JULIEN SMITH

Christ the Ideal King

Mohr Siebeck

Julien Smith

Christ the Ideal King

Cultural Context, Rhetorical Strategy, and
the Power of Divine Monarchy in Ephesians

Mohr Siebeck

JULIEN SMITH, born 1971; 2003 MAT, Fuller Theological Seminary; 2010 PhD, Baylor University; since 2010 Assistant Professor of Humanities and Theology at Christ College, Valparaiso University (USA).

Preface

It gives me great pleasure to thank the many people who have contributed to the writing of this book, which began as a doctoral dissertation in the Religion Department of Baylor University. From start to finish, this research project has been shepherded by my mentor, Professor Charles Talbert. His influence will be readily apparent to anyone familiar with his scholarship. Indeed, the seed of this study was planted while copy-editing Professor Talbert's recent commentary on Ephesians in the Paideia series. Throughout my research and writing, he has been uncommonly generous and perceptive with his guidance and encouragement. Professors Lidija Novakovic and Jeffrey B. Fish, the other members of my committee, have helped me clarify my thinking through their insightful comments and questions. Several key improvements in this book are the result of the penetrating questions posed by Professors Mikeal Parsons and Bruce Longenecker during a rigorous and lively oral defense. Professor Sharyn Dowd provided much-needed direction during the beginning stages of my research. Professors Larry Lyon, Dean of the Graduate School, and William Bellinger, Jr., Chair of the Religion Department, awarded me travel grants to present portions of my work in meetings of the Society of Biblical Literature, thus affording me the opportunity to receive valuable criticism from a wide array of scholars. In numerous seminars and colloquia, my fellow doctoral students subjected various portions of this project to intense, but always collegial, critique. These and other fine scholars at Baylor have modeled for me the vocation of a scholar in service of the church. My profound gratitude to them cannot be adequately expressed in these brief words.

I am furthermore grateful for the assistance and encouragement I have received while revising my manuscript during the first year of teaching at Valparaiso University. Professor Mel Piehl, the Dean of Christ College, exhorted me to begin thinking of my work as a book rather than a dissertation. His suggestions for improving the style can be seen in the subtitle of this book. Steven Siebert, the creator of Nota Bene software, gave me invaluable technical assistance throughout my research, most notably in compiling the indices. Paul Smith, my father, read and commented on portions of the manuscript. Mary Morales-Rivera, who copy-edited the entire manuscript, saved me from numerous infelicities of style.

Special thanks are due to Professors Hans-Josef Klauck and Jörg Frey for accepting my manuscript for publication in the series *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament*. Ms. Jana Trispel and other members of the editorial staff of Mohr Siebeck were exceedingly patient and generous with their time in helping me to navigate the intricacies of creating a book out of a manuscript.

Finally, I owe an incalculable debt of gratitude to my family and friends. My parents, Paul and Claire Smith, have shaped my life through their profound and abiding love. This book is a testament to their faith in me. Both they and my parents in law, Dirk and A. J. Barel, supported our family in countless ways large and small throughout the long sojourn of graduate school. The community of saints at Calvary Baptist Church in Waco, Texas, sustained us with their tender love during these years. My wife and two sons have made life sweet. To Hope, Eben, and Ian I dedicate this book.

July 2011   Julien C. H. Smith
Valparaiso, Indiana

Table of Contents

Chapter 1

Ephesians and the Quest for the Ideal King

1.1.   Purpose of the Present Study

During the reign of Constantine, the church came to look upon Christ as king. By the end of the fourth century C.E., churches were designed to represent the throne room of Christ, and prayers were addressed to Christ as *Rex Gloriae*. While the development of this tradition prior to Constantine is a matter of debate, its origins lie undeniably in the NT portrayal of Jesus in royal terms.[1] The NT tradition, of course, traces its roots back to the institution of the monarchy in ancient Israel, in which the king's anointing signified his legitimacy as the one chosen by Yahweh for the task of governing Israel. Passages such as Deut 17:14–20, 2 Sam 7, and the royal psalms provide evidence that throughout the monarchy and following its demise, Israel engaged in sustained reflection upon the nature of the ideal king. In the postexilic and Second Temple periods, hope arose within certain streams of Judaism that God would once again raise up such a king to govern God's people. The extent to which this hope was shared within the various streams of Second Temple Judaism is debated. Nevertheless, certain NT writers saw the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth as the fulfillment of this hope.[2] One may thus trace the roots of the tradition that cast Jesus Christ as an ideal king backwards through the NT and literature of Second Temple Judaism to the monarchic tradition that arose in ancient Israel and was preserved in the OT.[3]

