Eve-Marie Becker / Jan Dietrich / Bo Kristian Holm (eds.)

»What is Human?«

Theological Encounters with Anthropology

V&R

V&R Academic

Eve-Marie Becker/Jan Dietrich/Bo Kristian Holm (eds.)

"What is Human?"

Theological Encounters with Anthropology

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht

Contents

1. Biblical Anthropology: Historical and Theoretical Quests

2. Anthropology in Christian History and Culture: Systematic and Ethical Perspectives

3. Current Contextual Anthropologies: Perspectives from Church and Society

Preface

The present volume is the result of an interdisciplinary project within the Department of Theology at Aarhus University. The project was related to the research programme: "Christianity and Theology in Culture and Society: Formation – Reformation – Transformation", running from 2012–2016 at the Institute of Culture and Society, Faculty of Arts, Aarhus University. The idea was to bring together scholars from all disciplines of Theology at Aarhus University in order to stimulate and coordinate disciplinary and interdisciplinary research cooperation. One substantial fruit of this endeavor can be found in the form of the present volume.

The editors of this volume would like to make some initial acknowledgements: First of all, we would like to thank all contributors for engaging in this project, fruitfully contributing to collaborative and interdisciplinary work in the field of Theology.

Second, we are thankful that the publishing house Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht offered us the opportunity to publish this volume: We would like to express our special thanks to Jörg Persch and Moritz Reissing (both of Göttingen) for their professional guidance during the publication process.

Third, since all contributions went through a process of double blind external peer-reviewing, we would like to thank all peer-reviewers for their immediate and instructive cooperation.

Fourth, the editorial process of this volume, especially the process of copy-editing, was financed by Aarhus Universitets Forskningsfond (AUFF), whom we would like to thank for its generous support.

Finally, we express our thanks to stud. theol. Niels Peter Gubi and our colleague René Falkenberg (both of Aarhus), for their careful assistance during the editorial process.

It is our hope and wish that this volume – beyond discussing and tentatively answering the question: What is Human? – stimulates further cooperative re-

search within Theology and thus paves the way for other imitators: the diversity of disciplines and research discourses which theologians stand in does not only necessitate 'basic research' within the various fields of academic Theology, but also enables researchers within Theology to develop a colorful and meaningful picture of how theologians successfully can engage collaboratively and inter-disciplinarily in similar quests and challenges.

The editors
Aarhus, 31 July 2016

Eve-Marie Becker/Jan Dietrich/Bo Kristian Holm

What is Human? Theological Encounters with Anthropology: Introduction to the Volume

I

Anthropology is a long-serving, yet highly contemporary field of study with an abundance of approaches, perspectives, methods, hermeneutics, heuristics, and sub-subjects. Like every discipline of our modern sciences, anthropology emerged from the study of theology and philosophy, becoming both a discipline in its own right and forming sub-subjects within other disciplines (including theology and philosophy).[1] Within the discipline of theology, anthropological perspectives were for a long time impacted by philosophical anthropology as well as by contemporary needs and theological quests. This fact is most clearly mirrored in how the German philosopher Max Scheler (1915–19) described the study of anthropology as *the* crucial field of philosophy:

> In a certain sense all of the central problems of philosophy can be said to lead us back to the questions of what man is and what the metaphysical position and status is which he occupies within the totality of being, world and God.[2]

Scheler's words – written at the height of and revised shortly after the First World War – summarize and intensify a key issue of Western philosophy and theology. For millennia, speculations about the human were a continuous matter of admiration or of fear, as Sophocles (Antig 322) or Paul (Rom 7) show. Ancient historians like Herodotus and Thucydides gave shape to narratives in which they elaborated, more or less implicitly, their view of what is human and thus developed Western anthropology.[3] The issue of anthropology was frequently brought up in explicitly question-like form, expressed in the simple phrase, "What is a human?" – from Plato's τί δέ ποτ᾽ ἐστὶν ἄνθρωπος (Tht 174b) and

---

1 For an overview of different aspects and paradigms of anthropology and its sub-subjetcs cf., e. g., Wulf, Anthropologie; Bohlken/Thies, Handbuch.
2 Scheler, Idea, 184.
3 Cf. Will, Herodot, 184 ff. Not accidentally, Pannenberg, Mensch, 95 ff. reflects about the human also in terms of "Der Mensch als Geschichte".

