his role and the process of his enthronement.

This section will follow Oakes’ lead but rather than focusing on the similarities between Jesus and a particular figure such as the Roman emperor, this chapter will focus on the relationship between Jesus and God, comparing the dynamics of their interaction with narratives about elite patron, client and broker figures to shed light on how Paul conceptualises the relationship between Jesus and God within the parameters of Jewish monotheism.

4.3.1. Divine honours

2.5-6 τοῦτο φρονεῖτε ἐν ὑμῖν δ καὶ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ
δς ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων
οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἣγήσατο τὸ εἶναι Ἰσα θεῷ

Before comparing 2:5-6 with the logic of imperial ideology, some discussion of the terms μορφῇ θεοῦ, Ἰσα θεῷ and their relation to 2:1-5 is necessary. The passage begins by Paul describing Jesus as a royal benefactor in comparison to the Philippians. Several recent studies have situated μορφῇ θεοῦ in the context of Graceo-Roman honorific language. Hellerman and Heen make strong cases for seating the language of 2:6-8 in a Hellenistic context, interpreting μορφῇ θεοῦ and Ἰσα θεῷ as expressions of Jesus’ elite status as a benefactor. Hellerman’s lexical survey of μορφῇ and its cognates finds that the vast majority of Hellenistic Greek sources that use μορφῇ use it non-substantially. It has the basic meaning of ‘visible appearance’, with the majority of usages having no indication of inward reality. Hellerman interprets μορφῇ θεοῦ as an expression of Jesus’ status as a

324 Oakes (2001: 159).
325 Hellerman (2009: 784-86)
326 Ibid. 784.
preexistent divine being. One of his most telling examples comes from: τί θέος; τὸ κρατοῦν. τί βασιλέως; ἰσοθέος (‘What is a god? One that exercises power. What is a king? One who is equal with a god’).

Heen’s survey of ἰσόθεοι similarly concludes that ‘god-like honours’ is used in sources to describe an individual’s status and authority. However, Heen puts more emphasis than Hellerman on the technical nature of the terms, drawing attention to the use of ἰσόθεοι τιμαί in civic honours. Heen argues that ἰσόθεοι were some of the highest honours a city could bestow and were reserved exclusively for the royal family soon after Augustus’ enthronement. Heen finds that in Graeco-Roman sources ἰσόθεοι tends to refer to civic honours. In Jewish sources it is used in a critique of Greek civic honours. ἰσόθεοι in both categories reflects the honorific traditions of Greek cities. Heen uses this understanding of ἰσόθεοι to read μορφῇ θεοῦ as meaning someone destined to receive ‘god-like honours’. However, where Heen reads Paul’s use of this honorific language as a ‘pointed criticism’ of those who grasp after honours on both a civic and an imperial level, the relation between 2:6-7c and 2:1-5 suggests that it functions primarily to ‘convey to the Philippians a social change immeasurably beyond what they might be called to undergo’.

Like δόϋλος and σταυρός, μορφῇ θεοῦ and ἴσα θεῶ are powerful status symbols, and have the rhetorical function of heightening the contrast with the depths of status to which Jesus lowered himself. μορφῇ θεοῦ and ἴσα θεῶ overshadow and shame the ‘selfish ambition’ and ‘empty glory’ of the Philippians, depicting Jesus as a high status benefactor who did not act like other rulers and benefactors of this world. Following 2:1-5, verse 6 has the rhetorical force of saying ‘even Jesus, who had much higher status than us, renounced self-serving status’. Christ’s life exemplifies the behaviour Paul encourages in his recipients. Christ did not exploit/grasp at ‘equality with God’ (in comparison with 2:3). Christ ‘lowered himself’ (2:3), Christ

328 Pap. Heid. 1716.5, cited in Hellerman (2009: 789). Other examples include: Seleucid king Antiochus IV claiming god-like authority over seas and mountains (2 Macc 9:8-12) and Julius Caesar receiving honours ‘equal to gods’ (Appian, Bell. civ. 2.148).
331 Oakes (2001: 209). Heen’s view of comparison to the emperor and Phil 2:6-11 as a ‘hidden transcript’ is severely weakened by the fact that imperial cult does not appear to be an issue here.
was obedient to the extent of death (persevering amongst suffering: 1:27-8, 4:1). Christ ‘considers’ divine honours as the Philippians ‘consider’ each other (2:2). Jesus’ example would challenge those in the church who were avoiding helping others and would also encourage those who were suffering.

The evidence of μορφῇ θεοῦ and ἴσα θεῷ as terminology from the phenomena of honours and benefaction suggests that the terms function to describe Jesus’ royal status. The language was strongly honorific and was applied to rulers in Jewish and Graeco-Roman antiquity on the basis of the benefactions such figures provided. Whether these expressions posit Jesus’ actions in a pre-temporal sphere is a secondary question—the expressions’ primary force is to connect Jesus to royal figures. The ontological reality behind claims to divine honours is secondary to the allusions to the types of figures who made such claims.

When we understand Jesus’ divine status in 2:6 as having comparison to the Philippians primarily in view, rather than as having comparison to God in view, Jesus’ role as God’s agent comes into focus. For the Philippian audience, successful imperial figures were known for their moral qualities. Lack of self-interest, concern for others and moderation were important characteristics in a good leader. But where Oakes identifies these qualities in a good emperor, who acts as an agent on behalf of Rome and the people, I will argue that they are potentially more visible in the figure of an imperial client.

Paul’s emphasis on obedience is one reason which suggests that the Philippian audience might imagine an imperial client before they thought of an emperor-like figure, because of the attitudes of ideal clients that feature prominently in imperial ideology. Marcus Vipsanius Agrippa is most widely known as Octavian’s best

332 Ibid. 190, 199.
333 Ibid. 199-200.
334 Jipp (2015: 141) argues that the notion of pre-existence connects Jesus to concepts in Jewish royal ideology. He argues that whilst Jewish kings could be described as ‘firstborn’ in the sense of pre-eminence, such descriptions could also be understood as referring to pre-existence, citing LXX Ps. 88:28; LXX Ps. 71:17. Collins (2007: 59-62) and Collins & Collins (2008: 147-48) also cite 4QapocrDan ar. and 1QSa which are open to interpretation of the messiah as having a pre-existent, ontic divinity.
general and as a key supporter in his mission to becoming *princeps*. He fought for Octavian at Perusia, Naulochus and at Actium, and put down revolts in Gaul and Dalmatia. The literary sources present Agrippa’s virtues as well as his achievements as surpassing those of his peers. Appian contrasts him to Lepidus during the campaign in Sicily. In his account of the siege of Messana, Agrippa dutifully waits for Octavian’s orders unlike Lepidus who opts to take the city for himself.

Cassius Dio takes the opportunity to praise Agrippa for his construction of the Aqua Virgo aqueduct in 19 BCE and contrasts him to other elites:

Such was the character of this man; but others both strove for triumphs and celebrated them, not only for no exploits comparable to this, but merely for arresting robbers or for restoring harmony to cities that were torn by factious strife.

Dio holds Agrippa in high regard because of his loyalty to the emperor (he names the aqueduct Αὐγουστος) and his self-restraint of ambition. Dio records that after victories over the Cantabri in Gaul and Spain, Agrippa declined a triumph endorsed by both the Senate and the Emperor, thus showing ‘moderation (μετριάζω) in these matters…’ Dio and Appian hold up modesty appropriate to one’s status as a virtue of an ideal general and frowned on those who grasp after honours above their station. Agrippa’s attitude towards honours has parallels in Phil 2:6, whether ἁρπαγμός is translated as ‘a prize to be grasped’ or as something to be exploited for self-glorification. Both interpretations speak of a self-promoting attitude that Jesus, like an ideal imperial client, does not entertain.

4.3.2. Appearance of a slave

2:7a ἀλλὰ ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν
2:7b μορφήν δούλου λαβών,
2:7c ἐν ὀμοιώματι ἄνθρωπων γενόμενος.

---

336 (Habichte, 2005,242).
341 Hawthorne (2004: 98-9, 114-17) acknowledges the issues in both interpretations.
Verse 7 expands on the way that Jesus did not treat status as something to chase or exploit. Despite having the status and authority of a kingly benefactor, Jesus humbled himself, appearing instead like a slave. Much has been written on slavery and crucifixion as symbols of shame and degradation in the ancient Mediterranean: slavery was the lowest rung of the social ladder. Less attention has been given to Christ’s act of becoming a slave, particularly in relation to clientage. Clientage was connected to slavery in two significant ways. The first was through freedmen (*liberti*) who had previously quite literally been slaves. Whilst acquiring one’s freedom *could* mean an improvement in one’s fortunes, the social reality was that *liberti* continued to operate within the sphere of control of their ex-masters/patron.* Moritsen writes:

The position of freedmen was therefore always regarded as one of dependency, the irony being that by accepting freedom they also surrendered a major part of it. The very gift of *libertas* made them subject to the lasting authority of their benefactors.

However, the Christian story of the earthly life of Jesus, a peasant but freeborn Jew of Judea, surely prevents Christ’s actions from being understood as those of a slave or freedman. Rather, he is someone who chooses his ‘form’.

The second way clientage is linked to slavery is expressed in the satirists’ derision of free-born clients who put themselves into the service of wealthy Roman households. Both Lucian and Juvenal criticise patrons and clients for encouraging what they view to be an undignified relationship. Juvenal, probably writing about 100 CE, contrasts a patron and client’s varying perceptions of their relationship: the client considers himself a free man whilst the patron sees that the client is in fact ‘enslaved’ by the hope of a free meal. Juvenal ends the satire with the explicit and emphatic reproach: ‘Sooner or later, you’ll be offering to have your head shaved and slapped, and you won’t flinch from a harsh whipping. That’s the kind of banquet you deserve, and that’s the kind of friend.’

---

In *De Mercede Conductis* Lucian engages with Juvenal’s critique of Graeco-Roman clientage.\(^{346}\) Lucian, writing in the latter half of the second-century CE describes clientage as an envied position in the social hierarchy but derides it as constituting a loss of dignity for Greeks.\(^{347}\) He perceives clientage as ‘voluntary slavery’ (τῆς ἑθελοδουλείας), using several vivid metaphors to portray the debasement of the client’s slave-like state. These include a runaway slave, a fish caught by hook and a monkey with a collar around its neck.\(^{348}\) Both Lucian and Juvenal perceive clientage as a form of slavery and as a voluntary forfeit of one’s freeborn status.\(^{349}\) The fact that they were writing for different readerships suggests their negative portrayals of clientage reflects a popular view of the time.\(^{350}\) The emphasis Paul places on Jesus’ *choice* in taking ‘the form of a slave’ in 2:6-8 suggests that Paul has the figure of the client, rather than simply a slave, in mind.\(^{351}\) Jesus’ free choice to take the form of a slave (slave-like) is integral to his exaltation in 2:9-11 and to his usefulness as an ethical exemplar for the Philippians.

Elite imperial clients are also described as demonstrating slave-like qualities. However, demonstrations were regarded in a positive light as expressions of loyalty and allegiance to their emperor. Cassius Dio depicts Nero’s general Corbulo as a client who never seeks to reach higher than his station, even when others apparently wanted him to be emperor rather than Nero. Dio reports that Tiridates the client king of Armenia characterises Corbulo’s relationship with Nero as akin to slavery:

> [Tiridates] praised (ἐπαινέω) Corbulo, in whom he found only this one fault, that he would put up with such a master (δεσποτής). Indeed, he made no concealment of his views even to Nero himself, but said to him one day: “Master, you have in Corbulo a good slave (ἀγαθόν, ὦ δέσποτα ἀνδράποδον Κορβούλωνα ἔχεις”).\(^{352}\)

---

346 Bozia (2014: 26), citing Satura 1, 5 and Nigrinus 17
347 Ibid. 31-31.
351 Gathercole (2006: 25) describes the humility of Jesus as a ‘voluntary act’ (his emphasis). He writes: ‘he is not merely the passive envoy of the Father; the Son, too, is a willing subject on the mission and himself undertakes to assume the form of a servant.’
352 Cassius Dio, *Hist. rom.* 63.6.3-4.
In fact, Dio portrays Corbulo’s unquestioning obedience in contrast to Tiridates who expresses his clientship through underhand flattery and skill, gaining gifts from Nero including money and permission to rebuild Artaxa in his kingdom. However, Corbulo’s loyalty to Nero demands respect from Tiridates.  

Reading Jesus as a client in Phil 2:6-8 contextualises Jesus’ choice to become like a slave within the social milieu of its Graeco-Roman readers. It suggests that Paul employs a common figure as a point of comparison to communicate Jesus’ forfeiture of status and honour. However, the image of Jesus taking on a slave-like appearance to the extent that he died a slave’s death might have deeply challenged many of the Philippian audience, especially those of higher status or Roman ethnicity who shared Juvenal and Lucian’s view of clientage.

4.3.3. Humility and obedience

2:7d καὶ σχήματι εὐρέθεις ὡς ἄνθρωπος
2:8a ἑταπείνωσεν ἐαυτὸν γενόμενος ὑπήκοος μέχρι θανάτου,
2:8b θανάτου δὲ σταυροῦ.

In 2:7d-8 Paul describes Jesus’ self-degradation as a supreme act of obedience. Philippians 2:7d effectively repeats the idea of 2:7c but uses the passive voice (εὐρέθεις). Paul’s use of ἑταπείνωσεν in 2:8a reiterates Jesus’ act of humility previously expressed in ἕκένωσεν, connected by phonological repetition of the aorist third person singular prefix and suffix pattern (ἐ-νωσεν). However, ταπεινώω more closely associates Jesus’ action with concepts of status and hierarchy. The virtue of obedience further characterises him as a client figure and follows a familiar narrative of obedient Roman generals. All Roman governors, both legati Augusti and proconsuls, as well as the prefect of Egypt and the procurators of smaller provinces received mandata/ἐντολαί from the emperor. Mandata provided personal instructions on a range of administrative responsibilities, from legal procedures and city finances to the maintenance and running of the army.

353 Cassius Dio. Hist. rom 63.6.5-7.
Under the reign of Claudius, the proconsul of Asia, Gnaius Domitius Corbulo (whether the older or the younger is unclear), wrote to the civic leaders of Cos referencing the instructions to proconsuls (ἐντολαῖς ἐπιτέτακται) to present certain legal cases to the emperor.\textsuperscript{356} *Mandata* may have also contained instructions on how to use the army. Campbell writes: ‘Governors were expected to take no decisive action without consultation with the emperor.’\textsuperscript{357} This certainly concords with Caesar’s distinction between legates and commanders: ‘[…] officers (legati) and commanders (imperatoris) have different roles. The one ought to do everything as instructed, the other to act freely in view of the overall situation.’\textsuperscript{358} Good generals are often depicted as following their Emperors’ orders and as consulting with them before taking decisive actions.

During the campaign in Sicily the faultless general Agrippa waits for Octavian’s orders before taking the city of Messana. In contrast, Lepidus does not consult with Octavian and takes the city for himself.\textsuperscript{359} In Josephus’ account of the suppression of the Judean revolt, the loyal general Trajan sends for Vespasian’s orders before the siege of Japha.\textsuperscript{360} After Nero’s assassination, Vespasian sends Titus to Rome to receive the new emperor’s orders before proceeding to put down the Judean revolts.\textsuperscript{361} Dio likewise depicts the great general Aulus Plautius consulting with Claudius when he meets staunch resistance at Colchester.\textsuperscript{362} Corbulo provides a particularly vivid model of obedience and loyalty. Nero trusts Corbulo with more military powers than his other generals because he trusts that Corbulo will obey him and not attempt to usurp him.\textsuperscript{363} Corbulo even obeys his emperor at Cenchreae when Nero turns on him and orders his death.\textsuperscript{364}

The condemned man, as soon as he understood the order, seized a sword, and dealing himself a lusty blow exclaimed: “Your due!” Then, indeed, for the

\textsuperscript{356} IGR 4.1044; cf. Burton (1976).
\textsuperscript{357} Campbell (1984; 349).
\textsuperscript{358} Caesar, *Bell. civ.* 3.51.4-5 (trans. Cynthia Daemon, LCL).
\textsuperscript{359} Appian, *Bell. civ.* 5.13.123.
\textsuperscript{360} Josephus, *B.J.* 3.298.
\textsuperscript{361} Josephus, *B.J.* 4.490-91.
\textsuperscript{362} Cassius Dio, *Hist. rom.* 60.21.1-5.
\textsuperscript{363} Cassius Dio, *Hist. rom.* 62.19; cf. 23.5.
\textsuperscript{364} Cassius Dio, *Hist. rom.* 17.5.
first time he was convinced that he had done wrong both in sparing the lyre-player and in going to him unarmed.\textsuperscript{365} Dio puts words in his mouth to sarcastically present the action as an act of obedience. Even in his assassination Corbulo is the ideal client.

Obedience is also a virtue in other forms of asymmetrical exchange relationships. We will explore in more detail in chapter 6 how Dio Chrysostom characterises the ideal king as obedient to his patron deity. In the same way that a king’s subjects are obedient (ὑπήκουος) to their superior patron (κρείσσων), so the king should honour (προτιμάω) and be subject to (ἔρωμαι) his divine masters (δεσπότης) and rulers (ἄρχων).\textsuperscript{366} Even for the most elite members of society, adherence to one’s patron was a virtue.

For the Philippians familiar with the expectations of clients, Jesus’ obedience to his patron would have marked him as an ideal figure, despite the controversy of his death. His willingness to give his own life for a greater cause places him within the tradition of ‘the endangered benefactor.’\textsuperscript{367} Whilst Jesus’ behaviour in 2:7d-8 contains elements that connect to Paul’s ethical instruction in 2:1-4—such as his use of ταπεινόω—Paul’s focus has shifted onto the chain of events that leads to Jesus being made a figure of authority who relativises both earthly powers and the Philippians’ suffering.\textsuperscript{368}

4.3.4. Receiving imperial favour

2:9 διὸ καὶ ὁ θεὸς αὐτὸν ὑπερύψωσεν,
καὶ ἐχαρίσατο αὐτῷ τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ὑπὲρ πᾶν ὄνομα

Because of Jesus’ conduct in 2:6-8, God highly honours him, giving him unprecedented authority. The gift terminology of 2:9 frames the two figures in

\textsuperscript{365} Cassius Dio, \textit{Hist. rom.} 53.17.5-6.
\textsuperscript{366} Dio Chrysostom, \textit{2 Regn.} 71-72; cf. \textit{3 Regn.} 6, 55.
\textsuperscript{367} Danker (1982: 417-27). Lucian (\textit{Tox.} 20) describes the self-sacrifice of drowning friend in benefactor terms, as an act of goodwill (ῄνοια).
\textsuperscript{368} Oakes (2001: 209). Oakes terms Paul’s rhetorical strategy a ‘remapping’ of the Philippians’ universe which places Christ at the centre.
benefactor-beneficiary roles, the standard framework for conceptualizing relationships with the Roman emperor. Its use of conjunctions infers a logic about gift-exchange common to the ideology found in honorific inscriptions.

Χαρίζωμαι and the χάρι- word group have long been recognized as a common feature of epigraphic evidence of patronage and benefaction. Crook writes that the term χάρις has four closely related meanings ‘beautiful, beneficence or kindness, a concrete gift or benefaction, and gratitude’. Harrison describes it as a semantically versatile term, able to convey the favour, grace or goodwill of a patron or benefactor, or the thanks or gratitude of a beneficiary. It is often used to distinguish the gift exchange between patrons and clients from commercial transactions. Χαρίζωμαι has the general sense of ‘to bestow favour’. In Peterman’s study on gift exchange in Philippians he associates χαρίζωμαι with other common terms of giving and receiving such as δίδωμι, δέχομαι, λαμβάνω.

In his reading of Phil 2:9-11, Oakes emphasises that it was the bestowal of power by an authoritative body that legitimised the rule of the emperor. This then places Jesus in a position of comparison with the emperor. We certainly agree that the granting of power was an important part of imperial ideology. However, by the middle of the first century, the authority to bestow power would primarily have been equated with the emperor himself as benefactor par excellence. We have already discussed how during the transition from republic to empire, imperial offices became commodities to be petitioned for and bestowed by the emperor as favours. Thus, the beneficiaries of power would primarily have been equated with the emperor’s favoured subjects.

Josephus’ account of Herod the Great’s relationship with Augustus demonstrates this point. Josephus casts Herod’s relationship to his Roman overlords in patron-client terms. In the war between Octavian and Antony, Herod had allied with the latter.

---

370 Harrison (2003: 2).
371 Peterman (1992: 61-63). Plutarch (Mor. 830a) describes exchanging benefits (χαρίζωμαι; εὐχαριστεῖον) as an alternative to taking loans.
373 See chapter 3 (§3.6-7) and Excursus (§E7).
374 Millar (1977: 11).
calling Antony his benefactor (ἐυργέτης) and providing him with assistance (χρήσιμος). After Antony’s defeat, Herod appeals to Octavian’s honour (ἀρετή) for safety (σωτηρία), promising faithful friendship (φίλος). Notably, Herod describes Augustus’ rise to power and Antony’s demise as by divine appointment:

But his ears, it seems, were stopped by his [Antony’s] infatuation for Cleopatra and by God who has granted you the mastery (κρατεῖν χαρίζομενος).

Herod’s words to Caesar are clearly meant to flatter. He reflects both imperial propaganda regarding the legitimacy of the Caesars’ power and Josephus’ own view of providence which interpreted Vespasian and Titus likewise as God’s agents (Josephus, B.J. 3.292-93; 5.361-419). However, Josephus’ framing of the scene makes it clear who the real authority is and from whom benefits flow. Because of Herod’s appeal, ‘Caesar subsequently presented to Herod (δίδωσιν) Trachonitis and its neighbouring districts’. Caesar not only rewards Herod’s loyalty with enthronement but with gifts, honours and with additional territories.

Heracles, the model ruler, is also depicted as bestowing positions of power as favours:

He [Heracles] considered all such things worth nothing save to be given away (δοῦναι) and bestowed (χαρίσασθαι) upon others. At any rate he made presents (ἔδωρες) to many men, not only of money without limit and lands and herds of horses and cattle, but also of whole kingdoms and cities. For he fully believed that everything belonged to him exclusively and that gifts bestowed would call out the good-will of the recipients (τοῖς δοθεῖσι τὴν εὖνοιαν τῶν λαμβόντων).

Dio Chrysostom focuses on the emperor as the authority who legitimates all lesser powers. He lists local offices among the commodities commonly given as benefits by the emperor. Whilst imperial propaganda stated that the Emperor’s power was

375 Josephus, B.J. 1.386.
377 Josephus, B.J. 1.398-99. Caesar adds to his kingdom (προστίθημι) and bestows on him the territories between Trachonitis and Galilee (1:400: προσνέω). Cf. B.J. 5.1 where Josephus describes the Flavians’ rule as entrusted to them by God (τὴν ἡγεμονίαν νῦν αὐτοῖς ἐγκεχαρισμένην τοῦ θεοῦ).
378 Josephus, B.J. 1.393-98.
379 Dio Chrysostom, 1 Regn. 62.
legitimised by the Senate, the people and the gods, it simultaneously enforced the image of the emperor as the figure through whom other powers were authorised.\textsuperscript{380} Paul’s use of \textit{χαριζομαι} in Phil 2.9 depicts God’s action for Christ in terms reminiscent of imperial favours that enthrone local authority.

Interpretations of verse 9 have tended to neglect the conjunction \textit{διο}. The inclusion of \textit{διο} at the beginning of the sentence makes it clear that God exalts Jesus \textit{because} of Jesus’ actions in verses 6-8, specifically his obedience that led all the way to his crucifixion.\textsuperscript{381} Paul’s use of \textit{διο} locates God’s interaction with Jesus within the realm of patron-client exchange: divine favour is bestowed on the basis of obedient service.

The concept that clients had to show themselves worthy of receiving honours by their loyal service is well attested amongst the literary sources. Josephus makes it clear that when Augustus makes Herod king of Judea he does so on the merit of Herod’s loyal services to Antony. Herod is a worthy friend (\textit{ἄξιος}).\textsuperscript{382} Nero appoints Corbulo because of his many virtues including strength, fairness and loyalty. He appoints Vespasian because of his past experience, skill and loyalty.\textsuperscript{383} Vespasian considers Tiberius worthy (\textit{ἄξιος}) of promotion as one of his generals because of his fidelity.\textsuperscript{384} The importance of the worthiness of the client is also well attested in epigraphic evidence. A letter from the emperor Hadrian commends a certain nobleman to the ‘Council of Ephesians’. In the letter Hadrian offers to pay for the nobleman’s election if the council find the individual to be worthy of honour (\textit{της τεμις} \textit{ἄξιος}).\textsuperscript{385}

Honorific inscriptions play a key role in enforcing the ideology that loyal services should be reciprocated with honours. Countless associations render honours to their patrons in response to their patron’s services. Honorific inscriptions follow a very common formula along the lines of ‘A honors B with […] on account of […]’ The amount of detail can vary greatly but the conjunction is nearly always included.

\textsuperscript{380} For Roman generals receiving offices as favours from the emperor see Appian. \textit{Bell. civ.} 5.11.102 (Agrippa) and Josephus, \textit{B.J.} 1.391 (Herod); 3.3-6 (Vespasian).
\textsuperscript{381} Oakes (2001: 202).
\textsuperscript{382} Josephus \textit{B.J.} 1.386.
\textsuperscript{383} Josephus, \textit{B.J.} 3.3-6.
\textsuperscript{384} Josephus, \textit{B.J.} 5.45.
\textsuperscript{385} \textit{IEph} 1487 (128/129 CE), trans. Harland.
Standard formula tends to use ἑνήκα but διὸ also occurs. Eilers’ collection of Greek inscriptions to Roman patrons shows the types of virtues for which individuals were honoured. ἑνήκα is frequently combined with ἀρετή, εὐνοία and εὐσέβεια; also ἀνδραγαθία (nobility) and δικαιοσύνη. The lexicon and grammar of Phil 2:6-11 follow a certain logic regarding exchange of honours for services that is evident in honorific inscriptions. In the narrative of Christ’s humility, obedience and subsequent exaltation, διὸ functions to connect the service with the honours it merited, further characterising Jesus’ exaltation as a benefaction from a patron.

In fact, Paul’s use of χαρίζομαι sits awkwardly with conceptions of divine identity that rely on a clear boundary between divinity and creation. Bauckham argues that Phil 2.5-11 identifies Christ with the divine characteristics previously attributed to God alone, namely his eschatological sovereignty and reception of worship.

Bauckham begins with Paul’s allusion to Isa 45:23 to read an ‘integrated early Christian reading’ of Deutero-Isaiah in which YHWH’s eschatological sovereignty and universal worship is achieved through the humiliation and exaltation of the suffering servant figure. For Bauckham, it is in Jesus’ exaltation that God displays His unique identity. Bauckham writes:

Precisely Deutero-Isaianic monotheism is fulfilled in the revelation of Jesus’ participation in the divine identity. Eschatological monotheism proves to be Christological monotheism.

However, Paul’s use of χαρίζομαι suggests that the dividing line between divinity and creation is not as clear as Bauckham would like. Whilst Jesus is associated with God in the giving of the divine name and in the level of sovereignty he acquires, he is also presented as distinctly subordinate to God both in the text’s grammar and narrative. In the context of Jesus’ actions in Phil 2:6-8, God’s action expressed with χαρίζομαι implies a difference in status between the actor who provides loyalty and the actor who provides favours. Jesus is given a share in sovereignty over creation but χαρίζομαι positions Jesus as the subject of God’s benefaction, placed on the side of the created rather than the creator.

---

386 Eilers (2002).
387 Bauckham (2008: 34).
388 Ibid. 38.
4.3.5. Appointed to office for a purpose

2.10 ἵνα ἐν τῷ ὄνοματι Ἰησοῦ πᾶν γόνυ κάμψῃ
ἐπουρανίων καὶ ἐπιγείων καὶ καταχθονίων,
καὶ πᾶσα γλώσσα ἐξουσιοδοθήσεται ὑπὸ κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς

If διὸ καὶ infers that power is bestowed because of what is described in 2:6-8, then ἵνα emphasises the purpose for which power is given. It suggests that God appoints Jesus for a specific task – to subject the cosmos to God’s authority and his lordship.

Oakes identifies the concept of power granted for a purpose as a distinctly prominent component of Roman imperial ideology. Oakes emphasises that in Roman imperial ideology the office of the princeps was a power bestowed on a man for the fulfilment of a saving task. In order for the emperors to maintain control of the territories they had conquered they had to delegate tasks to their deputies. They appointed their favoured clients for specific tasks. Military offices were (a) bestowed as favours, (b) on the basis of loyalty and competence in order to (c) fulfill a particular task.

'Dogmatic difficulties’ in the exegesis of Phil 2:6-11 often arise from an overemphasis on one of these three aspects of Jesus’ exaltation to the neglect of the others. In narratives concerning the emperor and his generals, it is clear that offices were bestowed both as gifts and as commissions. ἵνα therefore affirms that God’s exaltation is a reward for his service and a commission to a new one.

Jesus’ adoption of the title κύριος—a proxy for the name YHWH, the name above every name (2:10) is frequently considered key to how Christians expressed their belief that Jesus was united with God, or included within the divine identity. Chapter 6 (§6.5.2) and chapter 7 (§7.5.3) will discuss the name bestowal in the context of theonomy. However, name bestowal also has parallels in patronal relations. Elite provincials who attained Roman citizenship adopted the name of their Roman sponsor. For example, Plutarch became L. Mestrius Plutarch after his

390 Oakes comes to similar conclusions.
391 Bauckham (1998b: 132); cf. Hill (2015a: 94). We accept Fee’s arguments (2007: 20-21) that κύριος would have been recognised by Paul’s readers as the divine name YHWH, which appeals to the sheer volume of quotes and allusions to the OT in Paul’s letters, and to the oral/aural culture of first-century society.
‘friend’ L. Mestrius Florus. Client kings also demonstrated their patronage to their emperor by adopting names of the imperial family. King Agrippa I has the cognomen of a powerful Roman patron, and his own children Drusus and Drusilla, are named after the family members of Tiberius and Caligula. Apprentices of craftsmen might sign their works with their own name and the name of their master. Intriguingly, their master’s name might sometimes take the position of a patronymic, ‘showing an interesting parallel between biological and intellectual affiliation’. Upon manumission, a freedman adopted the praenomen and nomen of his former master.

Bauckham argues that ‘the bearing of this divine name signifies unequivocally his inclusion in the unique divine identity’. In the Graeco-Roman context, bearing another’s name might, in some circumstances, signify a shared identity such as the identity of a particular household, but it primarily signified a relationship to the owner of that name or a representation of that person. As we will discuss in the next section and in more detail in chapter 8, Jesus’ possession of the name κύριος denotes his unique role as God’s broker. Hill rejects McGrath’s interpretation that Jesus bears the divine name representatively because it neglects the context of Isa 45:21-23 which ‘precludes God’s sharing his lordship with another’. However, name bestowal also has precedents in Isa 45.

In the narrative of LXX Isa 45, YHWH announces the Persian Cyrus as his anointed king (45:1: χριστός). He legitimates his rule (45:1), and commissions him to rebuild Jerusalem (44:28) and to release the captives (35:14). However, the appointment begins with God giving Cyrus a new name:

395 Hill (2015a: 94-95); McGrath (2009: 49). Hill’s second objection which is based on the implications of Jesus receiving worship is also problematised by Alexander (2016)”s argument that the emissary of the ruler was often honoured as the ruler himself.
396 The neglect in recent Philippians scholarship of the only reference to χριστός in the whole of Isaiah is surprising considering the compelling demonstrations that χριστός is a messianic title in the NT. O’Brien (1991), Fee (1995), Hawthorne (2004), Fowl (2005), Silva (2005), Reumann (2008). Hansen (2009), Ryan & Thurston (2009), Witherington (2011) do not discuss the use of χριστός in Isa 45. To our knowledge, Seeley (1994) is one of the few scholars to note any possible connection with Cyrus in Isa 45 but actually judges the hymn writer to deliberately avoid the connection.
For the sake of my servant Jacob, and Israel my chosen, I call you by your name, *I surname you* (NRSV), though you do not know me (45:4).397 We also see a sharing of divine titles in YHWH’s description of Cyrus as ‘my shepherd’ (MT 44:28), where before YHWH himself had that image (40:11). In a creative reading of LXX Isa 45, the sharing of YHWH’s name with Cyrus might be supported by the fact that Cyrus is called Κύρῳ (LXX 45:1), not dissimilar from κύριος ὁ θεός. A significant textual variant also renders 45:4b, ‘I call you by my name’ (ἐγὼ καλέσω σε τῷ ὄνομάτι μου).398

God’s appointing of Cyrus with an honorific name epitomises the symbiotic relationship between the two figures. In the wider narrative of Isa 44:24-45:25, YHWH achieves his sovereignty and restores Israel through Cyrus. As YHWH is a creator so Cyrus recreates the cities (45:12:13; cf. 44:24-28). As YHWH is a deliverer so Cyrus frees captives (45:13, 15, 22). As Cyrus is righteous (45:13) so is YHWH (45:21, 23-24). The conquered peoples’ kneeling and acknowledgment of God also clearly parallels the earlier prostration and confession that God is with Cyrus (45:14: προσεύξονται ὁτι ἐν σοί ὁ θεός ἐστι).399

This is not to say that there are not important differences between the two relationships. Cyrus is not the ideal client—like the nations, he clearly does not presently know God (45:3, 4), and God’s benefactions to him are not explicitly reciprocated in client-like fashion, although perhaps 45:3 suggests that they will be. It is a more overtly transaction-based relationship as YHWH pays Cyrus a ransom for captive Israel (45:13-14). However, God’s work through Cyrus and the honour that accompanies it sets a precedent for the eschatological agency of the son whose sovereignty previous anointed ones only provided in glimpses. Whilst recent scholarship on christology has argued that Paul applies Isa 45:23 to depict Jesus within God’s unique identity, there are good reasons to read Phil 2:10-11 as a depiction of God’s agent *par excellence* whose possession of the name legitimates his divine mandate.

---

398 Ziegler (1939), basing his edition on Alexandrinus which is judged to be more reliable for LXX Isaiah.
4.3.6. The emperor takes the highest honours

2.11b εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ πατρός.

Paul ends the passage declaring that every living thing will one day submit to Jesus’ authority to the glory of God the Father. Even though Jesus is exalted and honoured, it is to God that the total worship is given. This final part of the passage completes a picture that some of its hearers would have comprehended through expectations of familiar imperial narratives. Philippians 2:11 echoes the familiar ending of many stories of military victories. Despite the fact that it was the emperor’s generals who usually led the campaign, it was the emperor who claimed the ultimate glory. Following Augustus’ lead, subsequent emperors increasingly dominated military victories. After 19 BCE no military leader outside the imperial family was allowed to celebrate a triumph and the honours for successful generals were downgraded to lesser honours.400

Roman panegyric reflects the emperor’s monopoly of military victories and provide evidence for how the emperors presented themselves to their fellow elites. Pliny’s Panegyricus to the emperor Trajan—a text we will explore in more detail in chapter 6—paints colourful tableaux in which he depicts Trajan receiving the honours of a famous victory:

And so the day will come when the Capitol shall see […] an emperor coming home with true and genuine honour, bringing peace and the end of strife, and the submission of his enemies so evident that none shall be left to conquer.401

In the speech Pliny gives glory to Trajan for the victory, despite the fact that Trajan would have had limited access to the army and their actual battles. He also depicts the scene as if Trajan has personally fought the battle, his own hand and spear having devastated Rome’s enemies.402 As we will discuss in a chapter 6 (§6.2), some scholars interpret Roman panegyric to be instructions to the emperor on how to behave. However, Jones makes a compelling case for seeing the power dynamic in

---

400 When the legions in Germany revolt at the accession of Tiberius, they complain that ‘theirs the victories by which the empire grew; theirs the name which Caesars assumed!’ (Tacitus, Ann. 1.31 [trans. John Jackson, LCL].

the reverse order: parallels between Pliny’s and Dio Chrysostom’s panegyric suggests that they are in fact transmitters of Trajan’s own imperial ideology. Public inscriptions show how the emperors transmitted their unrivalled glory to the rest of the empire. The Arch of Claudius constructed in the wake of Claudius’ victories in Britain (43 CE) proclaims:

The senate and Roman people [dedicated this] to Tiberius Claudius Caesar Augustus Germanicus […] because he received into surrender eleven kings of the Britons conquered without loss and he first brought the barbarian peoples across the Ocean under the authority of the Roman people.

Claudius also broadcasted his status by printing his victory on coins in AD 46-7 and AD 49. The inscriptions declaring Claudius’ victory allow no room for his generals; it is the emperor who monopolises the glory.

The message from imperial propaganda contrasts vividly with Josephus’ view of Claudius’ actual involvement in the campaign (and therefore the legitimacy of his honours). Josephus attributes the conquest in Britain to Claudius’ generals and particularly his own patron, Vespasian:

He [Vespasian] had by his military genius added to the empire Britain, till then almost unknown, and thus afforded Claudius, his father, the honours of a triumph which cost him [Claudius] no personal exertion (ὅθεν αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ πατρὶ Κλαύδιῳ παρέσχε χωρίς ἵδρωτος ἴδιον θρίαμβον καταγαγεῖν).

Josephus here appears to describe Claudius as Vespasian’s father, confirming the expectation that the emperor would take the honour earned by his client. The imperial agent, whilst adding to his own reputation, is obliged to give up public honours to the emperor.

Though Jesus appears to be the instrument through whom universal submission is achieved, the final word of the passage puts that honour in its cosmological perspective. The Excursus (§E7) above has argued that the most prominent patron

---
403 Jones (1978: 118-19).
404 CIL VI 920-23 (trans. Barrett 1991: 12). The text is highly reconstructed); See other accounts of Claudius’ arch and honours in Suetonius. Claud. 17 and Cassius Dio, Hist. rom. 60.22.
405 Josephus, B.J. 3.5 (adapted from LCL).
and possessor of the title πατήρ was the Emperor himself. πατήρ is only used as a title for God on two other occasions in the letter (Phil 1:2; 4:20), amidst Paul’s twenty-two references to God. Paul’s use of the title at this juncture performs multiple roles. Firstly, it identifies God with the figure of the emperor as pater patriae. Secondly, it casts the interrelationship between God and Jesus as a hierarchal dependency relationship. It evoked patronal connotations, and in combination with other honorific vocabulary, functions as a metonym for God’s role as patronal protector of Jesus. Finally, and in conjunction with the previous function, it reinforces the notion that ultimate honours are directed towards God.

4.3.7. The general as an agent, emissary and broker

3:20-1 ἡμῶν γὰρ τὸ πολίτευμα ἐν οὐρανοῖς ὑπάρχει, ἕξο οὗ καὶ σωτήρα ἀπεκδεχόμεθα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, ὡς μετασχηματίσει τὸ σῶμα τῆς ταπεινώσεως ἡμῶν σύμμορφον τῷ σῶματι τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ δύνασθαι αὐτὸν καὶ ὑποτάξαι αὐτῷ τά πάντα.

