

CHAPTER 10

“BE(A)WARE OF THE DOGS, EVILDOERS, AND BUTCHERY”: TEXT AND THEORY IN THE DISCOURSE ON PEACE AND VIOLENCE IN PAUL

We have this treasure in earthen jars. (2 Cor 4:7)¹

Some time ago, when engaged in a conversation with my colleague Gordon Matties, who was then in the midst of writing his commentary on Joshua and agonizing over how abiding theological value might be found in that book,² I teasingly quipped: Just call it genocidal and be done with it. It might have seemed like I was saying this from the safe haven of the peace-loving, violence-free New Testament. But I have come to realize that the challenge that both Gordons (representing both testaments) have is one that differs in degree, not in kind. In fact, the problem of violence and war in the New Testament is in some respects more profoundly challenging, since that part of our Bibles is supposed to represent the authoritatively final and pure form of divine revelation, even if we don't chop off the Old Testament.

SHIFTING CONTEXTS, CHANGING AUDIENCES, VARYING THEORY

There was once a time when biblical (including Mennonite) discourse on violence and peace, at least in North America, operated within a setting

of relative cultural coherence (late Christendom), where partisans played by largely agreed upon rules of the game. The protagonists mainly played out the options of Christian pacifism in response to Christian just war, or just revolution theory, and violence was commonly understood to pertain to some form of overt physical harm. The significant contribution of Perry Yoder was to put the social and political justice question squarely into the center of biblical peace discussion,³ even though it was not entirely absent in earlier studies, including that of Willard Swartley.⁴

In recent discourse, however, not only has the definition of violence been exploded,⁵ but so also the rules (theory, premises, methods) by which biblical scholars interpret texts in the context of their chosen communities or audiences have multiplied.⁶ In accordance with a growing trend that finds religion in general as complicit in violence, a significant contributing factor to violence, or inherently violent,⁷ recent biblical scholarship has been finding violence to be endemic also to Scripture, including the New Testament and Paul.⁸ As the scope and understanding of violence has expanded, so it has become more manifest even within the Bible. Accordingly, many studies aligned with some sort of nonviolence theory may well find the New Testament to be deficient in a variety of ways precisely on this question.

As a result, biblical peace scholarship, especially as allied with nonviolent theory in some form,⁹ now operates on many fronts (or, with various dialogue partners), complicating its discourse and making it more challenging. My own view is that biblical peace scholarship will need to use rhetorical flexibility (of the sort perhaps also demonstrated by Paul himself, “for the sake of the gospel”) in varied contexts to remain viable and relevant.¹⁰ A natural difficulty will inevitably come, however, when one audience overhears what is said to another audience (something that also put Paul into very tricky situations), resulting in charges of inconsistency. Worse, however, will be the prospect of retreating to sequestered and safe intellectual havens, as is happening to some extent in the Society of Biblical Literature or in confessional-denominational (sub)groupings. The challenge for those committed to biblical peace will be to avoid merely putting up defensive bulwarks, but to forthrightly engage in the discussion of violent dimensions of Paul’s texts, while still holding Paul (and the rest of the NT) to be a resource in the nonviolent trajectory of the biblical drama toward peace and justice.

I proceed, then, by giving attention to a particular text as a way to situate the discussion of violence in Paul’s writings and to raise problems pertaining to that issue. This will lead to a review of texts and texture where Paul’s writings more generally are considered in recent discussion to be violent, dangerous, or deficient in some respect. And I will close

by returning to the problem of theoretical variation and broader cultural (and theoretical) multiplicity as crucial aspects and contexts of future biblical peace discourse.

THE CASE OF PHILIPPIANS 3:2 – SLANDEROUS ANTI-JUDAIC INVECTIVE OR REBELLIOUS ASSAULT ON EMPIRE?

Following a brief pause, formally a hesitation formula (Phil 3:1b), Paul unloads with a sharp rhetorical flourish of paronomasia, exhibiting what some recent scholars suggest is a good bit of violence:¹¹

Be(a)ware¹² of the dogs. (*blepete tous kynas*)

Be(a)ware of the evil workers. (*blepete tous kakous ergatas*)

Be(a)ware of the butchery [the cutting up]. (*blepete tēn katatomēn*)

For we are the circumcision [the cutting around] (*hēmeis gar esmen hē peritomē*):

those who serve God by/in the Spirit,
and who boast in Messiah Jesus,
and who put no confidence in the flesh.

If this is indeed a violent text, we must immediately inquire, in what sense violent? (a) Is it violent simply because Paul uses a word that can denote physical injury (*katatomē*), and a word that is socially derogatory (dogs)? That is, is the violence simply in the texture and imagery that Paul employs? (b) Is it violent in intent? That is, does Paul intend to harm in some specific sense? Is it violent because it engages in slanderous, or retaliatory invective against some kind of adversary or rival, even though these adversaries are not directly addressed? (c) Or is it violent in its potential or in its effect? That is, does it have either the potentiality or the inevitable effect of inciting social binaries that are exclusive, and thus of promoting or facilitating identitarian conflict and violence? (d) Does it manifest a “violent personality,”¹³ or does it display endemic and patterned cultural violence, and not the idiosyncrasy of an individual? (e) Does it matter what group is being referenced (with the “dogs, evil-doers, and butchery”), whether an (imperial) oppressor or a similarly marginalized socio-religious rival (below)? That is, does the text read differently if Paul is engaging in an act of resistance and naming imperial violence as opposed to slanderously attacking sibling rivals? Do differing assumed referents of the verbal invective make the text more or less violent, whether in intent, potential, or effect? (f) Does it matter if the referents actually engaged in physical and/or socio-psychological violence?¹⁴ (g) Does it matter that the verbal outburst comes from someone experiencing physical and psychological torture and abuse, as is likely? (h) Does the text’s canonical status give the text a greater moral

burden to bear (on the side of espousing or facilitating nonviolence), or make it more susceptible to facilitating physical and/or social violence? (i) Is the text more or less violent (in character and/or effect) when interpreted or claimed from a location of marginality, or from a position of power?

All this is to suggest at the outset that flat, simplistic depictions of the text as “violent” (or even as not violent) can’t quite explain its complexity and multi-valent character and potentiality.