similar reflections in Psalm 8:5 LXX τί ἐστὶν ἄνθρωπος?,[4] up to Immanuel Kant's ambition of designing human destiny ("Bestimmung des Menschen") as *the* vanishing point of philosophy *in sensu cosmopolitico*. In his letter to the Göttingen theologian Carl Friedrich Stäudlin, written in 1793, Kant says:

> Mein schon seit geraumer Zeit gemachter Plan der mir obliegenden Bearbeitung des Feldes der reinen Philosophie ging auf die Auflösung der drei Fragen: (1) Was kann ich wissen? (Metaphysik) (2) Was soll ich thun? (Moral) (3) Was darf ich hoffen? (Religion): welcher zuletzt die vierte folgen sollte: Was ist der Mensch? (Anthropologie; über die ich schon seit mehr, als zwanzig Jahren jährlich ein Collegium gelesen habe).[5]

Scheler's dictum, which brings us back to more recent times, not only mirrors how philosophy dealt over the course of time with metaphysics, moral, and religion in the light of anthropological quests – it can also be considered as paradigmatic for what philosophy and theology subsequently became and were constantly concerned with in twentieth-century academia and culture. Depending on how we describe and define the "human", we create images of God and conceptualize ethics and projections of communitarian life. As Western philosophy initiated, the modern history of research in and beyond theology is widely determined by anthropological quests.

Old and New Testament approaches to biblical anthropology, for instance, tended to place it in close relationship to German philosophical anthropology,[6] associated especially with the names of Herder and Kant, and later those of Max Scheler, Helmuth Plessner, and Arnold Gehlen.[7] In New Testament studies, Rudolf Bultmann most prominently made philosophical anthropology *the* basic heuristic approach to biblical anthropology. In his "Preliminary Remarks" on Paul, who plays the most central part in the "Theology of the New Testament", Rudolf Bultmann pointed out how anthropology, Christology, and soteriology in Paul's thinking always coincide.[8] Such a claim refers to object-based language ("objektsprachlich"), and is thus theological in nature. This claim of concurrence directly impacted textual interpretation. In his exegesis of Romans 7, Bultmann (1932) consequently asked:

---

4 מה־אנוש Ps 8,5; Job 7,17; cf. מה־אדם Ps 144,3.
5 Kant, AA XI, 429. Quoted according to: Brandt, Bestimmung, 102f.
6 Next to philosophical anthropology, dialectical theology had a major impact on biblical anthropology, cf., e.g., the classic work by Hans Walter Wolff (Wolff, Anthropology). For a critical appraisal, cf. Janowski, Wolff.
7 This is still true for some works from the twenty-first century as well, cf., e.g., Gerhards, Conditio Humana.
8 Cf. Bultmann, Theology, 190f.

Eve-Marie Becker / Jan Dietrich / Bo Kristian Holm (eds.): »What is Human?«

What is Human? Theological Encounters with Anthropology   **13**

wer ist das Ich, das hier redet? Ist es der Mensch unter dem Gesetz, oder ist es der Glaubende?[9]

Even though Bultmann's approach especially to Paul was criticized at an early stage – as indicated first by the famous debate with Ernst Käsemann[10] and more recently in Pauline studies yet again underlined by a historical point of view widely established by the so-called "new perspective" on Paul and its impact on New Testament exegesis[11] – Bultmann's interest in theological anthropology can still be seen as an important attempt to unveil the anthropological relevance of Christian theology. Not accidentally, Bultmann's concept finds its place in the Protestant tradition of reading Paul.[12] However, we cannot simply limit ourselves to Bultmann's model. Further steps in developing the field of anthropology in and beyond New Testament studies need to be taken.[13] And despite the Lutheran bias in Pauline studies in the twentieth century, the Reformation marked a turn in the history of anthropology that must still be taken into consideration, as it still contains elements that cut across dominant and powerful perceptions in contemporary culture.

A major new perspective on the human being was opened in the history of the Western idea of the human being by the Reformation's radicalization of the central Christian ideas of the divinity of the human Jesus of Nazareth and the humanity of Christ.[14] Both with regard to the Roman Church and with regard to the humanist critics, the understanding of the human being was deliberately put at the very center of this perspective, both by the Lutheran reformers and by their opponents (Jacobus Latomus of Leuven on the sinful nature of the human being, and Erasmus of Rotterdam on human free will).[15] The Reformation adds to our

---

9 Bultmann, Römer, 28. On the line of interpretation reaching from Bultmann to the new perspective (Ed P. Sanders), cf. Westerholm, Perspectives, 150 ff.