The final parallel between God and Jesus’ relationship and patronage relationships comes in a later passage in Philippians which is closely related to Phil 2:9-11. Paul exhorts his community to live by different ethical standards to those who are ‘enemies of the cross of Christ.’ The Philippians should do so because they have a heavenly πολίτευμα and a Lord whom they expect will soon appear with God’s power to subdue all things and to transform the Philippians as he himself was transformed.

Again, the relationship in focus has changed and in 3:20-1 we are back to a focus on the Philippians in relation to Jesus. Paul attributes the Philippians with subordinate status, using ταπείνωσις to associate them with clients. Jesus is the patron figure, taking the honorific titles σωτήρ and κύριος. However, God is in the background of the picture as the ultimate patron. Jesus is simultaneously a patron to the Philippians and broker of God’s will and power to them. Against some interpretations which read the sole agent of 3:21 as Jesus, ‘the one who is able to subject all things to
himself, the power in verse 21 is not primarily Jesus’ power (Paul could have used ὁτῶν) but Paul identifies it as ‘the power that enables him to subject all things to himself). This is an overt reference back to Phil 2:9-11 and the authority God gave to Jesus, thus positioning Jesus as the bearer of God’s power. Readings that interpret τὴν ἐνέργειαν as belonging to Jesus miss its connection to 2:13—where it is God who is ὁ ἐνεργῶν—and they downplay the degree to which Christ continues to depend on God the Father (cf. Rom 6:10).

Like Phil 2:6-11, Phil 3.20-1 is strongly reminiscent of accounts of Roman emperors and their generals. The tone of the Philippians’ anticipation for the arrival of Jesus—they eagerly await him (ἀπεκδέχοµαι)—is reminiscent of the friendly, relational language of patrons and clients. In approximately 111/112 CE, the proconsul of Asia, Q. Fabius Postuminus, wrote to the city of Aezani:

Having, from the beginning of my proconsulship, considered it in accord with my instructions (τὰς ἐντολὰς) and necessary for the city to pay you a visit I came readily ([εἴτεο[ι]µως]).

The consul visits the city in accordance with his imperial orders (ἐντολὰς), implying that he is sent, and he comes in friendly terms ([εἴτεο[ι]µως]).

Josephus’ account of the conquest of Tarichete shows the general Vespasian using a military subordinate as a broker, while he himself is an agent of the emperor Nero.

The next day Vespasian sent forward Trajan to a ridge of the hill to discover whether the whole multitude were peaceably disposed (εἰρηνικὰ φρονεῖν). Having assured himself that the people were of one mind with the petitioners, he then advanced with his army to the city (ὁς δ᾿ ἐγνω τὸν δῆµον ὁµοφρονοῦντα τοῖς ἱκέταις, ἀναλαµβάνων τὴν δύναµιν ἣ πρός τὴν πόλιν). The population opened their gates to him and went out to meet him with acclamations, hailing him as saviour and benefactor (σωτήρα καὶ ἐργεῖτην ἀνακαλοῦντες).

407 Cf. 1 Cor 15.27.
409 Josephus, B.J. 3.458-60. Note the contrast to 3.289-98 where Vespasian sends Trajan to Japha and meets resistance.
Vespasian sends his general to mediate and gather information. The citizens are of one mind with the broker and greet Vespasian as their patron. The Greek text portrays Trajan as both having his own identity as an agent and broker (τοῖς ἰκέταις), and as sharing functions with Vespasian—it is Trajan who gathers information but it is Vespasian who is described as knowing the outcome (δ’ ἔγνω). Vespasian himself acts on behalf of his emperor (Nero), using his resources to liberate the city and is welcomed as the city’s benefactor.

The fact that the citizens of Tarichete hail Vespasian, the emperor’s client, as saviour and benefactor, does not mean they are attributing Vespasian the same status as the current emperor. σωτήρ and εὐεργέτης are simply honorific terms attributed to individuals who provide a service conceptualised as ‘salvation’ or as a benefit. Even Augustus did not appear to have reserved the title σωτήρ as he did with πατήρ—his lieutenant Agrippa was honoured as saviour and benefactor by the city of Mytilene whilst Agrippa was still alive. The inscription on the statue of Agrippa reads: ὁ δῆμος Θεὸν Σωτῆρα τὰς πόλιος Μᾶκρον Ἀγρίππαν τὸν εὐεργέταν καὶ κτίσταν.410 C. Habicht argues that the title Θεὸν Σωτῆρα attributed to Agrippa means that he must have had a cult too.411 And yet the people of Mytilene would not have thought that Agrippa had equal status with Augustus.

The title alone σωτήρ is not enough to signify comparison with the emperor,412 nor identity with God. Fee argues that σωτήρ in 3:20 is ‘especially significant christologically’ since it is a title commonly attributed to God in the OT.413 Jesus is not ‘a saviour’ but ‘the saviour’.414 Whilst Paul’s use of σωτήρ is significant in relation to the OT, this thesis assumes that his Philippian audience would primarily have heard Phil 2:6-11 as aligning to expectations created by Roman imperial ideology. As Greeks and Romans living in a city where benefactors boasted their titles of σωτήρ and εὐεργέτης, they would have been less likely to hear the christological and presumably ontological significance Fee has in mind.415 σωτήρ

410 IG XII 2.203.
413 Fee (1995: 381; cf. 2007: 402-403)
414 Ibid. 402-403, n. 23.
simply denoted ‘the performance of a function and not membership of a class in the hierarchy of beings.’

Oakes argues that the title σωτήρ, when combined with the overall scenario in 3:20-1 is evocative of the emperor and only the emperor. There are clear parallels in the imperial ideology that cast the emperor as a saviour sent by the gods. Rome was forced to defend Philippi from Thracian raids during its first decades. Oakes quite sensibly gives a sustained rebuttal of those who would see Paul’s depiction of Christ in Philippians in contrast with a specific emperor, or even reading Paul’s contrast with the Emperor as the primary feature of his depiction of Christ. However, the denotation of σωτήρ should also be broadened to include imperial agents. Oakes himself suggests the emperor required agents (the legions) to perform his saving work. A consideration of σωτήρ as an honorific title in Greek civic practices suggests that an imperial agent might also fit the category of one sent with salvific powers. In his advice for praises of Roman governors, Menander Rhetor describes governors as ‘sent down’ from the emperor to ‘save’ his people. It is the emperor who is attributed ultimate responsibility for the activity of the governor. In Phil 3:20-21, Jesus’ status is associated with his saving action, which ultimately derives from God the patron who has provided him with the power to save.

Jesus’ role as an agent and emissary is also described in Phil 3:14 when Paul describes the call he received from God ‘in Christ Jesus’. In literary sources Roman generals are also described as emissary figures, entrusted to relay the Emperor’s wishes to the legions or to his other clients. Appian describes Octavian sending Agrippa to raise his veterans during the war against Antony. Tacitus describes Germanicus going to mutinous legions in Germany to reconcile them to Tiberius.

418 Ibid. 139.
420 Menander Rhetor II.178.31–379.1: ‘We owe very great thanks to the emperors for their other labours on our behalf, but we should be right to admit yet greater gratitude to them for sending down to us such a man as this’.
421 Appian, Bell. civ. 5.6.57.
422 Tacitus, Ann. 1.34.
Josephus describes Vespasian sending his son Titus to Alexandria to raise the fifth and tenth legions, Titus and Trajan to Japha, and Titus with part of his army (μετὰ τῆς ἑκκρίτου δυνάμεως ἀπέστειλεν) to destroy Jerusalem. Paul describes God’s call as coming through Christ Jesus, depicting Christ as an emissary and positioning him as a broker between God and Paul. Such a depiction of the relationship between Paul, Jesus and God affirms Jesus’ position as a client and broker figure in Paul’s cosmology. The fully divine christology that many scholars deduce from Jesus’ title σωτήρ is problematised by the fact the emissary of the principal comes with the authority of the principal himself.

This section has demonstrated how the interactions between God and Jesus in Phil 2:6-11 follow a logic about patronage relations that was propagated by Roman imperial ideology. Some in Paul’s audience, particularly Romans and the more wealthy Greeks may have identified the dynamics of Phil 2:6-11 with stories of Roman emperors and their generals. Others will not have picked up on such parallels but may have thought that the narrative made logical sense because of their daily experience of Philippi’s rigid, status-bound society wherein patronal relationships with social superiors were common.

Whilst Paul does not use any of the ‘technical’ vocabulary sometimes identified with Roman patronage, he does employ a combination of honour, familial and transactional vocabulary that constitutes a broad word field of informal patronage. Just as importantly, the shape of his narrative corresponds to the shape of social interactions within patronage relationships and has a number of parallels with other literary sources describing elite patronage relationships.

4.4. The shape of the relationship between Christ and God

4.4.1. Interdependent and mutual beneficiaries of honour

Our reading of Phil 2:6-11 focuses on the ideology of patronage and highlights the degree to which God and Jesus are interdependent. In Graeco-Roman ideology,

423 Josephus, B.J. 3.6; 3.289, 298-300; 4.656.
patronage was intended for mutual benefit: we have already surveyed how Roman legati served to further the honour of the emperors through their military victories whilst also advancing their own reputations. One more example will demonstrate this. At the accession of Tiberius, Tacitus describes Germanicus acting in the ideal manner:

But the nearer Germanicus stood to the supreme ambition, the more energy he threw into the cause of Tiberius. He administered the oath of fealty to himself, his subordinates, and the Belgic cities. \[424\]

The higher Germanicus rises, the more he supports his emperor and extols his triumphs in Germany. In literary patronage the success of the writer, poet or philosopher adds cultural and social capital to the patron through fame as an influential patron of the arts. \[425\] In relationships between Roman senators and their protégés, the protégé would depend on his suffragator for writing letters of introduction and for financial and political support. The mentor would depend on his protégé’s advance in status for his own reputation as a powerful man of influence. \[426\]

In Phil 2:6-11 Jesus relies on God’s favour and God relies on Jesus’ service both as obedient servant and as exalted ruler. God is magnified through universal submission to Jesus and Jesus is magnified through God’s exaltation of him.

The shape of the relationship we have identified through patronage ideology bears close resemblance to Hill’s identification of an ordered interrelation of asymmetrical reciprocity in Phil 2:6-11. \[427\]

The statements that Jesus is in the form of God, is equal to God, and receives the divine name serve the theological function of indicating Jesus’ oneness or identity with God, while the indication that the confession of Jesus as Lord is “to the glory of God the Father” serves to show that Jesus remains not only distinct from God the Father but distinct in a particularly ordered way, namely, as the Father’s “Son” who receives from God (v. 9) because he has been obedient to God (v. 8). \[428\]

---

\[426\] Saller (1982: 27-8).
Where our reading takes Hill’s further is by placing Hill’s asymmetrical, mutually informing divine identity—which is interpreted through concepts of ‘redoubling’ from Trinitarian discourse—within social categories from the Graeco-Roman world. However, it also provides a framework for Jesus’ close association with God which does not require a recourse to ontological assertions that Paul himself does not make.

4.4.2. Hierarchy and status

Our reading suggests that God’s position as patron is not threatened by the honour given to Jesus. Paul’s use of the effusive title ‘Father’ in 2:11 is itself a recognition of the recipient’s superior status. In Graeco-Roman sources, the title is often used as an expression of gratitude in response to favours received. It can be a means of flattery, anticipating and encouraging the prospect of further favours from one who has the resources to bestow them. Thus, the theocentric ending of the hymn reinforces the agency attributed to God throughout 2:9-11. God exalts Jesus and gifts him his name (2:9: ἐχαρίσατο) for his own glory (2:11b). Kreitzer is certainly correct to say that the hymn ends on ‘a note of subordination, with the Son stepping aside to allow God the Father to take his place as the focus of worship’. Hurtado, likewise appears correct in his assessment that ‘[…] in the final (and, I contend, climactic) words of 2:11 it is the glory of God “the Father” that is ultimately served and expressed in the acclamation of Jesus’ status’. However, this might not go far enough to acknowledge the role of 2:11b in directing how 2:9-10 is understood retrospectively as a praise of God’s benefactions exercised in Christ. God is the primary actor in the drama of 2:9-11 whose position as unparalleled patron requires the appropriate rendering of universal honours.

Whether Phil 2:6-11 ‘reflects a concern to emphasise that Jesus’ career and subsequent exaltation as well do not really represent a threat to the one God of biblical tradition’ is a trickier issue. Hill is correct to point out that such a reading
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430 God is the primary actor in the drama of Phil 2:9-11 whose position as unparalleled patron requires the appropriate rendering of universal honours.
relies on an antithetical positing of Jesus’ exaltation and his subordination that does not quite fit the tenor of the passage—it is compliment and correlation that are stressed.\(^{432}\) However, because Jesus is depicted as a distinct character to God, it is difficult to see the status-preoccupied culture of Paul’s society not being aware of the implicit tensions in the devotion given to both God and Jesus. As we have seen, the social reality of the power games of elite Romans was that ascendant clients could be perceived to threaten the statuses of their patrons, even the emperor himself. In the realm of divine-human patron-client relations, Greek and Roman rulers were often chastised for attempting to gain divine status. Whilst there is no evidence that Phil 2:6-11 is consciously intended to combat a perceived tension between monotheism and christology, it certainly functions to do precisely that.

4.4.3. Christ-devotion

While the form of Phil 2:6-11 is not sufficiently suggestive of a Pauline or pre-Pauline ‘hymn’ or as having an origin in a liturgical context, the narrative of universal obeisance to Christ (2:10-11) appears like a narrative map of the patterns of Christian devotion to Jesus reflected in Paul’s letters.\(^{433}\) Such patterns certainly go beyond what Dunn’s early work termed ‘worship of God, about Jesus’. However, the patron-client framework also adds specificity to Hurtado’s outline of devotion. For Hurtado, worship of Jesus ‘also serves’ the glory of God. From the other side, the glory of God necessitates ‘the breath-taking inclusion of Jesus at the centre of things’.\(^{434}\) But how does this happen? Precisely because even in his exalted position, Jesus remains God’s agent. Whilst Jesus is not explicitly active in 2:9-11, the implication of 2:11 is that Christ serves an exalted role to further the worship of God, a thought that will be developed in Chapter 5 in relation to 1 Cor 15:25. The interdependency of God and Jesus implied in the patronal framework of their


\(^{433}\) Hurtado (2005: 86-87).

\(^{434}\) Ibid. 103. This aligns our reading with that of Hurtado’s rather than with that of Bauckham. For Hurtado (2005: 93), Jesus truly ‘shares’ the honour of God, not as God but as his unique agent. In Bauckham’s reading, however, Christ’s rule on behalf of God tends to be subsumed in Christ’s sharing in God’s unique identity (1998b: 134). It does not fully appreciate the subordination/asymmetry required for such a role. The patron-client framework highlights that Christ serves as much as he shares God’s sovereignty—Jesus does not raise himself nor exalt himself over all others. This rather strains Bauckham’s definition of ‘identity’ (2008: 203).
interaction affirms that Jesus’ exaltation does not compete with God’s glory but only promotes it. For Paul, Christ-devotion operates to further God-devotion.

4.4.4. A different type of patron

Whilst God’s position as sovereign patron does not appear to be compromised but promoted by the exaltation of Jesus, Phil 2:6-11 does constitute a fresh revealing of his character. In Graeco-Roman ideology, patrons did not choose their clients indiscriminately. Whilst the relationship did bind individuals of unequal status together, elite patrons exercised discernment in giving gifts to those who were ‘worthy’. A patron would only enter into a relationship with a client whose (albeit more humble) reputation complemented their own. In this context, God’s favouring of a crucified man presents God as a different type of patron. Bauckham’s emphasis on the self-lowering of God in his vindication of the crucified Christ remains pertinent.

4.5. Conclusion

Using a combination of a patronal lexicon and motifs from Greek sources testifying to the relationships between the emperors and their generals, this chapter has argued that the interaction between God and Jesus in Phil 2:6-11 operates within the relational framework of Graeco-Roman patronage. Attention to possible patron-client dynamics in Philippians suggests that, whilst Paul seems to avoid using overt, technical patronage language, his thinking and christology is deeply influenced by an ideology of social relations between people of unequal status. This reading emphasises the distinction between the roles played by God and Jesus in the eschatological drama, but also their mutual dependence.

The reading takes seriously the overall ethical purpose of the passage. It attempts to treat the text within its setting in the letter and with its socio-cultural context of competition for honour and status in Roman Philippi. It concludes that in Phil 2:5-8,

---

Paul appeals to a story of Jesus in a particular way that shows Jesus as a model for the Philippians’ attitudes towards status—as a benefactor who exemplifies honourable conduct through submission and obedient service to God, a heavenly patron figure. Paul’s thought develops (2:9-11) to legitimise Jesus’ status as a universal authority, whose position is established by God and who works for God.
CHAPTER 5: Jesus as God’s eschatological agent and broker to believers in 1 Corinthians 15:20-28

5.1. Outline

In chapter 15 of First Corinthians, Paul argues for the future resurrection of believers. This is based on Christ’s own resurrection which Paul reasons has initiated a process of cosmic restoration that will culminate in God becoming ‘all in all’. His argument ends with the clarification that Christ, after subjecting all rival powers, will himself become subject to God.

But in fact, Christ has been rescued from the dead, the first of those who have died (15:20). For since, through a human being, death came, so through a human being came resurrection from the dead (15:21). For just as, in Adam, all die, so also in Jesus will all be made alive (15:22). But each in his own rank—Christ first fruit, followed by those who belong to him at his arrival.

(15:20-23)

A Then comes the end (15:24a)

B when (ὁταν) he hands over command to his God and Father (15:24b), after he has defeated every ruler and every authority and power. (15:24c)

C For (γὰρ) it is necessary for him [Jesus] to rule until he puts all his enemies under his feet; (15:25)

D The last enemy destined for defeat is death (15:26)

C’ For (γὰρ), ‘he [God] has placed all things in subjection under his feet’ (15:27a)

B’ But when (ὁταν ὁκ) it says that ‘all things are made subject’ (15:27b), it is clear that this excludes the one [God] who has subjected all things to him [Jesus] (15:27c). And when (ὁταν ὁκ) all things have been subjected to him, then the Son himself will be made subject to the one who subjected all things to him (15:28a),

A’ so that God might be all in all. (15:28b)

This text has been troublesome for interpreters since the times of the church fathers. Its depiction of Christ as subordinate to God sits awkwardly with doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation, and contributed toward later doctrinal formulations that differentiate the functional and the ontological natures of Christ. Thiselton reflects upon the theological tensions created by the text:

> Twenty centuries of reflection have hardly made it easier for us today both to assert the primacy of God as source and goal and to maintain the mutuality and reciprocity which characterises God’s own self-differentiation as an aspect of his gracious respect for the otherness of the “other” whom the one loves as the self.⁴³⁸

Like chapter 4, chapter 5 places the characteristics of reciprocity, asymmetry and dependence between God and Jesus within a historical ideology of social relations. We will employ parallels from the relationships between Roman emperors and their generals to illuminate the relational dynamics and exchange of resources between God, Jesus and believers in 1 Cor 15:20-28. The chapter begins with a discussion of the significance of patronage in Corinth (§5.2) before turning to the logic and motifs of patronage that underlie 1 Cor 15:20-28 (§5.3).

5.2. The Corinthians and patronage

5.2.1. Corinth, a different kind of Roman colony

Like Philippi, Corinth was tied to an initial act of benefaction by a Roman founder (44 BCE). At the time of Paul’s ministry Corinth had a relatively recent history as a Roman colony. As well as being tied to the Caesars, the city also had a special connection to Augustus’ lieutenant, Agrippa. Agrippa captured Corinth shortly before Actium.⁴³⁹ In 23 BCE Agrippa received proconsular power over the newly-created province of Achaea, and his official residence was in Corinth.⁴⁴⁰ Inscriptions in his honour have been found in Corinth, presumably from a time when Agrippa stayed at the city either whilst on his way to the Eastern provinces as governor in 16

---

⁴³⁹ Cassius Dio, Hist. Rom. 50.13.5; Velleius Paterculus, Hist. 2.84.
⁴⁴⁰ Achaea was originally a senatorial province, established by Augustus in 27 CE. In 15 CE, Tiberius made Achaea and Macedonia imperial provinces attached to Moesia. In 33 Claudius reverted them to senatorial provinces (Engels 1990: 19).
BCE, or from when he visited on his way back in 12 BCE shortly before his death. Some scholars have thought Agrippa to have been a patron of the colony. The number of Corinthian elites who bear Agrippa’s name further supports this thesis. The city’s connection to Rome was also manifested in the administrative and civic life of the colony. The city held festivals to celebrate events in the lives of the imperial family, as well as military victories. Although the population of Corinth was ethnically diverse and most likely spoke Greek in their daily lives, Corinth’s official administrative language was Latin. Inscriptions bearing official statements appear almost solely in Latin. Most coins discovered bear Latin legends until Corinth stopped minting its own coins in 69CE. In addition, potters with Latin names signed their names in Latin on pottery dated to the period between the colony’s founding and the mid-first century.

However, unlike Philippi, which was unique amongst the cities of the Greek East for its Romanitas, Corinth demonstrated a certain openness to its Greek history and population. The revised view of Corinth’s interim period (143-44 BCE) understands habitation of the city by Greeks to have continued in some form, and provides a foundation for the cultural pluralism for which the city was later known. Coins continued to bear the images of Greek gods and heroes. Corinth’s architectural layout pointed to an ambiguous cultural identity. Romano shows that the forum was aligned with ‘an earlier Greek orientation’. Oakes argues that the impression drawn from the city’s maintenance of its Greek monuments and building structures was that, in comparison with a colony like Philippi, Rome’s patronage to Corinth

---

441 West (1931: 15, §16).
442 Ibid. §6.
443 West (1931: §110); Kent (1966: 28-29, §153, 156); Braund (1985: 140).
445 Engels (1990: 70, 72); cf. Walbank (2003: 343); Wiseman (1979: 497); Winter (2001: 12). Of the 104 epigraphic texts that can be confidently dated from the reigns of Augustus to Trajan, only three are written in Greek. The situation changes in Hadrian’s reign, when the majority of inscriptions are in Greek (Kent 1966: 18-19).
446 Kent (1966: 20) argues from the survival of the temple of Apollo and the South Stoa that Corinth was neglected rather than obliterated. Gebhard and Dickie (2003: 262-78) point to material evidence of people living in the central part of city before 44 BCE. For Greeks in positions of land management and even ownership see Romano (1994); Forsell (2002). For a survey on the scholarship representing the revised view of interim Corinth see Dutch (2005: 45-56). Oster (1992: 54-55) observes that NT commentators have still tended to focus on Corinth’s Romanitas as the monopolising influence over life in the colony.
was in some sense ‘qualified’. In sum, whilst Roman Corinth formally demonstrated its ties to its patron city, Hellenistic traditions and values also constituted an important part in Corinth’s cultural milieu.

5.2.2. Patronage among Romans and Greeks

The continued Hellenistic presence in Roman Corinth leads us to question whether Corinth’s sense of clientela to Rome only existed amongst the city’s Roman inhabitants. In fact, what we find is that the city’s openness to its Greek population is shown in its integration of Greeks to positions of magistracies, an integration enabled through the structures of patronage.

Spawforth has examined the identity of the magistrates of the early colony. By investigating the names of the 42 duoviri who ‘signed’ the colony’s coinage during the first one hundred years of the colony’s life, Spawforth observes the relative mobility and influence of Corinth’s various social groups of the time. His results show that 8% of the duoviri were Greek provincials, whilst only 6% were Roman veterans, undermining ideas of a strong veteran presence in the life of the colony. Significantly, Spawforth’s results show that Greek interest in high civic offices was fast-growing at the time of Paul’s ministry. Before the reign of Claudius only one Greek is recorded to have risen to high office. In contrast, under Claudius no less than five men of Greek origin held office in Corinth, suggesting that a significant step in the integration of Romanitas into the surrounding Greek world was being made.

A number of these magistrates are notable for their patron-client ties to elite Romans which undoubted aided their career advancement. Spawforth suggests that P. Caninius Agrippa (Ilvir quinqu on coins for 16/17 or 21/22, also procurator of Achaea under Augustus) may have found favour through his father Alexiades’ support of Octavian at a time when most Greeks in the region were hostile to his cause. P. Memmius Cleander (Ilvir quinqu 66-7 CE) originated from Delphi and

---

450 Ibid. 173.
his name reveals origins in a Greek family elevated by P. Memmius Regulus, governor of Greece between 35 and 44. Cn. Cornelius Pulcher was an Isthmian agnothete and patron of Corinth in c. 41-7. He was also the grandfather of Cn. Cornelius Pulcher who rose to equestrian rank and who in turn was a patron of Corinth. C. Iulius Spartiaticus (Ilvir quinqu in 46-7 and Isthmian agnothete) came from a ‘dynasty’ of Roman clients. He was officially admitted to equestrian rank by Claudius and in 54 CE became the first high priest of the imperial cult in Corinth. Spartiaticus is a good example of how pervasive the patronage system was outside Roman circles. While Spartiaticus had Roman patrons he was also patron to Greeks in the city, honoured in both Latin and Greek inscriptions as patronus and primus. The story of Greek integration in Roman Corinth under Claudius aptly demonstrates the power of the patronage system for first-century provincials as well as for Romans.

The number of duoviri from Greek provincial families and from the negotiatores supports West’s view that by the middle of the first century many of the city’s inhabitants had obtained Roman citizenship and were very wealthy. These elite citizens were also keen to display their wealth and civic pride through gifts of benefaction. Kent lists twenty-seven structures dated from 25 BCE to the early third Century that are recorded as gifts from wealthy benefactors. These include baths, scholae, monuments, shops, buildings and pavement. The city’s residents also broadcasted their gratitude to their benefactors. Numerous surviving texts document ‘statues erected and honours bestowed by vote of the city council.’
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451 West (1931: 52) puts Spartiaticus’ magistracy in either 42/3 or 47/8 CE. If the earlier date is correct then Spartiaticus would have been in office alongside his father C. Iulius Laco and thus would have been a prominent model of powerful a father-son relationship in the Corinthians’ social world.
452 West (1931: 51, §68).
454 West (1931:51, §68).
455 Spawforth (1996: 169) suggests that 29% of Corinth’s duoviri between 44-68/9 came from ‘the milieu of negotiatores’.
456 Kent (1966: 20-21). By the time of Trajan another Euryclid, Eurycles Herculanus had been promoted to senatorial rank and funded the Baths of Eurycles in Corinth. See Kent (1966: 21, §314); Spawforth (1996: 174).
457 Kent (1966: 18, 21).
5.2.3. Concern for honour and status in the church at Corinth

Chow, Clarke and Winter argue that the formal and informal patron-client relationships that pervaded Corinthian society also had significant influence on the colony’s Christian community. Chow uses network analysis to suggest that the opposition Paul faced from some of the Corinthians might be explained by the presence of wealthy and influential patrons in the church. These patrons had good connections with elite individuals outside the church and sought to gain power and honour through lawsuits, marriage or through attending social occasions.\(^{458}\)

Clarke theorises that if members of the city’s elite are present in the church then it would be likely that they brought the principles of secular leadership with them, including those of patronage and benefaction.\(^{459}\) Clarke interprets the legal dispute referred to in 6:1-8 as the endeavours of an elite individual to advance his status. He interprets the neglected sexual immorality referred to in chapter 5 as the result of the church’s patron-client ties with the offending brother.\(^{460}\) Winter also identifies a preoccupation with honour and status in the Corinthian situation. Winter argues that Paul discourages the selling of oneself into slavery in 7:17-24 for the reason that it is motivated by desire for career advancement.\(^{461}\) Like Chow, Winter interprets the eating of meat offered to idols in 8:9 as the civic rights claimed by the members of the church involved in local politics and the feast days of the colony’s games.\(^{462}\)

What these scholars have in common is that they adhere to Theissen’s view that the church in Corinth included Christians thoroughly involved in the elite strata of Graeco-Roman society.\(^{463}\) They presuppose that in order for an individual to be a patron he was required to be involved in elite society.\(^{464}\) However, it is our view that the ideology of patronage was not restricted to the socio-economic elite. Rather, any relationship between individuals of unequal status that provided support or

\(^{458}\) Chow (1992: 166).
\(^{460}\) Clarke (1993: 85-86).
\(^{463}\) Theissen (1982).
\(^{464}\) Clarke cites 1 Cor 1:26 and the Erastus inscription (Kent 1966: §232). See our discussion in chapter 1 (§1.2.3).
protection for a dependent had the potential to become a patron-client relationship. Whilst patron-client ties between the Corinthian Christians and their pagan neighbours may lie behind some of the issues that Paul’s letter addresses, the terms of wealth, power and wisdom should not immediately identify the patrons amongst the Corinthians congregation as belonging to the elite classes. The terms are relative and could be applied to those who are better off than the majority, and powerful in comparison with the rest of the church, such as those at the upper end of the lower strata. Non-elite artisans were members of guilds and associations and the lower echelons would be just as keen to climb the social ladder relative to their means.

In summary, the issues confronted in the wider co-text of First Corinthians suggest a Christian community strongly influenced by the expectations of the patron-client relationships so pervasive in the life of the colony. Non-elites of higher status would have been clients to ambitious citizens and would have even replicated the structures of patronage within their own households and local associations.

5.3. Reading 1 Corinthians 15:20-28 in patron-client terms

As with many NT Christological passages, scholars have frequently turned to the Jewish scriptures for potential models, sources and parallels that could have shaped Paul’s thinking in 1 Cor 15:20-28. Whilst 1 Cor 15:20-8 has many connections to the Jewish scriptures, it is likely that Paul’s audience in Corinth was predominantly made up of Greeks and Romans rather than of Jews or synagogue-adhering Gentiles (1 Cor 12:2; cf. 8:7; 10:14).

1 Cor 15:23-28 is intriguing for its use of temporal clauses, indicated by terms such as ὅταν (repeated four times in the passage), ἔπειτα, ἔτα and τότε, and temporal conjunctions such as ἀχρί. Conzelmann and Collins have observed that such terms frame the passage as an apocalyptic schema, distinguishable by its concept of world
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465 Oster (1992: 55-56) warns against overstating the significance of the ‘Synagogue of the Hebrews’ inscription found in Corinth which a number of commentators identify with the synagogue in Acts 18:4. The epigraphic remains found in Corinth are of poor quality and modern interpreters tend to date the synagogue inscription to 179 CE. Whilst there is clear literary, papyrological and epigraphic evidence of Jewish groups living in Greek cities during the Julio-Claudian era it is difficult to know ‘the extent and nature’ of the Jewish presence in Corinth at the time of Paul’s visits. In favour, Philo mentions a Jewish community at Corinth (Philo, Legat. 281)
history following a predetermined order. Most commentators regard the text as apocalyptic or at least as containing some apocalyptic elements. The text’s temporal clauses do present a series of interrelated events, and the subjects’ actions in the past, present and future tenses provide the components of a linear narrative. Paul’s use of military imagery is also at home in Jewish apocalyptic thought. However, our focus on a Graeco-Roman perspective requires that we compare and contrast this narrative with a familiar discourse that Paul’s audience encountered on a daily basis, inscribed on the monuments they walked past and imprinted on the coins they exchanged.

This chapter will look to the imperial ideology encapsulated in local inscriptions and reflected in narratives about Roman military leaders, such as the works of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Josephus, Plutarch, Appian and Cassius Dio.

5.3.1. Patronage lexicon

In line with Saller’s criteria for detecting patronage relationships in ancient sources, God and Jesus in 1 Cor 15 can be recognised as representing figures of unequal status exchanging resources for a prolonged length of time. God raises Jesus from the dead, gives Jesus authority and subjects all his enemies to Jesus’ rule. In return, Jesus exercises God’s rule and defeats God’s enemies before handing rule back to God and becoming subject to him.

In chapter 15, Paul uses a significant imperial and transactional lexicon that posits God as a patron to Paul and to the Corinthians. In 15:1-3 Paul recounts that he received (παραλαμβάνω) the good news (εὐαγγέλιον) from God and in turn delivered it to the Corinthians (they have received [παραλαμβάνω] it). God is saving (σώζω) the Corinthians as long as they do not trust (πιστεύω) in vain. In 15:10-11 Paul claims that God demonstrated his favour (χάρις) in calling him as an apostle. The repetition of χάρις three times emphasises God’s favour as a patron. The Corinthians trust (πιστεύω) is again mentioned and repeated in 15:12-19. In 15:20-28 Paul narrows the focus onto God and Jesus. Whilst 15:20-28 does not contain all

\[466\] Conzelmann (1975: 269); Collins (2006: 549-553).

\[467\] Ciampa & Rosner (2010: 768) suggest that 15:24-8 portrays the world as a rebellious vassal state in need of subjection in order to be restored. They argue that the passage is evocative of an emperor sending out his best general to put down the rebellion, an image that ‘would have been familiar to anyone in the Roman Empire.’
the patronal lexicon of 15:1-11, the vocabulary of transaction continues and significant new lexica are introduced. Paul describes the relationship between God and Christ in terms of giving and receiving, subjecting and being subjected. Identification of patronage terminology provides us with a linguistic foundation for exploring the patronal themes apparent in the text’s narrative.

5.3.2. Patronage ideology in the motifs of 1 Corinthians 15:20-28, 57

The exact grouping and movement of Paul’s argument in 15:20-28 is contested. Some group 15:23-28 as a unit, often based on the belief that 15:23-24 constitutes one complete sentence in Greek.468 Others judge 15:24-28 to constitute one unit of text, as the syntax of 15:24 mirrors 15:28 in their double use of temporal clauses (‘when’ and ‘then’).469 But the chiastic structure of 15:24-28, with 15:26 at its centre, provides the clearest indication of the movement of Paul’s thought.470

As with Phil 2:6-9, 1 Cor 15:20-23 focuses primarily on the relationship between Jesus and believers. Paul’s thesis is that the resurrection of believers is an inevitable future event. He uses a series of images to express the bond between Jesus and ‘those who belong to him’. Jesus is raised (by God) in the same fashion that the dead are raised (by God). At the same time, Paul also distinguishes Jesus from believers to the extent that he is the instrument through which believers are raised (15:22-3). They are dependent upon him as clients are upon a benefactor.

The second section of the passage (15:24-28) draws primarily on the relationship between Jesus and God. Its thesis, that the resurrection of believers is the actualisation of God’s purpose to defeat death, introduces a series of military images to express a reciprocal and hierarchical relationship that, through a carefully-crafted chiastic structure, ties the resurrection of believers to ‘the goal’.

469 Lambrecht (1982: 504); Collins (2006: 549).
5.3.2.1. Jesus was rescued from the dead, the first fruits of those who have died

15:20 Νυνὶ δὲ Χριστὸς ἐγήγερται ἐκ νεκρῶν, ἀπαρχὴ τῶν κεκοιμημένων.

In 15:20 Paul declares his thesis which directly opposes what some Corinthians appear to have been saying, that there is no resurrection of the dead (15:12). Whilst Paul’s focus is on the inevitability of the future resurrection, his notion of Christ being raised by God contains an image of divine rescue from death which is further developed in 15:26 and 15:54-56. In fact, such a view seems to have been common amongst Christian writers in the decades after Paul. The author of Hebrews explicitly depicts the resurrection in terms of saving action, describing Jesus offering ‘prayers and supplications’ (δεήσεις τε καὶ ἰκετηρίας) to the ‘one who was able to save (σῶζειν) him from death’. In Acts, Peter describes Jesus’ resurrection as an act of rescue from captivity, ‘freeing’ (λύω) him from death ‘because it was impossible for him to be held (κρατεῖσθαι) by its power.’ In his letter to the Romans, Paul’s description of the resurrection parallels Luke’s rescue motif: ‘death no longer has dominion (κράτει) over him’. Whilst not explicit, the personification of death as an enemy who exercised temporary power over Jesus implies that the resurrection was a rescuing act for Jesus as well as a rescuing act for those who have faith. It functions as the saving act within the good news that saves the faithful (15:1-2).

The fact that Paul consistently articulates the resurrection with reference to God rather than as Jesus raising himself is significant for understanding the relationship between God and Jesus that Paul describes. Paul has repeatedly used the passive voice in his reminder to the Corinthians of the gospel that he preached to them (15:3-19), and continues the strategy throughout 15:20-28. In fact, the text’s subjects, including Christ, are rarely active: Christ is raised (15.20), believers are made alive (15.22), death is destroyed (15.26), all of creation is subjected, including Jesus (15.27-8). The only subject that is not characterised by the passive voice is God himself. The use of the passive voice throughout the passage suggests that even

471 Heb 5:7.
473 Rom 6:9-10.
though Paul is arguing for the reality of the resurrection, he conceptualises it as a
demonstration of God’s benefaction. Thiselton remarks that the description of
Christ’s resurrection in the passive voice has startling implications for christology, a
few of which we will explore as we continue through the text. Jesus and the
created order are both acted upon which aligns them grammatically. Thus, Jesus is
classified as part of creation whilst also being made Lord over it.

The thrust of Paul’s thesis (the logical inevitability of the resurrection) is
communicated by the first fruits metaphor. ἀπαρχή is primarily a cultic term
common to Hebrew and Graeco-Roman cultures. It describes the first or best parts of
the bounty obtained by conquest or by harvest which are typically offered to the
deity. Here, the image most likely describes the sense of the prior temporality of
Jesus’ resurrection, its representative quality, or its implication of more to come. It
thus shows that Jesus’ resurrection is the beginning of the general resurrection
(15:20, 23) and that the general resurrection is a participation in Jesus’ resurrection
(15:21-22).

However, there is also good reason to suggest that ἀπαρχή also carries connotations
of status that, at the beginning of this passage, influence the portrayal of Jesus. The
first fruits were taken from the first or best parts of the possession acquired and
served to sanctify the rest for general usage. In her study of cultic offerings in
Ancient Greece, Suk Thong Jim concludes that despite all the variations of first
fruits offerings within Hellenistic cultures its essential characteristic was its sacred
quality. ἀπαρχή as a metaphor applied to men is uncommon in literature outside of
the NT but it is occasionally used for those who dedicated themselves to temples as
priests or were dedicated by their parents, as a substitute for ἀνάθημα.

The suggestion that ἀπαρχή might indicate not only prior time but also superior
status to the whole of which it is a part is strengthened by its presence alongside
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479 Delling (1965: 485), citing Euripides, Ion, 3.10; Diodorus Siculus 4.66.6.
τάγμα in 15:23. Holleman, Thiselton and Ciampa and Rosner all understand the term to express rank or division, hence its use in military contexts and in apocalyptic literature.\textsuperscript{480} Moffatt emphasises the military connotations when he paraphrases: ‘As we might say, the two divisions of the risen host then come into action.’\textsuperscript{481} Less explored is the use of τάγμα in honorific contexts denoting social status. The term has been found in inscriptions to sometimes refer to a person’s social rank.\textsuperscript{482} An inscription found in Epidauria dated to ca. 34/35 AD names Titus Stratelius Timokrates as a ‘most worthy citizen of the first rank’ (ἀνήρ ἄξιόλογος καὶ τοῦ πρώτου τάγματος).\textsuperscript{483} Despite belonging to a different word field, ἀπαρχή’s expression of primacy parallels Greek honorific titles such like πρῶτος that were employed by some of the elite of Corinth.\textsuperscript{484} The honour and status language connoted by τάγμα accompanying ἀπαρχή depicts Jesus as belonging to a social rank superior to his followers. This simultaneously unites Jesus with those who belong to him and distinguishes him from them.