When it comes to interpreting this text according to the traditional rules of historical interpretation, a good case can be made that the referent of Paul’s verbal outburst and warning is the (actually violent) Roman imperium and elite Roman culture in general, not “judaizing” nor “Judaic” rivals. Space does not permit a full discussion of this reading here,¹⁵ but the main lines of evidence and argument are as follows: (a) *Katatomē* does not lexically signify “mutilation” in particular (though that translation has become the unquestioned rendering in the last hundred years), but more generally denotes “cutting down/against,” “cutting in two,” or “intensively cutting,” and can apply to (i) the cutting or chopping of flesh, whether in the butcher shop, medicine, personal assault, or war, (ii) leather-working, or (iii) earthen excavation or rock inscriptions. This same range of meaning is more or less characteristic of the Latin translation, *concisio*. (b) The three-fold imagistic combination of “dogs,” “evil-doers,” and “cutting” derives from the lament Psalm 22:16 (following the textual tradition of the DSS and LXX, “gouging hands and feet”),¹⁶ where the combined referent is unmistakably to oppressors and persecutors. Paul’s language in Philippians 1:18-20 makes it clear that he is indeed recalling and resonating with lament psalms during his ordeal, both in terms of the imagery of persecution and suffering, but also in terms of the ultimate deliverance and universal supremacy that comes through Messiah. (c) The function of Philippians 3:2 within the evident circumstance, main argument, and rhetorical agenda of Philippians 3:2-4:1, and the entire letter more generally,¹⁷ specifically suggests that it is a coded reference to the Roman imperium and its powerful allies. For instance, the adversaries referenced throughout Philippians, directly and indirectly, are those representing the persecuting elite of Philippi and the Roman imperial authorities holding Paul (probably in Ephesus). Meanwhile, Paul positively appropriates his Judaic citizenship markers,¹⁸ while also contextualizing them in reference to Messiah (3:2-11), as a way to set up his prime target—the preoccupation with the status, the questing for, or the practice of Roman citizenship and its values (3:17-21).¹⁹ (d) Recent scholarship has increasingly recognized that there are no “judaizing” elements in the vicinity of Philippi,²⁰ and that 3:2-11 is

hortatory and paradigmatic, not polemical or apologetic.²¹ (e) Later texts show Paul's retrospective reflection on terror, torture, and suffering at the hands of the Roman authorities, conjuring up his ordeal in Ephesus from which he writes Philippians.²² (f) The history of interpretation shows that the "judaizing" interpretation is not attested until the anti-Judaic rhetoric of Augustine and John Chrysostom²³ in the emerging Christian imperial situation, when attacks on the synagogue from the church were mounting.²⁴ Moreover, the traditional rendering assumes Galatians as the paradigmatic Paul, importing that agenda and context into the reading of Philippians, and thereby assumes that if there was opposition to Paul (and warning from him) it must have been primarily from a Jewish (or "judaizing") source. Within the context of Christendom, it becomes unimaginable that Paul would have attacked the Roman imperium so directly, and have embraced so unequivocally his Judaic heritage. (g) Even the first translations of Philippians 3:2 into English indicate that the text is understood to refer to schismatics in general (Wycliffe, *dyuysioun* [division]; Tyndale, Coverdale, *dissencion*; based on the possible sense of *katatomē* as "cutting in two"), in accordance with the pre-Christendom interpretive tradition, not "judaizers" in particular (the latter reading made explicit in the KJV's heading of Philippians 3,²⁵ and following the translation "concion" of the Geneva and Bishops' Bibles).

On the other hand, what is astonishing is the glee with which the anti-Judaic or anti-judaizing interpretation is often propounded in mainstream Christian commentaries, with hardly a nod as to how this might affect contemporary social dynamics, and no thought as to what kind of apologizing might be appropriate as a result of this and other outbursts, in terms of their eventual effects.²⁶ Commonly and uncritically repeated is the notion that Paul is simply throwing back the cursing invective of "dogs" from its (supposed Judaic) source,²⁷ thereby somehow exonerating it, but not admitting that this very retaliatory verbal assault would not measure up against Paul's own ethical standards (Rom 12:14; 1 Cor 4:13).

But what about the counter-imperial reading? (1) Does it make this text any less violent in its presumed original setting? (2) Does it mitigate the violent potential or effect of this text in particular? (3) Does it make Paul's perspective any less violent in character or potential? (3) Might this historical reading be articulated with the interest of making Paul less violent (a case of special pleading)? (4) Did it or might it perhaps facilitate (either then or now) some form of "seditious resistance?"²⁸

While this last query must be taken seriously, it seems to me crucial that the potential for a theory of resistance also be recognized in Paul,²⁹ not just a theory of nonretaliation (or nonviolence), in accordance with

Paul's interest in the justice question, expressed in various ways. Peace and justice are a biblical hendiadys, in Paul and elsewhere.³⁰ At the same time, this is not to say that Paul can be easily exonerated of all forms of violence or violent potential, and to this issue we must now turn.

PRESUMED VIOLENCE AND ETHICAL-THEOLOGICAL DEFICIENCIES IN PAUL

Violent elements can be (or have been) found in (1) Paul's direct ethical-social teaching, (2) his exercise of power and authority in his assemblies, (3) his ecclesial social construction, (4) his language and thought structure, and (5) in his personality. We will look at each of these areas in turn, acknowledging that these are overlapping areas, and are used here only for analytical purposes.

(1) Nonretaliation and peace, along with justice, are certainly central features of Paul's direct ethical teaching and theological vision.³¹ While interpreters generally agree that Paul did not endorse overt physical or lethal violence of any sort (including against the Roman empire),³² questions have been raised about the character of his very ethic of nonretaliation, peace-making, and love. Kent Yinger, for instance, has argued that this ethic applies only to relations within the assembly, and not also to persecuting outsiders or outsiders in general.³³ This reading could presumably be spun in more than one way: nonretaliation and love is wrongly restricted only to the elect, or absolute pacifism is properly not within Paul's purview. Another question pertains to the obviously apocalyptic framework in which this ethic is propounded, as a deference to God's exclusive prerogative for executive vindication ("wrath").³⁴ While some interpreters continue to minimize this aspect of Paul's ethic, others point to its deficiency (it is motivated by eschatological revenge, or enhances a view of God as ultimately violent), and still others highlight that it can only be properly understood in reference to the final justice question. Nonretaliation, peace, and love operate within a scheme that also embraces the matter of justice (whether retributive justice or restorative justice), and forgiveness and reconciliation are never blind to the necessities of accountability and consequences (thus the complementarity of "kindness" and "severity" even in the divine character, e.g. Rom 11:22-24). A God devoid of concerns of justice makes for an anemic God who merely assists in self-actualization or adapts to the status quo.