10 Cf., especially: Käsemann, Anthropologie; on the debate between Bultmann and Käsemann: Lindemann, Anthropologie.

11 In the frame of the new perspective it is, for instance, widely rejected that the discourse on the law (*nomos*) has its conceptual roots in Pauline anthropology. On this, still see the instructive anthology from 1996: Dunn, Paul. Representatives of the so-called "radical new perspective" currently express the shift of anthropological interest by stating: "Paul's primary anthropological categories are Jews and Gentiles": Eisenbaum, Paul, 237. On this quest, see also: Horn, Juden.

12 From this point of view, critical discussions about the "Lutheran Paul" (e.g., Bachmann, Paulusperspektive) might themselves be valued critically.

13 Specifically, on Paul and anthropology, cf. in this volume the contributions by: Eve-Marie Becker and Jacob Mortensen. For a Pauline concept in Manichaean texts cf. in this volume the contribution by René Falkenberg.

14 Cf. Johann Anselm Steiger's article on the role of the communication of attributes in Luther's theology, which shows how late patristic Christology formed the whole of the reformer's theology, including anthropology. Steiger, Communicatio.

15 Cf. Luther, Rationis Latominae confutatio; idem, De servo arbitrio.

discussion perspectives on the human being that still seem relevant in answering the question "What is human?" According to Martin Luther, the human being was an *animal rationale habens cor fingens* (a rational being with an imagining heart).[16] For this reason, the task of theology was to replace the false images with the right ones. Human rationality became an ambiguous phenomenon, praised on the one hand as something almost divine, but on the other condemned as the devil's whore because rationality was always used to establish false pictures and worldviews, especially of relations with God and with fellow human beings. What a human being is differs according to perspective. According to the philosophical definition, the human being is a rational, sentient and corporeal being (*animal rationale, sensitivum, corporeum*).[17] Theologically seen, the human being is, however, that being that is justified by faith (*hominem iustificari fide*).[18] The essence of the human being lies not in the human itself, but in this: that it is justified by faith alone, not through works. This distinction opens up the possibility of a critical perspective upon ideologies that seek the perfection and essence of the human being in human achievements, and reduces human interaction to economic patterns.[19] Reformation anthropology raises, furthermore, the question whether central arguments from the Reformation building upon the tradition of natural law can be reformulated in a post-metaphysical setting as a universal ethical norm.[20]

II

As indicated by the subtitle of the present volume, theological encounters with anthropology always take place in critical contestation with the particular "Menschenbild" ([public] understanding of human nature)[21] expressed by current philosophy and its neighboring academic disciplines, stimulated as they are by trends and developments in contemporary culture and society. Today, Kant's analytical idea of defining human destiny has been transformed into the phenomenological paradigm of the description of the human ("Beschreibung des Menschen"), found most prominently, for instance, in Hans Blumenberg.[22] It

---

16 Martin Luther's Lectures in Genesis: Luther, Enarrationes in Genesin, WA 42, 348.38. Luther's view of the human being converges here to some extent with the use of the concept of "social imaginaries", used e. g. by Charles Taylor. Cf. Taylor, Age, 171–176.

17 First thesis in Luther's Disputatio de homine, 175.4.

18 Luther, Disputatio de homine, 176.34f.

19 Cf. in this volume especially the contributions by: Else Marie Wiberg Pedersen as well as Peter Lodberg.

20 Cf. in this volume the contribution by Svend Andersen.

21 See for this translation: Zichy, Menschenbild, 249.

22 Cf. Blumenberg, Beschreibung.

Eve-Marie Becker / Jan Dietrich / Bo Kristian Holm (eds.): »What is Human?«

What is Human? Theological Encounters with Anthropology   **15**

thus seems that not only the field of anthropology but also its claims are under constant revision.

Next to philosophical anthropology, other forms of anthropological approaches also emerge and impact upon theological anthropology: physical and biological anthropology (with their influence on archaeology, including "biblical" archaeology), as well as body discourses, feminist anthropology, and gender studies (taken up by all theological disciplines),[23] cultural and social anthropology as well as historical psychology (taken up especially in the field of biblical exegesis),[24] the history of mentalities and historical anthropology (taken up especially by exegetes and Church historians),[25] narrative anthropology (taken up not only by exegetes, but also by systematic theologians),[26] cognitive anthropology, and also evolutionary anthropology (taken up by scholars working on the axial age).[27] In the twenty-first century, when "big data" and computer-operated life seem to be replacing human action and face-to-face interaction globally, the quest for "What is human?" has become even more pressing. It is against this background that contemporary theology and contemporary humanities are – possibly more than ever – being forced to reflect on *their* genuine contribution to the discourse on human self-understanding.