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

---

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

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

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

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

Beker's observation is apt and intriguing. It invites the question whether Ephesians' authorial audience would have found the letter's presentation of Christ to resonate with the victorious king that became prominent in later tradition. And if this audience did see Christ in this way, what difference would it have made to their understanding of the text?

In comparison with other letters attributed to Paul, Ephesians contains almost no information regarding its geographical destination, its addressees, or the historical situation that occasioned its writing. The consequent inability of scholars to reach consensus regarding the letter's purpose and setting have led to Ephesians' reputation as a "sublime yet elusive document."[5] E. J. Goodspeed's characterization of Ephesians as "the Waterloo of commentators"[6] seems well deserved. Goodspeed's own thesis, that Ephesians was written to serve as an introduction to the collection of the Pauline corpus, has failed to win support, as have a myriad of other proposals that seek to locate the letter's purpose in a concrete historical situation.[7] A brief survey of such proposals will suffice to illustrate the problem. H. Conzelmann proposes that the letter be read as a theoretical, theological essay.[8] The liturgical style and baptismal imagery in the letter lead others to read it as a baptismal homily.[9] P. Pokorný believes that the letter is intended to combat a form of

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

Judaistic Gnosticism.[10] E. Käsemann understands the letter's argument to address a crisis threatening the unity between Jewish and gentile Christians.[11] Not unrelated to Goodspeed's earlier thesis, R. P. Martin sees the letter as part of a strategy to regain Asia Minor for the Pauline gospel.[12] As the variety of even this merely illustrative list suggests, efforts to ground the letter's purpose in an historical situation will likely remain inconclusive. A new line of research, however, sees the letter as addressing the related issues of identity formation and behavior.[13] This study is aligned with this more recent trend and will seek to gain further clarity on the letter's rhetorical strategy to form the identity and behavior of its audience.

The present study will argue that in Ephesians, Christ is characterized as a type of ideal king. Such a portrayal of Christ would have resonated with a constellation of cultural expectations held by the letter's authorial audience, thereby ensuring comprehension of the letter's argument and purpose. The letter's primary theme, the reunification of the "fractured cosmos,"[14] comes into sharper focus when Christ is understood as the ideal king who establishes on earth the harmony that is understood to exist in the cosmos (1:3–

---

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

[11] Ernst Käsemann, "Ephesians and Acts," in *Studies in Luke-Acts* (ed. L. E. Keck and J. L. Martyn; Nashville: Abingdon, 1966), 291. Karl Martin Fischer, *Tendenz und Absicht des Epheserbriefes* (FRLANT 111; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973), 21–39, believes the letter was written to respond to a different sort of ecclesiastical crisis, that of a new order of episcopacy in Asia Minor.

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

[13] Charles H. Talbert, *Ephesians and Colossians* (Paideia; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic, 2007), 12–15; Rudolf Schnackenburg, *Der Brief an die Epheser* (EKKNT 10; Zürich: Benziger, 1982), 34; Andrew T. Lincoln, *Ephesians* (WBC 42; Dallas: Word, 1990), lxxxv; Ernest Best, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Ephesians* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 75; John Paul Heil, *Ephesians: Empowerment to Walk in Love for the Unity of All in Christ* (SBLSBL; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007), 1–4; Harold W. Hoehner, *Ephesians: An Exegetical Commentary* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic, 2002), 106.

[14] So Talbert, *Ephesians and Colossians*, 47–48.

