KEEPING THE FEAST

Society of Biblical Literature

Early Christianity and Its Literature

David G. Horrell, Editor

Warren Carter
Amy-Jill Levine
Judith M. Lieu
Margaret Y. MacDonald
Dale B. Martin

Number 16

KEEPING THE FEAST

METAPHORS OF SACRIFICE IN 1 CORINTHIANS AND PHILIPPIANS

by

Jane Lancaster Patterson

SBL Press
Atlanta

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Patterson, Jane Lancaster.
Keeping the feast : metaphors of sacrifice in 1 Corinthians and Philippians / by Jane Lancaster Patterson.
p. cm. — (Society of Biblical Literature. Early Christianity and its literature ; Number 16)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 978-0-88414-065-8 (pbk. : alk. paper) — ISBN 978-0-88414-066-5 (ebook) — ISBN 978-0-88414-067-2 (hardcover : alk. paper)
1. Sacrifice—Biblical teaching. 2. Metaphor in the Bible. 3. Bible.Corinthians, 1st—Criticism, interpretation, etc. 4. Bible. Philippians—Criticism, interpretation, etc. I. Title.
BS2655.S23.P38 2015
227'.206—dc23 2015022161

Printed on acid-free paper.

Contents

Acknowledgments

It is ironically fitting that the subject of this study is sacrificial metaphors, as the project has asked so much of those around me who have helped to bring it to completion. Principally, my doctoral advisor, Victor Paul Furnish, stayed the course over a long period of time, offering the guidance, clarity, and encouragement I needed at each point along the way. He modeled in all of his dealings with me the ethical patterns that are the subject of this dissertation, a life that is lived for the well-being of others. From him, I learned not only how to speak of these things, but what it means to live them. Words fail me in thanking him sufficiently.

The readers of the original dissertation—Jouette Bassler, Roy Heller, and Melissa Dowling—also remained patient and supportive far beyond what one could expect. They embody for me the Pauline virtue of encouragement. I am deeply grateful to the editorial committee in the Christianity and Its Literature series at the Society of Biblical Literature, especially Gail O'Day. Their responses were invaluable in the process of moving from a dissertation to a book.

John Lewis, my colleague and coworker in the Gospel at St. Benedict's Workshop, carried the major burden of our work for two years, as I focused on the original dissertation. Every page bears the imprint of our common work and the many conversations we have had over the years. Since then, my students and colleagues on the faculty at Seminary of the Southwest have willingly engaged in conversations on sacrifice as I thought this project through out loud. In particular, Cynthia Briggs Kittredge, Dean and President, and Scott Bader-Saye, Academic Dean, have provided a context where scholarship is fostered in a lively community of support and discussion.

In my teaching I have sometimes spoken on the role of benefactors in the New Testament, those people who incarnated their values through their use of money (Luke 8: 1–3; Rom 16:1–2, etc.). Likewise, this project would never have been completed without the generous assistance of

the Episcopal Church Foundation, the Schubert Ogden Fellowship, the Graduate Study Fellowships of Southern Methodist University, and the community of supporters of St. Benedict's Workshop, San Antonio, Texas.

Finally, my family sacrificed much, over many years, to support me in this work, and it is to them that I dedicate it: Emily, Jacob, and Dow.

Austin, Texas
January 2015

Abbreviations

Primary Sources

2 En.	2 Enoch
Ant.	Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities*
Ben.	Seneca, *De beneficiis*
Il.	Homer, *Iliad*
J.W.	Josephus, *Jewish War*
Let. Arist.	Letter of Aristeas
m. Pesah.	Mishnah Pesahim
Od.	Homer, *Odyssey*
Oed. Tyr.	Sophocles, *Oedipus tyrannus*
Phaedr.	Plato, *Phaedrus*
Piet.	Philodemus of Gadara, *De pietate*
Poet.	Aristotle, *Poetics*
Prom.	Aeschylus, *Prometheus vinctus*
Resp.	Plato, *Respublica*
Rhet.	Aristotle, *Rhetoric*
Rom.	Ignatius, *To the Romans*
Spec. Laws	Philo, *On the Special Laws*