A sense of honour associated with prior temporality is further illustrated at the end of the letter. Paul describes the household of Stephanas as ‘first fruits of Achaean’ to identify those Christians as amongst the first of Paul’s converts in the region (16:15).\textsuperscript{485} The depiction of them as ἀπαρχή also seems linked to their services, indicating that Paul perceives them as ‘mature, long-standing believers’,\textsuperscript{486} and explains why Paul urges the Corinthians to submit themselves (ὑποτάσσω) to them and to ‘give recognition (ἐπιγινώσκετε) to such persons.’ One imagines that these commands might have entailed some kind of honouring of Stephanas’ household through providing hospitality and by adhering to their teaching. The ἀπαρχή image therefore suggests an implicit qualitative difference between Stephanas’ household

\textsuperscript{480} Holleman (1996: 52); Thiselton (2000: 1229); Ciampa & Rosner (2010: 265). For military usage see Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Ant. rom. 6.42.1; Plutarch. Oth. 12.3; Josephus, B.J. 3.8; cf. 3.64-65, 123.
\textsuperscript{481} Moffat (1938: 246).
\textsuperscript{482} LSJ, s.v. ‘τάγμα’, 4.
\textsuperscript{483} IG4 2(1).81
\textsuperscript{484} See inscriptions to C. Iulius Spartiaticus in (West 1931: §68; Meritt 1931: §70). ἀπαρχή came to have the sense of ‘beginning’ (Delling 1965: 484).
\textsuperscript{485} Possibly as suggesting a guarantee of more conversions to come (Fee 1987: 829; Thiselton 2000: 1338).
\textsuperscript{486} Thiselton (2000: 1338).
and other Christians whilst simultaneously expressing a shared quality that binds them together.

The first fruits metaphor depicts Jesus’ resurrection and the Christian future as inextricably connected, like two sides of the same coin and yet with the prior having superior status to the latter because of its capacity to legitimise it. Wright’s comment on 1 Cor 15:35-49 equally applies here: ‘The Messiah, as the final Adam, the start of the renewed human race […] is not only the model for the new type of humanity. He possesses the authority to bring it into being.’

5.3.2.2. Jesus as a life-giving agent

In 1 Cor 15:21, Paul justifies his assertion of the connection between the resurrection of Jesus and that of believers in terms of Gen 1-3, the fall of Adam and Eve. In doing so, he depicts believers as dependant upon Jesus like a community is upon its benefactor. First Corinthians 15:21-22 is structured using metrical and syntactical parallelism to compare and contrast Adam and Christ as the origins and representatives of death and resurrection. The two verses are set in synonymous parallelism and thus mutually interpret each other. Repetition of δι’ ἀνθρώπου (15:21) sets up the parallel between Adam and Christ, with καὶ in apposition to ἐπειδὴ γὰρ, and ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν in apposition with θάνατος. The verse’s metre contributes towards its parallelism with both clauses having 11 syllables. 1 Corinthians 15:22 compares and contrasts Adam and Christ as ‘heads’ of death and resurrection. It repeats γὰρ, demonstrating its progression of thought. It repeats the formula ἐν τῷ […] πάντες to establish the parallelism, with apposition between ὀσπερ γὰρ and ὀφθες καὶ, between Ἀδὰ μ and Χριστῷ, and ἀποθνῄσκουσιν and ζωοποιηθῆσονται. The tightly controlled metre and syntax emphasise the

A comparison and contrast between Adam and Christ, presenting the two figures in binary opposition.

Adam is associated with the forces of death and destruction whilst Jesus is associated with life. Paul’s use of διά suggests both figures function as instruments or agents. The image of Jesus as one who brings life to his people is similar to the image of Phil 3:20-21 with Jesus appearing reminiscent of a benefactor bringing salvation. However, διά implies he is not the source of life itself but the instrument by which it arrives. For a Greek and Roman audience surrounded by the honorific language of civic patronage, the image of a figure who brings life to humanity would have been a familiar one; in Greek inscriptions the rhetoric of provision of life (ζωή) is an important element of patronage.

During the principate, Rome’s emperors were commonly depicted as deliverers of life. An inscription from Ephesus honours Julius Caesar as descendant of Ares and Aphrodite, ‘the god manifest’ and the ‘saviour of human life’. The letter of Maximus to the Asian Assembly describes Augustus’ birthday as ‘the beginning of life and living (ἀρχή τοῦ βίου και τῆς ζωῆς) which is the limit and end of regret at having been born.’ The Assembly likewise employs the motif to describe Augustus’ birthday as ‘the most perfect (culmination) for life (τὸ τεληότατον τῆς ζωῆς)…’ However, the fact that Paul describes Christ as an agent of life does not determine that he is portraying Jesus as a specific parallel to the emperor. In using ‘life’ rhetoric Julius Caesar and Augustus after him were simply casting themselves as great patrons and benefactors. Numerous inscriptions suggest that, like σωτήρ language, life rhetoric was attributed to patrons and benefactors who provided a service conceptualised as ‘salvation’ or as a benefit.

Stevenson has shown that the practice of portraying benefactors as providers of life goes back to the time of Homer. In one scene of the Odyssey, Athena reminds Odysseus that she has been a benefactor to him by saving his life (ζωαγία), to which

---

490 IEph 2.251, 48 BCE.
Odysseus replies: ‘It shall be between us as if you were my father / as if you saved me / gave me life (βιώσκομαι).’\(^{493}\) As Stevenson states, in Greek literary sources it is common for characters to invoke or recognise a benefactor-beneficiary relationship by casting the potential benefactor in procreative/tutelary terms, ‘namely in terms of power to give, sustain and protect life’.\(^{494}\) Even the state itself could be described in procreative terms.\(^{495}\) However, such patron/benefactor rhetoric did not disappear from public discourse in life under the principate. People still used procreative rhetoric to describe benefactors.\(^{496}\) Indeed, Seneca describes the gift of life as the highest of benefits (summa beneficia).\(^{497}\)

In sum, the image of Jesus as one who provides life posits him as a powerful patron or benefactor. Such procreative/tutelary rhetoric would have been very familiar to the Corinthians from their city’s culture of honouring patrons with procreative and tutelary titles such as πατήρ and κτίστης. However, the use of διά combined with the assertion in 15:20 that God had saved Jesus also positions Jesus as a broker and mediator of God’s power and maintains God as the source of salvation, consistent with 1 Cor 1:30.

5.3.2.3. Jesus as the ‘first man’ of the resurrection

15:23 ἐκαστὸς δὲ ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ τάγματι ἄπαρχή Χριστὸς, ἔπειτα οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ αὐτοῦ.

In 15:23-24 Paul clarifies the hierarchy and status of those ‘made alive’\(^{498}\) at the eschaton. The lexicon of 15:23 gives the passage a hierarchical aspect which functions as a natural transition into the military imagery of 15:24-28. We have already discussed the hierarchical use of τάγμα that, alongside ἄπαρχη, portrays Jesus as of superior, more honourable rank than that of believers, not just being


\(^{494}\) Stevenson (1992: 424).

\(^{495}\) Plato, *Crit.* 50D-51C.

\(^{496}\) For example, king Rab’el II of Nabatea (70–106 CE) was described as he ‘who brought life and deliverance for his people’ (די אחים ושלום), possibly for his reestablishment of Nabatean rule and new farming methods in the Negev (published as inscription 10 with discussion in Negev 1963).

\(^{497}\) Seneca the Younger, *Ben.* 2.30.1-2; cf. 2.18.8

\(^{498}\) Ciampa & Rosner (2010: 764).
resurrected in prior temporal sequence. ἔπειτα is the first of a series of indicators of logical and temporal sequence. Paul’s focus is still on the inevitability of the resurrection based on the bond between Jesus and believers. Thus, the logical sequence signified by ἔπειτα is the expected receipt of divine favour, and the distribution of beneficium by an imperial broker. ⁴⁹⁹ A client at the bottom of the patron-client ladder would be able to access favours from the top only because of the access that his broker/patron provides. ⁵⁰⁰ Similarly, a client city would hope for civic privileges and benefactions if their patrons and brokers in Rome were favoured by their own patrons. Believers can expect resurrection if they ‘belong to him at his coming.’

ἔν τῇ παρουσίᾳ further corresponds to a patronage context. On top of everyday usage denoting ‘arrival’ or ‘presence’ the term was also used for the visits of dignitaries or of the emperor himself to a colonised city. It was also used to refer to the epiphanies of the gods. ⁵⁰¹ In asking which context (official or sacred) provided the background for Christian usage of παρουσία, Radl looks to the emperor as a figure in whom the official (indicated by his title κύριος) and the sacred (by his title σωτήρ) was combined. But with regards to 1 Cor 15:23, it is important to keep in mind that παρουσία was also used for the emperor’s representatives and delegates, which in times of military campaigns could earn his generals honorific titles.

Alternative usages of παρουσία caution against the assumption that Paul parallels Jesus with the figure of the emperor in 15:23 simply by his use of the term. ⁵⁰² In a passage in which Paul identifies God emphatically as ‘the father’ and as the one to whom all things are subjected, it seems logical that Paul parallels Jesus with an imperial agent who manifests the authority and will of the emperor. Most significantly, the addition of ἔν τῇ παρουσίᾳ develops the thought of 15:23 to depict Jesus as the means by which believers are raised (by God). This prepositional phrase casts Jesus in the role of God’s broker. Jesus acts as an agent of divine power and accumulates honour in return for this role.

⁵⁰⁰ See Pliny, Ep. 10.5, 26 for examples of Pliny’s petitions to Trajan on behalf of his clients.
⁵⁰¹ Radl (1993: 44).
The status differentials inherent in Paul’s use of τάγμα are demonstrated in Ciampa and Rosner’s and Witherington’s observations of the ethical implications of 15:23.\textsuperscript{503} The Corinthians’ issues with divisions, factions and exclusion within the community (1 Cor 11:17-34) are corrected by the unifying vision of the resurrection in which there are only two distinguishable τάγμα—first Christ, then all those who belong to him. The Corinthians’ issue with authority figures is also challenged by the image of only one leader for the church: Jesus the messiah. In this way Paul’s eschatology matches his teaching to the community earlier in the letter (1 Cor 3:21-3). Thus, there is a connection between Paul’s eschatology in 15:23 and the pastoral needs of the Corinthian community, just as there is in 6:12-20.

The horizontal and vertical images of 15:20-23 depict a united but hierarchical relationship between Jesus and believers. Their resurrection is necessary because believers belong to Jesus. They will be raised as he was raised. The connection of belonging is also one of dependence. Jesus takes the position of a benefactor, representative of believers and is instrumental in rescuing them from death.

5.3.2.4. Jesus exercises God’s power until he has defeated his enemies

15:24a εἶτα τὸ τέλος, ὅταν παραδίδῃ τὴν βασιλείαν τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρί
15:24b ὅταν καταργήσῃ πᾶσαν ἀρχὴν καὶ πᾶσαν ἐξουσίαν καὶ δύναμιν

1 Cor 15:24a introduces the first reciprocal exchange between God and Jesus. The statement that Jesus returns ‘the kingdom’ back to God assumes that Jesus has been exalted to the position of a heavenly ruler, although this will be made explicit by Paul’s citation of LXX Ps 8:7.\textsuperscript{504} In the same way that Phil 2:9 appears to assume the resurrection in its portrayal of Jesus’ exaltation, 1 Cor 15:24a assumes Jesus’ exaltation follows his rescue from death.

Much of the military imagery in 15:24 appears to derive from Jewish apocalyptic and Davidic messianic literature. ἀρχή, ἐξουσία, πάς, βασιλεία are also found in

\textsuperscript{503} Witherington (1994: 305); Ciampa & Rosner (2010: 764).
\textsuperscript{504} van Kooten (2003: 85) considers the concepts of the resurrection and exaltation to be closely related in Paul’s thinking here.
LXX Dan 7:14, 27; 2:44 and Paul employs the same three-part formula to describe the forces that Christ will bring to subjection, repeating καὶ αὐτῷ ἐδόθη ἢ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ τιμὴ καὶ ἡ βασιλεία (LXX Dan 7.14). Such imagery gives the passage a distinctively military flavour but is sufficiently generic to be found in any Graeco-Roman military narrative. ἀρχή is commonly used to describe the Roman magistratus, and magistrates themselves. Paul could have Greek provincials in view as puppets of imperial power, or even Roman military commands. ἐξουσία is used for imperium. δύναμις could be associated with imperium and potestas. At this stage of the passage these antagonistic forces appear political, matching the political referents of 2:6-8. If these terms allude to the passages from Daniel above (especially 7:27), then a political, imperial interpretation of the terms would be continuous with their meaning there, as well as with uses of Dan 7:26-27 in Jewish apocalyptic literature.

The military context of the transaction in 15:24b evokes the behaviour of Roman generals when the emperor arrives personally at the scene of a battle. Cassius Dio’s account of the conquest of Britain depicts multiple exchanges between Claudius and his general Aulus Plautius after the emperor has arrived at the front:

Taking over (παραλαβών) the command of these [the legions], he [Claudius] crossed the stream, and engaging the barbarians, who had gathered at his approach, he defeated them (ἐνίκησε) and captured (ἤλε) Camulodunum, the capital (βασίλειον) of Cynobellinus […] He deprived the conquered of their arms and handed them over (προσέταξεν) to Plautius, bidding him also subjugate (προσκαταστρέψασθαι) the remaining districts.

505 The description of defeated kings as footstools also echoes Jewish military traditions preserved in Josh 10:24 and Isa 51:23, 66, as well as LXX Ps 8:7; 109:1.
506 Mason (1974: 15), citing Herodian, Ab excess. div. Marci. 8.6.8, Cassius Dio, Hist. rom. 41.36.2; Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Ant. rom. 8.44.4; 8.6.8.
507 Horsley (2004: 230); Mason (1974: 15) cites Plutarch, Mar. 8.409; Cassius Dio, Hist. rom. 69.19.2; Cassius Dio, Hist. rom. 36.31.4.
508 Mason (1974: 132-133). Cassius Dio uses the term to refer to imperium proconsulare (Hist. rom. 55.13.5; 55.10.18; 58.7.4).
509 Mason (1974: 134), citing Appian, Bell. civ. 2.36.
511 van Kooten (2003: 95), citing Sib. Or. 5; 4 Ezra; 2 Bar. Wischmeyer has recently promoted a helpful view of Paul’s eschatological language as something of a ‘philosophical koine’, reflective of a man who both rejected the pagan worldview in favour of the Jewish one and was interested, and versed, in Greek philosophy and culture (Wischmeyer, van Kooten, & Wright 2015: 246-48).
512 Cassius Dio, Hist. rom. 60.21.4-5 (trans. Earnest Cary, LCL).
In this scenario, Claudius receives command (παραλαμβάνω—the reverse of παραδίδωμι) from his general, implying that the Aulus Plautius handed over power when his emperor came to his aid. The emperor exerts absolute authority over the army, using them to subject his enemies to his general—an issue that will become relevant for our understanding of 15:25.

In Josephus’ account of the Roman conquest of Judea, the general Trajan (father of the later emperor) is described as handing over the final battle of the siege of Japha to his patron, Vespasian:

So he [Trajan] reserved the taking of the city to the general (ἀνετίθει τῷ στρατηγῷ τήν ἀλωσιν). Accordingly he sent messengers to Vespasian, and desired him to send his son Titus to finish the victory he had gained (ἠτείτο πέμψαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῶν Τίτον ἐπιθήσοντα τῇ νίκῃ τέλος).

In this scenario, the situation is not one where the general is in need of support. Instead he gives the final conquest of the city to the emperor as a matter of protocol. In a similar manner to these generals, Jesus hands over power to God once he has completed the mandate of his mission.

Following the repeated assertion that Jesus was raised by God, the return of power to God appears as a reciprocal act. But the relationship is also hierarchical. Paul’s use of πατήρ at this particular point in the passage further reinforces the depiction of God as a heavenly emperor. Of the 91 references to God in the letter, Paul only refers to God as πατήρ three times. Here, Paul uses πατήρ in conjunction with an image of Jesus in service to him, much like a Roman general in submission to his emperor. The emperor’s title pater patriae was well established in first century Corinth. The following Latin inscription dates to 47-50 CE, appearing in honour of Claudius and Britannicus in light of the conquest of Britain.

To Tiberius Claudius Caesar Britannicus, son of Augustus, (and) to Tiberius Claudius Caesar Augustus Germanicus, pontifex maximus, father of his

---

511 Hist. rom. 60.21.1-2.
514 Josephus, B.J. 3.298 (trans. H. St. J. Thackeray, LCL): ἀνατίθημι is also used in honorific language, to communicate a dedication to a god or benefactor. (LSJ: s.v. ‘ἀνατίθημι’, 2).
country [P.P.], holder of the tribunician power for [--- time, consul for the ---
time, Imperator for the ---- time,] censor.515

Several Greek inscriptions honouring the emperors as πατήρ πατρίδως have also
been found, possibly already commissioned by the time of Paul’s visit, with three
more post-dating the Corinthian correspondence,516 showing the endurance of the
patronal analogy in the imperial ideology of the principate. Due to the established
nature of the pater patriae title in Corinth some of Paul’s audience may well have
heard Paul to be depicting God as an Emperor-like figure.517 In the same way that
offices were bestowed by the emperor as gifts, so the reserving of military triumphs
for the emperor appears to be the expectation of one who honours and submits to the
emperor.

However, the chiastic structure of 15:24-28 appears to connect God’s status as
Father to Jesus’ status as son (with 15:28 describing the same event as 15:24). This
connection has the effect of particularising God’s fatherhood to his relation to Jesus,
in contrast with 1 Cor 1:3 where his fatherhood of believers is foregrounded. Wright
and Hill use the familial language of 15:24 and 15:28 to argue that the two agents are
mutually-defining but distinct.518 Whilst this point is true, it appears to miss the more
immediate concern of the text in order to answer ontological questions. Paul employs
God’s father title within a context of God favouring Jesus with rescue and
appointment (15:20) and receiving dominion. Jesus’ actions thus appear logical and
appropriate to his position. In the same way, Jesus’ subordination would be
expected of one whose father has exalted him to a supreme position of power.519

515 Kent (1966: §77).
516 Kent (1966: §92, 328). The reconstructions lack individual emperors’ names. For inscriptions
honouring Trajan see §99; for Hadrian see §103, 4.
517 Witherington (1994: 305) reads 15:24 in as anti-imperial polemic. According to Witherington,
Paul confronts a Roman ideology that regards the Emperor as father and benefactor and supplants it
with an ‘already but not yet’ eschatology that looks to a ‘truly divine Father’. For discussion of the
imperial father image at Corinth during this period see Lassen (1991).
519 Marcus Aurelius is hailed as ‘kind father’ at his death at Vindobona with his army (Herodian, Ab
excess. div. Marci. 1.4.8).
5.3.2.5. The necessity for Jesus to rule until he has defeated death

15:25 δεῖ γὰρ αὐτὸν βασιλεύειν ἀχρι oδ θῇ πάντας τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ.
15:26 ἐσχατος ἐχθρὸς καταργεῖται ὁ θάνατος

In 1 Cor 15:25, Paul alludes Ps 110:1/ LXX 109:1 to explain the necessity of Jesus’ present rule as the fulfilment of God’s will foretold in scripture. The first clause, δεῖ γὰρ αὐτὸν βασιλεύειν, appears to replace God’s command in Ps 110:1, ‘Sit at my right hand’, with the third-person perspective of an observer, possibly remixing it with language of LXX Psalm 8:7 and Daniel 7:27.

Augustus’ promotion of Agrippa provides a helpful example of how emperors promoted their favoured clients to high office in the wake of military success. In 23 BCE Augustus rewarded Agrippa above his other clients, rewarding him for his loyalty and military services throughout the civil wars. Dio expresses Agrippa’s promotion in the language of patronage and benefaction:

For Augustus, at least in the beginning, bestowed (ἐχαρίζετο) these rewards lavishly upon certain men, and those whom he honoured (ἐτίμα) by public funerals were very many. Accordingly, while these men gained lustre (ἐλαμπρόνωντο) through such distinctions, Agrippa was promoted (προήχθη) to the supreme power (αὐταρχίαν), one might say, by him.

As well as giving Agrippa proconsular imperium, Augustus honoured him again in the following five years by giving him his daughter Julia in marriage, thus assimilating him into the Augustan dynasty.

He therefore first added five years to his own terms as princeps, since his ten-year period was about to expire (this was in the consulship of Publius and Gnaeus Lentulus), and then he granted (ἔδωκε) to Agrippa many privileges almost equal (ἴσου) to his own, especially the tribunician power for the same length of time.

520 See Hill (2015a: 123-24) for a good case for reading 1 Cor 15:25 as alluding to Ps 110.
521 Cassius Dio, Hist. rom. 54.12.2-3.
522 Hist. rom. 54.12.4-5.
The emperor’s promotion of his generals is a familiar theme in imperial narratives and represents some of the most notable favours that the emperor bestowed on his elite clients. For the hearers of 15:25 God’s promotion of Jesus would have seemed a logical favour for a divine patron to bestow.

5.3.2.6. The subject of θῇ

Recent scholarship has attached great significance to the fact that, in 15:25, Paul appears to change the subject of ‘putting all his enemies under his feet’ from God (in the original Psalm), to Jesus.\(^{523}\) Paul adapts the person of the verb of LXX Ps 109:1 from θῶ to θῇ, and there is no internal indication that the subject of the verb has changed since οὐκ ἐστιν βασιλεὺς εἰς. Some commentators interpret Paul, in citing the Psalm, to import God as the subject of θῇ.\(^{524}\) However, the parallel statement in 15:24, holds the subject of παραδίδῃ to also be the subject of καταργήσῃ. Conzelmann argues that ἄχρι as a temporal conjunction indicates that the agent who delivers the kingdom to God when he defeats his opponents is the same agent who must rule until that same moment.\(^{525}\)

For those who read Jesus to be the subject of θῇ, Paul’s casting Jesus in the role occupied by God is a clear indication of his high christology. Wright comments:

> The passage clearly belongs with second-Temple monotheism, in declaring that the kingdom of the creator God is to be established in the world […] But within this monotheism Jesus is allotted a role which in ancient Israel was spoken of as that of YHWH himself. He is the one who, as in the Psalm and Isaiah, wins the victory over all enemies.\(^{526}\)

Bauckham likewise uses the passage as evidence of Paul depicting Jesus as performing an exclusive function of God—his sovereignty over ‘all things’, including cosmic, and angelic forces.\(^{527}\) Fee writes: ‘By his abolishing “the powers”, Christ has himself “fulfilled” Ps 110:1, which speaks of “putting all his enemies


\(^{525}\) Conzelmann (1975: 273).

\(^{526}\) Wright (2013b: 736, italics original).

\(^{527}\) Bauckham (2008: 177).
under his feet.”

This reading of 15:25 is the key component of Hill’s argument that 15:20-28 portrays Jesus and God as sharing the divine identity whilst also expressing the irreducible distinction. Despite many of these scholars consistently asserting that Paul is working from messianic expectations, with Jesus performing the role of Israel or of the king, they also interpret the maximum christological implications in Paul’s possible adaption of the Psalm: ‘In addition to taking the unusual step of attributing Ps 110:1b to the Messiah’s reign, Paul now seems to have taken the additional, unprecedented step of attributing the cause of that reign to Christ himself.’

Certainly, the text’s grammar makes Jesus the immediate subject of θῇ which is not qualified or altered until 15:27a. However, there are three major issues with the strong conclusions drawn by the scholars above. First, there is the allusion to Ps 110:1 and its qualification in 15:27a. Hill’s position—that 15:26 is a conscious allusion to LXX Ps 109:1 rather than being ‘a Pauline creation that echoes early traditional Christian usage without regard for its scriptural context’—actually works against his central thesis. In relying on his audience’s familiarity with the Psalm, Paul may simply intend them to assume God to still be the subject of θῇ. Whilst Fee is correct to say that nothing in the grammar of 15:25 prepares the reader for such a change of subject, the fact Paul is alluding to well-known scripture means that the surprise might be short-lived.

Secondly, whilst acknowledging some degree of ambiguity in the referents of ‘all things’, Paul makes it clear in 15:27-28 that God is the one who has subjected all things to Jesus. The use of LXX 8:7 in 15:27b appears to clarify the referents of his

---

528 Fee (2007: 110).
529 Hill (2015a: 122-23). Van Kooten (2003: 94, 82) is on stronger grounds in his comparison of the role of Jesus with the ‘son of man’ in Dan 7. Van Kooten argues that Paul’s eschatological intermediary figure from heaven is unique in his active participation in the subjugation of cosmological powers. According to van Kooten, the ‘son of man’ in Daniel is inactive: ‘There he receives the eternal kingdom (7:13-14, 22, 27) rather passively, after God has already totally destroyed the fourth kingdom (Dan 7:9-11).’ Paul’s concept of the role of the eschatological figure is thus found to derive from Christian tradition, not from Daniel. However, closer attention could be paid to the activity of God’s anointed agents in the Psalms.
previous scriptural allusion.\textsuperscript{532} If Paul intends the subject of θῇ to be Jesus then it renders the explanation of 15:27-28 somewhat nonsensical.

The third issue, is that these conclusions seriously undervalue the role of God’s agent in the OT texts from which Paul is drawing. In the verse immediately following Ps 110:1, the Davidic king is sent out from Zion by God (110:2). It is clear that whilst YHWH promises to fight for the king (110:5-6), the king is still expected to play a role in defeating his enemies:

Your people will offer themselves willingly
on the day you lead your forces
on the holy mountains.\textsuperscript{533}

Psalm 2 is likely connected to Ps 110:1 by YHWH’s promise to ‘make the nations your [the king’s] heritage, and the ends of the earth your possession.’ Wright argues that Psalm 2 is ‘never far away’ from Paul’s references to Jesus as God’s son.\textsuperscript{534} This Psalm likewise presents an active role for the king in fulfilling YHWH’s promises for him, vowing that the king will break the nations with a rod of iron (2:9). There is a reciprocal relationship envisioned as YHWH defeats the nations for his ‘son’, whilst the king appears to intimidate them into serving YHWH and into kissing his feet (2:11-12). The aspect of YHWH’s sovereignty which does appear to be associated with him exclusively is his anticipated defeat of death, described in Isaiah.

And he will destroy on this mountain
the shroud that is cast over all peoples,
the sheet that is spread over all nations;
he will swallow up death forever.\textsuperscript{535}

In 15:25 it is Jesus who is described as defeating death. However, 15:57 makes explicit that even here Jesus performs an instrumental role and it is still God who provides the victory. The participatory role of the king in fulfilling God’s promises to him qualifies the degree to which we can say that Jesus enacts the role of God in 15:25. That Jesus is conceived to join in God’s defeat of death certainly takes him

\textsuperscript{532} Kreitzer (1987: 149-54); Fee (2007: 112-13); Hill (2015a: 128-29) agrees that the subject reverts to God here.

\textsuperscript{533} Ps 110:3a (NRSV).

\textsuperscript{534} Wright (2013b: 734).

\textsuperscript{535} Isa 25:7 (NRSV).
beyond the role expected of God’s king. But his instrumental role still constitutes an identity distinct from that of God’s that can be viewed as having partial antecedents in God’s royal agents.

As we proceed through 15:27-28, we will show how the patronal relationships between the emperors and their generals offer a new way to understand how Paul can assert that both Jesus (15:25) and God (15:27-28) put the enemies under Jesus’ feet.

5.3.2.7. ‘God has subjected all things to Jesus’ except himself

15:27a πάντα γὰρ ὑπέταξεν ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ.
15:27b δὴν δὲ εἴπῃ δότα πάντα ὑποτέτακται,
15:27c δῆλον δὴ ἐκτὸς τοῦ ὑποτάξαντος αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα.

In 15:27a, Paul loosely quotes LXX Ps 8:7 to provide auxiliary evidence that in raising Jesus, God has empowered him to defeat every opposing authority and power. In doing so he retrospectively makes God the one who put all things under Jesus’ feet in 15:25, despite the implications of its grammar.536 One way to make sense of God as being the subject of 15:27a, and retrospectively of 15:25, is through the rubric of narratives of the direct military involvement of the Roman emperor. Herodian reports that the governor of Britain under Septimius Severus petitioned the emperor for more soldiers or else for the presence of the Emperor himself.537 And it is clear that in the event of a particular crisis the emperor could decide to intervene and enter the battlefield himself. We have already mentioned that Aulus Plautius is depicted by Cassius Dio as handing over command of the conquest of Britain to Claudius:

[…] Plautius became afraid, and instead of advancing any farther, proceeded to guard what he had already won, and sent for Claudius. For he had been

---

536 That God is τοῦ ὑποτάξαντος αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα indicates that God is also the subject of the quotation in 15:27a and 27b (van Kooten 2003: 83-84; cf. Hill 2015a: 128, n. 55).
instructed (ἐιρήτο) to do this in case he met with any particularly stubborn resistance [...] \(^{538}\)

Josephus also describes Vespasian coming to the rescue of Titus and his forces during the siege of Gamala: ‘But then Vespasian himself came to his assistance (ἐπιβοηωέω) against those that had fled to the citadel, and brought his whole army with him.’ \(^{539}\)

Legendary military leaders such as Pompey and Julius Caesar were also described as turning the tide of battles with their personal presence. Josephus too describes Vespasian and Titus frequently leading their armies to assist in battles when their forces were suffering heavy losses. Some emperors were clearly willing to fulfil their obligations in person to ensure their army’s success. The personal presence of the emperor affirmed his authority over the army and the victory under his leadership may also have placed his client-general further in his debt. For Paul, Jesus’ dramatic presence in the world signifies the imminent arrival of the heavenly patron himself.

However, the emphasis of 15:27a—and retrospectively in 15:25—is not on Jesus’ limitations but on God’s power to defeat his enemies. This suggests that another aspect of the emperor’s involvement in his army’s wars could influence Paul’s thinking. Rather than lead his armies personally, the emperor could send them out on his authority, resourcing his generals from a distance and still be credited with achieving victory himself.

Pliny’s Panegyricus, in praise of Trajan’s military strength, constructs a colourful tableau in which Trajan appears in a triumph exhibiting his trophy of conquered peoples:

[... then, close behind the conquered nations your own self standing high in your chariot, before which are the shields pierced by your own hand.] \(^{540}\)

In this speech Pliny gives glory to Trajan for the triumph, despite the fact that Trajan as emperor would have had limited access to the actual frontline of the battles. This

---

\(^{538}\) Cassius Dio, Hist. rom. 60.21.1-2.  
\(^{539}\) Josephus, B.J. 4.70.  
\(^{540}\) Pliny, Pan. 17.1-2.
does not prevent Pliny from depicting the scene as if Trajan has personally fought the battle, having devastated Rome’s enemies by his own spear.

The fact that the emperor had attributed to him responsibility for achieving the military victories of his armies is further illustrated in Commodus’ speech to his soldiers in the immediate wake of his father’s death where he exploits the practice in order to win his soldiers’ loyalty:

By doing this [finishing the war] you will win fame for yourselves and pay a fitting tribute to the memory of the father of us all […] Your brave achievements in the past are attributable to his wise generalship but what you demonstrate by your enthusiasm under a young emperor like me will earn you a reputation for loyalty, soundness and courage that is your own.641

Whilst Commodus’ words are clearly aimed at emphasising the bond between the army and his father which he hopes to inherit himself, his rhetoric reflects the political reality of emperor’s monopoly of military triumphs.

The ambiguous agency in Paul’s depiction of the defeat of the powers is neatly reflected in Josephus’ description of the battle of Japha. Trajan sends for Vespasian, requesting that he send Titus:

And he [Vespasian], conjecturing (ὅ δὲ συμβαλῶν) that some work still remained to be done, sent with his son (τὸν γιὸν ἐπιπέμπει) reinforcements consisting of five hundred cavalry and a thousand infantry. And he [Titus] rapidly marched to the city (ὅ δὲ πρὸς τὴν πόλιν ἐλθὼν), drew up his troops for battle, posting Trajan on the left wing, and himself taking command of the right, and led them to the assault.642

Josephus, like Paul, does not specify that the nominal reference has changed—it has to be inferred from the context that the direct object of the first sentence explains the nominative of the second. In 1 Cor 15:25, the grammar indicates that the subject is Jesus, whilst responsibility for the subjection of enemies is still attributed to God (15:27). In light of the relationship between the emperor and his army, and the army’s function as the emperor’s agent, Jesus’ offensive against his enemies appears

641 Herodian, Ab excess. div. Marci. 1.5.7 (trans. C. R. Whittaker, LCL).
642 Josephus, B.J. 3.299-300 (adapted from LCL).
as a campaign empowered by the heavenly emperor himself. It is attributed to God’s initiative and authority. In this manner, Paul envisions God’s acting in Jesus, his saving purpose manifested by Jesus.

5.3.2.8. After death is defeated the Son shows allegiance to his Father

15:28a ὅταν δὲ ὑποταγῇ αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα, τότε αὐτὸς ὁ υἱὸς ὑποταγήσεται τῷ ὑποτάξαντι αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα

Discussion of υἱός in 15:28 often focuses on the term’s familial meaning and the unique relationship it established with God, affirmed by the rare use of the definite article. Within the context of imperial military narratives, the emperor’s son (either natural or adopted) certainly has a role as the beneficiary of his father’s empire-building. The Senate awards an honorific name to both Claudius and his son, Tiberius Claudius Germanicus. In later decades, the emperors Titus and Commodus were known for leading campaigns as generals in Judea and on the northern frontier alongside their respective fathers. Marcus Aurelius is especially depicted as preparing Commodus for succession, bestowing several honours upon him.

Whilst the relationships between the emperors and their sons were ideally ones of privilege, they are also hierarchical. Plenty of the examples above involve the emperor’s son acting as his agent, both being sent as an envoy and being sent for. Burke has analysed the nature of the parent-child relationship in both Jewish and Graeco-Roman sources. He finds that writers from both cultural contexts expect the same basic characteristics from ideal parents and children. For these writers the relationship was essentially hierarchical with authority in the hands of the parents. Parents’ responsibilities consisted of begetting, caring for, educating and loving their children. Children were expected to reciprocate what parents had done for them.

543 Cassius Dio, Hist. rom. 60.22.2.
544 Herodian describes Commodus referring to himself as his father’s ‘fellow-soldier’ (Ab excess. div. Marci. 1.5.3); cf. 1.5.1-8; Cassius Dio, Hist. rom. 72.22.2; Hist. Aug. 17, 22.
545 Herodian, Ab excess. div. Marci. 1.2.1-2; Cassius Dio, Hist. rom. 72.3, 4; Hist. Aug. 16, 22, 27
546 Cassius Dio, Hist. rom. 72.22.2 describes Marcus Aurelius summoning (µετασέγει) Commodus. See also examples in chapter 4 (§4.3.7).
547 Burke (2003: 50-95).
Children should show love in return and care for their parents in their old age. Most importantly they had to obey their parents which was a way of showing respect and honour to them. Failure to demonstrate respect would be evident to those outside the family unit and would bring shame on the family. Whilst some interpreters endeavour to explain Jesus’ sonship as an indicator of ontological unity with God, despite his subordination, Jesus’ subordination and obedience to his father in fact complements his characterisation as God’s son.

The world fields of patronage and family are often integrated in classical sources. Lucian demonstrates the use of patronage terminology within the context of a father-son relationship: “I was a savior, a benefactor, and all things to him (καὶ σωτήρ καὶ εὐεργέτης καὶ πάντα ἐγώ)”.548 Philo parallels parents with benefactors and describes children as the recipients of benefits:

Now parents are assigned a place in the higher of these two orders, for they are seniors and instructors and benefactors and rulers and masters; sons and daughters are placed in the lower order, for they are juniors and learners and recipients of benefits and subjects and servants.549

Plutarch also uses the terminology of benefaction in discussion of household ethics. He suggests that it is widely accepted that the benefits that parents bestow on their children obligate the children to reciprocate by honouring their parents, citing Plato:

Nature and law […] have assigned to parents, after gods, first and greatest honor (τιμήν); and there is nothing which men do that is more acceptable to gods than with goodwill and zeal to repay to those who bore them up the favours “long ago lent to them when they were young.”550

Paul’s use of ὥθως serves to affirm the hierarchical categories within which God and Jesus operate. Within the wider context of the salvific themes of 15:20-8, Paul’s use of familial titles complements the patron-client imagery rather introducing a new characterisation.551

In relation to God, Jesus’ title ‘son’ expresses both his unique position and his subordinate status. By using the lexicon of father and son in 15:20-28, Paul reminds

548 Lucian, Abdic. 21.
549 Philo, Spec. 2.226-227 (trans. F. H. Colson, LCL); cf. Decal. 165-167.
550 Plutarch, Mor. 479F (trans. W. C. Helmbold, LCL).
his audience that even from a cosmic perspective the exalted Christ and God interact in an appropriate hierarchical relationship. Such conclusions are consistent with Richardson’s claim that relational titles such as ‘son of God’ primarily reflect the subordination and obedience of Jesus to God whilst at the same time hinting at the likeness of the two figures.\(^ {552} \)

At the end of the passage, Paul states that when all things have been subjected to Jesus, Jesus himself will be made subject to God. This sequence of events further extends the emperor and general motif. On return from battle a general was expected to subject himself to the emperor, showing that he was not threatening the authority of the emperor but honouring him with the victory.\(^ {553} \) In contrast to Phil 2:6-8, but in parallel to Phil 2:9-11, Paul moves to frame Jesus’ status in relation to that of God. More intriguingly, Paul’s use of the passive form of ὑποτάσσω in 28b conforms to the manner in which the opposing powers are also made subject. Having just spoken of the father and the son’s battle with enemy powers, clearly Paul is not likening Jesus to such powers. However, in response to the authority demonstrated in putting all things under his feet, Jesus himself bows the knee.

5.3.2.9.  God finally becomes all in all

15:28b  ἵνα ἃ ὁ θεὸς πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν.