14). Furthermore, salient aspects of the ideal king's reign function as unifying threads that tie various parts of the letter together under its main theme. Christ, the ideal king, effects reconciliation between Jew and gentile within the church (2:11–22), and is the basis for harmony within the Christian household (5:22–6:9). Christ, the ideal king, is the means by which the church enjoys union with God (3:12, 19), and enables the maturation of the church towards holiness (4:17–5:21). The goal of the present study is to demonstrate that such a characterization of Christ is a vital element in the letter's rhetorical strategy.

1.2. Justification for the Present Study

Although the motif of kingship has received some attention in recent scholarship treating various corpora in the NT,[15] no study to date has explored the characterization of Christ as a type of ideal king in Ephesians. In his recent commentary, however, C. H. Talbert proposes a shift in perspective that would greatly facilitate such a project. Talbert suggests that in order to understand the purpose of Ephesians, "one must recognize that the audience functions not only as the *cause* of the composition of Ephesians but also as the *catalyst* for the selection of its language, style, arguments, and *topoi*."[16] He finds that Ephesians addresses the following five aspects of the authorial audience's cultural repertoire, which are crucial for understanding the way in which Ephesians addresses identity formation. (1) The theme of the reunification of the cosmos through Christ (Eph 1:9–10; 3:4–6, 9–11) speaks to a pervasive cultural yearning for unity and for freedom from factionalism within the political order, widely understood as a mirror of the cosmos. This desire was reflected, for example, in traditions that cast Alexander as the great uniter of humanity and was also informed by Roman imperial propaganda. (2) Christ's triumph over cosmic powers in Ephesians (Eph 1:20–23) speaks to the fear of hostile powers, against whom the practice of magic was thought to offer protection. (3) Ephesians makes use of the cultural understanding of

---

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

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

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

Talbert suggests that certain themes in particular, such as the reunification of the cosmos through Christ, resonate with the cultural expectation that the rule of the ideal king was a necessary precursor to the establishment of harmony.[19] The present study draws out the implication of this suggestion by arguing that the portrayal of Christ as an ideal king functions rhetorically to unify the letter's major themes and clarify its argument and purpose.

The present study benefits from a number of recent studies on Ephesians and other Pauline literature, while at the same time seeking to advance and, in some cases, correct shortcomings of this research. Several of these studies focus on the importance of the theme of reconciliation between Jew and gentile in Eph 2:11–22 within the argument of the entire letter. This passage is of central importance for the present study, both because this reconciliation is central to the letter's larger theme of the reunification of the cosmos and because reconciliation figures heavily into expectations associated with the ideal king. E. Faust argues in the revision of his University of Heidelberg dissertation that the universal peace of Christ (*pax Christi*) in Eph 2:11–22 is presented as an antithetical alternative to the degrading integration of Jews within the *Pax Romana*.[20] This passage must be understood both within the

---

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

[18] Talbert, *Ephesians and Colossians*, 15–28.

[19] Talbert, *Ephesians and Colossians*, 17–18. See further, Francis Cairns, *Virgil's Augustan Epic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 10–28.

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

context of a Hellenistic Jewish "gnoseological" understanding of salvation[21] and within the context of fierce ethno-cultural conflict between Greeks and Jews under Roman rule. The purpose of the passage (and by extension the letter) is to elevate the status of Jewish Christians in the eyes of its gentile readers by reminding them of the priority of Jews in the salvation history of God, and also in the present church as mediators of the letter's soteriological perspective. This monograph is noteworthy for its attempt to locate the symbolic world of Ephesians within Hellenistic Jewish thought and its social context within ethno-cultural conflict between Jews and Greeks under Roman rule. However, the argument depends on reading "saints" in 2:19 and "holy apostles and prophets" in 3:5 as referring exclusively to Jewish Christians, a claim for which the exegetical foundation is lacking.[22] Faust thus fails to demonstrate his major thesis, that the purpose of the entire letter is to raise the status of Jewish Christians in the eyes of their gentile co-religionists. His argument that this is also the purpose of 2:11–22 similarly fails to convince.

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

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

---

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

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

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

[24] Timothy G. Gombis, "The Triumph of God in Christ: Divine Warfare in the Argument of Ephesians," PhD diss. (University of St. Andrews, 2005). The central argument of the dissertation, which focuses on the triumphs of the exalted Christ in Eph 1–2, is presented in slightly abbreviated form in Timothy G. Gombis, "Ephesians 2 as a Narrative of Divine Warfare," *JSNT* 26 (2004): 403–418.