As a scholarly discipline, theology sees itself partly in cooperation, partly in competition with the humanities. It is in any case an academic discipline in its own right, capable of formulating its own specific role, while modeling both a general contemporary understanding of studies in anthropology and an interpretive view of the human and of humanity. Academic theology especially takes the intellectual resources given by Christian religion and culture into account when revisiting and discussing contemporary quests and concepts of anthropology.[28] Theology, so to speak, comes with a *master narrative* of its own in its approach to debating and defining the "human" and "humanity". Again, the question raised in Ps 8:5 and related texts (e.g. Sir 18:8) acts as a magnifying glass for why and how biblical anthropology came into being in the first place:

---

23 Cf. in this volume the contributions by: Ulrik Becker Nissen and Benedicte Hammer Præstholm. For a biblical approach cf., e.g., Schroer/Staubli, Body Symbolism.

24 Cf. in this volume especially the contributions by: Jan Dietrich and Bernhard Lang. For cultural and social anthropology within Old and New Testament studies cf. furthermore, e.g., Rogerson, Anthropology, and Malina, New Testament. For historical psychology within biblical studies cf., e.g., Berger, Psychologie; Theißen, Theologie.

25 Cf., e.g., Janowski, Arguing, esp. 4–8, and Schribner, Popular Culture.

26 Cf. in this volume the contribution by David Bugge.

27 Cf. in this volume the contribution by Line Søgaard Christensen. For a general approach including ancient Israel cf. Bellah, Religion.

28 Cf. in this volume especially the contributions by: Bjørn Rabjerg, Troels Nørager, Maria Odgaard Møller, and David Bugge. Cf. already the critique of Pannenberg, Mensch, 95: "Die anthropologischen Wissenschaften mit ihren Bildern vom Menschen erreichen nie den konkreten Menschen".

"Die Frage nach dem Menschen bleibt … wie die Frage nach Gott vom Ansatz her eine offene Frage".[29] In many ways, the question "What is human?" might finally reflect no less than the daily sapiential attempt to find and to express existential self-assurance.

Christian anthropology which grows from biblical varieties of thinking and writing about "Man" (including women) is deeply rooted in the Israelite and early Jewish view of the human, a vision that is placed temporally and historically in a personal relation *coram Deo.*[30] Biblical anthropology is thus formed by a strong emphasis on the individual in interaction with cult and ethos.[31] In earliest Christianity and even earlier,[32] the aspect of *individualization* becomes even more important: it is now the figure of the individual apostle, missionary, author and "theologian" Paul,[33] or a gospel writer like Matthew,[34] who defines in a discursive fight how Christ-believing faith and ethics are to be interpreted and accomplished. The various processes by which Christianity has been gradually formed, reformed, and transformed during its history up to contemporary time, defining its particular societal duties (and especially the *diakonia*) in local as in global perspective,[35] have to a large degree been coined by individual *historical biographie*s and literary *self-configurations.* Already New Testament anthropology relies on the idea that the written text is composed by and addressed to humans.[36] The human nature of Jesus Christ thereby functions programmatically as a critical point in discussion. Christian theology soon goes on to develop anthropology within various *discursive frames*, whether these are Christological, soteriological, ecclesiological, or ethical debates, within which *anthropological language* (e.g. metaphors) is used or (re-)shaped. Within these debates, various arguments are put forward, based on (shared philosophical) ideas of the human, or which directly serve the construction of anthropology in a philosophical sense.

Consequently, a *theological anthropology* might be seen as a final – rather than an ultimate – outcome of how Christian narratives, rhetoric, arguments and

---

29 Frevel, Altes Testament, 7.
30 Cf. in this volume especially the contributions by: Jan Dietrich, Bernhard Lang, and Line Søgaard Christensen.
31 Typically is, e.g., the semantics of φρονεῖν: Becker, Begriff, 113 ff. Cf. more generally on anthropology and ethics: Konradt/Schläpfer, Anthropologie.
32 For possibilities and limits of individualization in ancient Israel and the ancient Near East, cf. Dietrich, Individualität.
33 On Paul and anthropology, cf. in this volume the contributions by: Eve-Marie Becker and Jacob Mortensen. For a Pauline concept in Manichaean texts, cf. in this volume the contribution by René Falkenberg.
34 Cf. in this volume especially the contribution by Ole Davidsen.
35 Cf. in this volume especially the contributions by: Johannes Nissen, Ulla Schmidt/Kirstine Helboe Johansen, and Jakob Egeris Thorsen.
36 Cf. Wischmeyer, Neues Testament, 63 ff.