God’s future as ‘all in all’ is predicated upon all things being made subject to Jesus and Jesus being made subject to God. God’s sovereign relationship to ‘all things’ is maintained. However, it has been uniquely demonstrated through the work of the exalted Jesus. If Jesus’ divine sonship in 15:28a evokes the Davidic king as son in Ps 2, then there is an additional echoing here with the ending of LXX Ps 2 which closes the celebration of supremacy of YHWH and his anointed: ‘Happy are all those who trust in him [YHWH]’. The section ends with reciprocity and hierarchy

\(^{552}\) Richardson (1994: 269-73). The designation ‘son’ also has an honorific element. As well as being used figuratively for clients (see appendix), the titles ‘son’ or ‘daughter’ were given to benefactors of cities and associations by civic organizations (Harland 2007: 65-66).

again complementing each other for the mutual gain of both actors as God’s goal is actualised, with 15:28b corresponding to 15:24a in the structure of the passage.

5.3.2.10. Epiphany, triumph and glory to God

15:57 τῷ δὲ θεῷ χάρις τῷ διδόντι ἡμῖν τὸ νίκος διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

God’s position as sovereign redeemer is reflected in the climax of the section 15:35-57. In this section Paul addresses a perceived opposition to belief in the resurrection, based on a scepticism amongst some of his congregation regarding the nature of resurrected bodies. After responding to this perceived opposition with an insult and an analogy (15:36-41), Paul delivers his thesis, again using agricultural imagery and Adam typology, as he did in 15:20-23. And like his first thesis, his second thesis transitions from Adam typology into military imagery, celebrating the defeat of death with a triumphalist tone (15:51-57). The apocalyptic tropes of disclosure of divine mystery, trumpets, resurrection of the dead and victory over death create the image of divine rescue, reminiscent of grand scenes of military rescue or divine intervention.554

Paul’s victory cry is followed by a thanksgiving to the deity in 15:57—the expected practice of a client upon receipt of a benefit. Paul gives thanks to God in line with Jesus’ own example in 11:24. This is consistent with the primacy that Paul has attributed to God throughout 1 Cor 15. God is the one who raised Jesus, who empowered him and who will raise believers in the future. It is God who takes those characterised by ἀτιμία and bestows on them δόξα and δύναμις through the general resurrection (15:43). Jesus, whilst associated with God in the thanksgiving (which is significant), is portrayed as instrumental, despite having been in many ways the hero of the eschatological drama of 15:23-8.

554 Cassius Dio, Hist. rom. 72.8 reports the story of Marcus Aurelius and his men receiving divine aid during a losing battle with the Quadi.
God’s relationship to Jesus in Paul’s praise reflects the Roman imperial hierarchy of military honours. An inscription dating to 5-8 CE from Africa demonstrates that the hierarchy of honour was broadcast for all people to see. The inscription praises Augustus for a military campaign that was led by Cossus Cornelius Lentulus, proconsul of Africa:

Marti Augusto sacrum
auspiciis Imp(eratoris) Caesaris Aug(usti)
pontificis maxumi (sic) patris
patriae ductu Cossi Lentuli
copl(n)s(ulis) XV uiri sacris faciundis
proco(n)s(ulis) prouincia Africa
bello Gaetulico liberata
ciuitas Lepcitana

Despite the fact that it was Lentelus who led the campaign, the city of Lepcis attributes ultimate honours to the emperor who is depicted as commander and overseer. It supports the view that the emperor had authority over his generals and monopolised the celebration of their achievements. Whilst generals were honoured for their military victories and for their loyalty, it was the emperor who received the ultimate glory and the highest honours. As with Phil 2:11, Paul’s depiction of God as the primary honorand reflects the emperor’s monopoly of public honours.

For the Corinthian audience, the honours of 15:57 would have resonated with their experience of imperial honours in their own city. As we have already seen, the Roman citizens of the colony celebrated the achievements of Rome and of their pater patriae. Inscriptions contemporary to Paul celebrated Claudius' victory in Britain. Such inscriptions along with local coinage demonstrate the colony’s desire to honour the military achievements of the emperor. Other (undated)

555 ‘Sacred to Mars Augustus. Under the auspices of the emperor Caesar Augustus, chief priest, father of the country, and the leadership of Cossus Lentulus, consul, member of the committee of the fifteen for religious ceremonies (at Rome), proconsul, the province of Africa was freed from the war with the Gaetuli. The city of Lepcis (set this up)’ (Reynolds & Ward-Perkins, 1952: §301).
557 West (1931: §86, cf. 87-90). Despite disputes over the age of the inscription §86, West asserts a first century CE dating: ‘One must certainly associate [The cult of Victoria Brittanica] with the activity of Claudius in Britain’ (1931: 71-72).
inscriptions have been found which simply read: VICTORIAE SACRVM.558 The fact that God as the heavenly emperor takes the ultimate glory in 15:57 would have come as no surprise to the Corinthian audience. While Jesus is given unprecedented status over the cosmos, it is his patron who must receive ultimate glory for his victory.

5.4. Conclusion

This chapter has demonstrated how the relational dynamics of 1 Cor 15:20-28 parallel a model of interaction characteristic of the Roman emperor and of his generals, relationships that were often themselves marked by patron-client dynamics. It has shown how the dense language of the passage might have been heard by an audience familiar with the motifs of Roman imperial ideology reflected in inscriptions and in military stories. Like the hearers of Phil 2:6-11, many in the Corinthian audience may not have consciously connected Paul’s imagery and figures with specific Roman powers, but would have felt that the interaction between the figures of God and Jesus was logical because of their own experience of rank and status in the life of the colony. By attending to the role of the imperial agent as the emperor’s representative we have proposed a framework for interpreting how both Jesus and God can be depicted as defeating death in 15:24-28.

With regard to the christology of the passage, two things are remarkable. When Paul focuses on the relationship between Jesus and believers (15:20-23), he emphasises both their shared dependence on God, and believers’ dependence on Jesus as God’s instrument. Jesus is their benefactor precisely because he is God’s agent. When Paul focuses on the interaction between Jesus and God (15:20-28) he presents Jesus as subordinate to God as a client was to his patron (15:20-28). God delivers Jesus, enthrones him and empowers him. Jesus in turn fulfils God’s will, fights for him and finally restores him as sovereign.

If, when looking at 15:24-28, we were to force a dividing line between the orders of creator and created (as Richard Bauckham does as part of his method for analysing

558 West (1931: §11).
Paul’s christology) then it seems likely that Jesus would fall on the side of the created beings because he is raised by God along with his followers (15:20-23) and is subject to God with the rest of creation at the climax of the passage (15:28). On the other hand, when Paul turns to his own position as a client, and to the Christians’ position as recipients of salvation/resurrection in 15:20-23, 57, Jesus is associated with God in Paul’s worship as their benefactor, even if he is characterised as God’s agent. For Paul, Jesus is a patron worthy of honour because he has connected mankind to the heavenly patron and to the salvation he delivers.
CHAPTER 6: Praise to God as the patron deity of Jesus the king: Ephesians 1:20-23 in the context of Ephesians 1-2 and the relationship between the emperor and Jupiter in imperial rhetoric

6.1. Outline

At the climax of his eulogy and prayer to God the Father, the author of Ephesians (AE) refers to the story of Jesus’ resurrection and exaltation as the ultimate demonstration of God’s power:

[God] exercised [this working of power] in Christ when he raised him from the dead and seated him at his right hand in the heavenlies (1:20), far above every rule and authority and power and lordship, and every name that is named, not only in this age but also in the coming one (1:21). And he placed all things in subjection under his feet and gave him as head over all things for the church (1:22), which is his body, the fullness of him who is filled completely (1:23).

The passage provides valuable insight into very early Christian thinking about the interrelationship between God the Father and Jesus the Lord. By itself, it presents a more one-sided interaction between God and Jesus than the balanced reciprocal dynamics we have delineated in Phil 2:6–11 and 1 Cor 15.20–28. God performs actions upon Jesus and Jesus performs actions upon believers.

Chapters 4-5 analysed the relational dynamics between God and Jesus through the lens of relationships between the emperor and his deputies. These relationships offered concrete examples of imperial agency and brokerage across the provinces of the empire. Chapter 6 develops our analysis by focussing on a relationship that offers a closer parallel to the relationship between Jesus and God—that between the Roman emperor and his patron deity. This relationship appears most prominently in the epideictic rhetoric of speeches to the emperor. Honorific inscriptions from Asia Minor also provide comparative sources for their descriptions of imperial benefactors in the third person perspective. This chapter demonstrates that, in the context of ch. 1-2 and Greco-Roman imperial pangegryic, Jesus’ rule is the culmination of God’s favour and protection, and that his dispensing of justice and salvation is a reciprocal service to God.
6.2. The christology of Ephesians and the relationship between the emperor and the gods in the panegyric of Pliny and Dio Chrysostom

Roman imperial discourse has proved to be a fruitful field for comparative study of the rhetoric of Ephesians and the cultural background of its audience in Asia Minor. Long finds significant parallels between the motifs of Ephesians and the common topoi of imperial ideology preserved in Cicero’s *De re publica* and in the Priene inscriptions, such as divine benefaction, proclamation of a gospel, established peace, temple-building, state-body imagery, military triumphs and household relationships. Long describes Ephesians as ‘Paul’s mature political theology’, which trumps and remodels each topos with a Christian worldview that envisages a new just ruler, established by God to raise his citizens to be good and upright.559

Long and Gupta have also disputed views of Ephesians as an accommodation to Roman political structures and social values, arguing instead for a coded critique which seeks to construct an alternative political reality within the church in which God is the supreme provider of salvation and benefactions. Long is correct to see the figures of Jesus and God occupying cosmological positions comparable to those of the Roman emperors and their patron deities but his suggestion of a ‘coded critique’ can only be taken so far. Any anti-imperial critique must be a secondary implication of AE’s cosmology rather than its primary concern.

Smith argues that the expectations commonly associated with the role of the king amongst Ephesians’ authorial audience helps to clarify the purpose of the letter— to show that Jesus as God’s vice-regent has reconstructed the cosmos, defeated enemy powers, bestowed salvific gifts on the church, and is transforming believers by his presence and by imitation of his exemplary virtues.560 Whilst Smith provides great insight into the relationship between the king and the gods—traditions traced back through Hellenistic Greece and even to classical times—he offers little reflection on what the hierarchical aspects of that relationship might mean for the christology of Ephesians.

---

560 Smith (2011).
The emperor’s close association with his patron deity is a popular topos in imperial pangegyric and makes Pliny the Younger’s Panegyricus and Dio Chrysostom’s discourses on kingship (De regno i-iv) valuable comparative sources for analysing the christology of Eph 1:20-23. Both Pliny and Dio appear to have written their texts for the emperor Trajan ca. 100 CE and preserve aspects of an imperial ideology that had developed since the Augustan principate.\footnote{Smith’s study of kingship ideology in the background of Ephesians also deals with Dio Chrysostom and Pliny the Younger. However, closer attention to the involvement in the patronage system of these two writers shines helpful light on their conceptions of power relations between gods and rulers, and thus on their relevance to the christology of Eph 1:20-23 (2011: 68-74, 81-83).}

Roman panegyric were employed for ceremonial occasions in the imperial calendar.\footnote{Russell (1998: 28).} Russell states: ‘They aim to confer immortality on an important ceremonial moment’, a quality achieved through the high culture represented by their literary style.\footnote{Russell (1998: 49).} Pliny’s Panegyricus was delivered before the Senate only two years into Trajan’s reign and a year and a half after he had arrived in Rome.\footnote{Braund (1998: 58).} It was given in response to being awarded the consulship in 100 CE as token of Pliny’s gratia to the emperor. It is a highly-elaborated version of Pliny’s original speech, documenting Trajan’s career beginning with his governorship of Upper Germany in 96 CE, praising his love for peace, political moderation and generosity.\footnote{Walsh (2006: xii).}

The Panegyricus also reveals the ideals of behaviour and character in a ‘good emperor’ that a senator would be expected to endorse, such as those of a paternal protector and benefactor (Pan. 4.1; Ep. 3.18.2). Roche calls the speech Pliny’s ‘manifesto’ in the sense that it offers admonitory guidance.\footnote{Roche (2011: 5).} Its themes include three common topoi of Roman panegyric: the emperor as father, comparisons with the emperor’s predecessors and relation to divinity, the last of which is approached from different angles.\footnote{Braund (1998: 71).} Pliny begins by denying Trajan’s divinity (Pan. 2.3) but simultaneously states that he was appointed by the gods (Pan. 5.1–2; 10.4, 72, 74). He avoids mention of Trajan’s natural father M. Ulpius Traianus and his birth place in Spain and instead focusses on his supernatural beginnings—thus adhering to the
The good ruler is one who is most like the gods, and in fact Trajan is the best, none other than Jupiter’s deputy (Pan. 80.4) and ward (94.1–2). According to Russell, the success of the speech rides on its ability to arouse positive feelings of admiration, patriotism and gratitude which are achieved through the emphasising of the ruler’s god-like qualities.

Dio Chrysostom’s discourses on kingship continue the tradition of Hellenic treatises, the basilikos logos, an antecedent of the Roman panegyric. Dio (45–115 CE) was a leading figure in the resurgence of Greek culture and thinking during the Roman principate. The discourses appear as essays although Konstan argues that the discourses may have originally been performed as speeches disguised as essays to avoid charges of flattery. Nonetheless, Dio’s speeches are situated within an imperial setting and thus reflect many of the traits of Roman imperial ideology.

Although Dio’s treatises ignore the biographical details characteristic of panegyric, most historians suspect Trajan to be the emperor in view. Like Jupiter in Pliny’s Panegyricus, Zeus plays prominent roles in Dio’s first and third discourses. Dio also depicts Heracles as the emperor’s prototype and avatar (1 Regn. 56–84), a deity whom Trajan adopted as his emblem, as testified on coins minted during his reign and on the iconography of his new legion, the Second Traiana. If Pliny’s Panegyricus was delivered in 100 CE, the same year that Dio arrived in Rome, then it may be deduced that Dio delivered his address the following year. It was Trajan’s third consulate, a year after he had entered Rome as emperor and a year before he left for Dacia to fight Decebalus.

---

570 Konstan (1997,126). Roman Panegyric adapted Hellenic basilikos logos for their own monarch, the Emperor, although antecedents of panegyric can be found in speeches from the Republic. In Pro Lege manilia (De imperio Cn. Pompeii), Cicero elevates Pompey to a virtually divine level in his endeavour to argue that Pompey should be given command of the Republic’s army for the war against Mithridates. His descriptions of Pompey express supra-human qualities (Leg. man. 33, 36, 41) that are intended to provide the proof that Pompey is suitably qualified for the role (Braund 1998: 74-5).
573 Jones (1978: 118).
Where Braund emphasises the potential for the panegyrists to exhort the new emperor and have an influence on his policy-making, Jones emphasises a more passive and complicit view of their role. Jones reasons that the ideological similarities between Dio’s first discourse and Pliny’s *Panegyricus* cannot simply be put down to a common friendship with Trajan but instead reveals a common imperial propaganda of its time. Konstan’s observations of the role of friendship in the speeches supports Jones’ reading. Konstan argues that friendship in Dio and Pliny’s works is a unique virtue amongst extant Graeco-Roman eulogies, leading him to suggest that *amicitia*/*φιλία* was part of the ‘spirit’ of Trajan’s reign that both Dio and Pliny made key to their representations of the figure.

Whilst Smith has demonstrated that there is a consistency to ideologies of kingship which can be traced back to classical times, we also need to acknowledge that panegyric was used in a variety of political contexts during Rome’s tumultuous principate. After an initial enthusiasm for Jupiter theology in the wake of Actium, Augustus moved to break with the mythology of the late Republic by replacing the state’s protection by Jupiter with that of his own person and his personal gods. Horace’s emphasis on the emperor’s subordination to the chief god can be seen as ‘a simple caution against the minor role of Jupiter in the political theology of the new principate.’ Assertion of Jupiter’s eternal protection of the emperor is particularly prominent during the reigns of Nero and Domitian when conspiracy and assassinations are real threats. Tropes of divine appointment are important during the Flavian regime whose emperors could not appeal to divine ancestry like the Julio-Claudian dynasty. That said, the fact that the ideology of the ruler’s relationship to Jupiter/Zeus was appropriated, reinforced, subverted and adapted under the reigns of different emperors testifies to its acceptance in ancient thought.

---

574 Jones (1978: 118).
577 Ibid. 74-5).
6.2.1. The relationship in the texts

Despite being at the top of the pyramid of imperial order, even the emperor had divine patrons. In imperial panegyric, Jupiter/Zeus is frequently described as the ruler of the universe, along with all the patronal connotations usually associated with the role of the ideal monarch. For example, Pliny the Younger contrasts the reign of Jupiter, ‘the best’ emperor, with that of ‘the worst’, Domitian.578 Dio similarly describes Zeus as ‘the supreme and first king’ (τοῦ μεγίστου καὶ πρῶτου βασιλέως) who stands as the paradigm good leaders should follow.579 Dio clearly includes notions of the ideal benefactor in his portrayal of Zeus as supreme ruler:

[...] it is impossible that the just and good man (τὸν δίκαιον ἄνδρα καὶ ἀγαθὸν) should repose greater confidence (πείθω) in any other being than in the supremely just and good (τοῖς δικαιοτάτοις τε καὶ ἀρίστοις) — the gods.580

The ‘just’ and ‘good man’ were commonly used expressions for describing patrons and benefactors in the Greek East, particularly in honorific inscriptions.581 Dio extends these titles to speak of the gods as the supreme patrons of even earthly patrons. Whilst the panegyrists do not call the emperor a client (cliens or πελάτης) they do use terms which clearly indicate his subordinate position to the gods. Dio writes that all good rulers of the past have been ‘followers and emulators’ of Zeus (μαθητάς τε καὶ ζηλωτάς).582

According to Dio, the king’s first duty is to honour the gods, much like a client’s priority towards his patron: ‘Such a king is, in the first place, regardful of the gods and holds the divine in honour (προτιμάω)’.583 Honour of the gods mainly took the form of ensuring their worship by maintenance of their particular cult.584 This would ensure that honour is returned to the gods for their favours to the people.585 The

578 Pliny the Younger, Pan. 94.4.
579 Dio Chrysostom, 1 Regn. 37.
582 Dio Chrysostom, 1 Regn. 38.
583 1 Regn. 15.
584 3 Regn. 51.
585 Dio also adds that honouring the gods should be a genuine act as well as a public act (3 Regn. 51). In Dio’s second discourse, he mentions worship in the form of singing hymns to be part of Alexander, the ideal king’s, routine (2 Regn. 28).
second means by which a good king should honour the gods is by imitation of their just rule.\textsuperscript{586}

[...] yet the gods, who are his superiors (ἀµείνων), he must follow (ἔποµαι), as being, I verily believe, good herdsmen, and must give full honour (προτιµάω) to their superior (κρείσσον) and more blessed natures, recognizing in them his own masters (δεσπότης) and rulers (ἄρχων) [...]\textsuperscript{587}

Seneca emphasises that this aspect of worship is important not just for the Emperor but for any respectable citizen: ‘Would you win over the gods? Then be a good man. Whoever imitates them, is worshipping them sufficiently’.\textsuperscript{588}

Emulation of the gods through his just rule was particulary important for the emperor’s role as the mediator between the gods and his subjects. Dio cites Homer who calls good rulers ‘Zeus-nurtured’ and ‘like Zeus in counsel’, epithets that are bestowed because of a ruler’s duty to \textit{imitate the gods in his duties}.\textsuperscript{589} Pliny describes Jupiter in retirement, ‘free to devote himself to heaven’s concerns’, as Trajan rules on his behalf.\textsuperscript{590} By imitating the gods the emperor could function as a mediator between the gods and mankind. Nicols argues that Augustus’ example of \textit{pietas} through his priestly duties and construction of temples was in turn imitated by elites of cities in Italy and further East.\textsuperscript{591}

Crucially, Dio describes the relationship between the king and the gods as one characterised by ‘trust’ (ἐπιτρέπος, πίστις), the outstanding quality of a successful patron-client relationship.\textsuperscript{592} In a passage on the advantages of patronage relations over familial relations Dio describes the gods as the king’s friends: ‘[...] friendship our king esteem as such an altogether sacred thing that he tries to make even the gods his friends’.\textsuperscript{593}

\textsuperscript{586} 1 Regn 38; 3 Regn. 52.
\textsuperscript{587} 2 Regn. 72.
\textsuperscript{588} Seneca the Younger, Ep. 50.
\textsuperscript{589} 1 Regn. 37–8.
\textsuperscript{590} Pliny the Younger, Pan. 80.4-5; cf. 94.4 (trans. Betty Radice, LCL).
\textsuperscript{591} Nicols (2004).
\textsuperscript{592} Dio Chrysostom, 1 Regn. 8-4, 3 Regn. 51; see also Pliny, Pan. 80.4-5.
\textsuperscript{593} 3 Regn. 115.
6.3. The style of Ephesians and the epideictic rhetoric of panegyric speeches

Another useful point of comparison between Ephesians and panegyric is their style. Both Danker and Hendrix have studied Ephesians in light of honorific inscriptions. Witherington argues that Ephesians imitates many of the features of Asiatic, epideictic homily, an oratory style popular with Greek rhetors in regions such as Ephesus, Pergamum and Smyrna. Asiatic Greek, in contrast to koine and Attic Greek, was a `highly artificial, self-conscious search for striking expression in diction, sentence structure and rhythm.' Epideictic rhetoric was a form of oratory not primarily employed to debate, discuss, or make an argument. Instead it was used for monologues and sermons, often directed towards a ruler, that did not require a direct response. It sought to magnify and embellish particular themes through dramatic speeches of praise or blame, often aiming at pleasing the audience.

Whilst these approaches do not neatly explain the whole of Ephesians, particularly the parenetic sections, and do not fully appreciate the significance of the epistolary form of Ephesians, they do situate the style of the opening Praise and Thanksgiving (Eph 1:3-14, 15-23) within the conventions of honorific discourse attached to benefaction practices popular in the towns of the Lycus Valley. Eph 1:3 sign posts its topic of praise as Menander instructs. The letter’s famously long sentences (1:3-14, 15-23) correspond to the grandeur of the epideictic rhetoric (Quintilian, Inst.

---

594 Danker (1982: 451); Hendrix (1988: 9) describes Ephesians as an ‘epistolary decree’ that expounds upon the benefactions of God and Jesus, and encourages the offering of reciprocal honours appropriate to beneficiaries.
597 Innes (2011: 68).
598 This chapter takes the position that Ephesians is best understood as a circular letter written to a group of Pauline churches spread across several locations in the province of Asia. The absence of the name ‘Ephesians’ in the earliest manuscripts appears to support this conclusion.
599 Ephesians touches on a number of topoi recommended for encomia in the fourth-century rhetorical handbook attributed to Menander of Laodicea, also called Menander Rhetor. Ephesians, like Menander’s ‘Imperial Oration’ (II.368-377.30), includes the notions that verbal praise should be offered in reciprocation to the king’s benefactions (II.368.15-16; Eph 1:3); that it is impossible to express or capture the magnitude of the favours bestowed by the king (II.36.20-369.1; Eph 1:19; 2:7; 3:18-19); that the new king’s reign should be compared and contrasted to the previous regime (II.367.31-377.9; Eph 2:1-3); that one should extol the king’s achievements in war and peace (II.372.25-27; Eph 2:13-22); his temperance (II.376.1-2; Eph 3:19; 5:22, 25), and that his virtues are exemplary for his subjects (II.376.4-14; Eph 5:2). Many of these topoi appear in the speeches to a Roman governor – ‘the speech of arrival’ (II.378.30-2.388.15) and ‘the address’ (II.415.1-418.4). They follow similar patter, they are incomplete encomia (II.415.1-5).
AE’s use of ἀνακεφαλαίομαι may indicate a familiarity with rhetorical techniques, the rarely used word (cf. Rom 13:9) being a technical term that refers to the summing up the headings of a speech. Most importantly, the letter’s emphasis on present divine benefactions might explain its adoption of stylistic ornaments that function to incite the audience to reciprocate in their communal ethics as the people of God living in the pagan world.

6.4. Motifs depicting God as the heavenly patron of Jesus the king in Ephesians 1–2

The interaction between God and Jesus in Eph 1:2-23 is framed within broader themes of patronage and benefaction in its co-text, Eph 1-2. AE’s depiction of the current situation for believers contains many of the characteristics of patronal discourse outlined in chapter 3. This section categorises them into the labels, attributes, reciprocal interactions and attitudes attached to Jesus and God. Such characteristics depict God as the patron deity to believers in general but to Jesus in particular, while also depicting Jesus as God’s royal agent.

6.4.1. Labels: God and Father of Jesus our Lord

AE’s eulogy begins with the image of divine fatherhood that establishes the unique relationship between God and Jesus that includes both interdependency and hierarchy: ‘Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ’ (1:3). We have already discussed how the title ‘father’ could be used to describe one’s patron. AE begins his letter with blessings from the heavenly father of believers (1:2), and in a similar fashion Pliny begins his panegyric by appealing to Jupiter as ‘founder and now the preserver of our realm’ (antea conditorem, nunc conservatorem). Towards

602 LSJ, s.v. ‘ἀνακεφαλαίομαι’.
603 The author’s repeated appeals to unity and his imperative to ‘love one another’ make it difficult to avoid the conclusion that Ephesians is cumulatively concerned with ‘identity formation’ (with Hoehner 2002: 106-110). This love is grounded in the relationship between Jesus and God and is empowered by the actions of God in Jesus which have reconstructed the cosmos under a new ruler (with Smith 2011).
604 See Excursus.
605 Pan. 1.
the end of the speech Pliny describes Jupiter as a *pater* and as a benefactor whose greatest act of favour has been to provide an emperor for Rome.\textsuperscript{606} Dio Chrysostom’s first discourse does not begin with an invocation but quickly turns towards the figure of Zeus whose multiple epithets characterise him, amongst other things, as a heavenly patron and paradigm of kingship for earthly rulers:

For Zeus alone of the gods has the epithets of ‘Father’ and ‘King’ (πατήρ καὶ βασιλεὺς) […] He is addressed as ‘King’ because of his dominion and power; as ‘Father,’ I ween, on account of his solicitude and gentleness (τὴν κηδεμονίαν καὶ τὸ πρῆσθον).\textsuperscript{607}

Dio’s analogy with Jupiter is a fundamental part of his strategy to cement Trajan’s association with the deity. Against the backdrop of imperial panegyric, AE’s use of πατήρ in 1:2 and 1:3 establishes God as divine patron of both believers and Jesus.

The title ‘God and Father’ also places Jesus in the role of a worshipper. The church fathers perceived the phrase ‘God of Jesus’ to be a threat to orthodox doctrine, leading them to interpret the second term, ‘Father’, as the head term for the genitive phrase (‘God who is the Father…’).\textsuperscript{608} However, Eph 1:17 counts strongly against this reading. The Granville Sharp principle makes the interpretation of the fathers unlikely.\textsuperscript{609} In fact, Codex Vaticanus omits καὶ πατήρ from 1:3 entirely to simply read ὁ 0ς τοῦ κυρίου· Ἰησοῦ.\textsuperscript{610} Muddiman suggest that the title ‘God of our Lord’ preserves the memory of Jesus as a prophet to his people.\textsuperscript{611} However, the title is a reference not only to a past relationship between God and Jesus but a present one and depicts YHWH as Jesus’ patronal deity. In imperial rhetoric, the emperor is an imitator (*1 Regn.* 37: μιμομένους), a disciple and emulator (38: μαθητάς τε καὶ ἡλεττάς) and a follower (ἐπομαι) of Zeus.\textsuperscript{612} It portrays the emperor as the paradigm of virtue who transforms his subjects, and as the ‘first citizen’ of Rome, elected by the gods and men to manage the empire. AE’s reference to God as the ‘god of our

\textsuperscript{606} Pan. 80.4-5.  
\textsuperscript{607} Dio Chrysostom, *1 Regn.* 39-41.  
\textsuperscript{608} Larkin (2009: 6).  
\textsuperscript{609} Larkin also points out that other NT writers appear to see no problem which YHWH being the god of Jesus, citing John 20.17; 1 Cor 15:24; 2 Cor 1:3; 11:31; Rev 1:6.  
\textsuperscript{610} P46 misses out the entire phrase, starting the verse at 1:3b (ὁ εὐλογήσας…), although this can attributed to the scribal error, *homoioteleuton*.  
\textsuperscript{611} Muddiman (2001: 66).  
Lord’ portrays Jesus as the authoritative exemplar of virtue and as a fellow citizen of humanity dutifully honouring the divine.

AE’s reference to Jesus as ‘the beloved’ (Eph 1:6 τῷ ἠγαπημένῳ) reinforces the unique relationship Jesus has with God. It is also a fitting label for the ideal king. Imperial rhetoric describes the ideal emperor in similar terms. Dio writes: ‘A ruler of this character is, to begin with, beloved of the gods (θεοφιλής), seeing that he enjoys their greatest respect and confidence (τιμῆς καὶ πίστεως).’\(^{613}\) The familiarity of the trope is attested in Pliny’s exploitation of it to magnify Trajan’s dedication to his subjects:

Nothing stands higher with you than your subjects’ affection: so much so, that you would put our love before that of the gods, and desire theirs only if you have ours.

_Adeo nihil tibi amore civium antiquius, ut ante a nobis deinde a dis, atque ita ab illis amari velis, si a nobis ameris._\(^{614}\)

Whilst many commentators describe ‘the beloved’ as a messianic title, it is also an epithet for YHWH in LXX Ps 67:13. Unlike in the synoptic gospels (Matt 3:17; 17:5; Mark 1:11; 9:7; Luke 3:22) ‘the beloved’ is a rare christological title in the Pauline corpus—it is only used elsewhere to describe believers (Rom 1:7; Eph 5:1; Col 3:12; 1 Thess 1:4; 2 Thess 2:13).\(^{615}\) AE’s usage portrays Jesus in the mould of a Graeco-Roman ruler. The title legitimises Jesus’ appointment as cosmocrator and implies that Christ is superior to Gentile rulers because his patron deity is none other than the one, all-powerful God of Israel.

6.4.2. Attributes: possessor of infinite resources

AE’s language of riches and power depicts God as a generous patron of extraordinary resources. He blesses his people ‘with every spiritual blessing’ (Eph 1:3) and lavishes ‘riches of his favour’ on them (1:7–8: κατὰ τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ ἦς ἐπερίσσευσεν εἰς ἠμᾶς. Believers should trust in their rich inheritance

---

\(^{613}\) 3 Regn. 51, adapted from LCL

\(^{614}\) Pan. 72.3-4

\(^{615}\) The association of the title with Jesus’ baptism was part of the reason some commentators identified the epistle as baptismal liturgy.
(1:11, 18). Pliny petitions Jupiter that his great gifts might be perpetual (*beneficiis tuis faveas*). Dio describes Heracles bestowing ‘money without limit’, lands and kingdoms on his clients, with the purpose that his gifts would increase his clients’ own generosity. As the emperor has received plentifully from the gods, so he dispenses generously, ‘as if the supply were inexhaustible’. The greater the benefits bestowed, the greater the patron. Like imperial panegyric, AE portrays God as the patron of unlimited resources who empowers his agent Jesus to be generous with his own clients (Eph 4:7).

6.4.3. Reciprocal interaction: salvation through the provision of a king, inspiring praise

God provides (χαριτόω) ‘his glorious gift’ ‘through the beloved’ (Eph 1:6). Adoption is through (διὰ) Jesus Christ (1:5). ‘In him’ believers have liberation and forgiveness through (διὰ) Jesus’ blood (1:7). ‘In him’ believers have an inheritance (1:11). However, it is salvation, delivered through Jesus that situates the passage within the realm of patronage and benefaction. The gospel that has been proclaimed to believers is the good news of their σωτηρία (1:13). Believers have been delivered (σῶζω) by the χάρις of God (2:5), which is through πίστις (2:8). In Greek literature and epigraphy σωτηρία is the hallmark of influential patrons. For Plutarch’s Minucius, the provision of σωτηρία is the quality that distinguishes the patronal Fabius Maximus from his own father.

The motif of divine powers providing salvific benefits through an agent is familiar in the imperial cultic activities of Asia Minor. The letters between Paulus Fabius Maximus and the Assembly of Asia describes August as a saviour bestowed (σωτήρα χαρισαμένη) on mankind by providence. Pliny likewise describes Trajan as the greatest of the gifts (munus) given by the gods. In chapters 4 and 5 we saw

---

616 1 Regn. 61–2.
617 1 Regn. 23–4
618 Translating ἐν τῷ ἄγασιμῳ as an instrumental dative.
619 Where ἐν ὑπὲρ ὁ is likely locative, to contrast with the following instrumental preposition.
621 Sherk (1969: §65, ll. 35–37, trans. Sherk 1984: §101). Dio writes that it is the role of the emperor to save (σῶζω) his subjects from tyrants (2 Regn. 68-72, also 3 Regn. 7, 83).
622 *Pan* 1.3–4; cf. *Pan*. 80.5.
how the emperors were described as saving the people by sending their generals as agents. We find a similar relational structure in imperial praise where it is the emperor who is the agent of salvation, sent by the divine sphere. In Ephesians, a similar combination of gift and soteriological language is employed. God bestows his favour ‘through Christ’ (1:6). The Ephesians are saved ‘by favour’ (2:5, 8).

AE depicts Jesus as coming (ἐλθὼν) and as having ‘proclaimed peace (εὐηγγελίσατο εἰρήνην) to you who were far off and peace to those who were near’ (Eph 2:17). Gombis follows Jeal to argue that the proclamation of Eph 2:17 should be interpreted within the ideology of divine warfare as the warrior’s ‘victory shout’ which is tied to ‘the appearance of Christ, along with his death, resurrection and enthronement as the cosmic lord’. Gombis argues that the motifs correspond to other divine warrior texts—the voice in Rev 12:10–12, and the processional of YHWH to the temple in Pss 24:7-10; 29:9b; 98:4–9. However, the voice in Rev 12:10–12 is anonymous, possibly belonging to God or to an angel. The Psalmist’s announcement of the divine warrior’s victory come from the narrator, not from God, and in Ps 29 the voice of the Lord is the force that conquers nature, not the one who proclaims victory. A closer precedent would be LXX Ps 67:11–12 which describes YHWH as one who ‘will give a word to the ones who bring good news (ῥῆμα τοῖς εὐαγγελιζομένοις) to a great host’. This Psalm provides a basis for a divine warrior who gives both good news and gifts to his people via an agent (Eph 4:7).

Whilst Gombis’ approach is useful in putting Jesus’ proclamation within a military context, the label of ‘victory shout’ overly-simplifies the imagery. As Gombis himself acknowledges, 2:1–10 describes ‘the triumph of God in Christ in overcoming the deep division within humanity’. Eph 2:11–19 details Jesus’ victory over the law, but this section appears to expand upon the instrumental role of Jesus (2:7, 10), who prepares a living temple for God to inhabit (2:21–22). With this nuance in mind, Jesus is not precisely the divine warrior but the royal warrior who proclaims his victory as the triumph of his patron deity, building a temple for him in

624 LXX Ps 67:12.
his honour.\textsuperscript{626} Pliny describes Jupiter as speaking his opinion through Trajan which both associate him with the god whilst maintaining a distinction as an agent.\textsuperscript{627} AE describes Jesus as both the one through whom God acts and the one through whom God’s victory is proclaimed. He is closely associated with God by his very subservience to God the heavenly patron.

Appreciation for God’s benefactions in sending Jesus the king is achieved through a strategy notably resonant with a key trope of imperial panegyric—the magnification of the emperor through contrast with one of his tyrannical predecessors. Pliny himself signposts this strategy when he contrasts Trajan with tyrants such as Domitian and Nero: ‘For no one can properly appreciate a good princeps who does not sufficiently hate a bad one.’\textsuperscript{628} Because Domitian’s reign had only come to an end four years prior to the delivery of the \textit{Panegyricus}, Pliny is able to draw on recent memory to magnify Trajan’s rule. Domitian’s reign is characterised by fear (\textit{attono}) and danger (\textit{periculum, terror}), and the monstrosity (\textit{immanis}) of his court described in detail.\textsuperscript{629}

Dio employs the same contrast between the good king (ὁ ἀγαθὸς) with the tyrant (ὁ κακός). Unlike the good king, the tyrant cannot be said to have been appointed by the deity (\textit{1 Regn. 12}) and the memory of his reign will not last long (46).\textsuperscript{630} AE similarly, after extolling Jesus’ victory over the powers, contrasts the Ephesians’ current state of blessing with their prior state. He urges the Ephesians to remember that they were once subjects of ‘the ruler of the power of the air’, in fact they were dead (Eph 2:1-2), ‘without Christ’ and ‘without God in the world’ (2:12). Under such a dictator, their lives are characterised by vice, ‘the passions of the flesh’ and wrath (2:3). In comparison, the reign of Jesus is magnified (2:11-22). AE’s rhetorical strategy posits Jesus as a divinely-appointed conquering monarch who has

\textsuperscript{626} A subordinate is often honoured for the honour he brings to his patron—something we will explore further in Chapter 7. The calendrical inscription from Priene describes a civic agreement that ‘The person who found the greatest honours for the god [Augustus] should have a crown’ (Sherk 1969: §65, ll. 43-45, trans. Sherk 1984: §101), and is honoured along with Caesar at the gymnastic festivals of Roma and Augustus as Pergamum (ll. 55-70).

\textsuperscript{627} LXX Ps 67:36; cf. \textit{Pan.} 94.4.

\textsuperscript{628} \textit{Pan}. 53.1-3, adapted from LCL.

\textsuperscript{629} \textit{Pan}. 48.3-5.

\textsuperscript{630} The speech ends with Heracles choosing between being a good king or a tyrant (\textit{1 Regn.} 58–84).
overthrown a tyrannical reign and brought salvation and blessing to its people.\textsuperscript{631} Such a benefaction inspired gratitude fit for the divine.

In Lucian’s defence of \textit{De mercede conductis}, he describes the emperor as receiving ‘payment’ (\textit{µισθός}) for his deeds, payments that consist of ‘praise (\textit{ἐπαινοι}), universal fame, reverence for his benefactions (τὸ ἐπὶ ταῖς εὐφρενεσίως), statues and temples and shrines bestowed on him by his subjects’.\textsuperscript{632} Dio Chrysostom describes the good king (ὁ χρηστὸς βασιλεύς) as ‘one whom all good men can praise (\textit{ἐπαινοῦντες}) without compunction not only during his life but even afterwards.’\textsuperscript{633} Paulus Fabius Maximus suggests changing the local calendar to celebrate Augustus’ birthday as ‘some manner of repayment’ ‘for his great many benefactions’.\textsuperscript{634} Where these sources attribute praise directed to the emperor, AE depicts praise as distinctly theocentric: God adopted believers for the praise of his glorious favour (Eph 1:6 \textit{εἰς ἐπαινον δόξης τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ}). Believers now ‘live’ for the praise of God’s glory (1:12). In fact, the whole purpose of God’s salvific plan is to further the praise of his honour (1:14). \textit{ἐπαινος} can also be used as a technical term in literary works and in honorific inscriptions, denoting a ‘formal commendation’, and ‘public recognition’.\textsuperscript{635} Menander Rhetor explains that epideictic speeches consist of either blame or praise (\textit{ἐπαινος}):

‘Praise’ (\textit{ἐπαινος}) of something, on the other hand, occurs sometimes in relation to gods, sometimes in relation to mortal objects.\textsuperscript{636} The eulogy of 1:3-14 functions as an \textit{ἐπαινος} in this sense. Both AE’s eulogy and the praise that the Ephesians embody in their lives function as reciprocal services to their God, the patronal deity of the messiah.\textsuperscript{637}

\textsuperscript{631} In this way the narrative of Eph 1–2 mimics the themes of appointment, triumph, sacrifice and celebration characteristic of narratives of divine warfare. However, looking at ANE myths leads us in wrong direction, and the depiction of tyrannical rulers is better identified with the contrasting strategies of Hellenic and Roman epideictic rhetoric than with narratives of divine warfare.