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

T.-L. N. Yee's revised University of Durham dissertation makes the case
that an attitude of Jewish exclusivism constitutes the primary reason for gen-
tile exclusion from Israel. In Eph 2:11–22, the author of the letter not only
intentionally makes his gentile readership aware of this attitude, but presents
the inclusivism of the Messiah as the antidote for this exclusivism.[25] For Yee,
then, Ephesians is written from a Jewish perspective, which regards Christ as
the solution to the estrangement and enmity between Jews and gentiles.[26]
While Yee's argument indeed constitutes a provocative attempt to apply in-
sights from the so-called New Perspective on Paul to Ephesians, the effort
founders for the following reasons. First, like Faust, Yee must read "holy
ones" in 2:19 as referring to Jews, a usage the term cannot support elsewhere
in the letter.[27] Second, by claiming that Eph 2:11–22 aims to upbraid Jews for
their ethnocentrism, Yee's study seems to controvert what is a much more
straightforward reading of the text, namely that it seeks to remind gentile
Christians of their inclusion into the commonwealth of Israel (2:12–13).
Third, one may wonder whether the ethnocentric depiction of Judaism puta-
tively countered by Ephesians is any less of a caricature than the legalistic
portrayal of Judaism that the New Perspective sought to replace.

Finally, B. Blumenfeld's monograph explores the political dimensions of
Paul's thought, tracing the genesis of such ideas back to Classical Greek and

---

[25] Tet-Lim N. Yee, *Jews, Gentiles, and Ethnic Reconciliation: Paul's Jewish Identity and Ephe-
sians* (SNTSMS 130; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 1–3, 30–33.
[26] Yee, *Ethnic Reconciliation*, 187–89.
[27] Yee, *Ethnic Reconciliation*, 196–98.

Hellenistic political philosophers.[28] Blumenfeld brings to light a tremendous wealth of potential conceptual parallels, which, he argues, illuminate the political framework of Paul's own writings. His study is useful for its thorough analysis of the Neopythagorean conceptualization of the ideal king in particular. Another strength of this volume is that it brings out the extent to which Paul expressed himself in terminology derived from political discourse. Of particular significance for the present study is Blumenfeld's argument (persuasive in our view) that Paul would likely have been familiar with Neopythagorean political thought, based on an abundance of conceptual parallels. Blumenfeld argues, for example, that in Paul's undisputed letters Christ functions as a "living law" (νόμος ἔμψυχος) as does the ideal king of the Neopythagoreans and other Greco-Roman authors.[29] This concept, it will be argued, is an important one for understanding the characterization of the Christ as ideal king in Ephesians.

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

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

---

[28] Bruno Blumenfeld, *The Political Paul: Justice, Democracy and Kingship in a Hellenistic Framework* (JSNTSup 210; London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001). The study does not treat Ephesians *per se*, but rather focuses on a reading of Romans.

[29] Blumenfeld, *Political Paul*, 331.

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

1.3. Method

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

With regard to the first question, we recall that little can be known about the author or recipients of Ephesians from the letter itself. Here, a brief digression on the question of the letter's authorship and intended audience is in order. This study will adopt the perspective that Ephesians was written by a later disciple of Paul towards the end of the first-century C.E. Although, in this writer's judgment, the preponderance of evidence lies in favor of this theory, it must be acknowledged that evidence for the claim of genuine Pauline authorship is by no means lacking. Indeed, adjudicating this dispute is fraught with difficulty, since assessing the evidence (and even determining what should count as evidence) is complex.[31] Determining the identity of the letter's intended recipients is equally difficult and cannot be achieved with any degree of certainty. This is because of the well-known textual issue concerning the phrase ἐν Ἐφέσῳ (1:1). The earliest form of the letter most likely did not contain this geographical descriptor of its intended recipients. In what follows, it will therefore be assumed that the letter was addressed to Christians whose provenance is no longer known. The best historical evidence, however, points to an intended audience of mostly gentile Christians in the Roman province of Asia Minor.[32]