Eve-Marie Becker / Jan Dietrich / Bo Kristian Holm (eds.): »What is Human?«

What is Human? Theological Encounters with Anthropology   **17**

debates converge in order to establish a "concise teaching or doctrine about the human". In other words, a Christian master narrative of the human.

However, in modern and postmodern times, Christian thinking about the human is sustainably challenged in at least two directions. First, in accordance with modern biology, genetics, and evolution theory, the picture of how the human emerged has generated its own explanatory models, which *can* widely be seen in contradiction to Christian traditions (based on Gen 1–2). Secondly, in postmodern discourse, the body – which might function here as *pars pro toto* for the human – has been understood as an object of socio-economic interest and conflict; as a carrier of meaning it is constantly deciphered and deconstructed by socio-historical and sociological theory (cultural anthropology).[37] The case of anthropology thus mirrors the plurality of what theology is *de facto* dealing with. In a *religious historical* sense, it leads us back to the Near Eastern origins of Christian culture; in a *literary historical* sense, it helps us to explain how narratives are shaped and metaphorical language is transformed and applied from ancient times onwards (literary anthropology); in a *philosophical* and *ethical* sense, the human is understood as an object of teaching and an agent of a mutual liability; and in a *sociological* sense, especially the physical expression of human existence – the body – is regarded as a constitutive factor of societal progress or decline.

To study the plurality of research quests and methods which are related to the investigation and understanding of the human also means, finally, to reveal how theology as an academic field dealing with a critical self-reflection and evaluation of Christian religion and culture came into being long ago, and has developed ever since.

III

The present volume is an interdisciplinary project within the Department of Theology at Aarhus University. It is the fruit of a three-year "research program" in which the discipline of theology was required to define its research profile in proximity to and distinction from other fields in the humanities. This research program was entitled "Christianity and Theology in Culture and Society: Formation – Reformation – Transformation", and it drew together scholars at Aarhus University from all disciplines in theology in a cooperative effort to discuss the current challenges and strengths of the field within its academic and societal surroundings. Once again, the quest for (theological) anthropology has

---

37 Cf. in this volume especially the contributions by: Benedicte Praestholm and Ulrik Becker Nissen.

revealed itself as the most fruitful "forum" or "meeting point" in elaborating the current state of theology in academia. The reader might himself/herself reflect whether he/she will discern a certain profile of an "Aarhus Theology" behind what the various authors in their contributions to the volume argue; indeed, by and beyond referring to K.E. Løgstrup.[38] All of us certainly share the idea that theology plays a constitutive role when studying culture and society in their Danish, European, or global settings. And we certainly agree that current theology includes a range of research quests and traditions, methods, and debates which cover philological and historical as much as philosophical and ethical, sociological, and empirical tools.

Contributions in this volume will thus not only (a) present the variety of studies related to the reading of the human (anthropology), or (b) provide insights into the rationale of Christian theology as such when dealing with anthropology; they will finally (c) also reflect on the specific tradition from which Christian anthropology originated, and the possible role that it alone might play in current academia and society. The contributions collected in this volume seek not only to reflect the state of the art in anthropological research from a theological point of view, but also to provide a theological interpretation of a question that seems more virulent than ever: "What is human?"

Bibliography

Armgard, L.-O., Antropologi: problem i K.E. Lögstrups författerskap, Gleerups 1971.

Bachmann, M. (ed.), Lutherische und neue Paulusperspektive: Beiträge zu einem Schlüsselproblem der gegenwärtigen exegetischen Diskussion (WUNT 182), Mohr Siebeck 2005.

Becker, E.-M., Der Begriff der Demut bei Paulus, Mohr Siebeck 2015.

Bellah, R.N., Religion in Human Evolution: From the Paleolithic to the Axial Age, The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press 2011.

Berger, K., Historische Psychologie des Neuen Testaments (SBS 146/147), Katholisches Bibelwerk 1995.

Blumenberg, H., Beschreibung des Menschen: Aus dem Nachlaß, edited by M. Sommer, Suhrkamp 2006.

Bohlken, E./C. Thies (eds.), Handbuch Anthropologie: Der Mensch zwischen Natur, Kultur und Technik, Metzler 2009.