\textsuperscript{632} Lucian, \textit{Apol.} 13 (trans. K. Kilburn, LCL).

\textsuperscript{633} \textit{I Regn.} 33-34

\textsuperscript{634} II. 15–20. In response to the governor’s initiative, the Assembly also describes him as a benefactor and a conduit through whom Augustus has gifted them (II. 44-50).


\textsuperscript{637} Hoehner (2002: 199, 230-231, 244-255) suggests that the three praises in 1:6, 12, 14) reflects Trinitarian shape to the theology of Ephesians as each praise is a response to the activity of each of the divine persons. Whilst father, son and spirit do play significant parts in the eulogy, the object of the praise in each passage is God the father. In the context of this eulogy in which God is the ‘one
6.4.4. Attitudes: God’s goodwill

AE presents God’s saving activity as an act of generosity, coming from an attitude of ‘goodwill’ (εὐδοκία). It is the motivation by which God gifted Jesus (χαριτόω) to mankind and it is in Jesus that God’s goodwill is chiefly manifested (1:8-9). Such good-will is closely associated with God’s providence (θέλημα) that has brought about adoption and inheritance for all believers. Goodwill (εὐνοοῦα, gratia, in relation to social exchange; favor, voluntas) is an ideal quality in Graeco-Roman social relations, representing an attitude rather than an action. Patronage relationships in particular are notable for the εὐνοοῦα that motivates a patron’s generosity toward his client and a client’s acts of gratitude toward his patron. It is the attitude with which the emperor exercises authority over his subjects, leading them to prosperity and saving them from enemies. Goodwill (εὐνοοῦα) is also commonly cited in honorific inscriptions to describe the kindly disposition of the benefactor or of the beneficiary towards each other. An imperial oath taken by the Assians in 37 CE petitions Zeus Soter, Augustus and Athena to have ‘goodwill’ toward Caligula and the imperial family. AE’s use of goodwill comes closes to that of Paulus Fabius Maximus, who writes: ‘[---] |from our ancestors (?) we have received [---] goodwill of the gods (τῶν θεῶν [εὐμενεῖς]’, a goodwill which appears to have culminated in the work of Augustus as saviour of the state. Whilst AE does not use εὐνοοῦα or εὐμένεια in these opening passages, he does use the similar term εὐδοκία. AE’s description of God’s providence and good will in Eph 1-2 resonates with the language of ideal patron-client relations and affirms God’s position as initiator of the relationship.

who blesses with every blessing’ (1:3), son and spirit play the parts of benefactions rather than benefactors.

639 Saller (1982: 21) Cf. εὐνοοῦα in Eph 6:3 to describe the attitude men have towards God which slaves should also adopt with their masters.
640 2 Regn. 68
642 IAssos 26, Mysia and the Troad, Asia Minor, 37 C.E.
644 The term also appears in Philippians immediately after the Christ hymn to describe the good will with which God enables believers to ‘work out’ their σωτηρία (Phil 2:12).
The co-text of Eph 1–2 contains several topoi familiar to imperial panegyric which posit God as the patron deity of both Christians and of Jesus their king. This section has added to the work of Long and Smith with specific focus on the patron-client relationship between the emperor and his god in political discourse. This next section gives a close reading of Eph 1:20–3 in dialogue with imperial panegyric to shed light on the relational dynamics between God and Jesus in the text.

6.5. Ephesians 1:20–23

In Eph 1:15–23 AE gives thanks for the Ephesians, offering a supplication on their behalf, that they might come to realise their ‘glorious inheritance’ and God’s power (1.17–18). Scholarship on 1:20–23 has tended to focus on the text’s form and background in the life of the early church. As our interest lies in the meaning of the text in its context in the letter we shall follow Hoehner and Witherington in treating the text simply as AE’s evidence for how God’s power is worked out for the Ephesians in Christ.645 The text draws on the language of Ps 110:1 and 8:6 and appears to combine the Adam christology and ‘powers’ found in 1 Cor 15:20–8, and the bestowal of the divine name found in Phil 2:6–11 with the text’s own unique interests in ‘the heavenlies’ and ‘principalities’.646 As in previous chapters, this story of God’s interaction with Jesus is constituted by sets of actions locatable within a certain type of first-century patron-client relationship.

6.5.1. God saved Jesus

1:20a: ἧν ἐνήργηκεν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐγείρας αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν,

In chapter 5 (§5.3.2.1) we discussed how the resurrection of Jesus was understood by some early Christians as an act of salvation. This understanding of the resurrection has a particular resonance when compared with imperial panegyrics. When offering

645 ‘There is a tendency to read early church or present day church liturgy back into NT times’ (Hoehner 2002: 273). Witherington (2007: 243) calls Eph 1:20–23 a rhetorical device known as an augmentation, citing Quintilian, Inst. 8.4.3–9.
646 van Kooten (2003: 150, 206) argues that Eph 1:15–2:10 is derived from 1 Cor 15:20–28. Hoehner (2002: 272, n. 272) argues that the two passages rely on similar concepts but address ‘entirely different subjects’.
prayers for the safety of the emperor (Pan. 94.2: salus principis), Pliny describes the gods as having already saved Trajan in order to bring him to his destined vocation:

This is no new concern we ask of you, for it was you who took him under your protection when you snatched him from the jaws of that monster of rapacity (Tu enim iam tunc illum in tutelam recepisti, cum praedonis avidissimi faucibus eripuisti); for at the time when all the peaks were tottering to their fall, no one could have stood high above them all and remained untouched except by your intervention.  

For the Flavian dynasty who could not claim divine ancestry, the notion of divine deliverance for the purpose of ruling was an important claim for their legitimacy. Dio trusts that Heracles, Trajan’s divine avatar, will be a protector (φύλαξ) and helper (βοηθός) to the emperor during his reign. The belief in the gods as protectors of the imperial family is enacted in the temples built by Domitian to Jupiter Conservator and Jupiter Custos in thanks for ensuring his escape from Vitellius’ siege of the Capitol in 69 C.E. God’s resurrection of Jesus from the dead coheres with this aspect of imperial ideology.

In Ephesians, there is no sense that Jesus requires continued protection from his deity. However, the historic act of salvation in the resurrection is a decisive element in the legitimacy of his position as Lord, and is a something of a paradigm for the resurrection of believers. In Pliny’s Panegyricus, the salvation of the Roman people is directly dependant on the salvation of the emperor. Pliny writes:

We were accustomed to offering vows to ensure the eternity of the empire and the safety (salus) of the emperors, or, rather, the safety of the emperors and thereby the eternity of the empire.

Pliny praises Trajan because he goes further than his predecessors in tying his own safety to his ability to protect his subjects: ‘But you act with full knowledge, Caesar, in your pact with the gods to preserve you (servo) if you deserve it […]’. In

---

647 Pan. 94.3  
648 I Regn. 83–84  
649 Domitian’s rebuilding is attested in Martial, Epigr. 9.3.7. Martial also writes, in speech directed to Jupiter: ‘I ought to petition you on behalf of Caesar; on my own ‘behalf I ought to petition Caesar (te pro Caesare debeo rogare: pro me debeo Caesarem rogare)’ (Epigr. 7.60.1–2).  
650 Pan. 67.3–4  
651 Pan. 67.7–8; Martial likewise connects Domitian’s safety to the status of the state: ‘O blest protector and savior of the world, whose safety assures us of Jove’s gratitude (o rerum felix tutela
Ephesians, the state of Christians is inextricably linked to God’s saving acting demonstrated in Jesus’ resurrection. The ‘surpassing greatness of [God’s] power’ was exercised in the resurrection (1:19-20) to the extent that AE can say that believers have already been raised and seated together with Christ in the heavenlies (2:5-6).

6.5.2. God seats Jesus at his right hand

1:20b–22a: καὶ καθίσας ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ὑπεράνω πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ εξουσίας καὶ δυνάμεως καὶ κυριότητος

AE uses the image of sitting at the right hand of God from Ps 110:1 to declare that God has appointed Jesus for universal rule. In the Psalm’s original context, the right hand of God likely referred to the Davidic king’s seat at the right of the ark, YHWH’s throne.

It communicated the ideology that the king ruled as YHWH’s vice regent on earth. The image is also used in Graeco-Roman honorific discourse. The inscription by the Assembly of Asia at Priene employs the image to describes the governor’s authority to administer judgment and justice:

Paulus Fabius Maximus the proconsul, as benefactor (εὐεργέτης) of the province || having been sent from that (god’s) right hand and mind (ὑπὸ τῆς ἐκείνου δεξιᾶς καὶ [γ]νώμης ἀπεσταλμένος) together with the other | men through whom he bestowed benefits (εὐεργέτησεν) on the province […]

Menander Rhetor likewise describes governors as ‘sent down’ from the emperor to save his people (κατέπεψαν ἐπὶ σωτηρία τοῦ γέωους). Lucian poetically describes Zeus sending Justice to sit at the side of the ‘dread goddesses’ (καθεζομένη παρὰ τάξασμας θεᾶς) to oversee the courts of mankind.

salusque, sopspite quo gratum credimus esse Iovem.’ (Epigr. 5.1.7-8, trans. D. R. Shakleton Bailey, LCL).

Collins (2010: 142).


Menander Rhetor II.415.14–15; cf. II.178.31–379.1: ‘We owe very great thanks to the emperors for their other labours on our behalf, but we should be right to admit yet greater gratitude to them for sending down to us such a man as this (ὅτι τοιοῦτον ἡμᾶν κατέπεψαν)’.

Lucian, Bis. acc. 4.
Roman panegyric tended to be more reserved in describing the emperor’s relation to the divine although the trope of spatial proximity to heaven is still present. After addressing the deified Nerva, Pliny says of Trajan: ‘You also, father Trajan (for you too, though not raised to the stars, must surely occupy the nearest place) […]’. The Emperor’s status as living man means that he cannot be completely identified with the divine. Despite having near-divine honour and status as Jupiter’s deputy, he is still barred from heaven and is more closely associated with his subjects. But even a deified emperor’s position at the right hand of god simultaneously associates and disassociates the him from the deity. He occupies a space close to the deity but not the same space as the deity. This distinction also appears in Paul’s exalted christology—Paul’s letters make no explicit reference to Jesus sitting on the throne of God but only to his right. This could allude to a secondary throne or a secondary position on God’s throne.

6.5.3. God appoints Jesus above all other names

Seated at God’s right hand, Jesus holds a position of authority above all other rival powers. The list includes those named in 1 Cor 15:24 but differs in its addition of κυριοότης and παντὸς ὀνόματος ὀνομαζομένου. That Jesus has a name more powerful than any other appears to draw on the tradition common to Phil 2:9–11 where God gives Jesus the divine name. Receiving names from the gods is also a motif common in imperial rhetoric. Pliny describes Jupiter bestowing his ‘own name and glory’ (tuo nomine tuo honore cessisti) on Trajan. As well as giving Trajan the patronal title pater patriae, which Trajan shared with his predecessors and
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657 Pan. 89.2.
658 This distinction is also made in Heb 8:1 and 12:2, whilst in Revelation the image is debated, with some passages implying God and Jesus share the throne (Rev 7:17; 22:3), others implying a distinct place on the throne or a subordinate position (Rev 3:21; 5:6, 13; 6:16; 7:9, 10)
659 See Litwa (2014) for a presentation of the Hellenist and Roman sources. Litwa argues that the ‘theonymy’ phenomenon expresses a belief in the divinity of the monarch. However, Litwa also acknowledges that it express a belief in the Emperor’s status as the god’s vice-regent.
660 Pan. 94.4.
which corresponds to the paternal title of Jupiter, Pliny also calls him *optimus*, a new name that outstrips all others.⁶⁶¹

Whilst functioning as the proof of the divine power that is at work amongst the Ephesians, the images of heavenly seats and divine names in Eph 1:20b–22a communicate the belief that God has appointed Jesus as cosmocrator. Roman panegyric makes divine appointment central to its depiction of imperial power. Pliny asserts that Trajan’s very presence makes it ‘evident that our emperor at least was divinely chosen (*constitutum*) for his task; for it was no blind act of fate but Jupiter himself who chose (*electus*) and revealed him in the sight and hearing of us all […]’⁶⁶² But writers also stress that an appointment is based on some merit or purpose. Dio describes the emperor as proving his divine appointment (τάσσω) in his sense of obedience and duty to Zeus.⁶⁶³ The superior (βελτίων) are appointed to care for (προνοέω) and rule over the inferior (ἥσσων),⁶⁶⁴ but the emperor’s success will depend on his endeavours to imitate the justice and equity of Zeus.⁶⁶⁵ Whilst not explicit, Jesus’ appointment is also predicated on his service to his patron (2:14–18) and is thus held up as an ethical exemplar for his subjects as the image of God (4:15, 20–21, 24; 5:1).

6.5.4. God gifts/appoints Jesus as head of all things for the church

1:22b-23a: καὶ αὐτὸν ἔδωκεν κεφαλὴν ὑπὲρ πάντα τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἥτις ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ

AE’s use of ἔδωκεν resonates with the language of gift exchange in imperial rhetoric. Section 6.4.3 has discussed how imperial rhetoric combined divine benefaction motifs with soteriological motifs. Dio describes the emperor as the head of his ‘friends’ who function like body parts to further his purposes.⁶⁶⁶ While Seneca’s treatise for Nero, *De Clementia*, is not a panegyric it does employ some the
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⁶⁶¹ Pan. 88.3, 5–6, 8.
⁶⁶² Pan. 1.5–6.
⁶⁶³ 3 Regn. 55.
⁶⁶⁴ 3 Regn. 62.
⁶⁶⁵ 1 Regn. 45.
⁶⁶⁶ 3 Regn. 106.
genre’s conventions. Written in the early years of his reign, Seneca envisages the relationship between the emperor and the state as one of mutual dependence: ‘the situation is that Caesar needs strength and the state needs a head (*nam et illi uiribus opus est et huic capite)*’. However, whilst the image of Jesus as head Eph 1:22b-23a has parallels with those of the patronal emperor, Jesus’ title as the ‘head of all things’ does not so much denote his interdependence with ‘the body’ but his authority over the cosmos which is ‘for the church’. If AE’s use of δίδωμι carries with it any sense of the Hebrew נָתַן then it could convey an idea of appointment. This aspect of ἔδωκεν emphasises that Jesus is made head over all things for the church, suggestive that he has been appointed its protector.

6.5.5. The church as the fulfillment of Jesus, who is filled completely by God

1:23b: τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν πληρουμένου.

AE finishes his petition by depicting Jesus as the conduit of God’s moral and salvific benefits to his people. The text is notoriously difficult to interpret on both grammatical and theological grounds. Hoehner argues that both πλήρωμα and πληρουμένου are intended in a passive sense and that τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν is adverbial, thus ‘[…] the church is filled by Christ who is being filled (by God) entirely or in every way.’ The advantage of this reading is its agreement with Eph 4:10 where
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667 Historians debate whether it was written before or after the murder of Britannicus in 55 CE. Braund (2009: 16-17) argues reasonably for a date between 15th December 55 and 14th December 56—after the murder of Britannicus.
668 Seneca, *Clem.* 1.4.3; cf. 1.3.5, 1.5.1, trans S. Braund. See 2.2.1 for head-body metaphor; Braund (1998: 17-18). identifies three literary traditions as influences, the kingship treatise, the panegyrical oration and the philosophical treatise.
669 Although the element of interdependence between God, Jesus and the church is more dominant in Eph 3:10.
671 Eph 5:23 indicates that AE regards the head of the church and the σωτήρ of the body to be parallel offices.
672 The key grammatical issues include the identities of the actors of the passage; whether τὸ πλήρωμα has an active of passive sense; whether πληρουμένου is in the middle voice with active sense the middle passive voice; and whether τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν is an adjectival (‘all things’) or adverbial phrase (‘completely’). Most recent commentators agree that πλήρωμα refers to the church rather than to Jesus, on grammatical grounds. However, the other elements are all disputed. See Yates (1972) for summary of issues. ‘In the end it must be admitted that Eph 1.23 cannot be pressed too hard for doctrinal clarity. The church, Christ, and the universe are linked closely together in order to celebrate what God has accomplished through Christ among God’s people’ (MacDonald 2008: 221-22).
Christ descends to fill up the church. It also agrees with 4:13 where Christ’s fullness is ‘the measurement to be attained’ rather than suggesting that Christ is somewhat lacking in something which the church can supply. In relation to the wider Pauline corpus, it is also in concord with the theocentricity of 1 Cor 15:27–28, providing a theocentric inclusion to the larger section (1:3–23) which began with a blessing on the god who has acted through Christ.

In relation to imperial ideology of kingship, this reading of Eph 1:23b also coheres with the political and ethical structure of the cosmos—the relationship between the people to the emperor is mirrored by the relationship between the emperor to the gods. The image of ‘filling’ is used in panegyric to describe the transformative effect of the emperor on his subjects. In Priene, divine providence fills Augustus with virtue and excellence for the benefit of mankind (ὦ εἰς εὐεργεσίαν ἁνθρώπων ἐπλήρωσεν ἄρετής). For Pliny Trajan also ‘fills’ Jupiter’s heavenly responsibilities by adopting his role in judicial matters:

Now he is rid of this part of his duties, free to devote himself to heaven’s concerns, since he has given you to us to fill (fungor) his role 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 (utilitate) for us and the greatest glory (laude) for you.

The divine ‘filling’ of the emperor is portrayed as being for the purpose of helping the state. Smith drawa attention to the Neopythagorean Ecphantaus who describes the king as the logos in disguise who fills up what is missing in the lives of his subjects because of sin. Van Kooten argues that the notion of filling ‘all things’ or the cosmos (πληρόω τὰ πάντα), has its background in Middle Platonic and Stoic philosophy. However, the magnified, deferential rhetoric of epideictic discourse can also explain the cosmological references in ch. 1–2. Pliny describes Trajan as omnipresent in his dispensing of justice: ‘Finally, like a swift-moving star

674 Seneca, Clem. 1.7.1.
676 Pan. 80.4-5
677 Smith (2011: 220), following Blumenfeld.
678 van Kooten (2003: 159). For Van Kooten, AE adopts a Christian appropriation of this concept from Colossians—which depicts the divine nature which dwells in Christ as having assumed the shape of the cosmic body - but adapts it to fit the future eschatology of Paul’s undisputed letters (2003: 163-65).
(velocissimi sideris), to see all, hear all, and be present at once with aid wherever your help is sought.\textsuperscript{679} The rhetoric of imperial panegyric also provides a more clearly delineated relationship between the ruler and his patron-deity. For Jesus can fill the church with God’s power and moral excellence precisely because he himself is filled by God. There is both empowerment and dependence here.

6.6. Theocentricity and christocentricity in light of panegyric

Eph 1:3–23 shows both correlation with and difference from Graceo-Roman panegyric to Trajan. Like Pliny and Dio Chrysostom, AE praises his king as a divine agent. Like the emperor, Jesus’ unique relationship with the divine both legitimises his status as moral exemplar and legitimises his position as head of the church. However, the writer of Ephesians is significantly more theocentric than both Pliny and Dio. Where their praise is primarily for the emperor, AE’s praise is for God who rules through Jesus. Writers of rhetorical handbooks caution against allowing the obligatory thanks to the honorand’s patron to outshine those for the honorand. In Pliny’s \textit{Panegyricus}, comparisons with Jupiter function to heighten the emperor’s qualities. Trajan’s benevolence for his people is described as exceeding even that of the gods:

\begin{quote}
And so this city which has always shown its devotion to religion and earned through piety the gracious favour of the gods has only one thought for the completion of its happiness: \textit{the gods must follow} where Caesar shows the way.\textsuperscript{680}
\end{quote}

A similar trope is employed by Martial when he depicts the gods as in debt to Domitian for the honours he has done them.\textsuperscript{681} In contrast, Jesus acts in complete harmony with God. Whereas Trajan’s position as agent of the gods works to his advantage, Jesus’ clientage is portrayed as coming at extreme personal cost. Access to God has been achieved by Jesus’ self-sacrifice (1:7, 2:13, 16). Whilst Jesus’ close association with God undoubtedly magnifies his cosmological status, ethical authority and ability for salvation, AE largely depicts Jesus as the agent and demonstrator of the power, authority and love of God the father.

\textsuperscript{679} \textit{Pan.} 80.3–4: ‘[…] the true care of a prince, or even that of a god’.
\textsuperscript{680} \textit{Pan.} 74. 5; cf. \textit{Pan.} 72.3–4.
\textsuperscript{681} \textit{Epigr.} 9.3.7.
The cause of praise in AE’s prayer is adoration of the son as God’s vice-regent, seated beside God, functioning as saviour and benefactor to his people on God’s behalf. However, the eulogy is directed towards the god of Jesus. Attempts to read ch. 1–2 as ‘a christological identification of God the father’ go beyond the evidence. Whilst the emphasis of the patron-client relationship in Eph 1–2 is on the privilege and honour of the relationship, a residual element of subordination still structures the interaction of the two figures. As a worshipper of God, albeit a unique one, Jesus is consistently associated with the church—he is predestined (Eph 1:4–5), raised and seated with them (2:6), is filled by God’s power and glory along with the church (1:23, 3:19, 21), animated by God’s activity (1:19–20) and is loved by God (1:6; 2:4). Most importantly he takes YHWH as his patron deity (1:3, 17) and acts as his priest (5:1). Fee’s claim that the emphasis of 1:3 is on God as most truly revealed in the Son rather than on God as the god that Christ worships (‘such an idea is totally foreign to Paul’) is not justified. Eph 1–2 is both theocentric and christocentric in that it praises God for his salvific action in Jesus his agent.

6.7. Conclusion

Ephesians 1:20–3, in the wider context of chapters 1–2, appropriates several literary tropes from imperial ideology preserved in panegyrics to the emperor and honorific inscriptions from Asia Minor. God is a patron deity not only to believers but particularly to his chosen king and to his people. His historic ‘protection’ of Jesus is a sign of Jesus’ divine appointment for universal rule and the historic act of salvation for his people. Through Jesus the king, God the Father bestows infinite benefits upon them and is to be honoured with praise. This king saves his people as he himself has been preserved by the Father, and fills his people with power and moral excellence as he himself is filled. More clearly than in Phil 2:6–11 and 1 Cor 15:20–8, Jesus assumes a position of an emperor-figure while God corresponds to the role of his patron deity. But despite this development in their analogies, the essential interrelationship of God and Jesus remains the same as both the god-emperor and

---

emperor-general relationship were conceptualised according to the same patron-client framework. Where the emphasis in Phil 2:6–11 and 1 Cor 15:20–28 is on the obedience and subordination of the Son necessary for his glorification, in Eph 1–2 it is on the Son’s derived honour as unique agent of the divine patron. Nonetheless, Jesus’ unprecedented authority is itself an act of service and is based on his God’s empowerment of him.
CHAPTER 7: Jesus as patronal broker of the cult and object of honour alongside God in 1 Corinthians 8:6

7.1. Outline

6a ἀλλ' ἡμῖν

6b εἰς θεὸς ὁ πατὴρ, ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα

6c καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτόν,

6d καὶ εἰς κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα

6e καὶ ἡμεῖς δι' αὐτοῦ.

But for us there is one God, the Father, from whom come all things and we live for him, and one Lord Jesus, the Christ, through whom come all things and we live through him.

First Corinthians 8:6, with its adaption of the Jewish Shema, has become something of a battleground in debates over Paul’s christology. Some interpreters understand the passage to be Paul’s clearest expression of his christological monotheism and even as paradigmatic for his wider christology. Others have emphasised the degree of subordination, distinction and unilateral dependence between Jesus and God expressed in the text.

The argument of this chapter unfolds in four stages, approaching Jesus’ role as mediator from three angles. The first part shows that Paul, throughout the letter, depicts Jesus as the Corinthians’ true benefactor who connects them to God the Father. The second part turns to the cultural context of 1 Cor 8-10 to argue that the way wealthy benefactors were honoured as brokers of divine benefits by cultic associations provides a means of understanding how Paul and his audiences could conceive of Jesus honoured next to God as God’s broker par excellence. The third
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684 Wright calls 8:6 ‘one of the greatest pioneering moments in the entire history of christology’ (1991: 136). Richardson (1994: 296, 304) and Bauckham (2008: 211, 218) understand its grammar, particularly its prepositions, to reflect the process of Paul’s theological thinking. Fee (2007: 93-4) suggests that 8:6 should serve as basic text from which all Pauline christological discussion should flow. Fletcher-Louis (2015: 39) makes his interpretation of 8:6 load-bearing for many elements of his ‘Jesus monotheism’ model for NT christology.

part analyses the function of the prepositions in 8:6 in depicting Jesus as a patronal broker to whom the Corinthians owe gratitude and loyalty. The final part uses Second Temple Jewish sources to discuss how Jesus’ role as broker leads to him being included in expressions of Christian identity that even use the language of the Shema.

This three-pronged approach, employing evidence from Christian, pagan and Jewish sources, aims to do justice to the multi-faceted cultural experience of Paul’s congregations. Rather than taking the short, dense passage as the interpretive key to Paul’s wider christology, our approach reads the role of Jesus in 1 Cor 8:6 as consistent with his role as patronal mediator in First Corinthians and as resonant with the relational structures of cultic activities that form the backdrop to 1 Cor 8-10. The chapter concludes that, as broker, Jesus shares aspects of God’s unique identity, standing at the centre of Christian devotion, but does so with a particular function that is integral to his own identity.

7.2. Jesus as broker in 1 Corinthians

Chapter 5 argued that 1 Cor 15:20-28 depicts Jesus as God’s eschatological agent and broker whose subordination to God the Father is both necessary for his exaltation, and determinative for the position he holds as recipient of worship alongside God. Like believers, Jesus is dependent upon God but he is also as a benefactor to believers based upon his status as God’s agent. The duel aspects of Jesus’ role as broker are also attested in other parts of the letter, suggesting that the brokerage relational structure underlies Paul’s christological thinking.

7.2.1. A grace-wish to those who ‘call upon the name of our Lord Jesus Christ’ (1 Cor 1:1-3 and 16:21)

Whilst Paul’s grace-wishes are sometimes used as evidence of an equating of Jesus with God, with the broker framework it is possible for Jesus to be identified with God whilst also performing a distinct role: ‘Grace to you and peace from God our
father and the Lord Jesus Christ’ (1 Cor 1:3). Paul associates Jesus with God as a provider of blessing but their different roles are unpacked in the subsequent verses. The Corinthians have received God’s gift on the basis of their relation to Jesus (1:4). Jesus is God’s agent through whom God enriches, strengthens, keeps faith and calls believers (1:5-9), and who is soon to be revealed.

Jesus is not just God’s agent but God’s broker. Believers are known as ‘those who call upon the name of our Lord Jesus Christ.’ Calling upon the name of a divine power (ἐπικαλομένος) is characteristic of ancient cultic activity, a practice that entreated for the presence of the deity. Whilst the practice might imply the treatment of Jesus as a divine being, Paul uses the phrase primarily to denote Christian identity, characterised by their client-like relation to Jesus their patron. As we shall see, Graeco-Roman associations honoured both their human and divine benefactors. Some even took their names from their human benefactors rather than from their patron deity. This is not to deny Jesus’ divine position but to suggest that he has a particular role in Paul’s cosmology which is lost if Jesus is described as divine without qualification. Christian self-identification as those who call on the name of the Lord (Acts 2:21; Rom 10:13), is made on the basis that God was believed to have appointed Jesus as his agent of eschatological and soteriological benefits. That Paul calls on Jesus at the end of his letter (16:2: Μαράθα θά) is certainly a testimony to Jesus’ exalted-divine status but it is a status that appears conjoined to his bearing of the divine name. It expresses Paul’s confidence in Jesus as the most effective purveyor of God’s grace.

7.2.2. Belonging to Paul, Apollos, Peter and Christ (1 Cor 1:12-13)

Jesus’ role as a benefactor to believers is also evident in Paul’s confrontation with the divisions in the church:

For it was made clear to me by Chloe’s people that there are divisions among you, my brothers (1:11). By this I mean that each of you says, “I belong to
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688 An association from Kyme take their name from their founder Menekleides whilst also invoking Dionysos (NewDocs 1.2).
689 Dunn (2010: 27).
Paul,” or “I belong to Apollos,” or “I belong to Cephas,” or “I belong to Christ” (1:12).

The Corinthians’ appeals to church leaders in 1 Cor 1:11-12 are sometimes regarded as expressing patronal dynamics. However, instead of there being an actual 'Christ group’ at Corinth, it is more likely this is part of Paul’s reductio ad absurdum, ridiculing the idea that in the community of Christ there could be claims of exclusive loyalty to particular leaders: ‘Was Paul crucified for you? Or were you baptised in the name of Paul?’ (1:13). That Paul can draw this ironic comparison between allegiances to church leaders and allegiance to Christ depends on the two relations having some correlation. The irony works because the Corinthians owe infinitely greater obligations to Christ. In fact, it is only in their relation to Christ that the Christian teachers have any role.

The unspecific nature of the genitive constructions supports this reading. Recent commentators have opted for genitives of relation over genitives of possession, preferring the language of husband-wife/child relations that express ‘connections with or dependence on’ these figures. However, from Graeco-Roman leadership patterns in civic or philosophical social contexts we know that patronal relationships displayed some basic characteristics which match the Corinthians’ situation in 1:12-13. Prominent figures competed for honour and reputation over and above their rivals. Their followers promoted their teachers’ interests in search of conferred status. The longevity of obligations of patronal relationships might mean that a follower could say that they ‘belong to’, or ‘are aligned with’ their leader. The sense of belonging also corresponds nicely with 3:23. If the genitives refer to persons rather than parties then they express relation or possession.

690 With Schrage (1991: 148). Against the view that the slogan represents an actual group within the congregation stands the facts that there is no mention of this group in Paul’s later references to divisions (3:4-5; 4:6) and that the dependence of all groups on Christ becomes the solution to the factionalism in 3:22-3.

691 Mitchell (1993: 84-85) argues that the genitives of 1:12 provide no more than a sense of dependence upon the named figures.


694 Brookins & Longenecker (2016: 17).
Some have argued that there really was a Christ group in Corinth. However, it appears that Paul’s tone is ironic because there is no mention of a Christ group in Paul’s talk of divisions elsewhere in the letter (3:22; 4:6). If the ‘slogans’ or appeals to certain leaders were familiar to the congregation then they would recognise Paul’s irony. When faced with the Corinthians’ divisive allegiances to church leaders, Paul responds forcefully by reminding them of their greater obligations to their true benefactors (1:31).

7.2.3. Believers belong to Christ, and Christ belongs to God (1 Cor 3:23)

Where 1 Cor 1:12-13 showed Jesus to be the benefactor of the Corinthians, 3:23 expands the picture to reveal Jesus as the broker between believers and God. Where, in the prior passage, Paul used christology to ironically illuminate the Corinthians’ folly, here he uses christology more positively to resolve the divisions among them:

So then, no one should boast in men. For all things belong to you, whether Paul or Apollos or Cephas or the world or life or death or the present or the future, all things belong to you, whilst you belong to Christ, and Christ belongs to God.

Paul positions the Corinthians as clients under Jesus, encouraging them to see themselves as a single group under their benefactor. However, in the very same breath Paul also places Jesus under God.

Recent commentators have preferred to describe the genitive constructions as genitives of possession. Conzelmann, reading 3:23 alongside Gal 3:29 and Rom 14:7 interprets that to ‘belong’ to Christ means to be his slave. To follow this logic throughout the passage might suggest that Paul also depicts Jesus as God’s slave. Brookins and Longenecker suggest that, unlike with Χριστοῦ, Paul would not have thought of God possessing Jesus, and so they translate θεοῦ as a genitive of relation, despite its structural analogy with genitives of possession on other occasions.
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695 Richardson (1994: 113-116); Moffat (1938 :10-12).
697 Stewart (2010: 165).
(2:11). However, the fact that a broker could be both patron and client suggests that Χριστοῦ and θεοῦ should be interpreted with the same sense. First Corinthians 3:21-23 states that the Corinthians are the recipients of divine benefits. The Corinthians’ ingratitude is clear in 4:7: ‘What do you have that you did not receive? And if you received it, why do you boast as if it were not a gift?’. According to the principle of reciprocity, these gifts imply that the Corinthians are obliged to, and dependent upon, Christ.

Whilst Paul places the Corinthians as dependent upon Jesus, he also clearly associates Jesus with believers through their shared, if ordered, dependence on God (cf. 15:27-28). Paul’s motive for including the final clause is unclear, although the dual nature of the broker figure might shed some light. One might suggest that it is an unintentional slip into a pre-existing Christian phrase. Richardson believes it attests to the Corinthians’ treatment of Christ as a cult leader to the marginalisation of God. There are issues with both these readings. The former is unlikely if 1 Cor 3:23 is an instance of gradatio, ‘an ascending order of thought through successive phrases, in which the last word of the preceding phrase is repeated as the first word of the next phrase’, with the effect of creating a climactic ending. Here, the gradatio works deliberately towards its climax, so that dependence on Christ amounts to a dependence on God because Christ too depends on God.

The latter is not possible if the two analogous phrases of 1 Cor 3:23 carry an element of comparison, even without a conjunction such as καθώς (cf. 1 Cor 11:1), so that Jesus’ position under God has a didactic function (cf. Phil 2:5-8). A similar strategy is found in Pliny the Younger’s letters. Pliny writes to his ‘friend’ Baebius Hispanius on behalf of his friend Suetonius:

I am writing this to show you how much he will be in my debt and I in yours if he is able to buy this small estate with all its advantages at a reasonable price which will leave him no room for regrets.
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701 As raised and rejected by Fee (2007: 145 in relation to 1 Cor 11:3).
704 Richardson’s interpretation also relies on the existence of an actual Christ group at Corinth.
Hoffer writes that Pliny uses ‘linked analogy’ (‘as A is to B, so B is to C’) to express a hierarchical set of relationships in which Pliny and his friends exchange favours and obligations with powerful friends and patrons, and with junior protégés and clients.⁷⁰⁶ In light of ‘linked analogy’, 1 Cor 3:23 is best read as a reminder of the Corinthians’ united allegiance to Christ, which is modelled on Christ’s allegiance to God.

Some commentators continue to distinguish a functional subordination christology in 3:23 from an ontological equality in 8:6.⁷⁰⁷ However, both texts appear consistent in their suggestion of reciprocity and status distinction between Jesus and God. Jesus’ role remains one of a broker who is simultaneously patron to the Corinthians and client of God. Jesus’ position as both patron and client (e.g. a broker) equally applies to 11:3 where Paul turns his attention to an issue of men and women’s headwear in the community’s worship gatherings: ‘I want you to know that the head of every man is Christ, the head of the woman is the man, the head of Christ is God.’ As Thiselton, following Gundry-Volf, notes, Paul argues from the ordered but reciprocal relationship between God and Jesus to set a standard for interpersonal relations within the community.⁷⁰⁸ However, the analogy is made possible because of Jesus’ position as broker where he is ‘head’ to every man and simultaneously has God as his head.

7.2.4. The memory of a priestly benefactor (1 Cor 11:24)

In 1 Cor 11 Paul reminds the Corinthians of a Jesus tradition in which Jesus is the benefactor and broker of the Eucharist meal (11:23-26):

> And having given thanks, he broke the bread (καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν) and said, “This is my body that is for you. Do this in memory of me” (11:24).

Whilst ch. 8-10 saw Paul confronting the patronage ties to pagan patrons, here Paul faces problems caused by patronal ties to Christian meal hosts. In the Graeco-Roman world, formal meals functioned as facilitators for, and commodities of, patron-client
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⁷⁰⁶ Hoffer (1999: 11).
⁷⁰⁷ Barrett (1968: 97-98); Fee (2007: 142-143); Ciampa & Rosner (2010: 166).
relations. The benefactions of hospitality, food and entertainment were expected to provoke praise and gossip.\textsuperscript{709}

Meals were a form of ‘social advertising’\textsuperscript{710} and invitations to them an ‘exclusive currency’.\textsuperscript{711} Patron-client dynamics also played an important role during the meal itself. Social status would determine who received the best food and the best seats at the table. Such practices can illuminate the problems at the Corinthians’ banquets where some are going hungry whilst others are getting drunk (11:21).

Regarding Paul’s rhetorical strategy in ch. 11, Walters builds on the work of Barton and Økland to argue that Paul uses the Jesus tradition to install Jesus as the patronal host of the meal.\textsuperscript{712} Walton argues that, in line with Roman colony laws that aimed to limit corruption and rivalry, Paul confronts divisions surrounding the Corinthians’ meals by renaming the occasion ‘the Lord’s meal’ (11:20), by connecting it to apostolic tradition (11:23-6), by explicitly contrasting it to meals at home (1:22, 34), by quoting Jesus’ words at the beginning and end of the meal (11:24-5), by emphasising the dangerous quality of the meal (11:27-32) and by structuring the meal as a ritual of incorporation. Paul effectively claims the generosity of the Corinthian hosts as the generosity of Christ. Thus, any honour that a Corinthian patron would expect as reciprocation for his generosity is transferred into praise for Christ as the Corinthians ‘proclaim the Lord’s death’ every time they celebrate the feast (11:26).\textsuperscript{713}

However, it is important to observe that in the Jesus tradition Jesus is not just the patronal sponsor of the sacred meal, but also the \textit{ideal client} of God. Paul mentions that Jesus first ‘gives thanks’ (εὐχαριστέω) to God (11:24). This seemingly incidental clause is significant in that it positions Jesus as the Christians’ priestly benefactor who is also the exemplary client of God, the patron. Thus, the generosity of his sacrificial death fits within a wider framework of his obedience to his patron,

\begin{footnotes}
\item[710] Fotopoulos (2003: 165).
\item[711] Foss (1994: 52).
\item[712] Walters (2010).
\item[713] Walters (2010: 362).
\end{footnotes}
God the Father. The Christian-Jesus-God relation in 11:23-26 is entirely consistent with that of 8:6 and of 3:23. The Corinthians relate to Christ as Christ relates to God and in doing so they relate to God. The human-divine relational network in 11:23-26 is in effect appositional to 8:6, unpacking the dense, poetic language of 8:6 in the narrative of the Last Supper.