---

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

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

There are at least two overlapping ways the writer of Ephesians may have thought of his audience. The first would have been the actual flesh-and-blood recipients of the letter. Such people would presumably have had some kind of a relationship with the author. Quite possibly, he had written to them in the past and would have expected his audience to be familiar with previous letters. This audience may even have been familiar with letters the author had written to other recipients. Knowledge of this specific audience and its relationship to the author would of course provide invaluable insight into our understanding of the letter as a chapter in the ongoing relationship between this author and his audience. Secondly, the author may have conceived of his audience in more general terms, as inhabitants of the same cultural milieu occupied by the author himself, that of the first-century C.E. eastern Mediterranean basin. One may think of this hypothetical audience as consisting of contextualized implied readers whose literary competence is not text-specific, but made up of certain socially determined skills of interpretation, and who possess the basic cultural and historical assumptions necessary to understand the author's communication. This is what P. Rabinowitz terms the "authorial audience."[33] This concept of the authorial audience implies that the writer of the letter and its recipients are *both* part of this audience. When the author of Ephesians imagined the cultural repertoire of his audience, he naturally would have thought of the linguistic, historical, social, or religious knowledge that comprised his own cultural repertoire. When the author thought of the maximally-informed first-century audience who would hear his letter, he inevitably thought of himself. To focus on the reception of Ephesians by its authorial audience is therefore to ask how the author would most likely have intended his letter to be heard by a general audience that shared the same cultural repertoire as the author.

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

---

[33] Peter J. Rabinowitz, "Truth in Fiction: A Reexamination of Audiences," *Critical Inquiry* 4 (1977): 121–41; "Whirl Without End: Audience-Oriented Criticism," in *Contemporary Literary Theory* (ed. G. Douglas Atkins and Laura Morrow; Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1989), 81–100.

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

determine whether the characterization of Christ in Ephesians resonates with the authorial audience's cultural expectations associated with an ideal king, and how such a characterization functions rhetorically to ensure that the message of the letter is understood.

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

One may object that focusing on the authorial audience's cultural repertoire will lead to an artificial construct of ideal kingship. How do we know that a first-century audience would have construed the portrayal of the ideal king in precisely the way we suggest? One could, by analogy, interview ten people today and arrive at ten visions of an ideal president. Is not the attempt to reconstruct a commonly held concept of the ideal king in antiquity similarly fraught with subjectivity? The charge of a certain degree of artificiality in our reconstruction of the ideal king cannot be answered in a way that does not beg the question. By definition, any theoretical construct is artificial. The admittedly subjective and artificial construct of the ideal king argued for in this study has, however, a firm textual basis, namely the letter to the Ephesians. Although we cannot be at all certain how widespread this view of the ideal king would have been, we may argue that it was held, at a minimum, by the author of Ephesians. He at least, we contend, believed that his characterization of the Christ as such an ideal king would have resonated with his audi-

---

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

ence. The burden of the following two chapters is to show that such reso-
nance indeed was likely – by considering a wide swath of opinion, represent-
ing a diversity of geographical, philosophical, and theological perspectives,
and by determining the common emphases in the conceptualization of the
ideal king that exist between cultures and across time.

Focusing on the audience affords us the advantage, moreover, of widening
the focus of our lens of inquiry while at the same time lowering the demands
for the burden of proof. We will not be arguing, as noted above, that the au-
thor knew of, and modified, particular traditions. To do so would bring the
focus narrowly on the author and require a tremendous amount of evidence.
Rather, we will argue that the author could depend on his audience to be fa-
miliar with the broadly distributed social stock of knowledge regarding the
expectations of an ideal king.[38] Given that both author and audience lived
under autocratic rule, as had previous generations, possession of this com-
mon stock of social knowledge would not only have been possible, but prob-
able. Further, to focus on how the authorial audience would likely have heard
this letter is not to ignore the author's intent in writing the letter. It is simply
to acknowledge that we do not have access to the intent of the actual author.
The closest one can get to discerning authorial intent is to posit a reading of
the text that adequately analyzes individual passages, synthesizes them into a
coherent whole, and does so in a manner that a first-century audience would
have found comprehensible and persuasive. Such a reading is the goal of this
study. In brief, then, the exegetical advantage of this study's audience-orient-
ed approach is that it affords us a lens of inquiry wide enough to understand
the letter's argument and rhetorical strategy in a first-century Mediterranean
milieu.