Violence or the potential for violence has also be found in (or experienced through!) Paul's teaching or pronouncements in the dynamics of a presumed hierarchy of being,³⁵ in which one party naturally submits

or is subordinate to the other (masters and slaves, rulers and subjects, men and women). While a good bit of ambiguity rests within these very texts, it cannot be doubted that for the greater part of Christian history these texts were interpreted “sympathetically” (at the literal level), favouring men over women,³⁶ masters over slaves, and rulers over subjects.³⁷ In recent years, however, as social mores and ideological premises have shifted, these texts have received a critical look, either explained as categorically irreparable and dangerous (so flawed that they can only be deconstructed or else avoided), or explained (relative to their inherent ambiguity or ambivalence) as not quite as bad as they seem, or indeed as offering an emancipatory ethic.³⁸ And more recently, the obviously less ambiguous texts of heterosexism have become the subject of scrutiny,³⁹ as their complicity in the ongoing violence against homosexuality has become patently clear.

(2) In recent years, Paul has also been found to be deficient (or violent) in his exercise of apostolic power and authority within his assemblies. Some interpreters explain this strictly and negatively as “power over,” and as a pressure towards “sameness” that rejects “difference.”⁴⁰ Others explain this matter with greater nuance, while not blind to the negative potentiality of Paul’s texts.⁴¹ It is certainly to be noted that the more authoritarian or threatening side of Paul emerges in the Corinthian and Galatian correspondence, and some sense of those particular dynamics must certainly be entertained in the assessment of these texts. In the Corinthian case, Paul warns that his coming may be either “with a rod” or “in love in a spirit of gentleness,” depending on their response (1 Cor 4:21); and later he admits that he is angrily “on fire” (2 Cor 11:29), cautioning that he may need to be “courageous” (as if in a battle, 2 Cor 10:1-8), “severe” (2 Cor 13:10), and ready “to punish” residual disobedience (10:8). Still, Paul claims that his apostolic authority is ultimately for the “building up” of the community, not its “tearing down” (2 Cor 10:8; 13:10), even as his work may involve the demolishing of intellectual “strongholds” (2 Cor 10:3-8). At the very least, Paul’s exercise of authority and power needs to be entertained in the context of ancient conventions,⁴² but also in relation to the exigencies of discipline and leadership in radical movements more generally.⁴³

Paul believes that the judgment of (legal action against) outsiders should be left to God, whereas the community, under the direction of its apostolic leader, is to engage in judgment within its own midst (1 Cor 5:12-13; within a set of judicial rules and procedures, 2 Cor 13:1-2). Accordingly, Paul pronounces judgment and utters curses on some of his theological rivals, for the sake of the gospel (against a “different gospel,” Gal 1:6, 8; 2 Cor 11:4). He does this despite (or in contrast to) an irenic

disposition toward rival apostles elsewhere, where judgment is left to God (1 Cor 3–4; Phil 1).⁴⁴ In Galatians, for instance, Paul offers an explicit “curse” on anyone promoting a “different gospel” (Gal 1:8–9), pronounces that the troublemaker “will bear his judgment” (Gal 5:10), and expresses this as a wish for the castration of those unsettling the community (Gal 5:12). His attack on Peter is somewhat subdued by comparison: he is “self-condemned” (Gal 2:11; even though it would appear that Peter seemed more keen to preserve the overall global unity of the church, not wanting to alienate his side of the emerging movement). In Romans 3 Paul notes that some theological rivals are making “slandering charges” against him, and he responds with a reciprocal derogation, “their judgment is just” (Rom 3:8). In 2 Corinthians, Paul also engages in retaliatory invective, painting his fellow Messianist rivals as “ministers of Satan” and “doers of evil,” and pronouncing that “their judgment is sure” (11:12–15; cf. 10:12–18; 11:4–6, 22–23; 12:11). While most interpreters avoid the evident tension between this invective and Paul’s own promoted ethic of nonretaliation (even in cursing), George Shillington has faced this problem head on, even though his explanation may not be fully satisfying.⁴⁵ In connection with this, we can also note Paul’s pronouncement of judgment and expulsion (“handing over to Satan for the destruction of the flesh”) of someone engaged in gross sexual violation (1 Cor 5:1–7), by virtue of apostolic prerogative (1 Cor 4:15).

(3) A third general area in which Paul has been found to be deficient is in his “violently dualistic” social and ecclesial construction, with “violently enforced boundaries.” Paul, according to Joseph Marchal, engages in a thoroughgoing in/out, we/they, right/wrong, saved/perishing binary construction that is absolutist, exclusive, and inherently violent, even in the apparently harmless letter to the Philippians. Paul’s attitude fosters a position that is diametrically opposed to the (ultimate) virtues of “dialogue and interdependence.”⁴⁶ Whether the label of violence is the most apt here could be challenged, but Paul’s categorical reference to all outsiders as the “perishing” (1 Cor 1:18; 2 Cor 2:15; 4:3; cf. 2 Thess 2:10) and as facing the prospect of “wrath, anger, trouble, and distress” (Rom 2:8–9) does need to be faced, albeit placed alongside the contrary direction of the universal inclusion and reconciliation of all humanity and creation in the final drama, a drama in which for Paul even the binary of “believer” and “unbeliever” will be overcome (e.g. Rom 11:11–36).⁴⁷ Still, whether this latter is necessarily a coercive universalism, or an embrace of diversity and the overcoming of dividing binaries needs to be vigorously addressed.