Secondary Sources

ABD	*Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
AcBib	Academia Biblica
AnBib	Analecta Biblica
ANRW	*Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung*. Part 2, *Prin-*

	cipat. Edited by Hildegard Temporini and Wolfgang Haase. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1972–.
ANTC	Abingdon New Testament Commentaries
AThR	*Anglican Theological Review*
Bib	*Biblica*
BibInt	Biblical Interpretation Series
BJS	Brown Judaic Studies
BRev	*Bible Review*
BTS	Biblical Tools and Studies
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
CRINT	Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum
EgT	*Eglise et théologie*
EncJud	*Encyclopedia Judaica*. Edited by Fred Skolnik and Michael Berenbaum. 2nd ed. 22 vols. Detroit: Macmillan Reference USA, 2007.
GBS	Guides to Biblical Scholarship
GNS	*Good News Studies*
GOTR	*Greek Orthodox Theological Review*
HNTC	Harper's New Testament Commentaries
HTR	*Harvard Theological Review*
HTS	Harvard Theological Studies
Int	*Interpretation*
JAAR	*Journal of the American Academy of Religion*
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JRitSt	*Journal of Ritual Studies*
JSNT	*Journal for the Study of the New Testament*
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series
JSOT	*Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series
JSS	*Journal of Semitic Studies*
JTS	*Journal of Theological Studies*
LAI	Library of Ancient Israel
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
LEC	Library of Early Christianity
LHBOTS	Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies
LQ	*Lutheran Quarterly*
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament

NovT	*Novum Testamentum*
NTS	*New Testament Studies*
PRSt	*Perspectives in Religious Studies*
RB	*Revue biblique*
RBL	*Review of Biblical Literature*
RBS	Resources for Biblical Study
RelSRev	*Religious Studies Review*
ResQ	*Restoration Quarterly*
RSPT	*Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques*
RSR	*Recherches de science religieuse*
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBS	Stuttgarter Bibelstudien
SJLA	Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
TDNT	*Theological Dictionary of the New Testament.* Edited by Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–1976.
Them	*Themelios*
TS	*Theological Studies*
TynBul	*Tyndale Bulletin*
USQR	*Union Seminary Quarterly Review*
VT	*Vetus Testamentum*
VTSup	Supplements to Vetus Testamentum
WBC	World Biblical Commentary
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
WW	*Word and World*
ZAW	*Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*
ZTK	*Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*

1
Introduction

Metaphors and sacrifices have in common that they both turn one thing into something else. But what does it mean when all this alchemical power is combined in *metaphors* of *sacrifice*? Paul's metaphors have the power to turn bodies into temples, communities into fields. Sacrifices turn farm animals into smoke that reaches God in heaven, a pleasing odor for the divine. Metaphors drawn from the sacrificial system turn crucifixion into glory, shame into honor, death into life. This study of sacrificial metaphors in Philippians and 1 Corinthians is a revised version of my dissertation, presented at Southern Methodist University in 2009. But my engagement with the subject matter began as a dutiful question to William J. A. Power, Professor of Old Testament at Southern Methodist University, during my years of coursework in the doctoral program there. "What do you wish students of the New Testament knew more about, in the area of Hebrew Bible?" I asked, naively. His answer came quickly: "Sacrifice. They know *nothing* about sacrifice." In the next breath, I regretted asking the question. I was reluctant to spend what appeared to me to be a very long semester studying sacrifice. That imagined long semester has turned into more than a decade of study, but a decade that was more rewarding intellectually than I had even hoped for. In addition, many other scholars also joined the conversation about both metaphors and biblical sacrifice during that period of time, and kept me returning again and again to examine both the practice and its rhetorical use in the New Testament.

There are gulfs of difference that must somehow be crossed, if one is to attempt even to approach an understanding of sacrifice in the ancient world. A practice that now needs a heavy freight of explanation was so inevitably a part of the culture of ancient Israel that it needed no explanation or justification or rationale whatsoever when it is introduced in Gen 4:3–7: "In the course of time, Cain brought to the Lord an offering"

Likewise, Leviticus, the biblical "Priests' Manual," begins the directions on the offering of sacrifice without any justification for the practice: "When any of you bring an offering" (1:2). This very inevitability of the practice in ancient times is a stumbling block for modern readers of the New Testament, who tend to approach metaphors of sacrifice as something rare and exotic, heavy with theological significance, and not the simple warp and woof of everyday religious experience that they were for their original audience. The comparison of the crucifixion of Jesus of Nazareth to a sacrifice has become reified as church doctrine, rather than an active vehicle of explanation to people who have a common experience of sacrifice.