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

---

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

[39] Norman R. Petersen, *Rediscovering Paul: Philemon and the Sociology of Paul's Narrative
World* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985), 1–88. Cf. the assessment of alternative approaches in
Bruce W. Longenecker, ed., *Narrative Dynamics in Paul: A Critical Assessment* (Louisville,
Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 2002).

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

What, then, is the story of Ephesians, who is telling it, and to whom is it being told? As noted briefly above, this study adopts the perspective that Ephesians was written by a later disciple of Paul to a community or communities of mostly gentile Christians located in Asia Minor. Of what significance for the story of Ephesians is the fact that the letter purports to be from Paul? Petersen points out that while narrative is commonly regarded as story, history is also a story, even a fiction, since it requires the selection, ordering, and plotting of events, which prior to their being (subjectively) recounted according to the point of view of a narrator, did not possess a predetermined unity of cause and effect. Thus Petersen concludes,

The fictions of narrative show that history is story in a double sense; both in the sense that the historical narrative *from a letter* is a story, and in the sense that the historical narrative we construct *from a letter's story* is also a story ... For our purposes, this means that we have to distinguish between Paul's fiction and ours. The story we construct from a letter is Paul's fiction, but the one we construct from that story is ours. But between these two fictions there is yet another one ... the fiction of Paul's wider narrative world.[41]

In contrast to Petersen's work, which is primarily interested in the fiction of Paul's wider narrative world, this study will deal primarily with the fiction of the letter itself. When discussing the narrative world of Ephesians, therefore, we accept the letter's identification of its author as "Paul, an apostle of Christ Jesus." Nevertheless, to avoid potential confusion between the implied author of Ephesians and the historical Paul, the implied author of Ephesians will be referred to throughout this study as simply "the author." When it is necessary to further identify the implied author by his fictional name, it will be enclosed within quotation marks: "Paul." When the name, Paul, occurs without quotation marks, it refers to the historical figure.

As Petersen correctly observes, the story one finds in a letter depends in large measure upon the point of view from which the story is told. It makes a difference, for example, whether one regards the story in Philemon to be that of Paul, Philemon, or Onesimus. Each of these characters may be seen to have his own distinct story line. Whose story line is determinative for the cor-

---

[40] Petersen, *Rediscovering Paul*, 71–78.
[41] Petersen, *Rediscovering Paul*, 14; author's emphasis.

rect understanding of the story? In Philemon, the story is Paul's; he is the story's central actor, without whom the story would disintegrate.[42] In Ephesians, the situation is different: both author and recipients of the letter play subordinate roles in the story's action. The central actors of Ephesians are God and Christ, and the letter may be seen as an attempt to incorporate its audience into the larger story of God's redemptive activity through Christ.

The second problem involves the method by which Christ can be said to be "characterized" in Ephesians. Both ancient and modern discussions of characterization recognize a variety of techniques by which character may be portrayed. In the *progymnasmata*, ancient compositional handbooks, one finds discussion of techniques such as *ethopoeia, ekphrasis*, and *synkrisis*.[43] Modern narrative critics, on the other hand, often talk about textual strategies designed to elicit empathy, sympathy, or antipathy on the part of the reader towards a given character in order to persuade the reader of the implied author's ideological point of view.[44] Ephesians makes use of none of these techniques to portray the character of Christ. What, then, will allow us to talk about Ephesians' textual strategies of characterization? F. W. Burnett points out that in classical Greek literature, characters were most frequently portrayed as types rather than individuals. That is, a character was depicted "either as an ideal representation or as an example of the characteristics of a species of group."[45]

What do we mean when we speak of a character as a type? P. Berger and T. Luckmann contend that the origin of social order lies is in the habitualization and typification of others' behavior.[46] This suggests that characterization may be reflected in the typification of a certain social role, which is exemplified by a constellation of recognized actions. Following Petersen, it will be helpful to speak of the character of Christ in Ephesians not in terms of individual traits, but rather in terms of the social role Christ occupies in the cul-

---

[42] Petersen, *Rediscovering Paul*, 65–66.