(4) Closely related to this ecclesial construction is the matter of violence in Paul’s language and thought structure. Some interpreters have found Paul’s use of military imagery to be violent in and of itself, insofar

as it might promote the faithful taking a posture of engagement in a cosmic battle or in a literal one in their immediate social surrounding.⁴⁸ Alternatively, it is suggested that the use of military imagery shows that Paul was quite supportive of the military in general, and the Roman military in particular as mediating the will of God in the world.⁴⁹ More likely, Paul employs military and soldiering imagery ultimately to subvert worldly combat.⁵⁰

The assessment of Paul's overall thought structure as "kyriarchic" (from the term *kyrios*, "lord," of which, for instance, patriarchy can also be included), in connection with Paul's underlying apocalyptic-millenarian framework,⁵¹ is also open to multiple readings. Admittedly, in Paul's eschatological drama, God out-empire empire (1 Cor 2:6; 15:24-28; Rom 8:31-39), whether imaged as world-subjection⁵² or as world-reconciliation,⁵³ and to that extent never fully transcends that imperial conceptuality (except perhaps in the sense of God being "all in all," 1 Cor 15:28; cf. Rom 11:36; Col 3:11; Eph 1:10; 4:6). In connection with this we should also locate Paul's pronouncements of doom on the present world order, including that of Rome and its allies (1 Cor 2:6; 1 Thess 5:3; Phil 3:19-21).⁵⁴ This does indeed put God into the role of being a military actor (replete with divine warfare imagery),⁵⁵ and to that extent a violent actor (since it would be inconsistent to label all human military activity as inherently violent, and not also divine military activity).⁵⁶ On the positive side, this imagery can be appropriated as offering a theory of resistance,⁵⁷ even if it comes with a deficient theory of ecclesial agency.⁵⁸ Moreover, its function to pacify and democratize the divine warrior tradition needs to be recognized.⁵⁹ Others, however, suppose that it may foster "seditious resistance,"⁶⁰ or emanate from a revengeful resentment.⁶¹ But there is no question that in Paul final cosmic peace is always an embattled peace, even as, arguably, justice in Paul is ultimately a form of restorative justice.⁶²

(5) Paul's "violent Christology of the cross" has also been targeted for special criticism. Gager and Gibson, for instance, propose that Paul's use of the cross as central saving symbol, along with solidarity with suffering as a pattern for Messiah, himself, and the adhering community,⁶³ represents a personal "predilection" for violence.⁶⁴ Paul is not to be understood "as a typical Jew, but rather, in his own words, as eccentric precisely in his attraction to violence."⁶⁵ Even within the early Jesus movement, "Paul's commitment to the crucified Christ was highly eccentric. . . both before and after his time."⁶⁶ Indeed, admittedly analyzing "like good amateur psychologists," Gager and Gibson suggest that Paul's persecution of early Jesus followers and his later embrace of the crucified Christ are of one piece, best explained in terms of Paul's persistent "violent personality,"

his “excessive zeal.” This rendering of Paul as suffering from a particular violent psychological malady is indeed amateurish,⁶⁷ and seems unable to appreciate the liberating power of remembering martyrs in their labours for justice.⁶⁸ Michael Gorman has offered a helpful rejoinder.⁶⁹

THEORY IN THE ENGAGEMENT WITH TEXTS

Textual interpretation is inevitably bound up in some theory, and so it is appropriate to review some basic postures in the discourse on peace and violence in Paul. Here is one possible typology (or continuum) of approaches.⁷⁰

(1) One approach operates on the premise of a singular, authoritative, and normative voice of Paul (and other NT texts), and seeks to minimize diversity, ambiguity, multi-valence, and multi-potential in Paul’s texts (decrying this as a concession to interpretive license, in which meaning is to be found simply in the transaction between reader and text, with priority given to the reader). While this approach usually denies any reliance on (pre-suppositional) “theory,” it practically operates according to the theory of a confessional stance⁷¹ and takes up some modest use of historical-critical methods. Troublesome texts are either exonerated or rescued, or their violent potential is minimized, and violent use explained as stemming from misreading.

(2) On the other side of the spectrum, some interpreters are convinced that Paul’s personality and texts are so flawed that they are inherently dangerous, not merely potentially so. The canonical status of these texts is often given as a further occasion for their violent potential, and thus the necessity of emphasizing their violent dimensions and of undermining their status, privilege, or canonical authority. An additional charge, as with any religious texts, is that the aura of certitude itself that surrounds the reading of the texts is dangerous and potentially violent. In these circumstances, the interpretive posture is usually (but not always) admitted up front, often with the designations feminist, postcolonial, or queer.⁷²

(3) Somewhere in a middle⁷³ position are those who are unwilling to relinquish the voice of Paul for constructive theo-political inquiry, while acknowledging the ambiguous potential and multi-valent character of Paul’s texts, and their violent effects in various settings. This general stance of sympathetic appropriation may be characteristic, on the one hand, of those who seek to be robustly Christian (for normative articulation for “faith and life”), or, on the other hand, of those who seek to be informed by Paul’s theory apart from any specific commitment to Christian practice or belief.⁷⁴ In both cases, it is assumed that the

positive core and potentiality of Paul's texts are not entirely negated by the deficient, dangerous, or violent aspects of his rhetoric. In effect, this approach allows the reader to read Paul as he read his own sacred texts: from the perspective of their emancipatory, inclusive center and direction.⁷⁵

A CLOSED CANON WITH AN OPEN TRAJECTORY

This last position may well be a difficult one for those standing in the Anabaptist-Mennonite stream, with its embrace of biblical (biblicist) restorationism and (formal) suspicion of ongoing tradition. On the other hand, it may not be readily appreciated by those who have a greater suspicion of religious faith and sacred texts. One might argue, in this connection, that the problem with Marcion was not his obvious commitment to the way of nonviolence and a God of peace, nor was it strictly his dualism, as the occasion for his reduced canon. Rather, it was his literalism that required all of his sacred texts to come out just right, alongside the willingness to jettison the past in favour of the new. Ultimately, it was only a literalism combined with a figural textual sense (with both a carnal and spiritual dimension) that could keep the entire Bible as the sacred text, precluding the living community from perpetually having to make canonical only the recently novel. Peace, nonviolence, and justice are vectors that give the Bible directional meaning (and normative boundaries) through the dynamic guidance of the living Word. The Christian canon is not static or spatial, but dynamic and directional.

AUFHEBUNG

"Paul created the conditions for the undermining of his own texts." These words (or something very near to them) were uttered by Slavoj Žižek, during a panel discussion at the 2005 conference at Syracuse University, "Saint Paul among the Philosophers."⁷⁶ Žižek was responding to a rejoinder to the effect that surely Paul could never be a friend to feminism, that his texts were irredeemably oppressive. In effect, Žižek's response was: Hey, give Paul a break, at least give him his due within the unfolding process of theo-political thought. Moreover, as evident in his further explanation, Žižek was using "undermine" in the sense of *Aufhebung*: at one and the same time an undermining and a fulfillment into a new mode, without thereby adopting interpretive license. In other words, one must take up Paul also in terms of the directionality of his thought, not simply in respect to his static location

Citizenship

in antiquity.⁷⁷ Despite the evident deficiencies (relative to modern sensibilities) or moments of violent rhetoric, Paul's overall message of peace and justice is a crucial resource for continued reflection on the challenges facing our own future.

use the term *autocheir* (“self-handed”) for this.