From early on, I began to see that the whole mood of sacrifice as it was practiced was potentially quite different than I had imagined it. From the outside, sacrifice appears to be about death, about the ritual killing of a portion of those animals whose lives are most closely bound up with the well being of the human community. But in one of the few interpretative passages of Leviticus, the blood of the animal, poured out or dashed upon the altar, is described as the animal's *life* (*nephesh*) made manifest, not its death (Lev 17:11, 14; see also Gen 9:4, Deut 12:23).[1] Within the rhetoric of Yom Kippur, at least, the Hebrew sacrifices affirm the power of the blood of the offered animals to set humans in right relationship with God and their neighbor to banish whatever would threaten fullness of life. Another unexpected dimension of the practice of sacrifice is its centrality to celebrations in the ancient world. In both the Jewish and Greco-Roman cultures, sacrifices were often intrinsic to celebration, as the sacrificial rituals consecrated the meat for a feast. As someone said to me early on, "Jane, think of a barbecue, not a church service."

Perhaps most important, the system of Hebrew sacrifices was as varied as any grammar of relationship. Sacrifices were offered to God for a variety of occasions, some prescribed by the religious calendar, but others offered spontaneously in thanksgiving or as a vow or in expiation. Lack of acquaintance with the practice has caused many readers of the New Testament to collapse the entire sacrificial system into atonement, as though Yom Kippur were the only day on the calendar and sin the only reason to offer sacrifice.

None of what I have discovered about sacrifice in the Hebrew tradition is terribly new, but it has surprised me to find how little this knowledge

1. See the discussion of the blood as life in William K. Gilders, "The Identification of Blood with 'Life,'" in his *Blood Ritual in the Hebrew Bible: Meaning and Power* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004), 12–32.

has been applied in the study of New Testament sacrificial metaphors. For example, even a very careful and influential Christian scholar may tend to read the sacrifices of Leviticus through the lens of Romans, rather than the reverse.[2] Further it is common among scholars to muddle the categories of martyrdom and sacrifice, even though one of the terms (sacrifice) is a metaphor and the other (martyrdom) is simply an interpretation of a literal death.[3] Moreover, virtually no attention has been paid to the relationship between the rhetorical purposes of individual Pauline letters and the types of sacrifice that predominate in a given letter. For example, what role do metaphors of sacrifice play in the encouragement Paul offers to the Philippians? How do the metaphors of Passover and covenant in 1 Corinthians fit into Paul's strategy of counteracting the community's factionalism? Further, why are the metaphors of atonement so pointedly drawn in Rom 3:23–26 that they have become lodged in the Christian imagination as the fundamental understanding of the meaning of Jesus' crucifixion? This final question is not an explicit topic of this book, but it is my hope that this project encourages some readers to look more critically at the sacrificial metaphors in Romans.

The alchemy that sacrificial metaphors appear to effect for the earliest Christians is one primarily of a radical shift in agency. The execution of Jesus of Nazareth at the hands of Roman soldiers becomes, through the use of a sacrificial metaphor, an act of God intended to bring human beings into right relationship with God and one another (Phil 2:5–11; Rom 3:23–26). Agency is shifted from the Romans to God, and the outcome is shifted from destruction to vindication and new creation.

Sacrifice: From Practice to Metaphor

Of course, one of the principal differences between the discussion of sacrifice in the Hebrew Scriptures and that of the New Testament is that, in the latter, discussion of sacrifice has slipped almost entirely into the realm

2. In this case James G. Dunn, "Paul's Understanding of the Death of Jesus," in *Sacrifice and Redemption: Durham Essays in Theology*, ed. S.W. Sykes (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), and Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 212–27.