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

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

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

[46] Berger and Luckmann, *Social Construction*, 54, 67–73.

ture at large and in the church.[47] The present study will pursue the following two lines of investigation into the character of Christ in Ephesians. The first, following Petersen, will be to analyze and compare the differences in the referential and poetic sequences of actions presented in the letter. The goal of this analysis will be to establish the story of Ephesians, and to discover what is emphasized by the author in communicating it. The second, following scholars who conceive of characterization in Greco-Roman literature as having to do with roles and types, will be to analyze Christ's actions to determine the role he plays within the symbolic universe of Ephesians. The goal here will be to determine whether Ephesians presents a "typificatory scheme" of Christ's actions. That is, do Christ's actions in Ephesians present us with a type of character that would be recognizable within antiquity as a type of ideal king? The analytic strategy outlined here will be discussed in further detail in chapter four.

1.4. Outline of the Argument

The argument that Christ is characterized as a type of ideal king in Ephesians will be set forth in three main sections. The first section (ch. 2) will establish the Greco-Roman concept of the ideal king. The procedure will be to trace the development of the concept from its origins in classical Greece to its appropriation within Roman imperial ideology. The survey and analysis of the literary data will be organized chronologically. In the Classical period, Plato, Aristotle, Xenophon, and Isocrates discuss the merits of kingship as an ideal form of government, as well as the character of the ideal king. In the wake of Alexander the Great, the discourse of kingship in the Greek-speaking world evolved to account for the new form of government under which many Greeks found themselves, that of autocratic monarchy. Although their dating is uncertain, the Neopythagorean treatises on kingship appear to reflect the negotiation with this new type of autocratic rule. Alexander's legacy provides a bridge between the era of Hellenistic kings and that of Roman emperors, as evidenced by the idealization of Alexander by Roman-era writers such as Plutarch. So it was that the memory of Alexander and commonly held perceptions of ideal kingship "did indeed help to transform a Roman *princeps* into a descendant of the Hellenistic kings."[48] The concluding section investi-

---

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

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

gates the Roman ideal of kingship and is organized chronologically according to Roman dynasties. Augustus, Virgil, and Seneca provide the witnesses for the Julio-Claudian dynasty. Musonius Rufus, Martial, and Statius shed light on the Flavian Dynasty. Finally, the literary portrayal of the ideal king under Trajan's reign is evidenced by Dio Chrysostom, Plutarch, Pliny the Younger, and Suetonius.

The second main section (ch. 3) will establish the character and role of the ideal king in Jewish thought. The survey begins with an overview of the institution of kingship in ancient Israel. Long after the historical demise of the monarchy, its idealized memory inspired hope within certain streams of Second Temple Judaism for a restored monarchy. For some, the object of this hope was an eschatological ideal king, or Messiah. As J. A. Fitzmyer's recent work shows, there is no small debate regarding the existence of messianic expectation in the OT.[49] The present study will not attempt to solve this debate for two reasons. First, when attempting to reconstruct the cultural repertoire of a first-century C.E. Jewish auditor, we need not regard historical precision in assessing the genesis of traditions as possessing paramount importance. Since our primary objective is to understand the ideas a first-century Jew may have been familiar with, it makes little difference whether such ideas arose in the eighth or fifth century B.C.E. Second, a distinction must be made between an ideal king and an *eschatological* ideal king. The latter is a particular iteration of the former and refers to God's anointed royal agent who will rule in the eschaton. Such a figure will be referred to in this study by the term Messiah. The more expansive term, ideal king, refers to the idealized conception of a king from the past, present, or future. This study will focus upon the Jewish concept of the ideal king. To establish this concept, we will investigate a wider swath of texts from the diverse literature of Second Temple Judaism than those which clearly speak of a Messiah. Here, the nature of the extant data suggests that geographical, rather than chronological, ordering of texts is more helpful. The survey begins with Palestinian Jewish literature, including the *Psalms of Solomon* and the Qumran scrolls. The *Sybilline Oracles, Letter of Aristeas*, and Philo provide evidence for the portrayal of the ideal king in Egyptian Jewish literature. Josephus provides the perspective from a Roman Jew. Rounding out the picture is a text of disputed provenance, the *Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs*.