Paul’s depiction of Jesus throughout First Corinthians establishes Jesus as a two-way agent, representing God to believers and believers before God. However, when analysing 1 Cor 8:6, it is also important to consider the situational context of Corinthian Christians involved in pagan temple activities. This context provides a second experience of interpersonal relations that influence how the christology of 8:6 would be understood.

7.3. Brokers in the socio-religious background to 1 Corinthians 8-10

Whereas much scholarly attention has been paid to the sources and forms behind 1 Cor 8:6, not enough attention has been given to the rhetorical function of the passage in the context of 1 Cor 8-10. Wright and Horrell investigate the ethical function of the christology of 1 Cor 8:6, but more can be said regarding the sociological function of the passage in the context of pagan religious activities in Corinth. As Meeks argues, religious doctrines only have meaning in the matrix of social patterns in which they are uttered. In 1 Cor 8-10, Paul is concerned by Corinthians who appear to have been eating meals in local or civic temples (8:9, 13; 10:7, 14, 21), likely driven by the need to maintain connections with wealthy, political patrons. This section explores the matrix of interpersonal relations between patrons, brokers and collective clients of pagan cults in order to offer a new perspective on Jesus as a second patron and broker figure in 1 Cor 8:6.

Other analogies might be found in pagan cults that made royal or eminent figures the objects of their devotion. Cults like that of the Demetriasts in Ephesus appear to have integrated members of the imperial family into their traditional rites and even into
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714 Wright (1991); Horrell (1997).
their group identity. Inscriptions from such cults, however, do not show secondary figures of devotion operating as mediators in the way that Jesus appears to mediate for God in 1 Cor 8:6. Honours to local benefactors provide insight into the mechanisms of resource-exchange that could lead to individuals being elevated in status and influence for their roles as brokers.

7.3.1. Gods as divine patrons of associations with human benefactors as their brokers

In an essay on ancient cities as centres of patronage relations, Oakes argues that temples operated as ‘honorific monuments’ for the human patrons who built them and for the divine patrons who are worshipped at them. Oakes argues that the Corinthians addressed in 1 Cor 8-10 have placed themselves, if only at a symbolic level, under such ‘double patronage’ of divine and human benefactors. However, these two vertical bonds can also be integrated. All deities and worshippers required human brokers. In the civic cults, the roles of brokers were played by the socio-economic elite of the city who could afford to buy priesthods, build temples and sponsor grand celebrations. In voluntary associations, these roles would be played by more proximate benefactors who could afford to rent dining rooms and sponsor feasts. In return for their services, client communities honoured their brokers along with their divine patrons.

7.3.1.1. Human benefactors as brokers of the gods: through temple building

One of the most dramatic ways for an elite benefactor to act as a god’s agent was to build a temple or sanctuary for the god. To do so was to position oneself as a servant of the patron deity. The act also presented the benefactor in continuum with the generosity and creative power of the deity itself, acting for or on behalf of the deity.
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717 See AGRW 130; Harland (2003: 116-119), citing IEph 4337 (19-23 CE); 213 (88-89 CE).
718 Oakes (2010).
719 Oakes (2010: 189). Stewart’s argument that divine patronage rather than human patronage lies at the heart of Paul’s concern is unnecessary (2010: 165). If we can assume that patron deities generally required brokers then human benefactors must be part of Paul’s concern in ch. 8-10.
Sanctuaries from across the Mediterranean are inscribed with the names of their founders, letting the populace know who channelled divine favours to their city. Whilst the emperor had monopoly over building projects in Rome, elite citizens were permitted to be benefactors in other cities.\textsuperscript{721} For example, at the harbour at Ephesus a temple inscription declares:

\textit{This was dedicated to Demeter Karpophoros and the most sweet homeland by Publius Rutilius Bassos, her priest, when his father, Rutilius Bassos, was secretary. He built the temple of Demeter and the area in front of the temple from his own resources.}\textsuperscript{722}

Sometimes individuals presented themselves as agents by divine commissioning.\textsuperscript{723} A first-century inscription from Thessalonica describes a letter apparently sent from the god Serapis to a local benefactor to provide a house for him.\textsuperscript{724} A temple dedication to Dionysos from the second century BCE in Piraeus shows a wealthy benefactor acting as an agent for his community, dedicating a sanctuary with hope of safety for his family and cult group.\textsuperscript{725}

Paul’s readers at Corinth would be well familiar with these types of figures. There are at least four elite benefactors memorialised on the temples sometimes associated with 1 Cor 8-10.\textsuperscript{726} During the reign of Tiberius, freedman Cn. Babbius Philinus was \textit{pontifex} and \textit{duumvir} of the colony.\textsuperscript{727} He sponsored the building of a small circular temple in the \textit{agora}, as well as an aedicula and a fountain of Poseidon/Neptune, one of the patron deities of Corinth, in the west end of the forum.\textsuperscript{728} Marcus Antonius Milesius, a Corinthian whose \textit{nomen} suggests he received his citizenship from Mark Antony, repaired the sanctuary of the Asklepeion—a popular location in reconstructions of the Corinthians’ dining practices—some time (ca 25 BCE) after the battle of Actium.\textsuperscript{729} In the second century CE one Gaius Vibius Euelpistos, most likely a native Greek of Corinth, was

\textsuperscript{721} Nicols (2004); Veyne (1992: 253).
\textsuperscript{722} AGRW 130 (120 CE), trans. Harland.
\textsuperscript{723} IG XI 4.1299, ll. 10-20.
\textsuperscript{724} NewDocs 1.6.
\textsuperscript{725} IG 2.2948.
\textsuperscript{726} See Fotopoulos (2003) for an overview.
\textsuperscript{727} West (1931: §132).
\textsuperscript{728} West (1931: §2).
\textsuperscript{729} Kent (1966: §311).
honoured as priest and physician at the temple.\textsuperscript{730} The temple of Isis and Serapis, another potential dining location, was sponsored by one Gaius Julius Syrius in the middle of the first century.\textsuperscript{731} Temples in the Graeco-Roman city functioned as honorific monuments for patron deities and their human brokers, representing their power and influence.

7.3.1.2. Human benefactors as brokers of the gods: through cultic service

In addition to founding temples, wealthy benefactors also brokered the favours of the gods by sponsoring the activities of the cultus, paying for banquets in temple dining rooms\textsuperscript{732} or hosting meals in their own homes.\textsuperscript{733} Whilst particular cultic services might be performed by specific functionaries internal to the association, benefactors themselves could play functional roles as priests.\textsuperscript{734}

A relief from Beroia, dated to 7 BCE illustrates the position of the association leader as a broker between the gods and the community. The relief depicts the society’s benefactor holding a libation cup, standing across the altar from the society’s patron deity Dionysos, who also holds the libation cup and a sceptre.\textsuperscript{735} The benefactor may have donated the ceremonial cup himself or even sponsored the altar, a service for which the society awards him a crown and the relief. Harland argues that benefactors of some associations in Asia Minor were responsible for offering sacrifices to the imperial family.\textsuperscript{736} Benefactors brokered the favours of the gods by providing the materials and the ‘manpower’ for worship. In providing benefits to a deity’s clients, the human benefactor shared the primary characteristic of the gods, namely power.

\textsuperscript{730} Bookidis (2005: 159); Kent (1966: 33, §57.
\textsuperscript{731} Newton (1998: 100).
\textsuperscript{732} \textit{AGRW} 224.
\textsuperscript{733} Willis (1985: 42), citing P. Colon 2555; Hatzfeld (1927: 74, §14); Smith (2003: 81-84); \textit{AGRW} 221.
\textsuperscript{734} Harland (2007); \textit{IGR} 1.1151, cf. \textit{AGRW} 18, 226
\textsuperscript{735} \textit{AGRW} 35, trans. Ascough.
\textsuperscript{736} Harland (2013: 127).
7.3.2. Benefactor ‘shares’ in the honours to the deity

As well as generating honour for the god, temples also generated honour for the human patrons who paid for their construction. In return for their acts of piety, human benefactors were honoured by their client groups. Often these honours were not attributed to the benefactor alone but were expressed within the framework of the association’s religious devotion to the deity. In this way we could say that benefactors ‘shared’ in the honours to the deity. Sometimes this ‘sharing’ manifested itself in an explicit manner, as this inscription by a second-century BCE synod of Egyptians at Delos illustrates:

[...] This was dedicated to Sarapis, Isis, Anubis, (?) . . . and Apollo . . .
(missing lines naming two different benefactors) . . . [...] Because he behaves in a good manner and is just, he has a share in suitable honors (διὸ καλὸς ἔχων ἔστιν κ[αί]) δίκαιον μεταλαβεῖν αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ | μέρει τὸν ἄρμοζουσόν τιμῶν) [...] 737

This ‘sharing’ also manifested itself in an implicit manner by including benefactors in a range of visual and verbal honorific gestures directed towards the deity.

First, the sharing of honours is illustrated in a common form of inscription which praises a benefactor for his favours. For example, a second-century BCE inscription by an association at Lindos (Rhodes) pays dues to the reputation of their priest in a gesture which is simultaneously an act of dedication to ‘the gods’:

[...] The Alkimedonteian Hermes-devotees honored their own benefactor (τὸν αὐτὸν εἰρηγεῖταν). This is dedicated to the gods. 738

Versnel suggests that an inscription attesting to the generosity of a divine or human benefactor was a form of advertisement for their superior honour and excellence. It both completed and renewed a cycle of transactions between patron and client which began with supplication and ended with thanksgiving. 739

However, inscriptions like the one above honour both divine and human patrons simultaneously and complementarily.

737 *IDelos* 1521 (200-166 BCE), trans. Harland. A second-century BCE benefactor in Mysasa is honoured with ‘a share (µερίδα) from all the sacrifices contributed by the tribe’ (*NewDocs* 9.1, ll. 10-20).

738 *AGRW* 249 (ca. 115 BCE), trans. Harland.

739 Versnel (1981: 60).
Second, since Hellenistic times royal benefactors were awarded with statues or images placed in the sanctuaries of the deities worshipped by the association without being intended as cultic images themselves.\textsuperscript{740} In the imperial period the practice was more commonly applied to members of the imperial family. However, it could also be extended to private individuals, ‘priests, priestesses and benefactors in general’.\textsuperscript{741} In 194 CE a phratry of Artemisians at Neapolis honoured the elite freedman Munatius Hilarianus with ‘exceptional honours’ for his opulent refurbishment work. Amongst the honours which are ‘statues’ (ἀνδριάντων) and images (εἰκόνας) placed in the ‘building of the brotherhood’,\textsuperscript{742} The association offers statues of the benefactor and his son to be placed in the temple, and also prayers to be said on his behalf.

Fishwick observes that it was usual for images to be placed in the entrance porch of the temple. The higher the honour, the closer one’s statue could come to the sacred space of the cella or the cult simulacrum. He writes:

Such a practice did not deify an individual but to have one’s image in the cella clearly implied exalted status by association with the divine, the more so if the representation was of precious metal like the cult statue.\textsuperscript{743}

Theoretically, individuals who are honoured have all expressed common virtues of ‘piety’ (εὐσέβεια) or goodwill (εὔνοια) toward the association and its celebrated deity. The honorific gesture is expressed in relation to the deity, and is presented as an act of devotion to the deity. For a cult of Serapis it was the god himself who honours the group’s benefactor for his piety by setting an image of him in his sanctuary.\textsuperscript{744}

Finally, we also see this ‘sharing’ in the titles that client groups gave to their benefactors. An association in Delos honours their patron deity Roma as:

Roma, benefactor (Ῥώμην θεάν εἰρήγετιν) […] when Mnaseas son of Dionysios, benefactor (εἰρήγετου), was head of the society for the

\textsuperscript{740} Fishwick (1989: 180). For example, see \textit{AGRW} 224, ll. 20-34.
\textsuperscript{741} Fishwick (1989: 180).
\textsuperscript{742} \textit{Ineapolis} 44, ll. 20-30, trans. Harland.
\textsuperscript{743} Fishwick (1989: 181).
\textsuperscript{744} \textit{AGRW} 221, ll. 1-10 (ca. 200 BCE), Delos.
By using the same honorific title for both Roma and Mnaseas the association identifies the two as benefactors, with both performing the honourable role of protecting or providing for the group. Parental titles could also connect human benefactors to divine benefactors. In Apuleius’ *Golden Ass*, Lucius refers to the priest of Isis, who restored him to human form, using the title ‘father’ in the same manner as he addresses the god Isis as his mother. Both figures act as benefactors to Lucius and are thus eulogised in common terms.

To summarise, this section has outlined how Graeco-Roman religious groups often involved brokers and mediators who used their wealth and influence to promote the reputation of their patron deity. These wealthy benefactors provided space for worshippers to encounter the deity’s favours and thus could be described as agents of the deity itself. Their pious generosity was reciprocated with honours that associated them with the deity. Honorific language and gestures sometimes occasionally bordered on the cultic, significantly increasing a benefactor’s status and influence.

7.4. Jesus as broker in 1 Corinthians 8:6

7.4.1. God and Jesus as patron and broker whose gifts require gratitude in the form of exclusive devotion

1 Cor 8:6 associates Jesus with God in a striking manner. However, in the context of patron-broker-client relations in pagan cults, the distinctions between God and Jesus perform a significant function in Paul’s rhetorical strategy. The relational terms and phrases λέγομεν θεοὶ and ἡμῖν in 8:5-6 construct a clear sense of Christian identity in contrast with that of the dominant culture. But Paul does not contrast the existence of ‘many gods and many lords’ with the existence of God and Jesus, but contrasts the allegiances to these figures (cf. 8:11-12; 10:20-22). The portrayal of
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745 *AGRW* 226 (130–69 BCE), trans. Harland.
746 Apuleius, *Meta.* 11. 1-11, 24-27 [Hanson, LCL].
747 The adversative ἀλλὰ set in contrast with the concessive εἰς ὑπὸ (Waaler 2008: 396).
748 Interpreters such as Bousset (1970: 147, 205-6), Fee (1987: 373) and Thiselton (2000: 633) have seen a deliberate distinction between the many gods and many lords. Others, such as Ciampa & Rosner (2010: 381) and Fitzmyer (2008: 342), argue that any distinction is unintentional.
God and Jesus as patron and broker figures emphasises the loyalty and obligations owed by the Corinthians to their heavenly benefactors, to the exclusion of pagan patrons and brokers.

The provision of ‘all things’ by God and Jesus is key to their characterisation as benefactors. Some interpreters have read τὰ πάντα in 8:6b and 6d as the cosmos on the basis that the prepositions evoke Stoic philosophical formulae regarding ‘the all’. However, Horsley has shown that the prepositions were used to express different types of causation in Platonic traditions that also influenced Hellenistic Jewish thought. Horsley (1978). Bauckham and Waaler argue that Paul’s use of τὰ πάντα is consistent with the Jewish usage of referring to creation. Bauckham (2008: 214-216); Waaler (2008: 406). Waaler also concludes that ‘it must be admitted that Gentiles without knowledge of Jewish religion might have interpreted this phrase differently’ (2008: 410).

However, most interpreters tend to ignore the possibility that τὰ πάντα could be intentionally non-specific. The fact that 8:6, as a double nominal sentence, does not require a verb places emphasis on ‘all things’ and on the prepositions which connect them to the subjects. Richardson (1994: 297-298); Dunn (1980: 180-182).

In the context of allegiances to deities, τὰ πάντα is better understood as the effusive language characteristic of patron-client discourse. A first-second century CE papyrus letter greets a patron as ὁ πάτ[ρ]ι[ο]ν μου καὶ τροφεύς, using cognates of πας seven times in its expression of gratitude. A household association in Philadelphia describes the gods as those who ‘always give (?) … them all good things (δώσουσιν αὐτοῖς ἀεὶ πάντα τἀγαθὰ), whatever things gods give ([διδόσουσιν]) to people whom they love’. Josephus in his version of the opening chapters of Deuteronomy has Moses say: 755

749 Horsley (1978).
750 Bauckham (2008: 214-216); Waaler (2008: 406). Waaler also concludes that ‘it must be admitted that Gentiles without knowledge of Jewish religion might have interpreted this phrase differently’ (2008: 410).
752 See Murphy-O’Connor (2009) for his revised position.
753 Although in English translation, verbs of motion (‘come’) are preferable to static verbs (‘exist’) to highlight the bestowal of gifts (cf. Murphy-O’Connor (2009: 19-22).
754 NewDocs 1.16.
755 AGRW §121, late second-early first century BCE, trans Harland.
O children of Israel! there is but one source of happiness (ἀγαθῶν κτήσεως) for all mankind, the favour of God (ὁ θεὸς εὖμενής); for he alone is able to give good things to those who deserve them (μόνος γὰρ οὖν οἱ δοῦναι τεταῦτα τοῖς ἄξιοις).\footnote{Josephus, \textit{A.J.} 4.180.}

Josephus’ combining of God’s generosity with his uniqueness provides an intriguing parallel to 1 Cor 8:6. Ultimately the distinction between τὰ πάντα as salvific or cosmological is a false trail. The use of effusive language in patron-client relationships suggests that τὰ πάντα in 1 Cor 8:6 would likely by understood as non-specific benefits, encompassing both salvific and cosmological gifts. Creation was often described as a benefaction in Hellenistic Judaism (cf. 1 Cor 10:26),\footnote{Murphy-O’Connor (2009: 21); cf. LXX Isa 44:24.} and Paul’s point here is that God, as opposed to the many idols, is the one from whom all gifts come.\footnote{There is also sense of irony in 8:5-6 that ‘all things’ come from just one God, rather than from the many.}

7.4.2. The role of the prepositions in presenting Jesus as agent of divine favours

8:6b ἐξ θεοῦ ὁ πατὴρ ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα [...] 
8:6d καὶ ἐξ κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, δι’ οὗ τὰ πάντα

Whilst God and Jesus are united as providers of benefits, the prepositions ἐκ, εἰς, and ὑπὲρ to distinguish God as the source and Jesus as the instrument or agent of ‘all things’.\footnote{Bousset (1970: 205); Barrett (1968: 193).} God is the source of all benefits and Jesus is the agent through whom they have arrived. The presentation of Jesus as an agent performs two functions.

Firstly, it elevates Jesus’ status through derived honour whilst also demonstrating the status of God who has appointed him. In a world in which persons were appointed to posts by high personages, the receipt of an office publicised the esteem of the great man who had given it.\footnote{Lendon (1997: 185).} At the end of the second century CE, two Greek benefactors in Halicarnassus paid for the building of a toll office, its stoa and refurnished a statue to Aphrodite.\footnote{OGIS 525 = Harland (2014: 258-259).} They describe themselves as ‘agents’
of an overseer of the harbours of Asia and procurator of Augustus, one M. Aurelius Mindius Matidianus Pollio. The intention may be simply to provide legitimacy to the building project, but it also derives honour from the authority of the powerful Roman.\textsuperscript{762} The transfer of honour also works the other way round. If the toll office benefits local civic interests then the inclusion of Pollio as the overseer of building activity in the inscription also promotes Roman benefaction. It may even attribute Pollio with ultimate responsibility for the building work. Whilst the exact motives behind the inscription are somewhat ambiguous, the inclusion of ‘agents’ elevates the mediator and depicts the acts of benefaction within a larger network of powerful actors.

Secondly, the depiction of Jesus as God’s agent maintains the status of God as source. In 18-19 CE Germanicus, with one eye on Rome, sent an edict to the Alexandrians rejecting their offer of divine honours. He was rectifying a political faux-pas he made by opening the grain houses in Alexandria without imperial warrant:

‘For they [divine honours] are suitable to him alone who is really the saviour and benefactor of the whole human race, namely my father and his mother, who is my grandmother. \textit{The deeds reputed as mine are but an additional working of their divinity} (τὰ ἡμέτερα ἐν <λόγῳ> πάρε<γρ> ἀ ἐστιν τῆς ἐκείνων θειότητος) […]’\textsuperscript{763}

By playing the role of agent/mediator, Germanicus does not deny his actions but rather attributes them to his own father, Tiberius. He lessens the threat of being perceived as a competitor by casting himself as loyal son.

The specification that ‘all things’ come ‘through’ Jesus both elevates Jesus’ status to that of a cosmic benefactor alongside God also distinguishes Jesus in a way that affirms God’s status as the source of all benefactions. Jesus’ role as God’s agent is integral to Paul’s conception of Jesus’ position beside God at the centre of Christian devotion.

\textsuperscript{762} Harland refers to the benefactors as ‘servile’.
\textsuperscript{763} Oliver (1989: 65-69, §16-17), this author’s emphasis.
7.4.3. The role of the prepositions in presenting Jesus as broker of reciprocal devotion

8:6c καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτόν [...]  
8:6e καὶ ἡμεῖς δι’ αὐτοῦ.

Where 8:6b characterised God as the provider of ‘all things’, 8:6c expresses the Christian response. Interpreters tend to translate ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτόν either as a soteriological, eschatological expression of purpose (‘we move towards him’) or as an expression of Christian dedication (‘we live for him’).\textsuperscript{764} The former is particularly influenced by cosmological formulations.\textsuperscript{765} The latter better fits the context of gestures of allegiance to pagan deities. In this context, ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτόν reflects the reciprocal devotion that client associations were expected to show to their divine patrons. Paul wants the Corinthians to honour God by desisting from participating in meals at pagan temples. If the implied verb is something like ‘live’ then it connotes a life lived appropriately in accordance with their identity as worshippers of the deity who provides ‘all things’.

The expectation that habitual gratitude should follow divine benefit is well expressed in Horace’s address to his Roman countrymen: ‘It is because you hold yourselves inferior to the gods that you rule. For every beginning seek their approval; to them attribute its outcome’.\textsuperscript{766} A second-century guild of fishermen in Miletos honour their patron ‘because of everything’ (διὰ πάντων).\textsuperscript{767} The same expectation is found in the biblical tradition where reciprocal fidelity/honour is associated with God’s title ‘Father’. The Song of Moses rebukes the Israelites for their idolatry: ‘Do you thus repay the Lord, O foolish and senseless people? Is not he your father, who created you, who made you and established you?’\textsuperscript{768} 1 Cor 8:6c corresponds to this pattern of benefit and reciprocal devotion, stating that God’s clients should be responding to

\textsuperscript{764} For the former see Wright (2013b: 665); Fitzmyer (2008: 342); Murphy-O’Connor (2009: 2); Thielson, (2000: 636-638). Ciampa & Rosner (2010: 382) is open to both options.

\textsuperscript{765} Barrett (1968: 192) interprets 8:6a as ‘we exist to serve him and our destiny is found in him.’

\textsuperscript{766} Horace, Od. 3.6.5-6.

\textsuperscript{767} AGR\textsuperscript{W} 182b, trans. Harland.

his benefaction by living for him in a manner that testifies to his influence and power, and not to others.

Where 8:6d depicted Jesus as God’s agent, 8:6e shows Jesus’ agency to be bi-lateral. It declares that the Corinthians live (for God) ‘through’ or ‘because of’ Jesus. The image of believers having access to God, or giving glory to God through (διὰ) Jesus is attested in other Pauline letters. The opening of Philippians even finishes its prayer with similar wording; Paul prays that the Philippians will produce ‘the harvest of righteousness [that comes] through (διὰ) Jesus Christ for (εἰς) the glory and praise of God’ (1:11).

The notion of the broker as a person worthy of esteem would be familiar to Paul and his congregations from the public displays of local benefactors. In the reign of Domitian, one L. Pomepeius Apollonius wrote to the governor of Asia on behalf of an association of Demeter worshippers at Ephesus. He sought (successfully) renewed recognition of, and possibly support for, their activities surrounding local and imperial gods. He mentions that ‘the ones obligated to oversee the mysteries necessarily petition you through my agency (διὰ ἐμοῦ)’. It is unclear whether Apollonius is a member of the Demetriasts or is a more distinct patron. Nonetheless, the inscribed letter draws attention to Apollonius and the necessity of the Demetriasts to use him, broadcasting his influence as a broker to Roman power.

Associations themselves were keen to honour the individuals who led or enabled their acts of religious devotion. A Thracian cult to the ‘god who hears’ dedicated an altar from its own resources διὰ ιερέως | Ἑρμογένους καὶ προστάτου Αὐγουστιανοῦ. A cult from Saittai did the same ‘through the agency of its temple warden’ (διὰ τῆς ναυκόρου). A cult of Zeus Hypsistos in Pydna suggest that supervision of their inscription was ‘through the agency (διὰ ἐπιμελή)’ of their head
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769 Fitzmyer (2008: 343).
770 2 Cor 3:4; Eph 2:18.
771 Rom 1:8; 7:25; 5:11; 16:27; 2 Cor 1:20; Col 3:17.
773 See Jones (2009) for an argument identifying this Apollonius with Apollonius of Tyana.
774 ITraceD, letter O (ca. 200 CE), trans. Harland.
775 TAM V 179 (172/173 CE), trans. Harland.
of synagogue and their scribe. Against the background of cultic honorific discourse, the expression καὶ ἡμεῖς δι’ αὐτοῦ depicts Jesus as the agent through whom Paul and the Corinthians ‘live for God’.

The honorific gestures of Graeco-Roman associations provide valuable insight into the ways by which a secondary figure could be honoured in a cult’s honours for the deity without leading to practices that could be called a separate cultus. The phenomenon does not fit the systematic manner in which Jesus is included in devotional life of the community nor the height of status attributed to Jesus. However, we have argued that the roles of local benefactors in mediating relationships with cult deities highlight the significance of Paul’s depiction of Jesus as a mediator in 1 Cor 8:6. Despite operating on a higher sphere, Paul’s Jesus retains characteristics of brokerage in First Corinthians that suggest distinctions in identity that in turn encourage Jesus to be held alongside God the Father. Whilst Christians live for God, their identity is also defined as οἱ ἐπικαλομένοι τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

7.5. Paul’s use of the Shema in 1 Corinthians 8:6 and its implications

Finally, we turn to the significance of Jesus as broker in 1 Cor 8:6 from the perspective of Second Temple Jewish monotheism. Following studies by Dunn and Wright, scholars have increasingly considered 1 Cor 8:6 to represent a careful adaptation of the Jewish Shema (Deut 6:4/ LXX Deut 6:3). Wright, Bauckham, Waaler, Fee and, most recently, Fletcher-Louis argue that Paul ‘splits’ the very wording of the Jewish confession ‘The Lord your God’, and glosses ‘God’ with ‘the Father’, and ‘Lord’ with ‘Jesus Christ’. They argue that Paul does not add Jesus to the Shema as an external, messianic agent but effectively ‘places’ Jesus within the identity of YHWH. 1 Cor 8:6 incorporates Jesus into the Shema, and thus into the identity of God in a manner that can be termed ‘Christological monotheism’. Dunn and McGrath hold a different view, that Jesus is not fully incorporated into
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776 AGRW 45 (250 CE) = Melanges Daux §51-55.
God but maintains a distinct identity, outside that of God, as an intermediary figure. Rather than intending to attribute to God and Jesus a shared identity as the Lord God (YHWH-elohim), Paul’s thought is closer to that of Psalm 110:1: ‘The Lord said to my Lord, sit at my right hand’.780

This section argues that to equate Paul’s linguistic move with his conception of God is overly simplistic. The metaphors of ‘splitting’ and ‘supplementing’ the Jewish Shema do not translate easily onto the relational reality to which the Shema points. We will show that the choice presented between a split or supplemented Shema reduces the range of linguistic and semantic options available in interpretation of 1 Cor 8:6. Instead we will suggest that patronal relationships, based on the role of brokers in Graeco-Roman religion, provide a conceptual framework which facilitates both Paul’s portrayal of Jesus as sharing in God’s honour and Paul’s characterisation of Jesus as a distinct person.

7.5.1. A split Shema?

The strength of the split Shema theory is that Paul appears to use almost all the words of the Greek form of the Shema.781 Bauckham argues that Paul ‘takes over’ and ‘rearranges’ LXX Deut 6:4, adapting ἡμῶν to the ἡμῖν and ἡμεῖς in 1 Cor 8:6. However, whilst Paul arguably ‘uses up’ all of the content of the Shema, he does not rearrange all of the words: Ἀκοινοῦ, Ἰσραήλ· κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν κύριος εἷς ἐστιν. Paul adds an extra εἷς and elides the Shema’s second invocation of κύριος. One possibility is that God retains his name κύριος but it is signified, rather than glossed, by using πατήρ as a proxy. This would suggest that the second κύριος is extended to Jesus on the basis of a name-bestowal narrative (cf. Phil 2:9-11). Whilst there is no more evidence for this reading than for that of the above scholars, it is an alternative that cautions against drawing the maximal theological implications from the text’s wording.

Wright’s reading of 8:4-6 shows the connection between Paul’s theology and his ethics. Placing Jesus within the identity of the one God provides the Corinthians who are eating in pagan temples with the model of how the one God is to be worshipped. Paul rejects intellectual assent (‘knowledge’) that there is only one god (8:1, 4). Instead one needs to learn that God has revealed himself in the crucified Christ:

1 Corinthians 8:6 [...] states in microcosmic form Paul’s belief that Jesus belongs to the heart of the Shema [...] in order to stress that the community founded by the work of this ‘One God, one lord’ must learn what it means to live under the rule of the crucified one, and not to engage in a trial of strength with him by flirting with the daimonia who are only too ready to catch them out.\(^{782}\)

One of the criticisms of rival interpretations is that they do not explain how the supplementing of the Shema with Jesus as Lord advances the rhetorical purpose of ch. 8-10 better than Wright’s redefined Shema.\(^{783}\)

Fletcher-Louis takes the ‘split’ Shema metaphor to its extreme in his application of numerical analysis of the confession. Taking the Hebraic practice of ‘gematria’ in other parts of the NT as his justification, Fletcher-Louis argues that the two parts of 1 Cor 8:6 (excluding ἀλλὰ’) are made up of thirteen words each.\(^{784}\) Thirteen is the numerical value of the Hebrew word ‘one’ (יָהָ’), and together these parts equal twenty-six which is the value of the name YHWH in Hebrew.

[...] in this ingenious use of both the numbers twenty-six and thirteen, the confession says, emphatically, that Iē̂sous Christos is placed inside a split Shema. Not outside of it.\(^{785}\)

For Fletcher-Louis, this numerological interpretation affirms Paul’s understanding of an ‘undifferentiated’ divine identity of YHWH, made up of constituent parts, or persons—the Father and the Son: ‘In the case of this divine identity “one plus one” really does, however mysteriously, “make One.”’\(^{786}\)

\(^{782}\) Wright (2013b: 733-34); cf. Wright (1991: 133).
\(^{783}\) Fletcher-Louis (2015: 36).
\(^{784}\) Cf. Matt 1.1-17; Rev 13:18.
\(^{785}\) Fletcher-Louis (2015: 47, italics original).
\(^{786}\) Fletcher-Louis (2015: 47).
Fletcher-Louis’ numerological analysis is attractive but relies on some circumstantial elements which prevent it from bearing too much of the weight of his reading of Paul’s christology. Fletcher-Louis’ excludes ἀλλ’ (8:6a) but not ἡµῖν from the pre-Pauline confession, on the basis that ἡµῖν evokes ‘Hear ‘O Israel’. However, there are doubts as to whether ἡµῖν would be included in the hypothetical original confession. The concessive conjunction followed by the adversative conjunction is familiar to Paul’s own style (1 Cor 9:2). Secondly, the presence of gematria is reliant on the whole of 1 Cor 8:6 being a pre-Pauline formula, something which cannot be firmly presupposed. Denaux is on much more stable ground when he writes: ‘Whatever one may think about the origin and tradition history of the acclamation, it is clear that Paul’s intention by integrating it here in 1 Cor 8 is the first meaning accessible to the interpreter.’ In which case it is hard to imagine Paul being concerned by hidden meanings in his written response to an urgent situation.

The numerological interpretation also leans on some circular reasoning: the ‘formula’ is pre-Pauline, therefore it may be open to numerical analysis, an investigation which shows that the text is indeed a pre-Pauline formulae. This process allows Fletcher-Louis to posit the confession’s Sitz in Leben in a ‘bilingual, Greek—and Hebrew–speaking environment’, such as Antioch or Damascus. At the heart of the issue is Fletcher-Louis’ assumption that the focus of 1 Cor 8:6 is God’s divine identity whereas we have found that its focus is allegiance to the one God, a concept which is closely tied to expectations of gratitude in response to the god’s salvific favours. Ultimately it is not clear how Fletcher-Louis’ numerical analysis has a determinative effect on the text’s description of divinity. If Jesus’ very lordship is a declaration of what God has done to and through his agent, then this in no way excludes the fact that Jesus could maintain his own distinct identity. The gematria still functions and God is still celebrated for what God has done through Jesus.

790 Waaler (2008: 399-400, following Lindemann. Waaler (2008: 397-398) argues that the ἡµῖν of 8:6 is a dative commodi.
794 Ibid. 44.
The argument that Paul’s close association of Jesus with God constitutes a substantial redefinition of God’s identity also runs through Hill’s work. Hill argues that Paul’s defining of Jesus by his relation to God is, in fact, bi-directional. There are many aspects of Hill’s exegetical conclusions from his treatment of 1 Cor 8:6 which complement our own, especially his identification of asymmetric interdependence as the key characteristic of the relationship between God and Jesus. However, Hill’s process involves some moves that are worth critical attention.

Rather than risk ‘collapsing’ the identity of Jesus into that of God (contra Bauckham), Hill reads the parallelism of God 8:6 with the aid of the Trinitarian concept of ‘redoublement’. The concept locates the need to speak of God ‘twice over’ to describe three persons as ‘irreducibly distinct’ yet one in ‘essence, will and power.’ In this way Jesus can be understood as included in the Shema in an intermediary role that does not compete with God’s role as source and goal, nor lessen his divinity. In these roles neither the Father nor the Son holds primacy but are God together. The ‘redoublement’ language which Hill adopts corresponds to some degree with the shape of our own broker model in which the broker assumes the characteristics of a patron on behalf of his own patron. However, the broker model assumes this doubling of roles within a larger hierarchical social matrix.

Hill argues that there is a redoubling of divine identity in the statement that Jesus is the κύριος of the Shema. Hill explains that such a conclusion is indicated by the fact that a) Paul shares with Jesus the causal prepositions depicting God’s activity in 11:36a, b) Jesus is conjoined with the one God in opposition to the ‘many gods and many lords’, and c) that the ‘one God and one Lord’ of 8:6 expands upon the ‘one God’ saying in 8:4. However, the context of Paul’s use of the prepositions in the doxology of Rom 11:36 is very different to 1 Cor 8:6 where, we have argued, Paul is focussed on the relational dynamics of favour and reciprocity. With regard to the evident connection between 1 Cor 8:6 and 8:4, the extent to which it ‘unpacks’ it is uncertain. In 8:4 Paul is likely quoting the Corinthians in a statement describing the way things are, whereas in 8:5 εἰπερ progresses the flow of thought to Christian

797 See also Murphy-O’Connor (2009: 64-5).
practice and identity. Lastly, the prevalence of brokers in pagan and in Jewish traditions suggests that Jesus was more likely understood as fulfilling a distinct role which, whilst closely associated with God, was not to be quite fully identified him.

7.5.2. A supplemented Shema?

Dunn understands 8:6 to depict Jesus’ lordship as the fullest ‘expression’ of God’s creative power but not to fully equate Jesus with God. In numerous publications Dunn argues that Paul splits the Shema and ‘appends’ it to the Christian confession that Jesus is Lord. His latest publication on christology (2010) is less assertive but maintains that Paul’s belief in God as ‘the God of our Lord Jesus Christ’ (Rom 15:6; 2 Cor 1:3; 11:31; Col 1:3; Eph 1:3, 17; cf. 1 Cor 3:23; 11.3) is equally present in the confession of 8:6:

Even as Lord, Jesus acknowledges his Father as God. Here it becomes plain that kyrios is not so much a way of identifying Jesus with God, but if anything, more of a way of distinguishing Jesus from God. For Dunn it is the Jewish tradition of speaking of God’s wisdom which allows Paul to attribute to Jesus the high status of being God’s instrument and embodiment of God’s activity in the world. A strength of Dunn’s interpretation is that it only requires Paul’s audience to be familiar with the proclamation that God has made Jesus κύριος (Acts 2:36; Phil 2:9-11), rather than being expected to follow an unprecedented splitting of the name of God (YHWH-elohim) to communicate a somewhat abstract concept of shared identity.

Other support for the ‘supplemented’ Shema is found in analogies from Second Temple Jewish literature. Jewish writers were known for using the oneness of God
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802 Richardson (1994: 296); McGrath (2009: 40-42), citing 2 Sam 7.22-24; 1 Tim 2.5; Josephus A.J. 4.200-201, 5.112; Philo, Spec. 1.67, Sib. Or. 3.629, 773-75. Waaler’s claim that such texts in Josephus and Philo are not true parallels to 1 Cor 8:6 because the church takes the position of the one nation and one temple in Paul’s argument cannot be sustained (2008: 434, 445-46). Josephus mentions one God, one temple and one people which can be viewed as analogous to Paul’s framework where Christ embodies the place where God’s presence and favours are brokered and God’s name honoured.
to justify other exclusive features of Israelite culture. In Josephus’ version of the
opening chapters of Deuterononomy oneness language is prominent as Josephus
distinguishes Israelite worship from that of the Canaanite peoples. There is only one
city with one altar to YHWH: ‘for God is but one, and the nation of the Hebrews is
but one’.

On the basis of these analogies, McGrath doubts that the Shema is split
in an unprecedented fashion. Instead he reads 1 Cor 8:6 showing Jesus venerated
alongside YHWH as the exalted messianic agent. Conceptually, Jesus is similar to
other intermediary figures who are honoured for bearing the divine name whilst
themselves worshipping God. For McGrath, however closely Paul might identify
Jesus with God, the two agents remain ultimately distinguishable because Jesus, like
other divine agents, is subject to God.

In light of Dunn’s arguments it is surprising that more attention has not been given to
Psalm 110:1 (LXX 109:1) as a basis for Paul’s thought in 1 Cor 8:6. Whilst the
Psalm in the LXX repeats the title κύριος, Jews and Jewish Christians would most
likely have appreciated the difference between ὁ κύριος as the LXX’s proxy for the
Hebrew divine name, and τῷ κυρίῳ as a referent to the messianic king. However, if Christian exegetes read their scriptures creatively, as Bauckham, Hays and others affirm, then they may well have read LXX Ps 109:1 as affirming the belief that God
had given his messiah his own name. In LXX Ps 109:1 we find not only the
conceptual preposition μου which could be adapted to ἡμῖν and ἡμεῖς in 1 Cor 8:6.

1 Cor 8:6’s use of τὰ πάντα also evokes Ps 8:6, a text Paul connects with Ps 110:1
through gezerah shawah. There are more connections to Ps 110:1 than have
recently been considered.
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804 McGrath (2009: 40).
806 McGrath (2009: 50).
808 LXX Ps 8:7: Cf. 1 Cor 15:25, 27 and Eph 1:20-22.
The key problem with the ‘supplemented Shema’ reading is that it would appear to contradict the logic of Paul’s polemic against paganism, as there are in fact many gods and lords. Bauckham argues, ‘If he [Paul] were understood as adding the one Lord to the one God of whom the Shema speaks, then from the perspective of Jewish monotheism, he would certainly be producing, not Christological monotheism, but outright ditheism.’ 810 This is where Jesus’ role as broker might be able to explain both the unity and distinction present in Paul’s association of Jesus with the Shema.