3. For a recent book-length example, see Jarvis J. Williams, *Maccabean Martyr Traditions in Paul's Theology of Atonement: Did Martyr Theology Shape Paul's Conception of Jesus's Death?* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2010).

of metaphor, leaving unresolved the question of the relationship between early followers of Jesus and the Jewish cult before the razing of the Temple at Jerusalem in 70 CE.[4] This is not to say that sacrifice was always spoken of in strictly literal terms in the Hebrew Scriptures. The prophetic discussion of behavior incongruent with sacrifice (e.g., Mic 6:6–8; Ps 50) became the foundation for metaphorical reinterpretation of sacrifice in the Hellenistic period by various Jewish writers who did not see themselves as mitigating the importance of the cult. In parallel fashion, the metaphorizing of sacrifice by early followers of Jesus need not mean that they no longer perceived the Jewish cult as valid. Rather, the use of metaphors of sacrifice may have been the way for Jews in the Diaspora to maintain a sense of daily contact with the Temple cult far away in Jerusalem.[5] The writings of Philo, as well as Jewish apocryphal and pseudepigraphal texts,[6] equate obedience to Torah with the offerings in the Temple:

> The one who keeps the law makes many offerings; one who heeds the commandments makes an offering of well-being. The one who returns a kindness offers choice flour, and one who gives alms sacrifices a thank offering. (Sir 35:1–4)[7]

The sense of such interpretations is not to denigrate the offerings in the Temple, but to raise up the effectiveness of obedience to Torah. For those who are able to participate in the Temple cult, their offerings in God's presence call them to a life of daily holiness, to live by an ethic congruent with the cult;[8] for Jews in the diaspora, such interpretations provide a way to

4. In order to keep the referent clear, I am capitalizing "Temple" when referring to the Jewish Temple in Jerusalem. When I refer to temples more generally, I use the lowercase, "temple." This is a purely arbitrary convention, but it is helpful for clarity in this particular project.

5. See the discussion of the relationship between the synagogue and the Temple in Donald Binder, *Into the Temple Courts: The Place of the Synagogues in the Second Temple Period*, eds. Michael V. Fox and Mark Allan Powell, SBLDS 169, (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1999).

6. Those quoted here, Sirach, the Letter of Aristeas, and the Prayer of Azariah, are all most likely from the second century BCE.

7. See also Sir 34:21–24; Tob 4:10.

8. In this way, these texts reiterate the force of much of the prophetic literature on sacrifice (see more discussion on this subject in the critique of Finlan's schema of spiritualization of sacrifice).

live faithfully, to make offerings of daily life, as it were, far from Jerusalem. This excerpt from the Letter of Aristeas makes a similar point:

> [The king] praised him generously, and asked the tenth guest, "What is the highest form of glory?" The reply was, "Honoring God. This is not done with gifts or sacrifices, but with purity of heart and of devout disposition, as everything is ordained by God and ordered according to his will." (Let. Arist. 234 [Shutt])[9]

The Prayer of Azariah, though most likely written in the second century BCE, is imaginatively set during the period of the Babylonian exile. Lacking a way to offer sacrifice, an attitude of the heart—contrition—becomes the substitute for the cult:

> In our day we have no ruler, or prophet, or leader, no burnt offering, or sacrifice, or oblation, or incense, no place to make an offering before you and to find mercy. Yet with a contrite heart and a humble spirit may we be accepted, as though it were with burnt offerings of rams and bulls, or with tens of thousands of fat lambs; such may our sacrifice be in your sight today, and may we unreservedly follow you, for no shame will come to those who trust in you. (Dan 3:38–40 LXX)

The passages above certainly resonate in Rom 12:1: "I encourage you, brothers [and sisters], by the mercies of God, to offer your bodies as a sacrifice, living, holy and acceptable to God, which is your rational [*logikēn*] worship." All of these passages emphasize the essential congruence between the practice of sacrifice and devotion expressed in moral attitudes and actions.