Brandt, R., Die Bestimmung des Menschen bei Kant, Felix Meiner 2007.

---

38 Cf. in this volume especially the contributions by: Svend Andersen, Maria Odgaard Møller, and Bjørn Rabjerg. One of the first doctoral theses on Løgstrup, signifcantly, is entitled Anthropology: Armgard, Antropologi. On Løgstrup-reception in German theological anthropology, cf., e.g., Pannenberg, Mensch, 58ff.

Eve-Marie Becker / Jan Dietrich / Bo Kristian Holm (eds.): »What is Human?«

What is Human? Theological Encounters with Anthropology   **19**

Bultmann, R., Theology of the New Testament, translated by Kendrick Grobel, Vol. 1, SCM Press 1952.

–, Römer 7 und die Anthropologie des Paulus (1932), in: R. Bultmann, Der Alte und der Neue Mensch in der Theologie des Paulus: Sonderausgabe, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft 1964, 28–40.

Dietrich, J., Individualität im Alten Testament, Alten Ägypten und Alten Orient, in: A. Berlejung et al. (eds.), Menschenbilder und Körperkonzepte im Alten Israel, in Ägypten und im Alten Orient (ORA 9), Mohr Siebeck 2012, 77–96.

Dunn, J.D.G. (ed.), Paul and the Mosaic Law: The Third Durham-Tübingen Research Symposium on Earliest Christianity and Judaism (Durham, September, 1994) (WUNT 89), Mohr Siebeck 1996.

Eisenbaum, P., Paul, Polemics, and the Problem of Essentialism, in: Biblical Interpretation 13 (2005) 224–238.

Frevel, C., Altes Testament, in: C. Frevel/O. Wischmeyer, Menschsein (NEB 11 – Themen), Echter Verlag 2003, 7–60.

Gerhards, M., Conditio Humana: Studien zum Gilgameschepos und zu Texten der biblischen Urgeschichte am Beispiel von Gen 2–3 und 11,1–9 (WMANT 137), Neukirchener Verlag 2013.

Horn, F.W., Juden und Heiden: Aspekte der Verhältnisbestimmung in den paulinischen Briefen. Ein Gespräch mit Krister Stendhal, in: M. Bachmann (ed.), Lutherische und neue Paulusperspektive: Beiträge zu einem Schlüsselproblem der gegenwärtigen exegetischen Diskussion (WUNT 182), Mohr Siebeck 2005, 17–39.

Janowski, B., Arguing with God: A Theological Anthropology of the Psalms, Westminster John Knox Press 2013.

–, Hans Walter Wolff und die alttestamentliche Anthropologie, in: J.C. Gertz (ed.), Neu aufbrechen, den Menschen zu suchen und zu erkennen. Symposium anlässlich des 100. Geburtstages von Hans Walter Wolff (BTS 139), Neukirchener Verlag 2013, 77–112.

Käsemann, E., Zur paulinischen Anthropologie, in: E. Käsemann, Paulinische Perspektiven, 2. bearbeitete und ergänzte Auflage, Mohr Siebeck 1972, 9–60.

Konradt, M./E. Schläpfer (eds.), Anthropologie und Ethik im Frühjudentum und im Neuen Testament (WUNT 322), Mohr Siebeck 2014.

Lindemann, A., Anthropologie und Kosmologie in der Theologie des Paulus. Eine Auseinandersetzung mit Rudolf Bultmann und Ernst Käsemann, in: M. Bauspieß et al. (eds.), Theologie und Wirklichkeit: Diskussionen der Bultmann-Schule, Neukirchener Verlagsgesellschaft 2011, 149–183.

Luther, M., Rationis Latominae confutatio in: M. Luther, D. Martin Luthers Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe, Herman Böhlaus Nachfolger 1883ff, WA 8: 42–128.

–, De servo arbitrio, in: M. Luther, D. Martin Luthers Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe, Herman Böhlaus Nachfolger 1883ff, WA 18: 600–787.

–, Disputatio de homine, in: M. Luther, D. Martin Luthers Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe, Herman Böhlaus Nachfolger 1883ff, WA 39 I: 175–177.

–, Enarratio in Genesin, in: M. Luther, D. Martin Luthers Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe, Herman Böhlaus Nachfolger 1883ff, WA 42–44.

Malina, B.J., The New Testament World: Insights from cultural anthropology, Third edition, Westminster John Knox Press 2001.