51. Philemon 17-19 confirms this noncategorical preference. Paul assumes that Philemon as a slave owner can legitimately pursue his legal right for compensation, either for the loss of work incurred through his slave’s defection or for some unknown injury. But Paul also implies that Philemon should give up this right to compensation; he recommends that the loss be “charged to his account” and that Philemon is himself indebted to Paul.

52. J. Rufus Fears, “The Theology of Victory at Rome: Approaches and Problems,” *ANRW* 17.2: 737-826; Jewett, *Romans*, 779.

53. For detailed documentation for this next section, see the fuller discussion in Zerbe, *Non-Retaliatio*, 249-64.

54. For the text, see F. L. Griffith, *Stories of the High Priests of Memphis* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1900), 32: “I will cause him to bring this book hither, a forked stick in his hand and a censer of fire upon his head.”

55. Phil 1:28 might also be cited here. But that ambiguous text more likely refers to the adversaries’ hope for the Messianic community’s demise. See my forthcoming *Philippians* (Believers Church Bible commentary; Herald Press).

56. A similar notion is evident in 1 Thess 2:16, the latter part most certainly, and all of it probably, however, is an editorial addition to Paul’s text after the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 CE.

57. On eschatological judgment for unrepentance and the rejection of Jesus’s message, see Matt 10:14-15/Luke 10:10-12; Matt 11:21-23/Luke 10:13-15; Matt 12:38-42/Luke 11:29-32. On judgment for the persecution of Jesus and his followers, see Matt 23:29-30, 34-36/Luke 11:47-48, 49-51; Matt 23:37-39/Luke 13:34-35; Matt 24:45-51/Luke 12:42-46. For discussion, see Zerbe, *Non-Retaliatio*, 198-204.

58. See Zerbe, *Non-retaliatio*, 232-40.

59. 2 Cor 1:5; Phil 3:10-11; Rom 8:17; 2 Cor 4:10-12; Gal 6:17; cf. Col 1:24; 1 Peter 4:13; 5:1.

60. Gal 2:19-20; 6:15; cf. 3:27; Rom 6:1-11; cf. Col 2:11-14; 3:3.

61. Gal 6:17; 2 Cor 4:7-11; 1 Cor 15:30-32. Paul’s and Christian suffering is also on Christ’s behalf: Phil 1:27-28; 2 Cor 4:11; 12:10.

62. 2 Cor 4:12. Cf. Phil 2:17; Eph 3:1, 13.

63. 2 Cor 4:17. Cf. Rom 5:2-4; 8:17-18; Phil 3:10-11; on the necessity of suffering, cf. 1 Thess 3:4.

64. See Michael Gorman, *Cruciformity: Paul’s Narrative Spirituality of the Cross* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001); idem, *Inhabiting the Crucified God: Kenosis, Justification, and Theosis in Paul’s Narrative Soteriology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), esp. ch. 4: “While We Were Enemies”: Paul, the Resurrection, and the End of Violence, 129-60.

Chapter 10

1. For the application of this image to Scripture, I am indebted to Clark H. Pinnock, “‘This treasure in earthen vessels’: the inspiration and interpretation of the Bible,” *Sojourners* Oct 9 (1980): 16-19. The figural use of this text beyond

its original application is consistent with Paul's own hermeneutical flexibility in appropriating his own sacred text; Paul uses this image to highlight how the power is not in his own instrumentality, but in God, and that the light comes not from the letter, but through the Spirit (2 Cor 3:4–4:7).

2. Gordon Matties, *Joshua* (Waterloo/Scottsdale: Herald Press, 2012).

3. Perry Yoder, *Shalom: The Bible's Word for Salvation, Justice, and Peace* (Newton: Faith and Life Press, 1987).

4. Willard Swartley, *Slavery, Sabbath, War, and Women* (Scottsdale/Kitchener: Herald Press, 1983), 96–149.

5. E.g. Robert McAfee Brown, *Religion and Violence*, 2nd ed. (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1987); Nancy Scheper-Hughes and Philippe Bourgois, eds., *Violence in War and Peace: An Anthology* (Oxford and Malden: Blackwell, 2004); Slavoj Žižek, *Violence* (New York: Picador, 2008). Even when “violence” signified primarily some kind of overt physical harm to person or property, its use was certainly complicated in that it was not so much a descriptive term, but an evaluative one, denoting not so much something that is immediately injurious (physically), but something that is judged to be wrong, inherently harmful, or illegal. Thus, surgery, policing, or (just) war, for instance, could be excluded from its purview. It is certainly proper that violence is now seen in institutional, latent, verbal, psychological, systemic, covert, or social forms. But the term violence is now becoming a blunt, catch-all word of pejoration, replacing (or absorbing) words such as oppression, domination, harm, exclusion, marginalization, or discrimination.

6. The explicit reference to some aspect of theory or location in the very organization of scholarly communities in the Society of Biblical Literature has multiplied immensely in the last 25 or so years.

7. Mark Juergensmeyer, *Terror in the Mind of God: The Global Rise of Religious Violence*, 3rd ed. (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2003); J. Harold Ellens, ed., *The Destructive Power of Religion: Violence in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*, 4 vols. (Westport/London: Praeger, 2004); Joseph Hoffman, ed., *The Just War and Jihad: Violence in Judaism, Christianity and Islam* (New York: Prometheus Books, 2006); Jack David Eller, *Cruel Creeds, Virtuous Violence: Religious Violence across Culture and History* (New York: Prometheus Books, 2010); John Teeham, *In the Name of God: The Evolutionary Origins of Religious Ethics and Violence*, 5th ed. (Oxford and Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010); Charles Kimball, *When Religion Becomes Lethal: The Explosive Mix of Politics and Religion in Judaism, Christianity and Islam* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2011); Jeffrey Ian Ross, ed., *Religion and Violence: An Encyclopedia of Faith and Conflict from Antiquity to the Present*, 3 vols. (M. E. Sharpe Reference, 2010). For one rejoinder, see William Cavanaugh, *The Myth of Religious Violence: Secular Ideology and the Roots of Modern Conflict* (Oxford, 2009).