7.5.3. A ‘brokered’ Shema

Firstly, it is important to say that the framing of the question as a choice between the ‘splitting’ and ‘supplementing’ metaphors minimises the polyvalence of the text. According to Fletcher-Louis, either there is one God and his messiah who is also a lord, or else Jesus is included in the identity of God and is therefore also YHWH. 811 We have found both options to have their problems. 812 The supplemented Shema undervalues the significance of Jesus sharing God’s name, prerogatives and receipt of devotion. The split Shema undervalues the significance of Jesus’ subordination and service to God in the letter, as well as neglecting Ps 110:1 as a basis for how a human figure could be exalted by YHWH to act as his vice-regent. The two options that Fletcher-Louis presents to the reader forces him or her to place Jesus on either side of a dividing line of divinity—a classification that does not sit comfortably with the multiplex role of the broker who is both a patron and client simultaneously.

Secondly, the analogies for Shema language in Josephus suggest that attaching another figure to the Shema might not necessarily contradict Paul’s polemic against many gods.

In *Contra Apionen*, the oneness of God affirms other forms of oneness: ‘There ought also to be but one temple for one God; for likeness is the constant foundation of
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812 We find Schrage’s comment appropriate: ‘The Christological continuation is really not to be intended simply as an addition, but rather as a precise perspective and orientation of the theological statement. But (it should not be understood) in the sense of equality or identity either.’ Schrage (2002: 168-169, this author’s translation).
agreement. This temple ought to be common to all men, because he is the common God of all men.”

Josephus confirms that oneness in Jewish worship, such as the temple or the worshipping community, affirms the oneness of God. Jesus’ position as broker would mean that his singularity as agent of salvation would be seen to complement God’s singularity as source of ‘all things’.

In fact, the relational framework of the passage naturally lends itself to being read in patron-client terms. The christology and theology presented in 8:6 are clearly expressed in relational and experiential rather than in ontological terms. The community’s relation to the one God results from ‘being known by him’ (8:3). Paul’s use of ἡμῖν, ἡμεῖς, ἡμεῖς in 8:6 contrast with the allegiances to the ‘so-called gods and lords’. From the perspective of believers, Jesus is a patron who is held alongside God because his patronage derives from his status as God’s broker.

Reading 8:6 through the lens of the brokerage model, we might also suggest that Jesus bears the name of YHWH in recognition of his intermediary role as God’s representative to his creation. Bearing the name of YHWH also authorises Jesus’ position as divine representative. Paul refers to Jesus as Lord Jesus Christ four times in the letter (1:2, 10; 5.4; 6.11, 15:57), consistently communicating ideas of representation, presence and authority, sometimes directing calls to him and sometimes worshipping or receiving eschatological benefits through him. An under examined text, LXX Zech 14:9, provides the closest parallel to 1 Cor 8:6 with its double use of ‘one’ language:

καὶ ἦσται κύριος εἰς βασιλέα ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν
ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἦσται κύριος εἰς καὶ τὸ ὅνομα αὐτοῦ ἐν.

The co-text of Zech 13 and 14 provides several intertextual connections to 1 Cor 8-10, including the exorcism of an unclean spirit from Israel, exclusive mutual allegiance between YHWH and his people, testing of the people, divine supremacy over all things, and sanctification of the nation to YHWH. On the basis that some Jewish scriptures attest to the belief that the name of God could be abstracted from

814 See Neyrey (2004: 163-171) for his map of the heavenly hierarchy in First Corinthians.
815 Conzelmann (1975: 145); Richardson (1994: 298-9).
816 See also Block (2011b: 96).
God himself and be borne by some angelic or priestly intermediary, 817 Jesus could be perceived to bear the one name of the one God. Such a move would represent neither a splitting nor a supplementing of the Shema.

Litwa has argued that ‘theonomy’ (the phenomenon of attributing the proper name of a deity to a human being) was a way of expressing deification in the ancient Mediterranean of the Roman era. In the same way that Julius Caesar, Augustus and their successors adopted the name of Zeus in the eastern provinces of the empire, so Jesus takes the name YHWH in Phil 2:9-11. He writes: ‘If Augustus-Zeus and YHWH-Jesus were not equivalent to the high God, they were, as God’s vice regents, made sharers of his divine status.’ 818 However, Litwa also notes that in imperial ideology the emperor is always subordinate to his patron deity, responsible for acting as the god’s divine representative on earth. Emperors who demanded divine status for themselves inevitably lost it. 819 This ideology corresponds to what we found in Eph 1-2 where Jesus is depicted as mediating divine favour to the community through his restoration of peace and his providing of salvation.

Litwa’s compelling argument raises the question as to whether bearing the divine name makes Jesus the representative or the embodiment of YHWH. Our brokerage model holds that the relational contexts in which references to κύριος Ἰησοῦς are embedded are key to analyses. In 1 Cor 8:6 κύριος Ἰησοῦς exists in relation to two other actors: to God the Father, and to believers. Whilst Jesus is associated with God in relation to ‘us’ he is also distinguished in his relation to God by the preposition διὰ. The preposition relates Jesus to believers as the means by which they live in relation to God. An imperial equivalent could be the statue of Claudius in Rome where Claudius is depicted as Jupiter, half naked to indicate divinity and holding a sceptre, but in his other hand holding a libation dish rather than Jupiter’s lightning bolt. 820 Arguably, the focus in this picture is the emperor as pontifex maximus of the
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817 In Exodus, God sends an angel to go before Israel and ‘in him’ is God’s name (LXX Exod 23:21: τὸ γὰρ ὄνομά μοι ἐστιν ἐκ τοῦ αὐτῶ). Fee (2007: 128) argues that in Deuteronomy, the expression of ‘calling on the name of the Lord’ functions to distinguish Jerusalem as the place where God’s name dwells (12:11; 14:23; 16:2, 6, 11; 26:2; cf. 1 Kgs 8:43; 2 Chron 6:33; Ps 74:7; Jer 7:12). In Deutero-Isaiah, God’s people are those called ‘by my name’ (Isa 43:7; cf. Jer 7:20; 7:11, 14, 30; 15:16; 25:29). Cf. Block, 2011a.


820 Museo Vaticano Inv. No. 243, Rome.
empire, standing at the intersection between gods and men. In 1 Cor 8:6, Jesus is confessed as both divine agent and facilitator of the divine-human relationship.

In other places (1 Cor 9:1, 2, 5, 14 and 10:21, 22, 26), Jesus appears to take the position of patron to believers—the embodiment of God’s own role. Here, Jesus as ‘the Lord’ and ‘our Lord’ without explicit reference to God implies that Jesus holds a position of ownership over believers, commanding them, revealing himself to Paul and becoming jealous by their idolatry. In this patronal role, Jesus embodies the proper role of God in relation to believers. The difference between embodiment and representation is one of relation—in relation to believers Jesus appears as the embodiment of YWHW with his authority over believers. In relation to God he appears as representative. This flexibility and ambiguity in Jesus’ role as patron and patronal broker will be further developed in chapter 8.

7.6. Conclusion

First Corinthians 8:6 confesses Jesus as God’s agent who is both united with God at the centre of Christian devotion and distinct from God as a mediator between God and believers. This relational pattern is consistent with the wider letter in which Paul appeals to Jesus’ position as the Corinthians’ broker-benefactor in attempts to remodel the community as collective clients under Jesus’ authority. They are indebted to Jesus’ favour because Jesus connects them to God. This collective identity relativises social stratification within the community as they are all equally gifted by Jesus’ favour and are equally obliged to honour him in the way that they treat each other.

Despite the fact that 1 Cor 8:6 has been treated as a paradigm for Paul’s christological monotheism, evidence from the Corinthian cultural setting suggests alternative interpretive options. The role of brokers in pagan associations, which we have presented as showing significant parallels to the role of Christ for the Corinthians, invites us to understand Paul as portraying Jesus as uniquely associated
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with God whilst possessing an identity distinct from that of God. Crucial to Paul’s christology is that believers live for God through Jesus. As broker par excellence, Jesus brings the Corinthians to God and is accordingly honoured for his service.

Having considered some of the traditions within Second Temple Judaism in which the name of the Lord could be used in an intermediary role, the views that 1 Cor 8:6 represents either a ‘split’ or a ‘supplemented’ Shema appear reductive. They risk woodenly transferring Paul’s redactional decisions onto the metaphysics of Paul’s theology. The factors above instead suggest that a Corinthian audience were more likely to have heard Paul mediating the relationship confessed in the Shema through the brokerage of Jesus in 1 Cor 8:6—neither ‘splitting’ nor ‘supplementing’ the Shema. Claims that Paul ‘includes’ Jesus within the divine identity rather than adding him to it as a foreign entity still seem primarily concerned with ontological concerns that the Corinthians were unlikely to have entertained. The ‘glossing’ of Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς both adds a second figure to the devotion expressed in the Shema and maintains its monotheism by depicting Jesus as a mediator whose exalted status magnifies God’s own status.
CHAPTER 8: The implications of a ‘broker christology’ for understanding the way that Jesus exercises divine functions

8.1. Outline

Chapter 7 argued that Jesus’ role as God’s broker in 1 Cor 8:6 allows Paul to associate Jesus with God using the language of the Shema whilst maintaining God’s own unique identity. This chapter explores the implications of a broker christology for Jesus’ participation in the actions and attributes that Israel traditionally ascribed to God alone. It argues that even when Paul in 1 Cor 8-10 depicts Jesus with the characteristics of God, a dynamic, reciprocal relationship between Jesus and God is maintained that allows Jesus to be associated with God in particular way.

8.2. As God’s broker, Jesus stands on both sides of the boundary between creator and created, participating in divine prerogatives and bringing creation to God

Paul’s characterisation of Jesus in First Corinthians as a two-way agent challenges straightforward assertions that Jesus stands conceptually on side of God. It also sits uncomfortably with models of divine identity that are based on a strict distinctions between the creator and the created, between divine sovereign and subject creatures.\(^{822}\) The problems with such distinctions are exhibited in Bauckham’s reading of 1 Cor 8:6 which positions Jesus within the unique identity of God as creator.

Bauckham argues that, for first-century Jewish reader, τὰ πάντα would be understood by as ‘the whole reality created by God, all things other than God their creator.’\(^{823}\) Thus:

The purpose of what is said about Jesus Christ in 1 Cor 8:6 is not primarily to designate him the ‘mediator’ (a not strictly appropriate term in this context, but frequently used) of God’s creative work or of God’s salvific work, but rather to include Jesus in the unique identity of the one God.\(^{824}\)

\(^{822}\) Bauckham (2008: 182).
\(^{823}\) Ibid. 216.
\(^{824}\) Ibid. 216-17. As Dunn (2010: 108-109, 146), Hill (2015a: 106-107, 118) and most recently Fletcher-Louis (2015: 88-121, 93, 99-100) have observed, Bauckham’s reading of 8:6 tends towards
Bauckham rightly asserts that, in the context of pagan polytheism, Paul inclusion of Jesus in an expanded allusion to the Shema and in God’s creative activities does include Jesus in his concept of God.

However, that Paul’s intention in 8:6d is to include Jesus within the identity of God (e.g. identify Jesus as God) via his participation in creation is less apparent than is supposed. The qualifier λεγόµενοι (8:5) and the adversative conjunction ἀλλ᾽ ἡµῖν, in the context of a pastoral letter, implies that Paul’s primary focus is Christian identity, rather than divine identity. In the previous chapter (§7.4) we argued that the use of πᾶς was a familiar way of speaking about benefaction in the honorific language in the Graeco-Roman world. Rather than intending to include Jesus in his creational monotheism, it is more likely that the cosmological connotations of τὰ πάντα are a corollary of Jesus’ role as agent of divine favours. As an agent of divine benefits, Jesus performs a role parallel but superior to elite brokers of pagan cults, creating a relational pattern that is resonant with patterns of brokerage in pagan cults. These parallels aid Paul’s rhetorical purpose to discourage gestures of allegiance to pagan deities. Contrary to Bauckham, Jesus’ role as mediator or broker is precisely what places him alongside God at the heart of Christian devotion.

In addition, the shape of the divine identity model does not correspond to that portrayed in 1 Cor 8:6. Richardson argues that the prepositions in 1 Cor 8:6 grammaticalise an inclusio pattern in Paul’s thinking. This chiastic pattern begins with God as source before moving to Christ as mediator who forwards God’s goals

merging the distinctions between God and Jesus, whilst also being unclear as to why being a mediator is an inappropriate term. Bauckham also argues that the way that Paul associates Jesus with God in opposition to pagan idols (1 Cor 8:5-6) demonstrates that Jesus also shares in Paul’s cultic monotheism.

825 That said, Paul’s theology is clearly inseparable from his concept of Christian identity.

826 In the Priene inscription, the proconsul describes Augustus’ birthday as ‘the beginning of all things (τῆι τῶν πάντων ἀρχῆι)’, using creation imagery to magnify the significance and the achievements of Augustus (Sherk (1969: §65, l. 6, trans. Sherk 1984: §101). Murphy O’Connor and Hurtado have also argued that Christ’s pre-temporal existence is dependent upon his eschatological role. Murphy-O’Connor’s argument depends upon an apparent emphasis in the biblical tradition that God’s role as creator is secondary to his role as deliverer (2009: 74-5). Hurtado (1993; 2003: 124; 2010: 5) argues that, instead of coming from Hellenistic ideas or Jewish wisdom traditions (e.g. Hengel 1976: 66-76), Paul’s language of pre-existence appears to have its roots in the apocalyptic traditions which depict God as the Lord of history, in which the last things determine the first (cf. Col 1:16-17; John 1:1-3; Heb 1:2). Hurtado suggests that the preexistence attributed to Jesus expresses two convictions—that Jesus’ origins and meaning lie in God, and that his appearance is event of transcendent importance (1993). See Richardson (1994: 297-298) and Fee (2007: 595-630) for problems with wisdom christology.
and glory (represented as Θ-X-X-Θ). However, to take Richardson’s insight into how God and Jesus are grammatically interdependent and develop it into something of a theological, interdependency of identity, as Bauckham does, goes beyond the evidence. Bauckham writes:

He [Richardson] does not, however, quite see its full significance, which is that Paul is not just including language about Christ between his language about God, but including Christ in the identity of God. The literary inclusio reflects Paul’s theological inclusion of Jesus Christ in the unique identity of the one God of Jewish monotheism.

However, if Paul’s depiction of Jesus as mediator is simply a way for Paul to share God’s identity with Jesus, then Bauckham’s relational structure would look as follows:

God and Jesus > believers
believers > Jesus and God

In this reading, favours derive from God and Jesus to believers with minimal distinction, and reciprocal honours are returned from believers to both. Instead, we need to explain why Paul, in a parallel statement, clearly distinguishes Jesus from God the Father as the one ‘Lord’ who mediates God’s relation to believers. The cycle of reciprocal resource exchanged in 1 Cor 8:6 is better represented as follows:

8:6b, d: God > Jesus > Believers
8:6c, e: Believers > Jesus > God

The text presents a complete cycle of reciprocity with the aid of a broker figure. For the cycle to function, Jesus cannot only represent God in mediating favours to believers, but represent Christians before God. His identity is both defined by his relation to the creator and to the created.

---

827 Richardson (1994: 301, 304).
829 See also Fletcher-Louis’s critique (2015:99).
830 Dunn (2010: 27-28): ‘Christ, in other words, seems to have been thought of as on both sides of the worship relationship—as in at least some degree the object of worship, but also the enabler or medium of effective worship’.
8.3. As God’s representative, Jesus shares God’s exclusive claim to devotion

In Tilling’s reading of 1 Cor 8-10, Jesus receives the kind of devotion that Israel rendered to God alone, thus sharing the divine identity. This happens in two key stages. First, Paul corrects the Corinthians’ propositional knowledge of monotheism with a ‘relational “necessary” knowing of love for God’ that is grounded in exclusive loyalty to God over against idols. Second, Paul expresses love for God as a loyalty to Christ, employing the terms and categories of Israel’s relationship with YHWH in the Jewish scriptures.\textsuperscript{831} For example, 10:6-10 connects the Corinthians’ relationship with Christ to Israel’s dysfunctional relationship with YHWH as described in the Pentateuch—desiring evil, becoming idolaters, indulging in sexual immorality, testing and complaining—whilst 10:14-21 compares Lord’s supper to Jewish cultic meals at the Temple. The Corinthians can expect the same devastating consequences for their disloyalty as Israel endured for theirs (10:9-10, 22; 11:20).\textsuperscript{832}

Our broker model of christology affirms Tilling’s main analysis—that Paul describes the Christ-relation and the God-relation as the same in type. Both relations are patronal in that they describe relationships characterised by their exchange of different types of resources (favours for gratitude), between individuals of unequal status, over a length of time. However, whilst the two relations are similar in type, in that both relations are patronal, there remains significant distinctions. This leads us to differ from Tilling’s conclusion that the Christ-relation amounts to a divine relation in the full, identity-sharing way that Tilling intends.

Whilst Tilling finds considerable similarities between the relational qualities which Paul attributes to Christ and those commonly attributed to God,\textsuperscript{833} he does not take into account the fact that as God’s representative agent Jesus has to overlap with God in terms of his characteristics and his ultimate goals. Under the rubric of ‘the agent who is treated as the principal himself’, even divine titles and

\textsuperscript{831} Tilling (2012: 91, cf. 88-90).
\textsuperscript{832} Ibid. 94-103, 97-8.
\textsuperscript{833} Ibid. 176-80.
epithets such as ‘saviour’ in Phil 3:20 and ‘god’ in Rom 9:5 could be applied to the agent.\textsuperscript{834}

Tilling’s survey of the differences between the two relations complements our analysis of Christ as patron and broker. Only God is patron alone and is not a broker or client to anyone (cf. Rom 11:34-35). Once we have understood Jesus’ common characteristics with God to be necessary to his role as God’s broker and representative, two subtle distinctions appear between the Christ-relation and the God-relation in 1 Cor 8-10 that help to reframe Tilling’s Christ-relation within a God-relation.

The first distinction lies in Paul comparison between the fellowship Christians have with Jesus at the Lord’s Supper and the fellowship Jews have with YHWH at the altar (1 Cor 10:14-20). Both ‘partnerships’ emphasise vertical rather than horizontal relations (divine-human rather than intra-human) but they involve different agents, potentially implying that Jesus is identified as the patronal deity of the cultic meal in contrast to pagan cultic practices (10:19-21). Nevertheless, when Paul actually describes the Corinthians cultic meal (11:23-26), he depicts Jesus as the Corinthians’ priestly benefactor, providing the favour of his own life, and leading the Corinthians’ thanksgiving to God. Whilst Paul directly parallels the ‘table of the Lord’ with the ‘table of demons’ (10:21-22), it is the patronal allegiances, or ‘partnerships’ (κοινωνία), symbolised by them that he compares, not the ontological statuses of the Lord and of the demons. Paul’s other use of κοινωνία in the letter (1:9), which also comes with a witness to God’s πιστός as in (10:13) emphasises that it is God who has called the Corinthians into partnership with Jesus.

The second lies in the consequences of the Corinthians’ disloyalty to Christ compared with the consequences of Israel’s disloyalty to God (10:6-13, 22). Whilst the relationship is similar in type—it is characterised by testing and jealousy—the context implies that Christ acts as judge on God’s behalf, rather than for his own end. At both the beginning and the climax of the epistle, Paul depicts Jesus as God’s

\textsuperscript{834} Crook (2004: 195-96) concludes that Jesus’ capacity to represent God the patron explains how the two figures could be confused for one figure in later theological developments.
eschatological agent who is revealed to come in judgement on the day of the Lord (1:7-8). First Corinthians 15:20-8 affirms that Jesus’ eschatological role remains subject to divine action. So also, the Israelites are punished by a divine agent, ὀλοθρευτής (10:10), which likely to be a reference to the angel of the Lord at the Passover and who was believed to been active in Korah’s rebellion.835 Paul’s Christ-relation and Israel’s God-relation are similar in type (Tilling uses the term ‘substance’) but they are not identical. Rather, Paul appears to understand the Corinthians as participating in Israel’s God-relation on the basis of, and with the continuous involvement of, their Christ-relation. Where Israel related to God as a client to a patron, Christians relate to Jesus as a patronal broker.836

Tilling’s interpretation of the christology of 1 Cor 8-10 reflects a weakness in his methodology more broadly. His hermeneutic has the tendency to displace the God-relation with the Chris-relation, both in instances of close textual work and in its cumulative analysis of Paul’s letters.837 Take for example his treatment of the referent of κύριος in 10:22:

Indeed, whilst some commentators lapse into speaking of God’s jealousy coming to expression in 1:22, this is not what the text says. Rather, κύριος in 10:22, as Bell writes ‘almost certainly refers to Christ’ […] It is the Lord they are not faithfully in κοινωνία with who is provoked. The κύριος is Christ.838 Christ, rather than God, is now the κύριος for Paul. The Christ-relation supersedes the God-relation, downplaying differences in their shape. However, our brokerage framework highlights that Jesus bears the name of God (YHWH-κύριος) as God’s representative and broker. Therefore, the Lord in 10:9 and 10:21-22 acts with the full authority, and according to the will of God. As God’s agent, what Christ does can be said to be what God does. The κύριος is Christ, but on the basis that he is acting on behalf of God. Because the agent is treated like the principal, the characterisation of Jesus necessarily overlaps with that of God whilst also remaining a figure distinct from God.

836 Alternately Moses/the Law could be understood as Israel’s broker which Paul replaces with, or sees fulfilled in Jesus.
8.4. As God’s broker, Jesus receives cultic worship

The position of the broker in exchanges of favours for gratitude and loyalty adds clarity to the remarkable inclusion of Jesus in Christian worship. It also questions whether Bousset’s description of a ‘peculiar doubling of the object of veneration in worship’ is a sufficiently precise description of the practices reflected in Paul’s letters.\(^{839}\) Bauckham’s analysis of Pauline and NT christology appears to affirm such a description with Jesus understood as the ‘co-recipient’ of worship.\(^{840}\) North, McGrath and Dunn, on the other hand, argue that the lack of language of sacrifice and traditional cultic language (\(\lambda\alpha\tau\rho\varepsilon\imath\alpha\), \(\lambda\alpha\tau\rho\varepsilon\upsilon\omega\)) used in relation to Christ means we should stop short of speaking of cultic worship of Jesus.\(^{841}\) Schrage protests against such a description of Pauline belief, claiming that despite belonging inseparably together, God and Jesus do not operate on the same level – thus ‘doubling’ is inappropriate.\(^{842}\) Nevertheless, as Hurtado and Tilling have shown, Paul’s letters clearly reflect a ‘pattern’ of corporate and personal devotion to Jesus that goes beyond formal addresses of prayers and sacrificial metaphors,\(^{843}\) ‘an undeniable two-ishness’ as Jesus forms both the occasion and content of Paul’s worship to God.\(^{844}\) But such two-ishness has a particular shape.

Jesus is included in Christian worship not only as God’s agent of divine favours, but as God’s broker who enables worship of God (Rom 1:8; 7:25; 8:34; 16:27; 2 Cor 1:20; Eph 5:20; Col 3:17). This aspect of Christian worship corresponds to Hurtado’s label ‘binitarian’ or ‘dyadic’ worship that describes the ‘concern to define and reverence Jesus with reference to the one God’.\(^{845}\) Bauckham is correct to insist that ‘worship of Jesus is also worship of his Father, but it is nonetheless really

\(^{839}\) Bousset (1970: 147).


\(^{842}\) Schrage (2002: 172).


\(^{844}\) Hurtado (2010: 105; cf. 2003: 151-52). A pattern of devotion that Dunn has more recently acknowledged is striking in its cultural-religious context (2010).

worship of Jesus.\textsuperscript{846} Because Jesus is not just agent but provides the ‘benefit of brokerage’, there exists a bond of dependence and obligation between believers and Jesus, as well as the bond between believers and God. Because Christ is a broker dealing in second-order resources he generates his own credit, reputation and good will as a patron to believers.\textsuperscript{847} So whilst 1 Cor 8:6 depicts Jesus as a mediator within the Corinthians’ relationship with God, the broker lens implies that they are also engaged in a second patron-client relationship with Jesus.\textsuperscript{848}

Receiving patronal honour as a broker does not mean that Jesus functions independently of God. The interdependency of patron-client relationships suggests that as God’s appointed agent and client \textit{par excellence}, the status and honour Jesus generates ‘for himself’ in fact elevates the status of God, his patron. Our analysis into local brokers of the Graeco-Roman associations found that \textit{such figures had to be position themselves as clients of the deity in order to receive the status of patrons.} They had to act as pious servants and agents of the deity in order to be exalted in honorific gestures of dedication to the deity. The relational structure suggests that Jesus commands a distinct role, and even identity, to that of God the father in 1 Cor 8:6, without breaking from monotheism into polytheism. In a similar way that worship of Jesus in Phil 2:10-11 realises the eschatological acknowledgement of God as sovereign, so holding Jesus at the heart of Christian devotion, as expressed in 1 Cor 8:6, affirms a cultic monotheism.\textsuperscript{849} God as patron and Jesus as broker relate symbiotically whilst still having distinct identities.

From the experiential perspective of Christians, their object of devotion is, \textit{to some extent}, doubled because a) Jesus is a plenipotentiary representing God the patron, and b) because Jesus offers the benefit of access to God—a favour that demands gratitude. However, being a patronal broker rather a patron \textit{per se}, Jesus’ role is distinct from that of God, a difference that requires some form of acknowledgment

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{846} Bauckham (1998: 134; 2008: 202).
\item \textsuperscript{847} Boissevain (1974: 159-164).
\item \textsuperscript{848} The cycle of favours with Jesus as mediator also implies a third cycle between Jesus and God, in which Jesus would functions like a client in acting reciprocally to God’s exaltation of him, as explored in chapters 4-5.
\end{itemize}
in order to properly do respect to the arch patron and to Jesus’ services as client/broker.

8.5. Conclusion

A broker model of christology shows that a particular relational structure underlies Paul’s depictions of Jesus performing the functions traditionally ascribed to God. It goes further than models of Christological monotheism, which tend to present rather static concepts of ‘shared identity’, by foregrounding the pattern of reciprocal exchanges that determines the way that Jesus exercises divine functions and the intention involved in worship of him. The image of Jesus as mediator, maintained in the confession of 1 Cor 8:6, implies that Jesus does not receive worship simply alongside the one God, but receives it, as part of an ongoing reciprocal relationship, as his honour also honours God the Father. His position is dependent upon the Father who exalted him. The worship of Jesus heightens God’s own status as his purposes are furthered by Jesus’ lordship.
CHAPTER 9: Conclusions: The ambiguous but distinct identity of the broker

The aim of this project has been to better understand the significance of Jesus’ subordination to God in Paul’s writings, and the degree to which Jesus ‘shares’ the identity of God. It has endeavoured to locate the interactions between God and Jesus within a first-century understanding of social-relations in order to understand how the Pauline church could show extraordinary devotion to Jesus whilst continuing to worship the one God of Israel. Our approach to christology has been to focus on relations between actors rather than focus on classical characteristics of divinity. By concentrating on how resources are exchanged between actors of different statuses for mutual benefit, we have suggested a way in which Jesus could be treated and depicted as God’s agent whilst simultaneously having a distinct identity to that of God.

Chapter 2 discussed how the various analogies adopted in modern scholarship are unable to properly balance elements of Paul’s writing that depict Jesus as subordinate to God with those that depict Jesus as divine. We proposed the figure of the broker, operating within the matrix of patron-client relations, as an analogy that could overcome this problem. Understanding Jesus as broker facilitates the variety of ways Paul describes Jesus as divine in relation to believers and as subordinate in relation to God the Father.

Chapter 3 argued for the pervasiveness of a ‘patronal ideology’ in Graeco-Roman society and sought a perception of this ideology amongst Greeks at the time of the early principate. This ideology undergirded expectations of how transactions between figures of unequal status were to be conducted. We applied a sociological definition of patronage to Greek sources to isolate some common clusters of lexicon, showing how the essential elements of patronage manifested themselves in the relationships between the Roman emperor and his generals. Sufficiently similar clusters of lexicon associated with hierarchy, reciprocity, duration, and kinship were then shown to be present in Phil 2:6-11, 1 Cor 15:20-28 and Eph 1:20-23.

Chapters 4 and 5 proceeded to analyse the interactions between Jesus and God in Phil 2:6-11 and 1 Cor 15:20-28 by analysing the texts through the lens of the
patronal dynamics between the Roman emperor and his generals. Both chapters focused on the logic and lexicon of patronage and benefaction which in turn elucidated the narrative and the rhetorical purpose of the texts. In Phil 2:6-11, asymmetry and interdependence in the relationship between God and Jesus are vital components of the narrative. The subordination of Jesus to God is causally linked to his exaltation and worship, whilst the glory attributed to Jesus redounds to the glory of God. Philippians 2:6-11 comes the closest of all the subordination texts to Paul consciously depicting Jesus and God in the terms of elite Roman patron-client relations, with Jesus’ obedience to God forming the basis of Paul’s ethical instruction to the community of honour-concerned Philippians.

We found that the military imagery in the apocalyptic narrative of 1 Cor 15:20-28 lent itself to comparison with descriptions of emperors and their legates on military campaigns. Features such as the legate as representative and broker for the emperor, transactions of resources between the two figures, and the power dynamic in celebrations of victory all had explanatory value for addressing the ambiguities in exegesis of Paul’s eschatological scenario. Both God and Jesus play distinct and ordered roles in subduing the powers whilst their actions can be attributed to each other because of Jesus’ function as God’s agent. Because Jesus has a personal identity as God’s agent he is honoured along with God as the deliverer of salvific benefits. The honours attributed to Jesus do not threaten the status of God because the exalted Jesus ‘acts out’ his subordination to God. As both the receiver of God’s benefactions and the agent of God, Jesus is identified both with the divine and the created orders, not only during his lifetime, but also at the eschaton.

Chapter 6 developed our exploration of Jesus’ role in relation to God by reading the christology of Eph 1:20-23 in light of a closer parallel—the relationship between the emperor and his patron deity. We argued that Eph 1-2 displays numerous topoi that are also employed in the imperial panegyric of Pliny and Dio Chrysostom to portray the emperor as the vice-regent of divine power and as the recipient of divine favour. Against the background of imperial ruler ideology, Jesus ‘the beloved’ king appears as the agent of God’s gifts. As God’s broker, the letter’s expressions of honour to Jesus are inextricably linked to the honour of God. However, an underlying element of subordination still forms the structure of interaction between the two figures.
Jesus never supersedes God as an object of praise but his status is closely tied to God’s action through him. In contrast to imperial rhetoric, Ephesians is more theocentric than speeches to the emperor. Jesus’ status as one favoured by the divine comes at unique personal cost. The exalted position of Christ in the rhetoric of Ephesians is grounded in Jesus’ sovereign activity on behalf of the deity who empowers him.

Chapter 7 used our analysis of Jesus as broker in First Corinthians in order to elucidate the structure of brokered relations in 1 Cor 8:6, a text deeply embedded in a Jewish worldview. To imagine how Paul and the Corinthians might have conceived of associating Jesus with God in the language of the Shema, we explored the ways that human benefactors could be caught up in the honorific displays of pagan cultic associations. We argued that while Jesus is ‘identified’ with God in the Christian confession, his identity is tied to his role as mediator of divine benefits. Paul’s use of prepositions and of the honorific expression ‘all things’ portrays Jesus as the Corinthians’ unique broker who deals in second-order resources (access to divine benefits). He is simultaneously a client to God and a patron to the Corinthians, who enables them to live in proper relationship with God. The function of Jesus as broker contributes to Paul’s rhetorical strategy in 1 Cor 8-10 by emphasising the obligations that the Corinthians’ owe to Jesus and to God to the exclusion of other patrons.

The final part of chapter 7 argued that the current scholarly positions which view 1 Cor 8:6 as representing either a ‘split’ or a ‘supplemented’ Shema are reductive. Instead, an understanding of Jesus bearing the divine name as God’s representative shows Jesus to mediate the relationship confessed in the Shema. Rather than being included within the divine identity, or added alongside God in Christian confession, Jesus is depicted as divine broker *par excellence* whose provision of access to God puts him at the centre of Christian devotion.

Chapter 8 argued that Jesus’ role as God’s broker is key to the way that Jesus performs divine functions in 1 Cor 8-10. Jesus is shown to be closely associated with God, but to say that Paul identifies Jesus with, or even as, God would be to seriously misconstrue the relationship. As God’s representative, Jesus possesses God’s characteristics in the provision of benefits and in the exercise of authority over the
community. He can stand with God at the centre of Christian devotion because elevation of his status as broker elevates God’s status as patron of the community. Jesus’ position as one subordinate to God means that the ‘God-relation’ is never marginalised but introduces a new component with which the God-relation now operates.

The structure of this thesis has attempted to do justice to the variety of literary forms, rhetorical aims, life situations and socio-cultural backgrounds in which Pauline depictions of the interrelationship between God and Jesus are located. Each of these factors influences the ways by which Paul expresses his belief in the activities and interactions of his heavenly patrons. Jesus’ obedience as God’s ‘servant’ is an exemplar for the Philippians’ treatment of one another; his act of ‘lowering himself’ idealised as a virtue that leads to exaltation. In First Corinthians, Jesus’ status as the first man of the resurrection and as God’s eschatological agent affirms his authority over the divided Corinthians. As a benefactor who brokers the salvific benefits of God, Jesus commands exclusive allegiance over and above ties to local temples and their social structures. The praise of Jesus as God’s vice-regent in Ephesians depicts Jesus as an alternative emperor who truly delivers divine favours and whose reign guides the direction of believers’ new lives.

At the same time as taking account of the diversity of the Pauline corpus, our analysis using the patron-broker-client model has highlighted some consistent elements in Paul’s descriptions of Jesus’ activity as God’s agent. Jesus’ subordination to God in texts such as Phil 2:6-11 and 1 Cor 15:20-28 is an integral element of his identity as God’s agent. In correspondence with a patronal ideology, it is also the prerequisite for his exaltation and to the reverence he inspires. As God’s ‘client’, Jesus’ rise in honour and status does not compete with God’s status but rather increases God’s reputation as his patron. Jesus’ role as broker between God and believers accounts for his multi-faceted characterisation. When his relation to God is in view Jesus functions as a client—the beloved, the Christ, the son. When his relation to believers is in view Jesus functions as a patron. Jesus’ status is essentially relational as he is associated with both divine and human spheres according to the actor to which Paul relates him.
This research challenges recent work on NT christology that presents the distinction between divinity and humanity in overly-absolute terms. Whilst this binary model has some correspondence with the binary structure of a patron-client framework, it is necessarily complicated when a broker who can represent the divine is introduced. On one hand, the human client views the broker as carrying all the authority of their divine patron, and their actions as representing the patron’s actions. On the other hand, the broker’s position means that he is subordinate to the patron, and thus cannot be confused with him.

The ambiguous nature of the client implies that the scale between divinity and humanity is more multiplex than has recently been portrayed in high christology models. To approach the issue of divinity from a perspective of resource-exchange within relationships suggests that Jesus’ status does not equate to that of God because only God relates to others as a patron. God only deals in first-order resources whilst Jesus deals in both second and first order resources. This perspective reveals the difficulty in speaking of Paul’s view of Jesus as ‘fully divine’, or as ‘sharing the identity of God’. However, Jesus’ position as unique broker and representative between God and humankind does provide a basis for Christians speaking of Jesus as their personal patron within a monotheistic context.

Our reading of a ‘broker christology’ in Paul’s letters builds on ‘divine agent’ christology, affirming the view that many of Paul’s expressions of devotion are dyadic, rendered to God with reference to Jesus as his exalted agent. The broker christology’s patron-client framework emphasises the relational dynamics that allow Paul to conceive of Jesus as associated with God as his divine agent. Its presentation of the interactions between Jesus and God as transactions of resources between distinct actors reveals that Jesus’ status as recipient of cultic worship is achieved and maintained on the basis of God’s exaltation of him and on the basis of his services to God.

Here we might posit a distinction between the theology, or ideology, of Paul’s economy of salvation and its function. From a theological perspective, God’s identity remains that of the arch-patron upon whom everyone else, even Jesus, is dependent. From a functional perspective, the introduction of a broker implies an
interdependence between the two actors as God’s status as eschatological sovereign is dependant upon Jesus’ status as king. God’s status as recipient of worship appears to be inextricably linked to Jesus’ receipt of worship.

The degree to which the relationship between God and Jesus coheres with an ideology of patronal relations, especially as manifested in Roman imperial relationships, suggests that Paul’s christology is often ‘supra-imperial’ rather than anti-imperial. The patronal aspects of Phil 2:6-11, 1 Cor 15:20-28 and Eph 1-2 suggest that Paul appropriates a Graeco-Roman ideology of social relations whilst subverting or ‘perfecting’ it with dramatic new content. The research undertaken in this thesis offers new points for approaching Paul’s attitude to Rome and questions whether Jesus’ position as divine agent conflicts with, or relativises, dominant claims to power and authority.

This research on the ‘shape’ of Paul’s christology might also be of further value to research on the origins of early christology. Our approach uses a social-historical definition of ancient relationality to suggest how early Christians could consider their devotion to Jesus as complimentary, or even necessary, to their worship of the God of Israel. We have concentrated on the Graeco-Roman aspects of Paul’s context for understanding his relational christology. If the frameworks of patronage and brokerage could be employed for analysing Jewish sources and the socio-religious context of Palestine then we might find further clues for understanding christological origins. If variation in christology is best explained by the social and ethnic contexts—rather than by evolutionary models of diachronic development—then a patron-client model might provide a way of judging structural coherence amongst diverse christological expressions.