Two Sets of Tools: Social Science and Literary Criticism

Bruce Malina has written that "biblical interpretation, as the investigation of linguistic communications from the past, requires at least two sets

9. See also 2 En. 45, in the J recension, in which the activities of the cult are seen as merely a test for purity of heart: "Does the Lord God demand bread or lamps or sheep or oxen or any kind of sacrifices at all? That is nothing, but he demands pure hearts, and by means of all those things he tests people's hearts" (Andersen). Also Judith: "For every sacrifice as a fragrant offering is a small thing, and the fat of all whole burnt offerings to you is a very little thing; but whoever fears the Lord is great forever" (Jdt 16:16); and Josephus's paraphrase of 1 Sam 15:22 in *Ant.* 6.147–150.

of tools: one set of a linguistic sort that can deal with texts as texts, and not as words or sentences or supersentences, and another set of an historical sort that can deal with the past in some cross-cultural way."[10] In her article on the intersection of social scientific study and the study of the New Testament,[11] Susan Garrett remarked that "there are a variety of methodological problems calling for both sustained theoretical reflection and test-case analyses: for example, the relationship between social reality and various metaphors used by early Christians (e.g., familial or household language used to describe the church, or slave-terminology used to describe discipleship)."[12] Sacrifice is a part of the social reality of first-century Christians that has come into their ethical and theological reflection principally by means of metaphor.

This study combines historical and sociological attention to ancient practices of sacrifice with a consideration of how metaphors function cognitively and rhetorically, in order to clarify the use of sacrificial metaphors in two of Paul's letters. Both of these areas of inquiry are needed, in order to grasp the rhetorical power of metaphors drawn from contemporary cultic practices. Hence, chapter 2 offers an overview of metaphor theory; chapter 3 discusses ancient sacrificial practices and reflection, in both Greco-Roman and Jewish contexts, and chapter 4 reviews the history of scholarly interpretations of the meaning of sacrifice. The present study is directed toward fruitful exegetical outcomes, toward increasing comprehension of the counsels of 1 Corinthians and Philippians, by the use of both literary and social scientific methods.

Three fairly recent studies of cultic metaphors in the Pauline literature bear mentioning. The earliest is Michael Newton's *The Concept of Purity at Qumran and in the Letters of Paul* (1985). In Newton's view, Paul conceives of his Christian churches in a way analogous to that of the Qumran community, as a substitute for the Jerusalem Temple. He uses E. P. Sanders's structure of entrance into and maintenance of membership in a religious community to examine the function of the language of purity at Qumran and in Paul's letters. In Newton's rendering, Paul's

10. Bruce J. Malina, "The Social Sciences and Biblical Interpretation," *Int* 36 (1982): 229.

11. Susan Garrett, "Sociology of Early Christianity," *ABD* 1:89–99.

12. Here Garrett references Dale Martin, *Slavery as Salvation: The Metaphor of Slavery in Pauline Christianity* (Yale University, 1990); Garrett, "Sociology of Early Christianity," 98.

cultic language is more real than metaphorical. For Paul, the Christian community *is* the (new) Temple, and his counsels follow from that foundational supersessionist assumption. If, however, one does not assume from the outset that churches have replaced the Temple as the locus of faithful devotion to God, then Paul's language of purity may be analyzed as metaphorical constructions. To do so enables a more subtle understanding of the creative and persuasive power of this body of language in his letters.

Two more recent studies of cult and metaphors are Stephen Finlan's *The Background and Content of Cultic Atonement Metaphors* (2004) and Albert Hogeterp's *Paul and God's Temple* (2006). These two works are witnesses to an upsurge in interest by biblical scholars in the Jewish cult over the last ten years, as is signaled by the institution of the "Sacrifice, Cult, and Atonement" consultation of the Society of Biblical Literature, inaugurated at the 2007 Annual Meeting. Recent scholarly interest in the topic of sacrifice generally is also attested by the publication of *Ancient Mediterranean Sacrifice* (edited by Jennifer Knust and Zsuzsanna Varhelyi, 2011) and *Ritual and Metaphor* (edited by Christian Eberhart, 2011). Finlan's and Hogeterp's studies concern themselves with Paul's cultic language and thus overlap somewhat with the subject matter of this work but are not identical with it, and neither occupies itself with attention to the rhetorical function of metaphor as such.

Finlan's work concerns itself with the study of metaphors of atonement in Romans. The most important aspect of his work that is also heeded in this study is his description of Paul's metaphors as sometimes mixed but not confused. Finlan is especially concerned that modern readers be clear about exactly which sacrifice or other cultic ritual is the referent of a given metaphor. For example, modern readers have become habituated to confusing the sacrifice of atonement on Yom Kippur with the scapegoat ritual that occurs on the same day. Though the two actions are connected, they have very distinct meanings and roles in the process of atonement. Their confusion leads to a failure to understand clearly what Paul is saying about the death of Christ in such passages as 2 Cor 5:21, Gal 3:13, and Rom 8:3 and dulls the reader's sense for the creativity of Rom 3:21–26. Clarity about the sacrificial system is important in the present work also, because it is equally important here not to confuse what Paul calls the Passover sacrifice (1 Cor 5:7) with a sacrifice of atonement, or any other element of the sacrificial system. To do so is to misunderstand the specific rhetorical strategy behind metaphors of the Passover.