8. Yvonne Sherwood and Jonneke Bekkenkamp, eds., *Sanctified Aggression: Legacies of Biblical and Post-Biblical Vocabularies of Violence* (New York/London: T & T Clark, 2003); Shelley Mathews and E. Leigh Gibson, eds., *Violence in the New Testament* (New York/London: T & T Clark, 2005); David A. Bernat and Jonathan Klawans, eds., *Religion and Violence: The Biblical Heritage* (Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Phoenix, 2007); Ra'anan S. Boustan, Alex Jassen and Calvin Roetzel,

eds., *Violence, Scripture, and Textual Practices in Early Judaism and Christianity, Biblical Interpretation* 17/1-2 (2009); Peter G. R. Villiers and Jan Willem van Henten, eds., *Coping with Violence in the New Testament*, Studies in Theology and Religion (Leiden: Brill, 2012). Also noteworthy is the continued work of the SBL Section, Violence and Representations of Violence among Jews and Christians.

9. There are many strands of “nonviolence theory,” one of which is enshrined in Mennonite confessions of faith, e.g. *Confession of Faith in a Mennonite Perspective*, Articles 20–24. Swartley is to be applauded for seeking to keep peacemaking biblical and the Bible to be about peace; Willard Swartley, *Covenant of Peace: The Missing Peace in New Testament Theology and Ethics* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 1-10. At the same time, those who embrace that confessional commitment will make alliances and correlations in the broader nonviolence movement, not all of which will make the same kind of confessional commitments, and not all will have the same regard to Paul as an apostle of peace. Indeed, now some of the attacks on Paul for his violence come from precisely those who espouse a theory of nonviolence.

10. See, for instance, the concluding words in my “The Politics of Paul: His Supposed Social Conservatism and the Impact of Postcolonial Readings,” in *The Colonized Apostle: Paul through Postcolonial Eyes*, ed. C. Stanley (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2011), 73: “In contexts where Paul’s authorial voice is venerated, it will be natural to highlight Paul’s anti-imperial perspective, reading against the grain of received interpretations. On the other hand, in contexts where readers are open to placing Paul in broader dialogue with other voices in the Christian canon and in the merging Christian assemblies (including those that were silenced), it will be appropriate to highlight how Paul both challenges and reinscribes imperial and subordinationist schemes.”

11. E.g. John G. Gager, with E. Leigh Gibson, “Violent Acts and Violent Language in the Apostle Paul,” in *Violence in the New Testament*, ed. S. Matthews and E. L. Gibson (New York/London: T & T Clark, 2005), 18; Joseph A. Marchal, “Imperial Intersections and Initial Inquiries: Toward a Feminist, Postcolonial Analysis of Philippians,” in *The Colonized Apostle*, 155.

12. *blepete* here has the dual sense of “observe” and “danger,” as in the French “attention!”

13. Gager, with Gibson, “Violent Acts,” 16-19.

14. For Roman violence, see for instance Magnus Wisstrand, *Entertainment and Violence in Ancient Rome: The Attitudes of Roman Writers of the First Century A.D.* (Göteborg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis, 1992); Andrew Lintott, *Violence in Republican Rome*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999); Klaus Wengst, *Pax Romana and the Peace of Jesus Christ*, trans. J. Bowden (London: SCM Press, 1987).

15. See my forthcoming *Philippians* (Believers Church Bible Commentary; Herald Press).

16. The Masoretic Text of Ps 22:16 (Hebrew 22:17) is garbled. The verbs used in the Dead Sea Scrolls (*krh*) and the LXX (*oryssō*) overlap in meaning with *katatemnō*, referring usually to gouging or digging in the ground, but sometimes also to the incision or chopping of flesh. Paul’s choice of *katatomē* is occasioned

not first by the required contrast with *peritomē*, but by the paronomasia of Phil 3:2, in its correlation with Ps 22:16.

17. Once this focus of Paul's rhetoric is recognized (the close correlation of 1:27–2:16 and 3:1–4:1), all the reasons to postulate multiple letter fragments collapse.

18. The profile of the Philippian assembly also appears to be more Judaic than Gentile in background.

19. For this general line of interpretation (but still assuming that Phil 3:2 refers to judaizers or Jews in some way), see Chapter 1 in this volume; N. T. Wright, "Paul's Gospel and Caesar's Empire," in *Paul and Politics; Ekklesia, Israel, Imperium, Interpretation*, ed. R. A. Horsley (Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 2000), 173–81.

20. For instance, Gordon Fee, *Paul's Letter to the Philippians*, New International Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 293–96.

21. Joseph Hellerman, *Reconstructing Honor in Roman Philippi: Carmen Christi as Cursus Pudorum* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 121–28. "No confidence in the flesh" (Phil 3:3) does not refer to a negation of circumcision in particular, but anticipates the question of worldly privilege and status more generally (Phil 3:4–21; cf. 1:27–2:11; similarly 2 Cor 11:18).

22. 2 Cor 1:8–11; 2:14–16; 4:7–12; 6:2–10; 11:23–12:10; Rom 5:3–5; 8:17–27, 31–37.

23. Augustine, *A Treatise against Two Letters of the Pelagians*, ch. 22; John Chrysostom, *Homily on the Epistle of St. Paul to the Philippians*, X.

24. Isaiah M. Gafni, "The World of the Talmud: From the Mishnah to the Arab Conquest," in *Christianity and Rabbinic Judaism: A Parallel History of their Origins and Development*, ed. H. Shanks (Washington, D.C.: Biblical Archaeological Society, 1992), 240–51.

25. "Hee warneth them to beware of the false teachers of the Circumcision."

26. For instance, Fee, *Philippians*, 294–96, quoting: The reason for the invective lies with Paul. Such people have been "dogging" him for over a decade, and as the strong language of Gal 5:12 and 2 Cor 11:13–15 makes clear, he has long ago had it to the bellyful with these "servants of Satan" who think of themselves as "servants of Christ" (2 Cor 11:15, 23). . . . Paul uses epithets that "turn the tables" on them, as to what they think themselves to be about in contrast to what he thinks. . . . [The first] metaphor is full of "bite," since dogs were zoological "low life," scavengers that were generally detested by Greco-Roman society and considered unclean by Jews, who sometimes used "dog" to designate Gentiles. Paul thus reverses the epithet; by trying to make Gentiles "clean" through circumcision, the Judaizers are unclean "dogs." . . . *katatomē*, used here, denotes "cutting to pieces," hence "mutilate." . . . Along with the play on "cutting" in Gal 5:12, where he urges them to "castrate" themselves, this is the ultimate derogation of circumcision, the most "cutting" epithet of all.