850 To use the terms of Galinsky (2011: 222).
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## Appendix A: The terms of the relationship between God and Jesus in the Pauline corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>God’s actions on/identity in relation to Jesus</th>
<th>Greek terms</th>
<th>Jesus’ actions on/identity in relation to God</th>
<th>Greek terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Romans</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raises J. (1:4; 4:24; 6:4, 9; 8:11; 34; 10:9)</td>
<td>ἐγείρω; ἀνάστασις, ἡ</td>
<td>Is son (1:3, 4, 9; 5:10; 8:3, 29, 32)</td>
<td>νίος, ὁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declares J. son (1:4)</td>
<td>ὁρίζω</td>
<td>Lives to G. (6:10)</td>
<td>ζάω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displays J.’ death as a propitiation (3:25)</td>
<td>προτίθημι, ἱλαστήριον</td>
<td>Sits at G.’s right hand (8:34)</td>
<td>δεξιός, ἀ, ὁν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sends J. (8:3)</td>
<td>πέμπω</td>
<td>Accepts believers to the glory of G. (15:7)</td>
<td>προσλαμβάνω, δόξα, ἡ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivers J. over to death, for Christians (4:25; 8:32)</td>
<td>παραδίδωμι</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blesses J. (9:5)</td>
<td>εὐλογητός, ἡ, ὁν</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a Father (15:6)</td>
<td>πατήρ, ὁ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 Corinthians</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elects J. crucified (1:27-28)</td>
<td>ἐκλέγω</td>
<td>Is son (1:9; 15:28)</td>
<td>νίος, ὁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raises J. (15:4, 13, 14, 15, 16, 20)</td>
<td>ἐγείρω</td>
<td>Became wisdom from G. (1:30)</td>
<td>γίνομαι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puts enemies under J. (15:25, 27)</td>
<td>τίθημι; ὑποτάσσω</td>
<td>Belongs to G. (3:23)</td>
<td>θεός, ὁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects all things to J. (15:28)</td>
<td>ὑποτάσσω</td>
<td>Has G. as his head (11:3)</td>
<td>κεφαλή, ἡ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a Father (15:24)</td>
<td>πατήρ</td>
<td>Give thanks to G.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Hands over the kingdom (15:24)</td>
<td>παραδίδωμι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Subjects himself/ is subjected to G. (15:27-28)</td>
<td>ὑποτάσσω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 Corinthians</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a Father (1:3; 11:31)</td>
<td>πατήρ, ὁ</td>
<td>Is son (1:19)</td>
<td>νίος, ὁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raises J. (4:14)</td>
<td>ἐγείρω</td>
<td>Is image of G. (4:4)</td>
<td>εἰκόν, ἡ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

851 Reading the passives of ἐγείρω as divine passives on the bases of God being the subject in Rom 4:24; 10:9; 1 Cor 15:15 and elsewhere in the NT.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Greek Text</th>
<th>English Representation</th>
<th>Reference(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustains by his power</strong></td>
<td>ζάω; δύναμις, ἡ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(13:4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Galatians</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raises J. (1:1)</td>
<td>ἐγείρω</td>
<td>Is son (1:16; 2:20; 4:4, 6)</td>
<td>υἱός, ὁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reveals J. (1:16)</td>
<td>ἀποκαλύπτω</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes promises to J. (3:16)</td>
<td>ἐπαγγελία, ἡ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sends J. (4:4)</td>
<td>ἐξαποστέλλω</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sends J.'s spirit (4:6)</td>
<td>ἐξαποστέλλω</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wills J. to rescue and to give himself (1:4)</td>
<td>θέλημα, τὸ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ephesians</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a Father (1:3)</td>
<td>πατήρ, ὁ</td>
<td>Worships G. (1:17)</td>
<td>θεός, ὁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is god (1:3)</td>
<td>θεός, ὁ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives J. rule (1:10)</td>
<td>οἰκονομία, ἡ</td>
<td>Reconciles to G. (2:16)</td>
<td>ἀποκαταλλάσσω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raises J. (1:20)</td>
<td>ἐγείρω</td>
<td>Glorifies G. (3:21)</td>
<td>δόξα, ἡ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seats J. at right hand (1:20)</td>
<td>καθίζω</td>
<td>Is son (4:13)</td>
<td>υἱός, ὁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects all things to J. (1:22)</td>
<td>ὑποτάσσω</td>
<td>Is a sacrifice to G. (5:2)</td>
<td>παραδίδω, προσφορά, ἡ; θυσία, ἡ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives J. as head (1:22)</td>
<td>δίδωμι</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Philippians</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly exalts J. (2:9)</td>
<td>διὸ; ὑπερυψῶ</td>
<td>Is in the form of G. (2:6)</td>
<td>ὑπάρχω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives J. the name (2:9)</td>
<td>χαρίζομαι; ὄνομα, τὸ</td>
<td>Does not exploit equality with G. (2:6)</td>
<td>ἡγεῖμαι; ἵσος, ἡ; θεός, ὁ; ἀρπαγμός, ὁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a Father (1:3; 11:31)</td>
<td>πατήρ, ὁ</td>
<td>Empties himself (2:7)</td>
<td>κενόω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowers J. (3:21)</td>
<td>δύναμις</td>
<td>Takes form of a slave (2:7)</td>
<td>μορφὴ, ἡ; δούλος, ὁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Is found in human form (2:7)</td>
<td>σχῆμα, τὸ, ἄνθρωπος, ὁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Humbles himself (2:8)</td>
<td>ταπεινῶ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Obeys (2:8)</td>
<td>υπήκοος, ὁν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Colossians</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is Father (1:3, 13)</td>
<td>πατήρ, ὁ</td>
<td>Is son (1:13)</td>
<td>υἱός, ὁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creates all things for J. (1:16)</td>
<td>κτίζω</td>
<td>Is image of G. (1:15)</td>
<td>εἰχών, ἡ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>κατοικέω</td>
<td>Presents</td>
<td>παρίστημι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwells in J.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Christians to G.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1:19; 2:9)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1:22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes J. known</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1:27)</td>
<td>γνωρίζω</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes J. first born</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1:18)</td>
<td>πρωτεύω</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raises J.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2:12)</td>
<td>ἐγείρω</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seats J. at right hand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3:1)</td>
<td>κάθημαι</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reveals J. in glory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3:4)</td>
<td>φανερὸς</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Thessalonians

| Raises (1:10; 4:14) | ἐγείρω; ἀνίστημι | Is son (1:10) | υἱός, ὁ |

2 Thessalonians

| Reveals J. from heaven (1:7) | ἀποκάλυψις, ἡ |               |               |

1 Timothy

| Gives life to all things (6:13) | ζωογονέω | Is a mediator between God and man (2:5) | μεσίτης, ὁ |
| Brings about Jesus’ appearing (6:15) | δείκνυμι, ἐπιφάνεια, ἡ |               |               |
| Is sovereign, king of king and lord of lords (6:15) | δυνάστης, ὁ; βασιλεύς, ὁ; κύριος, ὁ |               |               |

2 Timothy

| Raises J. (2:8) | ἐγείρω |               |               |

Titus

| - | - | - | - |

Philemon

| - | - | - | - |
Appendix B: A Greek lexicon of *patrocinium* from Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Antiquitates romanae* 2.8-11.1, with text

The terms are categorised according to labels, attributes, reciprocal actions, attitudes, relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patrons</th>
<th>Greek term</th>
<th>Clients</th>
<th>Greek term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Labels</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father (2.8.1, 10.2)</td>
<td>πατήρ, ὁ</td>
<td>The poor (2.8.1, 9.3)</td>
<td>ἀπορος, ὁ; πένης, ὁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricians (2.8.3, 10.1, 11.1)</td>
<td>πατρίκιος, ὁ</td>
<td>The lowly (2.8.1, 9.2, 9.3)</td>
<td>ταπεινὸς, ὥ, ὁν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well born (2.9.1)</td>
<td>εὐπατρίδης, ὁ</td>
<td>The undistinguished (2.8.1)</td>
<td>ἀσημος, ὁν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Superior (2.9.1)</td>
<td>κρείσσων, ὁν</td>
<td>Plebeians (2.8.1, 11.1)</td>
<td>τοὺς πληβείους</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patron (2.9.2, 10.2, 10.4, 11.1)</td>
<td>προστάτης, ὥ</td>
<td>The people (2.8.1)</td>
<td>δημοτικὸς, ὥ, ὁν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guardian (to cities) (2.11.1)</td>
<td>φύλαξ, ὁ</td>
<td>Inferior (2.9.1)</td>
<td>ἤσσον, ὁν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>-</em></td>
<td><em>-</em></td>
<td>Client (2.9.2, 10.1, 10.2, 10.4)</td>
<td><em>-</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attributes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved for their virtue (2.8.1)</td>
<td>ἀρετή, ἡ</td>
<td>Lacking rank (2.8.1)</td>
<td>καταδεής; τύχη, ἡ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher rank (2.8.1)</td>
<td>κρείσσων, ὁν; τύχη, ἡ</td>
<td>Son-like (2.10.1)</td>
<td>παῖς, ὥ, ὥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eminent from birth (2.8.1, 8.2, 10.4)</td>
<td>ἐπιφανής</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealthy (2.8.1)</td>
<td>εὐπορος, ὁν</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are older (2.8.1)</td>
<td>πρεσβεῖως</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerful (2.8.2)</td>
<td>δυνατός, ὥ, ὥν</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father-like (2.10.1)</td>
<td>πατήρ, ὥ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matter of great praised to have many clients (2.10.4)</td>
<td>μέγας, μεγάλη, μέγα (A); ἔκαινος, ὥ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocal actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acquire clients by their merit (2.10.4)</strong></td>
<td>ἐπικτάομαι; ἄρετή, ἡ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reciprocal actions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have duties (2.9.1)</td>
<td>πράσσω</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have duties (2.9.1)</td>
<td>πράσσω</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have friendly offices (2.9.3)</td>
<td>ἔργων, το; χρηστός, ἡ, ὁν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have friendly offices (2.9.3)</td>
<td>ἔργων, το; χρηστός, ἡ, ὁν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defend charges against client (2.10.1)</td>
<td>ὑπέχω</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist with dowries (2.10.2)</td>
<td>συνεκδίδωμι</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain laws (2.10.1)</td>
<td>ἐξηγέομαι</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay ransom (2.10.2)</td>
<td>καταβάλλω; λύτρον, τό</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take care of (2.10.1)</td>
<td>ἐπιμελέομαι</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay for patron’s losses, not as loans but as gifts (2.10.2)</td>
<td>λύω; χάρις, ἡ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have duties (2.10.1)</td>
<td>δέω</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choose patrons (2.9.2, 11.1)</td>
<td>βούλομαι</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do all things that fathers do for sons (2.10.1)</td>
<td>πράσσω; ἄπας; πατήρ, ὁ; παις, ὁ, ἡ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share costs of patron’s offices as for kin (2.10.2)</td>
<td>μετέχω; ἀνάλοιμα, τό; γένος, τό</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bring to suit of behalf of client (2.10.1)</td>
<td>λαγχάνω</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not accuse or bear witness against other (2.10.3)</td>
<td>κατηγορέω; καταμαρτυρέω</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure the peace clients need (20.10.1)</td>
<td>παρέχω; εἰρήνη, ἡ; δέω</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are not amongst other’s enemies (2.10.3)</td>
<td>ἐξετάζω; ἐχθρός, ἡ, ὁν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not accuse or bear witness against other (2.10.3)</td>
<td>κατηγορέω; καταμαρτυρέω</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deem worthy to render all services (2.10.4)</td>
<td>ἀξιόω; ὑπηρετέω</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are not amongst other’s enemies (2.10.3)</td>
<td>ἐξετάζω; ἐχθρός, ἡ, ὁν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compete in giving gifts (2.10.4)</td>
<td>χάρις, ἡ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wish not to trouble clients (2.10.4)</td>
<td>ἐνοχλέω</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not accept gifts of money (2.10.4)</td>
<td>προσήμημι; δωρεά, ἡ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VIII.852 Ετέρα δὲ αὐτῶν πάλιν τῶν ἀνδρῶν ὡς τὰ φιλάνθρωπα καὶ τὰς τιμὰς διανέμουσα κατὰ τὴν άξιαν, ἡν ἴπτλλω διηγείσθαι. τοὺς ἐπιφανεῖς κατὰ γένος καὶ δι’ ἄρετην ἐπαινομένους καὶ χρήσιμον ὡς ἐν τοῖς τότε καιροῖς εὐπόρους, οἰς ἥδε παιδεῖς ἦσαν, διώριζεν ἅπο τῶν ἄσιστων καὶ ταπεινῶν καὶ ἄπορων, ἐκάλει δὲ τοὺς μὲν ἐν τῇ καταδεστέρα τῇ πληθία καθός ἐστὶ βυκανῶς συνῆγον κηρύκων ὡς καὶ οὔτε ἡ ἐπὶ ἀνάκλησις τῆς δὲ ἐκκλησίας τὰς ἀνθρώπους τινὲς δὲ δησικοὺς τοῖς ἐξ, καὶ κηρύκες οἱ ὀνόσυγκαλεῖν ἀκτής πατρόθεν τε ἡ ἐνεκράσμην ὡς ἔχοντω καὶ γεονί τῶν ἄνθρωπον εἶχον, ἀλλ’ κληθῆναι ὅτι πατρικίους οὐ ἐκεῖνος ταῦτα διὰ πατέρας φασιν τὸ δυσγένεια καὶ φθόνον αὐτὸς ἔκαθιστος εἰς πρᾶγμα πόλιν φασι τοὺς ἄνδρας ἐκείνους κληθῆναι διὰ τῆς Ἀθηναιών πολιτείας, ὡς ἐν τις εἰκάσει, τῆς κατ’ ἐκέενον τὸν χρόνον ἐπὶ διαμενούσης (2) τὸ παράδειγμα λαβὼν. ἐκέενοι μὲν γὰρ εἰς δόο μέρη νειμαντές τὸ πλῆθος εὐπρεπίδας μὲν ἐκάλουν τοὺς ἐκ τῶν επιφανών οἴκων καὶ χρήσιμα δυνατούς, οἷς τῆς πόλεως ἀνέκειτο προστασία, ἀγιοίκοις δὲ τοὺς ἄλλους πολίτες, οἱ τῶν κοινῶν οὔδενος ἦσαν τῶν κόσμων. (3) σὺν χρόνῳ δὲ καὶ οὕτως προσελήφθησαν ἐπὶ τ Coroutine display text
βουλοπροστάταις ἀἡλίκος ἄλλας ἔχει συνιστά συγγενικῶν Ρωθεῶν ἀλίστα κατοῖς ἀζεῖν. Διὸς ἔθει τὸν κτείνειν ἀνόλον δὲ ὡς ἐνος διαπροττό τι ἀθείον ἀλλὰ, τί µἰδίων ἀργυρικὸν τῶν ἐνας µαυτοῖς τοῖς παίδων καὶ πελάταις τὰς Ρωθεὶς Δητταλοί χρώ ενοι, δή τοῖς φαύλων τὰς ἀτοντας πράττειν πόλιν τούτως, ὡς αὑτὸς ἐμβολείτο, νέμειν προστάθην, ἐδος Ἐλληνικὸν καὶ ἀργαῖον, ὁ Θησαλοὶ τε μέχρι πολλοῦ χρόμοιν διετέλεσαν καὶ Αθηναῖοι κατ’ ἀρχάς, ἐπὶ τὰ κρείττων λαβόν. ἐκεῖνοι μὲ γὰρ ὑπεροπτικὰ ἔχροντα τοῖς πελάταις ἔργα τα πεπιτάττοντες οὐ προσήκοντα ἐλευθέρους, καὶ ὡστε µὴ πράξειν τι τῶν κελευσμῶν, πλήγας ἐνέντεινες καὶ τάλλα ὅσπερ ἀργυρωνήσος παραχρώμενοι. ἐκάλουν δὲ Αθηναῖοι µὲ θῆτας τοὺς πελάτας ἐπὶ τῆς λατρείας. Θησαλοὶ δὲ πενήστας ονειδίσσες αὐτοῖς εὐθὺς ἐν τῇ κλήσει τῆς τύχην. (3) ὁ δὲ Ρομύλος ἐπικλήσει τε εὐπρεπεῖ τὸ πάραγμα ἐκόσμηση πατρανείαν ὀνομάσας τὴν τῶν πενητίων καὶ ταιεινών προστασίαν, καὶ τὰ ἔργα χρήστα προσέδεχεν ἐκάτερος καὶ πολιτικὸς ἀπεργαζόμενος αὐτῶν τὰς συζυγίας.

Χ. Ἡν δὲ τὰ ὑπ’ ἐκείνου τότε ὀρισθέντα καὶ µέχρι πολλοῦ παραμείναντα χρόνον Ῥομαίοις ἔδει περὶ τὰς πατρανείας τοιάδε: τοὺς µὲν πατρικίους ἐδεί τοὺς ἐαυτῶν πελάτας ἔξηγεσθαι τὰ δίκαια, ὅν οὐκ εἶχον ἐκείνοι τὴν ἐπιστήμην, παρόντοι τε αὐτῶν καὶ µὴ παρόντον τοῦτων ἐπιμελεῖσθαι τρόπον ἅπαντα πράττοντα, δόσα περὶ παιδῶν πράττοντο πατέρες, εἰς χρήματα τε καὶ τῶν περὶ χρήματα συμβαλλομένων λόγων· δίκας τε ὑπὲρ τῶν πελατῶν ἀδικουμένων λαγχάνειν, εἰ τὰς βλάπτουσιν τὰ συμβόλαια, καὶ τοῖς ἐγκαλοῦσιν ὑπέγειν· ὡς δὲ ὅλιγα περὶ πολλὸν ἄν τις εἴποι, πάσαν αὐτοῖς ζητήσει τὸν τε ἰδίων καὶ τῶν κοινῶν πραγμάτων. (2) ὥς µάλιστα ἑδοντο, παρέχειν. τοὺς δὲ πελάτας ἐδεί τοὺς ἐαυτῶν προστάτας θυγατέρας τε συνεκδοθῆσαι γαιομένες, εἰ σπανίζουν οἱ πατέρες χρήματι, καὶ λύτρα καταβάλλουν πολεμίσοις, εἰ τὰς αὐτῶν ἢ παιδῶν αἰχμάλωτος γένοιτο· δίκας τε ἄλοντον ἴδιας ἢ ζημίας ὁρλόντων δημοσίας ἀργυρικόν ἐχούσας τίμημα ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων λύτορα χρημάτων, ὡς δανεισμα ποιοῦντας, ἄλλα χάρτες· ἐν τοῖς ἀρχαίς καὶ γεφυρισίας καὶ τῶν ἄλλας τες εἰς τὰ κοινὰ δαπάνας τῶν ἀναλωμάτων ἵν τούς γένει προσήκοντας μετέχειν. (3) κοινὴ δ’ ἀμφότερος οὐτε δόσιν οὐτε δέμη νη ἐκατηγορήθησαν ἄλληλοι ἐπὶ δίκας καὶ καταμαρτυρεῖν ἢ ψήφον ἐνιαντία ἐπιφέρειν εἰ μετὰ τῶν ἐχθρῶν ἐξετάσθησα. εἰ δὲ τῖς ἐξελεγχθεὶ τούτων τι διαπροττόμενος ἄνοχος ἦν τὸ νόμω τῆς προδοσίας, ὅν ἐκκύρωσεν ὁ Ῥομύλος. τὸν δὲ ἄλοντα τὸ βουλομένω κτείνεν δόσιν ἢ ως θῆμα τοῦ καταθονίου Δίου. ἐν ἐδεί γὰρ Ῥομαίοις, ὄσος ἐμβολείτο νηπιον τεθνάναι, τὰ τούτων σῶμα τεθεὶν ὀφθότην, µάλιστα δὲ τοῖς καταθονίοις κατονυμιζεν· δ’ καὶ τότε ὁ Ῥομύλος (4) ἐποίησε. τοιγάρτοι διείμαντον ἐν πολλαῖς γενεαῖς οὐδὲν διαφέρουσι συγγενικῶν ἀναγκαιοτήτων αἰ τῶν πελατῶν τε καὶ προστατῶν συζήτησαν παίοι παιδών συνιστάμεναι, καὶ μέγας ἐπαινὸς ἦν τοῖς ἐκ τῶν ἐμβολείον ὀσίων ὡς πλείστος πελάτας ἔχει τὰς τε προγονικὰς φυλαττόσας διαδοχὰς τῶν πατρανείων καὶ διὰ τῆς ἐαυτὸν ἀρετῆς ἅλλας ἐπικτιμοῦσιν, ὁ τε ἄγων τῆς εὐνυῖας ὑπὲρ τοῦ µὲ λειφηθῆναι τῆς ἄλληλῶν χάρτες ἐκτόπου ἡλίκιος ἀμφότερος ἦν, τῶν µὲν πελατῶν ἅπαντο τοῖς προστάταις ἐξιούντων ὡς ὁνάκεις εἶχον ὑπηρετεῖν, τῶν δὲ πατρικίων ἥκεστα βουλομένων τοῖς πελάταις ἐνοχλεῖν χρηματικῆν τε οὐδεμίαν διορέαν προσεμένων.
οὕτως ἐγκρατής ὁ βίος ἦν αὐτοῖς ἁπάσης ἡδονῆς καὶ τὸ μακάριον ἄρετῆ μετρῶν, οὐ τύχῃ.

XI. Οὐ μόνον δ` ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ πόλει τὸ δημοτικόν ύπὸ τὴν προστασίαν τῶν πατρικίων ἦν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ἀποίκων αὐτῆς πόλεων καὶ τῶν ἐπὶ συμμαχία καὶ φιλία προσελθόντων καὶ τῶν ἐκ πολέμου κεκρατημένων ἑκάστη φύλακας εἶχε καὶ προστάτας οὓς ἐβούλετο Ρωμαίων.
Appendix C: A Greek lexicon of *patrocinium* from Plutarch, *Romulus* 13.1-6

The terms from Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Romulus* 13.1-6 are categorised according to labels, attributes, reciprocal actions, attitudes and relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patrons</th>
<th>Greek term</th>
<th>Clients</th>
<th>Greek term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Labels</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsellor (13.1)</td>
<td>βουλευτής, ὁ</td>
<td>The rest (13.3)</td>
<td>ἄλλος, ἡ, ὁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrician (13.1)</td>
<td>πατρίκιος, ὁ</td>
<td>The lowly (13.3, 6)</td>
<td>ταπεινός, ἡ, ὁν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father (13.3)</td>
<td>πατήρ, ὁ</td>
<td>The inferior, deficient (13.2)</td>
<td>ὑποδεής, ἦς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The powerful (13.3, 13.5, 6)</td>
<td>δυνατός, ἡ, ὁν</td>
<td>Client (transliteration) (13.5)</td>
<td>‘κλίεντας’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The superior (13.3)</td>
<td>κρείσσων, ὁν</td>
<td>The multitude (13.5)</td>
<td>πολύς, πολλή, πολλον;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The first (13.3)</td>
<td>πρότερος, ἂ, ὁν</td>
<td>Client (translation) (13.5, 6)</td>
<td>πελάτης, ὁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patron (transliteration) (13.2, 5)</td>
<td>πάτρων, ὁ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patron (translation) (13.5; 6)</td>
<td>προστάτης, ὁ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attributes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best (13.1)</td>
<td>ἀριστος, ἡ, ὁν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective (13.2)</td>
<td>κηδεμονικός, ἡ, ὁν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serviceable (13.2)</td>
<td>βοηθητικός, ἡ, ὁν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have honours (13.3)</td>
<td>τίμη, ἡ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reciprocal actions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watch over clients (13.3)</td>
<td>ἐπιμελέομαι</td>
<td>Pay debts (13.6)</td>
<td>συνεκτίνω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were advisers in legal issues (13.5)</td>
<td>ἐξηγητής, ὁ</td>
<td>Honour (13.6)</td>
<td>τιμάω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were defenders in court (13.5)</td>
<td>προστάτης, ὁ</td>
<td>Assist financially (13.6)</td>
<td>συνεκβολιμί</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not bear witness against other (13.6)</td>
<td>καταμαρτυρέω</td>
<td>Do not bear witness against other (13.6)</td>
<td>καταμαρτυρέω,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were councilors and friends (13.5)</td>
<td>σύμβουλος, ὁ; κηδεμόν, ὁ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepts no gifts of money (13.6)</td>
<td>λαμβάνω; χρήμα, τό</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitudes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watch over clients with father care and concern (13.3)</td>
<td>Consider and address as fathers (13.3)</td>
<td>Show astonishing goodwill toward other (13.5)</td>
<td>Taught not to fear patrons (13.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πατρικός, ἢ, ὡν (A); κηδεμονία, ἢ (N); φροντίς, ἢ;</td>
<td>νομίζω; προσαγορεύω</td>
<td>θαυμαστός, ἢ, ὡν (A); εὔνοια, ἢ</td>
<td>δείδω</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A protection (13.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Called a patronage (13.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brings privileges (13.5, 6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

XIII. 853 Κτισθέεσις δὲ τῆς πόλεως πρῶτον μὲν ὅσον ἦν ἐν ἕλκια πλῆθος εἰς συντάγματα στρατιωτικά διείλεν· ἐκαστὸν δὲ σύνταγμα πεζῶν τρισχιλίων ἦν καὶ τριακοσίων ἵππων. ἐκλήθη δὲ λεγεῶν τὸ συνάδες εἶναι τοὺς μαχιμους ἐκ πάντων. ἐπειτα τοῖς μὲν ἄλλοις ἔφητο δήμῳ καὶ πολυπόλους ὑψομάθης τὸ πλῆθος· ἐκαστὸν δὲ τοὺς ἄριστους ἀπέειδε βουλεύτας, καὶ αὐτοὺς μὲν πατρικίους, τὸ δὲ σύστημα σεβάστῳ προσηγορεύεσσαν. (2) ὁ μὲν οὖν σεβάστος ἀτρέκος γερουσιαὶ σημαινεῖ: πατρικίους δὲ τοὺς βουλεύτας κληθήναι λέγουσιν οἱ μὲν ὅτι παῖδον γνησίων πατέρες ἦσαν, οἱ δὲ μᾶλλον ὡς αὐτοὺς ἔχοντας ἑαυτῶν ἀποδείξει βασικάς, ὅπερ οὐ πολλοὶ υπήρξε τῶν πρῶτων εἰς τὴν πόλιν συρρεόντων· οὶ δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς πατρωνείας· οὕτω γὰρ ἐκάλουν τὴν προστασίαν καὶ καλοῦσιν ἠχρὶ νῦν, οἱ Πάτρων ἑνὶ τῶν τῶν Ἕλλανδρῳ παραγενομένων· κηδεμονίκοι τῶν ὑποδεστέρων ὄντα καὶ βοηθητικόν, ἀλλὰ αὐτὸ τὸ πράγματα ταύτην τὴν προσηγορίαν ἀπολιπεῖν. (3) μάλιστα δὲ ἀν τις τινὶς τοῦ εἰκότος, εἰ νομίζοι τὸν Ῥωμαίον ἂξιονα ὑπὸ τοὺς πρῶτους καὶ δυνατότοτος πατρικῆς κηδεμονίας καὶ χρησιμοτοὶ προσήκεις ἐπιμελείθαι τῶν ταπεινώτερον, ἄμα δὲ τοὺς ἄλλους διάδοσκοιν μὴ δεδείναι μὴ ἀγήσονται ταύς τῶν κρείττων τιμαῖς, ἀλλὰ χρῆσθαι μετ᾽ εὐνοίας καὶ νομίζοντας καὶ προσαγορεύσαντας πατέρας, ὦτος ὀνομάσαι. (4) καὶ γὰρ ἠχρὶ νῦν τοὺς ἐν συγκλητὶ σεβάστας οἱ μὲν ἔξοθοι ἀνδρὰς ἡγεμόνας καλοῦν, αὐτοὶ δὲ Ῥωμαῖοι πατέρας συγγεγραμένους· τὸ μέγιστον μὲν ἀξίωμα καὶ τιμήν, ἦκετα δὲ τὸν ἄνδραν ἄρχοντος χρώμενοι τῶν ὀνόματον. ἐν ἀρχῇ μὲν οὖν πατέρας αὐτοὺς μόνον, ὕστερον δὲ πλείονον προσαναλαμβανούν, πατέρας συγγεγραμένους προσηγορέσαν. (5) καὶ τούτῳ μὲν ἦν ὄνομα σεμνότερον αὐτῷ τῆς

853 Text is taken from LCL 46, trans. B. Perrin.
πρὸς τὸ δημοτικὸν τοῦ βουλευτικοῦ διαφορᾶς· ἐτέροις δὲ τοὺς δυνατοὺς ἀπὸ τῶν πολλῶν διήρει, πάτρων δὲ νομᾶξεν, ὥπερ ἔστι προστάτας, ἐκείνους δὲ κλέντως, ὥπερ ἔστι πελάτας· ἣμα δὲ πρὸς ἀλλήλους θαυμαστὴν εὔνοιαν αὐτοῖς καὶ μεγάλων δικαίων ὑπάρξουσαν ἐνεποίησεν. οὕτως μὲν γὰρ ἔχοντας τῇ τῶν νομίμων καὶ προστάτας δικαζομένως συμβουλοῦσι τῇ (6) πάντων καὶ κρινομόνας ἐαυτοὺς παρεῖχον, ἐκείνοι δὲ τούτους ἔθεράπευον οὐ μόνον τιμῶντες, ἀλλὰ καὶ πενομένους θυγατέρας συνεκδίδοντες καὶ χρέα συνεκτίνοντες, καταμαρτυρεῖν τῇ πελάτῳ προστάτῃ, ἢ προστάτῳ πελάτην, οὔτε νόμος οὐδὲς οὔτε ἄρχον ἡνάγκαζεν. ὡστερον δὲ, τὸν ἄλλων δικαίων μενόντων, τὸ λαμβάνειν χρήματα τοὺς δυνατοὺς παρὰ τῶν ταπεινοτέρων σύγχρον ἐνομίσθη καὶ ἀγενές. ταῦτα μὲν οὖν περὶ τούτων.
Appendix D: A Greek lexicon of elite patronage from Plutarch, *Praecepta gerendae rei publicae*, 805E-814F

The terms from Plutarch, *Praecepta gerendae rei publicae* 805E-814F categorised according to nouns, adjectives and verbs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek terms associated with patrons</th>
<th>Context (F=friend)</th>
<th>Greek terms associated with clients</th>
<th>Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nouns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καθηγεμόν, ὁ</td>
<td>Guide (805F)</td>
<td>φίλος, ὁ</td>
<td>Friend (806A, 807D, 814C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ποιητής, ὁ</td>
<td>Maker (806A)</td>
<td>φιλοτυπία, ἡ; ζηλοτυπία, ἡ</td>
<td>Bad examples are prone to ambition and jealousy (805F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φίλος, ὁ</td>
<td>Friend (806B, 814C)</td>
<td>καλός, ὁ</td>
<td>Noble (805F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἡγεμόν, ὁ</td>
<td>Leader (806C)</td>
<td>φιλοτυπία, ἡ</td>
<td>Ambition (806E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δόξα, ἡ</td>
<td>Reputation (805F, 806A)</td>
<td>ζήλος, ὁ</td>
<td>Eagerness (806E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀρετή, ἡ</td>
<td>Excellence (806A, C)</td>
<td>εὔνοια, ἡ; φιλία, ἡ</td>
<td>Receives glory in goodwill and friendship (806F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φθόνος, ὁ</td>
<td>Bad examples are envious (806C)</td>
<td>ἀρετή, ἡ</td>
<td>Excellence (808D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>περιουσία, ἡ</td>
<td>Abundant resources (808B)</td>
<td>δόξα, ἡ</td>
<td>Reputation (808D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σύμβουλος, ὁ</td>
<td>Advisors of favours (808D)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εὐμέneoia, ἡ; φιλανθρωπία, ἡ</td>
<td>Invites others to speak in kindly and gracious manner (812C)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σπουδή, ἡ</td>
<td>Eagerness (814D)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χάρις, ἡ</td>
<td>Gives favours (808B, 814D)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εὔνοια, ἡ</td>
<td>Good will (814D)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjectives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἔνδοξος, ὁ</td>
<td>Famous, of reputation (805E)</td>
<td>νέος, α, ὁ</td>
<td>Young (805E, 806E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πρεσβύτερος</td>
<td>Older (805E)</td>
<td>ἄδοξος, ὁ</td>
<td>Obscure (805E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φιλόκαλος, ὁ</td>
<td>Lover of noble things (806C)</td>
<td>πολιτικός, ἡ, ὁν</td>
<td>Statesman-like (805F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φιλότιµος, ὁν</td>
<td>Not only lovers of honours (806C)</td>
<td>ταπεινός, ἡ, ὁν</td>
<td>Of humble station (806A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δυνατός, ἡ, ὁν</td>
<td>Powerful (806C)</td>
<td>μέτριος, ᾿α, ὁν</td>
<td>Bad examples lack moderation of judgment (806D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φιλαρχος, ὁν</td>
<td>Not only lovers of office (806C)</td>
<td>δργανος, ἡ, ὁν</td>
<td>Living and thinking tools (807D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἁγαθός, ἡ, ὁν</td>
<td>Worthy (806D)</td>
<td>φαῦλος ἡ, ὁν; ἁτοπος, ὁν; ἁξιωσις, ἡ</td>
<td>Bad examples makes base and unseemly requests (808D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μέγας, μεγάλη, μέγα</td>
<td>Great (806E)</td>
<td>ἁγαθός, ἡ, ὁν</td>
<td>Good (812C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πρῶτος, ἡ, ὁν</td>
<td>First of many great ones (806E)</td>
<td>πιστός, ἡ, ὁν</td>
<td>Trustworthy (812C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αἴτιος, ᾿α, ὁν</td>
<td>Originators of favours (808D)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πρᾶος, ὁν</td>
<td>Rejects requests gently (808D)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄνω; δυνατός, ἡ, ὁν</td>
<td>High station (814D)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Verbs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>χράω</td>
<td>Bad examples stop employing F. (806C)</td>
<td>ἐπαίρω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀπορρίπτω</td>
<td>Bad examples reject F. (806C, D)</td>
<td>χαρίζω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πέμπω</td>
<td>Sends F. (806D)</td>
<td>ἀφεστήξω; φιλοτιµία, ἡ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αἴρω</td>
<td>Exalts (806E)</td>
<td>κτάοι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μεταδίδομι</td>
<td>Shares (806E)</td>
<td>αἴρω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κρατέω</td>
<td>Gains power over F. (806E)</td>
<td>αὐξάνω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek term</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀρχω</td>
<td>Commands (806F)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>μεθίστημι</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transfers allegiance to worthy men (806D)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βοηθέω</td>
<td>Aids F. (808B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>λαμβάνω; ύφαρπάξω</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Receives glory, not snatching it (806F)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>παρίστημι</td>
<td>Stands with F. (808B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>δουλεύω</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learns to obey (806F)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συνεκπονέω</td>
<td>Helps F. out of trouble (808B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ύφαρπάξω; δόξα, ἡ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does not snatch glory away from F. (806F)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συλλαμβάνω; ἄρχη, ἡ</td>
<td>Helps F. to gain office (808B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ἀγαπάω</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shows affection (808D)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐγχειρίζω; ἔνδοξος, ὁν</td>
<td>Enters trust honourable roles to F. (808B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ἐπαινέω</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Praises (808D)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τάσσω</td>
<td>Appoints himself (808C)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>χρεία, ἡ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provides service (812C)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>προσαιρέομαι</td>
<td>Selects F. as an assistant (808C)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>λαμβάνω; κορπός, ὁ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gain advantage from F. (814D)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐπαινέω</td>
<td>Gives praise, receives praise (808D)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συνεισποιέω; χάρις, ἡ</td>
<td>Shares acts of favour with F. (808D)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κελεύω</td>
<td>Urges beneficiaries to praise and show affection (808D)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀποτρίβω</td>
<td>Rejects base and unseemly requests (808D)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>παραχωρέω; ἄρχη, ἡ</td>
<td>Yields offices (812C)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>προσκαλέω</td>
<td>Invites others to speak (812C)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὀφελέω</td>
<td>Confers benefits (814D)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βούλομαι; πρῶτος, ἡ, ὁν; μέγας, μεγάλη, μέγα</td>
<td>Wishes to be the first of many great ones (806E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Greek terms describing the relationship</strong></td>
<td><strong>Context</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀσφαλής, ἔς; σχολαῖος, α, ὁν; πάροδος, ὁ</td>
<td>Safe and leisurely way (805E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χάρις, ἡ, ὁμιλέω</td>
<td>Pleasant company (806B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φιλοφρονέομαι</td>
<td>Friendly-relations (806B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The terms from Dio Chrysostom, 3 Regno categorised according to nouns, adjectives and verbs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek terms associated with patrons</th>
<th>Context (F=friend)</th>
<th>Greek terms associated with clients</th>
<th>Context (K=king)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nouns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὑγίεια, ἡ</td>
<td>Brings health (82-83)</td>
<td>φίλος, ὁ</td>
<td>Friend (86-88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σωτηρία, ἡ</td>
<td>Brings salvation (82-83)</td>
<td>πίστις, ἡ</td>
<td>Faithfulness (86-88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δόξα, ἡ; ἄγαθός, ἡ, ὁν</td>
<td>Brings a goodly report (82-83)</td>
<td>εὐπάθεια, ἡ</td>
<td>Beneficial experience (108)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κτήμα, το; καλός, ἡ, ὁν; ἱερός, ἡ, ὁν</td>
<td>Considers friendship his most beautiful and sacred possession (86)</td>
<td>ἄρχων, ὁ</td>
<td>Governor (132)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εὐνοία, ἡ</td>
<td>Depends on loyalty (88-89)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πρόνοια, ἡ</td>
<td>Solicitude (106)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τέρψις, ἡ</td>
<td>Joy (108)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀρετή, ἡ</td>
<td>Merit (110)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjectives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄγαθός, ἡ, ὁν; δόξα, ἡ</td>
<td>Brings a goodly report (82-83)</td>
<td>ἰσχυρός, ἀ, ὁν</td>
<td>Strongest (88-89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἰσχυρός, ἀ, ὁν</td>
<td>Strong (88-89)</td>
<td>ἄριστος, ἡ, ὁν</td>
<td>Excellent (103)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φανερός, ἀ, ὁν; τιμή, ἡ</td>
<td>Bestows illustrious honours (132)</td>
<td>χρήσιμος, ἡ, ὁν</td>
<td>Useful (104)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εὐδοξία, ὁν</td>
<td>His table lends distinction (132)</td>
<td>ἐλεύθερος, ἂ, ὁν</td>
<td>Free man (110)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἡδύς, ἡδεία, ἡδῷ</td>
<td>A pleasure to give favours and receive gifts (110)</td>
<td>πιστός, ἡ, ὁν</td>
<td>Trustworthy (128-29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>σπουδαῖος, ἂ, ὁν</td>
<td>Best (129)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Verbs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek terms describing the relationship</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συμφέρω</td>
<td>Advantageous (52)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀρχήν, ἡ</td>
<td>Rule (52)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Translation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φιλία, ἡ</td>
<td>Friendship (86-88, 94)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κτήμα, τό</td>
<td>Is K.’s possession (86-88)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χρήμα, τό</td>
<td>Is superior to other means (86-88)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φυλακή, ἡ</td>
<td>A protection (86-88)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ζύμφορος, ον</td>
<td>Profitable (94)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ηδύς, ἡδέια, ηδό</td>
<td>Pleasurable (94)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χρήσιμος, η, ον</td>
<td>Useful (94)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κοινός, ἡ, ὁν</td>
<td>Enjoys common resources (110)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀγαθός, ἡ, ὁν; φιλία, ἡ; συγγένεια, ἡ</td>
<td>A greater good than kinship (113)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>