Pannenberg, W., Was ist der Mensch? Die Anthropologie der Gegenwart im Lichte der Theologie, 3. Aufl., Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1968.

Rogerson, J.W., Anthropology and the Old Testament, Basil Blackwell 1978.

Scheler, M., On the Idea of Man (1915), translated by C. Nabe, Journal of British Society for Phenomenology 9 (1978) 184–198.

Schribner, R.W., Popular Culture and Popular Movements in Reformation Germany, Bloomsbury Academics 1987.

Schroer, S./T. Staubli, Body Symbolism in the Bible, The Liturgical Press 2001.

Steiger, J.A., Communicatio idiomatum as the Axle and motor of Luther's Christology, Lutheran Quarterly 14 (2000) 125–158.

Taylor, C., A Secular Age, The Belknap Press of the Harvard University Press 2007.

Theißen, G., Psychologische Aspekte paulinischer Theologie (FRLANT 131), Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1994.

Westerholm, S., Perspectives Old and New on Paul: The "Lutheran" Paul and His Critics, Eerdmans 2004.

Will, W., Herodot und Thukydides: Die Geburt der Geschichte, Beck 2015.

Wischmeyer, O., Neues Testament, in: C. Frevel/O. Wischmeyer, Menschsein (NEB 11 – Themen), Echter Verlag 2003, 61–117.

Wolff, H.W., Anthropology of the Old Testament, SCM Press 1974.

Wulf, C., Anthropologie. Geschichte, Kultur, Philosophie, Anaconda 2009.

Zichy, M., Menschenbild: Begriffsgeschichtliche Anmerkungen, Archiv für Begriffsgeschichte 56 (2015) 7–30, 249.

1. Biblical Anthropology: Historical and Theoretical Quests

Jan Dietrich

Human Relationality and Sociality in Ancient Israel: Mapping the Social Anthropology of the Old Testament

1.   Introduction: Man in His Relatedness

Anthropological approaches to the Hebrew Bible can be divided into the social scientific and the theological; the first being an "etic", scientist-oriented approach and the second being an "emic" approach that reconstructs the given culture's own conceptions.[1] In this article,[2] I use both approaches in an overlapping manner, focussing on the different forms of social and bodily constructed relationships that are so important in the Old Testament and which could also be part of a "Theology of the Old Testament".[3] According to Old Testament's scriptures, the capacity to form relationships is not a *differentium specificum* that distinguishes human beings from animals and from God, but a characteristic that connects *homo mundanus*[4] to the world in such a basic way that it can be grasped everywhere in the texts either explicitly or implicitly. Relationality and sociality are not accidental, but essential, features of man: The human being, particularly in the Old Testament, has always been a creature in relations with other creatures and can only be understood based on this relatedness and its special forms. It is the human being's relatedness to God, to the world, to oneself, to fellow human beings, and to animals and plants that is reflected in the stories and metaphors of the Old Testament.[5] The human being of

---

1 Cf. Callender, Approaches. Concerning the difference between symbol-oriented and cultural-anthropological interpretations, cf. Schüle, Anthropologie, 408–413.

2 This contribution builds upon my German article *Sozialanthropologie des Alten Testaments. Grundfragen zur Relationalität und Sozialität des Menschen im alten Israel*, ZAW 127 (2015) 224–243. I wish to thank Dorothea Beck (Hamburg) and Sarah Jennings (Aarhus) for their help with translations and corrections.

3 Rogerson, Theology, for example, integrates aspects of social anthropology and ethics into his "Theology of the Old Testament".

4 Cf. Welsch, Homo.

5 Cf. Schroer/Zimmermann, Mensch/Menschsein, 368. For gender-studies cf. e.g. Fischer, Egalität; Berlejung, Körperkonzepte; Erbele-Küster, Körper; Maier, Körper. For a discussion of homoeroticism cf. Nissinen, Homoeroticism; Ackerman, Heroes.

the Old Testament is not simply a part of a collective personality – as scholars have long postulated – nor an individual in the modern sense of having to hone and demonstrate one's own uniqueness; instead, he is a relational creature that should be understood from the perspective of its relatedness in its various historical and cultural forms. Consequently, the social anthropology of the Old Testament examines the Old Testament human being as a relational creature in its structures of relationships. In this paper, I aim to provide a foundation for this research interest.