27. Mark D. Nanos, "Paul's Reversal of Jews Calling Gentiles 'Dogs' (Philippians 3:2): 1600 Years of an Ideological Tale Wagging an Exegetical Dog?" *Biblical Interpretation* 17 (2009): 448–82.

28. Marchal, "Imperial Intersections," 159.

29. For instance, Walter Wink, *Engaging the Powers: Discernment and*

Resistance in a World of Domination (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992); Neil Elliott, *The Arrogance of Nations: Reading Romans in the Shadow of Empire* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2008), 143-66.

30. See Gordon Zerbe, "Peace and Justice in the Bible," in *Peace and Justice: Essays from the Fourth Shi'i Muslim Mennonite Christian Dialogue*, ed. Harry Huebner and Hajj Muhammad Legenhausen (Winnipeg: CMU Press, 2011), 124-43.

31. See Chapter 9 in this volume; William Klassen, *Love of Enemies: The Way to Peace* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 110-32; Richard B. Hays, *The Moral Vision of the New Testament: Community, Cross, New Creation* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1996), 16-59, 317-46; Swartley, *Covenant of Peace*, 189-253; Michael Gorman, *Inhabiting the Crucified God: Kenosis, Justification, and Theosis in Paul's Narrative Soteriology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 129-60.

32. E.g. Elliott, *Arrogance of Nations*, 12: "Paul issued no call to arms against Rome; he rallied no rebel garrison," even though "inescapably in conflict with the empire's absolutizing claims on allegiance."

33. Kent Yinger, "Romans 12:14-21 and Nonretaliation in Second Temple Judaism: Addressing Persecution within the Community," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 60 (1998): 74-96.

34. See Chapter 9.

35. See below on the "kyriarchic" character of Paul's worldview.

36. See, for instance, Jennifer Bird, "To What End? Revisiting the Gendered Space of 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 from a Feminist Postcolonial Perspective," in *The Colonized Apostle*, 175-85.

37. Neil Elliott, *Liberating Paul: The Justice of God and the Politics of the Apostle* (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1994), 1-90.

38. Thomas R. Yoder Neufeld, *Killing Enmity: Violence and the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011), 98-121.

39. Philip L. Tite, *Conceiving Peace and Violence: A New Testament Legacy* (Lanham: University Press of America, 2004), 135-91.

40. Elizabeth A. Castelli, *Imitating Paul: A Discourse of Power* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1991); Sandra Hack Polaski, *Paul and the Discourse of Power* (Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999).

41. Cynthia Briggs Kittredge, *Community and Authority: The Rhetoric of Obedience in the Pauline Tradition* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1998); Kathy Ehrensperger, *Paul and the Dynamics of Power: Communication and Interaction in the Early-Christ Movement* (London/New York: T & T Clark, 2007); Todd Still, "Organizational Structures and Relational Struggles among the Saints: The Establishment and Exercise of Authority within Pauline Assemblies," in *After the First Urban Christians: The Social-Scientific Study of Pauline Christianity Twenty-Five Years Later*, eds. T. D. Still and D. G. Horrell (New York/London: T & T Clark, 2009), 79-98.

42. For the imagery of warfare in ancient moral discourse, see Abraham Malherbe, "Antisthenes and Odysseus, and Paul at War," *Harvard Theological Review* 76 (1983): 143-73.

43. The notion of leaderless movements is a fairly recent innovation. On the issue of discipline and hegemony within (arguably analogous) radical movements,

see Richard J. F. Day, *Gramsci is Dead: Anarchist Currents in the Newest Social Movements* (Toronto: Between the Lines, 2005). See also Chapter 12 in this volume.

44. Cf. Rom 14:10-12, where [personal] judgment against fellow members is censured, in favour of deferring to God's judgment.

45. Shillington, *2 Corinthians*, 237-38. His alleviating explanation is that (a) Paul does not attack his opponents directly, (b) his purpose is to steer the congregation from the misguided (triumphalist) teachings, (c) his desire is to defend the (cruciform) gospel, not his personal status, and (d) other texts confirm that Paul can also ignore abuse and that he is fundamentally committed to love and not retaliation. I think that in many circumstances (especially those where a very high view of Scripture is maintained) this will be a sufficient explanation, but in other settings an explanation that simply admits to rhetorical excess here will also be appropriate.

46. Marchal, "Imperial Intersections," 154-59. The word "violent" to depict Paul's ideology and texts is perhaps more frequently used in the work of Marchal in comparison to other scholars.

47. See Chapter 7 in this volume.

48. Joseph A. Marchal, "Military Images in Philippians 1-2: A Feminist Rhetorical Analysis of Scholarship, Philippians, and Current Contexts," in *Her Master's Tools? Feminist and Postcolonial Engagement of Historical-Critical Discourse*, ed. C. Vander Stichele and Todd Penner (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005), 265-86.

49. Michel Desjardins, *Peace, Violence and the New Testament* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 82.

50. See Zerbe, "Politics of Paul," 66-68; Chapter 8 in this volume.

51. Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *The Power of the Word: Scripture and the Rhetoric of Empire* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), 13-29, 82-109, 149-93.

52. Phil 2:9-11; 3:20-21; Rom 15:8-12; 1 Cor 2:6-8; 15:24-28.

53. Rom 8:18-25; 11:15; cf. Col 1:19-20; Eph 1:10, 22-23; 2:1-3:21.

54. I take the final statement on the final judgment of the Jews in 1 Thess 2:16 (at the least) to be a later gloss; but the heightened rhetoric against persecutors and non-believers in 2 Thess 1:5-9; 2:8-12 can't be so confidently discarded as non-Pauline in character or source.

55. Thomas R. Yoder Neufeld, *'Put on the Armour of God': The Divine Warrior from Isaiah to Ephesians* (Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 73-156; idem, *Killing Enmity*, 122-49; Swartley, *Covenant of Peace*, 222-53.

56. There is perhaps an irony that this is the one area where for Mennonites and biblical pacifists warfare is not always by definition labeled as violent. Still, this would be consistent with the common usage of violence, that it is not so much a descriptive word but an evaluative one, in which certain "violent" acts are deemed to be proper, and thus not specifically violent. See above n. 5.