---

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

The portrait of the ideal king sketched in these two chapters provides us with an important element of the cultural repertoire of the authorial audience of Ephesians. This data serves as the backdrop for the literary analysis of Ephesians in the final section of the study (ch. 4). The goal of this section is twofold. First, it will be shown that the characterization of Christ in Ephesians does indeed present the reader with a type that would be recognizable to the authorial audience as an ideal king. The beginning section demonstrates that Christ is portrayed as God's vicegerent, or deputy, the one authorized to rule in his stead. Second, it will be argued that when the character of Christ is understood in this fashion, the central theme of the letter, the reunification of the fractured cosmos through Christ, is brought more sharply into focus. In reconciling the cosmos, Christ is thus seen as the ideal king who reconciles humanity to God (2:1–10) and who reconciles humanity with itself by reconciling Jew and gentile in the church (2:11–22). As an ideal king, Christ is further understood to function as the church's benefactor, the one through whom the church receives divine blessing (4:1–16). These divine gifts promote the unity of the church, which reflects the divine harmony understood to exist in the cosmos. Christ's benefaction of the church is thus related to the larger theme of the reconciliation of the cosmos. Through the Christ, moral transformation within the church is enabled (4:17–5:21). This reflects the widespread belief that the ideal king would be able to inculcate virtue in his subjects. The Christ furthermore enables harmony within the household (5:22–6:9), a notion consonant with the expectation that harmony in the household mirrored harmony in the state, which in turn mirrored divine harmony in the cosmos. Thus, harmony within the household and church both accord with the larger theme of God establishing harmony in the cosmos through Christ. Finally, Christ enables the church's victory over the hostile powers arrayed against it (6:10–20). This image is consistent with the portrayal of the ideal king as victorious in antiquity.

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

Chapter 2

The Ideal King in Greco-Roman Thought

This chapter will trace the development of the concept of the ideal king in Greco-Roman thought from Classical Greece through the reign of the Roman emperor Trajan.[1] The concept of the ideal king has a long history in Greek literary, rhetorical, and philosophical traditions.[2] As witnessed by the numerous citations of Homer in kingship treatises, many ancient writers believed that the first serious thought about kingship began with Homer himself.[3] In the fourth century, writers such as Plato, Aristotle, Xenophon, and Isocrates began to consider with full treatments the merits of monarchy as an ideal form of government. These largely theoretical discussions gave way to a more robust attempt to devise a political philosophy that could deal with the vastly changed political landscape following the short-lived empire of Alexander the Great. Treatises on kingship abounded during the Hellenistic era, as both the rulers and the ruled sought to legitimate this new form of autocratic government. The evidence, although fragmentary and diverse, nevertheless displays convergence in a number of central themes.[4] The Roman emperors

---

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

[2] The most complete survey of political philosophy, spanning the development from ancient Mesopotamia and Egypt up until the Byzantine period is Francis Dvornik, *Early Christian and Byzantine Political Philosophy: Origins and Background*, 2 vols., Dumbarton Oaks Studies 9 (Washington, D. C.: Dumbarton Oaks Center for Byzantine Studies, 1966). Note, however, the cautions advised by Oswyn Murray, "Review of Dvornik (1966)," *JTS* 19 (1968): 673–678. See also the useful summaries in Francis Cairns, *Virgil's Augustan Epic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 10–15; Glenn F. Chesnut, "The Ruler and the Logos in Neopythagorean, Middle Platonic, and Late Stoic Political Philosophy," *ANRW* 2.16.2 (1978): 1313–20; W. W. Tarn, *Alexander the Great and the Unity of Mankind* (London: Milford, 1933), 7–14.

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

[4] Cairns, *Augustan Epic*, 15, suggests that "the general picture for the hellenistic period is of a proliferation of books about kingship, written from all viewpoints, including philosophical ones, but on the whole converging in their conclusions." He may be overstating