Albert Hogeterp's study of the metaphors of Temple and cult in 1 and 2 Corinthians amplifies some of what will be attended to in the present work, as we are focusing on at least one letter in common. Hogeterp discusses primarily the role of metaphors of the Temple in Paul's rhetorical strategy to counter factionalism at Corinth with images of a holy building. As will be shown, the metaphor of the Passover contributes its own overtones to this rhetoric of building up community.

Hogeterp studies the metaphors of the Temple primarily in their sequence in the letters, without examining how they relate to the structure of the letters as a whole. By contrast, I have chosen to examine the metaphors of sacrifice in 1 Corinthians and Philippians in part because of a formal quality that they share, the placement of a very poignant narrative from the life of Christ, described in sacrificial terms or patterns, roughly at their centers (Phil 2 and 1 Cor 11). It was the way in which that placement recalled for me the centrality of sacrifice in Jewish practice that made me want to attend to how these narratives function in the arrangement of the two letters. Together with other sacrificial metaphors, the Christ Hymn of Phil 2:5–11 and the narrative of 1 Cor 11:23–26 establish a pattern for Christian life that is intuitively grasped through the structure of each letter.

Finlan and Hogeterp disagree on the question of whether Paul's use of metaphors of sacrifice is indicative of a conviction that the Jewish sacrificial system has been superseded by belief in Jesus Christ. It will be seen that I have come to agree with Hogeterp, that Paul's metaphors of sacrifice (or Temple) do not indicate such a replacement of the cult. This issue may indicate the importance of maintaining clarity with regard to the rhetorical purpose of each instance of cultic metaphor, rather than trying to develop a supposed Pauline "theology of sacrifice." Once one has decided that Paul has such a thing as a theology of sacrifice as a whole, and that such a theology of sacrifice would be a specific element in Christian belief, one has given primacy to a working metaphor that may not be supported by the texts, when taken individually. In what follows, sacrifice is examined as a *tool* of Paul's thought rather than an *object* of his thought.

Like the subject of sacrifice, metaphor has recently increased as a focus of study for biblical scholars. Neither Hogeterp nor Finlan gives more than scant attention to the issue of how metaphors function, assuming a fairly simple Aristotelian understanding of metaphors as a figure of speech. Likewise, in a study of Paul's metaphors more generally, David Williams depends upon Aristotle's brief definition ("the application of an alien name by transfer"), which he references only in a footnote in *Paul's Metaphors:*

Their Content and Character (1999).[13] Williams's project is based upon the assumption that what is needed in the interpretation of an ancient metaphor is more information about its reference. For example, to understand Paul's counsel, "Do you not know that your bodies are a temple of the Holy Spirit?" (1 Cor 6:19) what is most needed is more information on the Jerusalem Temple. Williams is not incorrect about the need for a more accurate historical imagination, but without attention to how metaphors function, one cannot really grasp the point of the comparison. By contrast, this study presents some historical foundations for understanding references to sacrifice in their ancient context, but also explores the complex rhetorical function and creativity of sacrificial metaphors.

As in the case of the studies mentioned, Dale Martin's important study of the metaphor of slavery in 1 Cor 9:16–18 is more concerned with elucidating the social context of slavery and the rhetorical move to speak of slavery to Christ as soteriological than with the linguistic function of metaphors per se.[14] On the other hand, Bonnie Howe's work on 1 Peter, *Because You Bear This Name: Conceptual Metaphor and the Moral Meaning of 1 Peter* (2006), offers an extensive overview of theories of metaphor, from Aristotle to cognitive linguistic theory, to aid in the understanding of the moral teaching of 1 Peter, with a view toward its applicability today. Thus, there remains a need for giving the same kind of sustained attention to Paul's use of metaphors of different types, and particularly to the cultic metaphors that have had a profound effect upon Christian theology and practice, while being so little understood in their literal reference.