A person's involvement in social contexts and roles – i.e. a person's sociality – is a fundamental characteristic of Old Testament anthropology.[6] It is for this reason that the creation texts of the Old Testament already reflect relatedness as a determination of the essence of man.[7] Moreover, these texts reveal that humans are more than relational creatures that engage in relationships with other humans. Old Testament relationality goes deeper: Human existence is essentially characterised and determined by its relationship with both God and the world.[8] In the first creation text (Gen 1:1–2:4a), man is created last and as an exceptional part of the world, but still "only" as a *part* of the world, together with the land animals on the sixth day. Being created in the image of God (Gen 1:26–28) and the position of god-like honour (Ps 8) are relational concepts and part of social anthropology in so far as they tell us something about man in his relationship to God and to the world. Even the first biblical statement on man is a statement on man in his typical relatedness, because it describes what God considers man to be.[9] Additionally, man as an image and statue of God[10] is given mandate to rule over the world. Accordingly, in H.W. Wolff's classical study, the chapter "God's Image – The Steward of the World" appears as the first chapter of part three on "The World of Man: Sociological Anthropology".[11] The extent of man's involvement in the world as *homo mundanus* is shown in Psalm 104: Here, man in the world of creation exists with and next to the animals solely *coram deo*, in and through his relationship with God.

In the second creation text (Gen 2:4b–3:22), both the relationship between man and God and between man and animals precede interpersonal relationships. By naming the animals, man engages in relationships with them and recognises them as their fellow creatures and partners.[12] In real life, most people of ancient

---

6 Cf., e.g., Janowski, Anthropologie, 544; Frevel/Wischmeyer, Menschsein, 49.
7 Cf., e.g., Bauks, Forschungen, 113.
8 Concerning different modes of justification of man before God, cf. Staubli, Konstellationen.
9 Cf. Schellenberg, Mensch, 126–127.
10 For *ṣælæm* and *dᵉmût* cf. the ancient Aramaic self-designation of king Hadad-Yiśi with *ṣlm* and *dmwt'* (cf. Abou-Assaf/Bordreuil/Millard, Tell Fekherye, 23).
11 Wolff, Anthropology, 159–165.
12 Cf. de Pury, Gemeinschaft, 132.

Israel also lived with their livestock under the same roof.[13] The prevailing view is that of a community of fate shared by man and animal as well as a recognition of specific animal rights;[14] as such, man not only hoped for peace with God and fellow human beings, but also with the animals (Isa 11:1–9).[15]

For this reason, the social anthropology of the Old Testament considers man's relatedness as a fundamental and multidimensional relatedness. In contrast to the traditional social anthropology of the modern era, which deals primarily with forms of relationships between people, the social anthropology of the Hebrew Bible texts is not limited to interpersonal matters: Here, interpersonal relationships only represent one of the basic socio-anthropological forms of relatedness.

According to the Old Testament, man's relationality is so fundamental that it is rooted in the so-called body terms themselves. Many of the body terms in the Old Testament do not refer to monadic, self-contained and self-sufficient bodily phenomena of a *corpus incurvatum in se ipso*, but are inherently relational and seek relatedness: In many cases, "body terms" are concepts with relational connotations. I will discuss this in more detail in the following section.

2.   Body Terms are Concepts with Relational Connotations

It has become clear in Old Testament research that the so-called basic anthropological terms are not subject to forms of dichotomy or trichotomy found in ancient Greek philosophy.[16] So how should we characterise such terms? There are many answers to this, but, in this section, I will discuss one essential aspect: many of the body terms in the Old Testament are concepts that carry socio-anthropological connotations, and relationality is also shown in corporeality: Man's relationality is often expressed in his corporeality, and man's corporeality is unthinkable without its inherent relationality.[17] As Francesca Stavrakopoulou and Martti Nissinen remark, "Indeed, the human body was considered much more than a physical organism or biological entity. Depending on its social and theological contexts, it was also simultaneously a social body (that is, a body interpreted, legitimized, and positioned by the community), and a cosmic body (that is, a body interpreted in relation to the cosmic order, deities, and religious institutions)".[18] We misunderstand, e.g., the term *næpæš* if we equate it in a

---

13 Cf. Stager, Archaeology, 12–15.
14 Cf. Riede, Tier.
15 Cf. Janowski, Tiere, 17–21.
16 Cf., e.g., Wagner, Reduktion, 187.
17 Cf. Krieg, Leiblichkeit, 9; Häusl, Leib, 138–142; Gruber/Michel, Körper, 309–310.
18 Stavrakopoulou/Nissinen, Introduction, 454–455. For an explanation of the recent interest in body discourses, see Koch, Reasons. For many aspects of the so-called "synthetic body