57. Swartley, *Covenant of Peace*, 222-53; see Chapter 12 in this volume.

58. Elliott, *Arrogance of Nations*, 152-66.

59. Yoder Neufeld, *'Put on the Armour of God'*, 84-93; Gordon Zerbe, "Pacifism' and 'Passive Resistance' in Apocalyptic Writings: A Critical Evaluation," in *The*

Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation, ed. James H. Charlesworth and Craig A. Evans (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 65-95.

60. Marchal, "Imperial Intersections," 159.

61. For instance, F. Nietzsche. For excerpts, see W. Meeks, *The Writings of St. Paul* (New York/London: W. W. Norton, 1972), 288-302.

62. See Chapter 8.

63. Citing texts such as Rom 6:6; 8:36; 1 Cor 2:2; 4:9; 2 Cor 6:5; 11:23-29; Gal 2:19.

64. Gage, with Gibson, "Violent Acts," 16-19.

65. *Ibid.*, 16.

66. *Ibid.*, 19. Since Paul had other Christological options before him—Jesus the prophet, teacher, healer, gloriously resurrected Son of God in heaven, and others—Paul's unique cruciform Christology requires special explanation. That Paul's Christology was that eccentric in this sense is historically doubtful.

67. At the very least, there is no discussion of Paul's supposed personality dysfunction in reference to current psychological, social-psychological, or socio-cultural theory.

68. See Luise Schottroff, Silvia Schroer, and Marie-Theres Wacker, *Feminist Interpretation: The Bible in Women's Perspective* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998), 218-223, esp. Schottroff's discussion titled "Cross—Sacrifice—The Concept of God—Christology."

69. Gorman, *Inhabiting the Cruciform God*, ch. 4: "While We Were Enemies": Paul, the Resurrection, and the End of Violence, 129-60.

70. Other factors could be overlaid over it, for instance questions regarding the social and cultural location and function of interpretation.

71. For instance, in the preamble to *Confession of Faith in a Mennonite Perspective*, 8, the first stated function of confessions of faith is to "provide guidelines for the interpretation of Scripture."

72. Marchal, "Imperial Intersections"; Bird, "To What End?"; Mathews and Gibson, "Introduction."

73. One might call this a "mediating" position, except that such mediation might certainly be rejected (as with many attempts at mediation) by either of the two ends of the continuum already noted, even when there is agreement on core values of nonviolence.

74. Jacob Taubes, *The Political Theology of Paul*, trans. D. Hollander (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004); Agamben, *Time That Remains*; Daniel Boyarin, "Paul among the Antiphilosophers; or, Saul among the Sophists," in *St. Paul among the Philosophers*, eds. J. Caputo and L. Martin (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2009), 109-40.

75. Paul, too, was aware of both the limits and the revelatory potentiality of the sacred written text (Rom 3:21-31; 2 Cor 3:4-4:6).

76. Caputo and Martin, eds., *St. Paul among the Philosophers*, 160-83.

77. On the theme of textual recapitulation, "the time of legibility," as opposed to interpretive license, see also the thought of G. Agamben, *Time That Remains*, 138-45.

Chapter 11

1. Nancey Murphy, *Religion and Science: God, Evolution, and the Soul* (Scottsdale: Herald Press, 2002); idem, *Bodies and Souls, or Spirited Bodies?* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006); Warren S. Brown, Nancey Murphy and H. Newton Malony, eds., *Whatever Happened to the Soul?* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998); Warren S. Brown and Malcolm A. Jeeves, "Portraits of Human Nature: Reconciling Neuroscience and Christian Anthropology," *Science and Christian Belief* 11 (1999): 139-50; Philip Heffner, *The Human Factor: Evolution, Culture, and Religion* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993); John R. Russell, N. Murphy, T. Merering, M. Arbib, eds., *Neuroscience and the Person* (Vatican City State: Vatican Observatory, 1999); J. P. Moreland and Scott B. Rae, *Body and Soul: Human Nature and the Crisis in Ethics* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2000); William Hasker, *The Emergent Self* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1999); Kevin Corcoran, ed., *Soul, Body, and Survival*, (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2001); Joel B. Green, ed., *What About the Soul? Neuroscience and Christian Anthropology* (Nashville: Abingdon, 2004).

2. Augustine, *On the Literal Interpretation of Genesis*, 19.

3. Tim Folger, "What Fills the Emptiness?" *Discover* (August 2008): 24-28.

4. For a sketch of the shift from a pervasive assumption of dualism to the predominant emphasis on monism or holism, see Murphy, "Human Nature: Historical, Scientific, and Religious Issues," in *Whatever Happened to the Soul?*, 21-26.

5. R. Gundry, *SOMA in Biblical Theology, with an Emphasis on Pauline Anthropology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 147-56; J. Knox Chamblin, "Psychology," in *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*, ed. G. F. Hawthorne, R. P. Martin, and D. G. Reid (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1993), 765-75; John W. Cooper, *Body, Soul, and Life Everlasting: Biblical Anthropology and the Monism-Dualism Debate*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000); idem, "Biblical Anthropology and the Body-Soul Problem," in *Soul, Body, and Survival*, ed. Kevin Corcoran (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2001), 218-28.

6. This pervasive conception in evangelical circles is attributed by Joel Green especially to the "enormously influential" writings of Watchman Nee. See Joel B. Green, "Bodies—That Is, Human Lives': A Re-examination of Human Nature in the Bible," *Whatever Happened to the Soul?*, 151.

7. Nancey Murphy, *Bodies and Souls, or Spirited Bodies?*, 1-37; see also idem, "Human Nature: Historical, Scientific, and Religious Issues," in *Whatever Happened to the Soul?*, 1-30. For Murphy, the biblical witness would suggest that both a radical dualism (which denigrates the body, and posits the immaterial soul as that which seeks reuniting with God) and a radical, reductionist monism (materialism, physicalism), in which there is no room for human uniqueness and relating with God, are "out of bounds."

8. Joel B. Green, "Bodies—That Is, Human Lives'," 149-73; idem, "Scripture and the Human Person: Further Reflections," *Science and Christian Belief* 11 (1999): 51-63; idem, "Monism and the Nature of Humans in Scripture," *Christian Scholar's Review* 29 (2000): 731-43; idem, "Eschatology and the Nature of Humans: A Reconsideration of the Pertinent Biblical Evidence," *Science and Christian Belief* 14 (2002): 33-50; idem, "Body and Soul? Questions at the Interface of Science and Christian Faith," in *What About the Soul?*, 5-12; idem, "Resurrection of the Body: New Testament Voices Concerning Personal