Chapter 2 of this study highlights the literary methods that are employed to study Paul's use of sacrificial metaphors. I stand among others who find it very fruitful to use cognitive theories of metaphor in the study of metaphors in the New Testament.[15] Categories developed in the work of Lakoff and Johnson serve here in the process of analyzing how metaphors "work" in human thought, and how cultic metaphors in particular function rhetorically in two of Paul's letters.[16] Such metaphors help to make a

13. David J. Williams, *Paul's Metaphors: Their Content and Character* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1999), 4.

14. Martin, *Slavery as Salvation.*

15. In addition to Bonnie Howe, see Reidar Aasgaard, "Family and Siblingship as Metaphors: A Metaphor-Theoretical Approach," in his *'My Beloved Brothers and Sisters!' Christian Siblingship in Paul* (London: T&T Clark, 2004).

16. George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By* (Chicago: University

leap of thought from the known to the unknown, and their "entailments" (the various related moods, images, and meanings that cling to them) color the literary work in which they stand. Metaphors of sacrifice in the Pauline corpus are evidence of a relatively early phase of Christian thinking about how to make some meaning out of the death of Christ and about what constitutes a faithful response by the believer. Thus, part of what may be gained from this work is a lively appropriation of metaphors of sacrifice from a time before they became so accepted that they have become moribund as true metaphors and become deceptively straightforward-seeming Christian doctrine. The intention here is to observe metaphors "at work," so to speak, rather than metaphors that have become part of an accepted system of thought.

Tools of rhetorical criticism then extend the study of discrete metaphors to elucidate how the constellation of metaphors of sacrifice used by Paul in a given letter contribute to his persuasive strategy for addressing the distinct issues of that congregation. I examine in particular how cultic metaphors figure in the structure of 1 Corinthians and Philippians as a whole, and how the entailments of metaphors of Passover (1 Corinthians) and thank offerings (Philippians) resonate throughout those letters.

Philippians and 1 Corinthians as Test Cases

Chapters 5 and 6 are exegetical studies of the use of sacrificial metaphors in Philippians and 1 Corinthians as an element in Paul's overall persuasive strategy in each of those letters. In each case, it appears that a particular sacrifice (in Philippians, the *shelamim* (sacrifices of thanksgiving); in 1 Corinthians, the Passover) has been developed in such a way that members of the community would be able, in the future, to return to their understanding of the sacrifice and its entailments for further moral guidance.

Attention to the metaphors of sacrifice makes sense of elements of these letters that have otherwise appeared baffling, such as the combination of suffering and joy in Philippians, or Paul's warning that failure to "discern the body" in the Lord's Supper (1 Cor 11:29) is an invitation to chaos and destruction upon the community. But more than that, attention to the entailments of the sacrificial metaphors connects them to most of

of Chicago Press, 1980). Lakoff and Johnson subscribe to what is known as the cognitive linguistic understanding of metaphor.

the principal counsels of the letters. These metaphors are used to make an imaginative point not in one passage only, but to link arguments in different sections of the letters.

Having examined Philippians and 1 Corinthians, then, in the final chapter one is in a position to examine the sacrificial metaphors in Romans in at least a cursory way. It will be seen that, though Romans contains some very vivid instances of sacrificial metaphors (especially 3:21–26 and 12:1–2), there is not the same sustained use of a particular sacrificial complex as an imaginative guide for the community's ongoing ethical reflection. The final chapter continues the use of cognitive metaphor theory, together with attention to the actual sacrificial practices that constitute the metaphorical references, to link the cultic metaphors to Paul's persuasive program in Romans.

Listening for these metaphors and their entailments has changed my own approach to Paul's letters. While the letters' interpretation requires all the expected literary tools for dealing with a text, I have come to experience them less as texts, and more as music; as a kind of complicated fugue, a performance to process aurally over the time it takes to hear it. Certain metaphors resound long after the passage in which they occur, and their entailments weave in and out of the surrounding arguments. Attention to sacrificial metaphors as an element in the overall thematic arrangement of a letter can serve to elucidate how the letters function persuasively by lodging in the imagination, long after the last note is heard.